U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 87—PART 9

NOVEMBER 26, 1941, TO JANUARY 2, 1942
(PAGES 9143 TO 10152)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON 1941

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
SEP 1 '42

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who didst manifest divine love to bring us to our Father, in Thy name we pray. Grant that we may have a finer conception of the riches of Thy goodness, so that Thy name may become one of power, of hope, and of inspiration. We pray Thee to enrich us with the spirit of fidelity, of helpfulness, and of gentleness, fulfilling our daily conduct with the spirit of our Elder Brother. How blessed is that life which lives by its higher nature; it reveals and interprets the divine and at last stands in Zion in the presence of God.

Blessed Lord, what a change would come over human society if all the pain-bearing elements should die away and be destroyed by the incoming spirit of Jesus of Nazareth; we pray that all bitterness or resentment whether silent or vocal may be forgotten. By Thy graciousness draw us close to Thee, making us forget our poverty of soul and lead us to forgive the weaknesses and failures of others, arising undismayed to greater effort. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Association of Motor Vehicle Commissioners concerning certain bills pending in the House; and, second, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered before the Seventy-seventh Division by former Capt. Vincent Murphy on the subject The Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRICE-CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to consider an amendment to H. R. 5900 entitled "A bill to further the national defense and security by checking speculation and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes."

One of the most objectionable features of this type of legislation is the proposal or tendency to regulate wages. I want it distinctly understood here and now that I am opposed to all legislation which in any way attempts to put a ceiling on the wages to be paid to the American workingman.

We recently passed a tax bill which means higher income taxes on every wage earner, and there has been a suggestion from the Secretary of the Treasury that we increase the social-security tax.

If we pass legislation to carry out these proposals, the only thing left for the average person will be his right to work and pay taxes. This is not a bright outlook for the millions of decent, peace-loving men and women of America.

This control legislation and tax legislation is due to the defense program. The persons who will suffer most are those in the lower-salary brackets and are the ones making the supreme sacrifice by giving their sons to the armed forces of the country. We all know that the majority of men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps come from the average American home, which homes unfortunately are not blessed with great wealth. The membership of this House should be searching for ways to cut the cost of government to the citizens instead of passing legislation restricting the rights of the people and loading them down with new taxes.

During my 18 years of legislative service I have worked and voted for every measure to improve the standard of living, hours of employment, and for the payment of a living wage. I am going to resist every effort which might in any way impair the gains of labor; and, to my way of thinking, regulation of wages will be the first step toward tearing down the structure of labor legislation of which I am so proud, because of the part that I played in its development and building.

I hope that the House will follow my leadership in this direction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to extend my remarks: First, to include an address delivered by Mr. Boyd, president of the American Petroleum Institute; and, second, to include an address delivered by Mr. Davies, Federal Petroleum Coordinator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by James B. Reston, which appeared in the New York Times of the 18th; and also an article by John S. Knight, publisher of the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a short newspaper article entitled "Want To Help Kill America."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a report from the Office of Production Management relative to the employment situation at the Illinois Ordnance Plant in my congressional district. This report is in reply to my request for an investigation and for the establishing of a definite policy with respect to employment by the executives responsible for the successful operation of the plant.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in six instances and include therein a statement and tables showing the work done by the N. Y. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the N. Y. A. in Oklahoma, especially, and, in my opinion, throughout the United States, has been doing a splendid job. The Congress appropriated moneys for the N. Y. A., but the Bureau of the Budget through its power is withholding the funds in Oklahoma in particular. Last week 7,000 N. Y. A. workers engaged in defense training were cut off. Last week Oklahoma sent 1,000 trained men to California to be airplane workers in defense plants. Five hundred of these were N. Y. A. trainees. I hope the N. Y. A. work will be continued.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PRICE-CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the time is at hand when this House has an opportunity of demonstrating to the country that it has recaptured its independence and its self-respect. It has the opportunity in its hands to give evidence of the fact that it expects to have something to do with writing legislation from now on.

The Gore amendment, in my opinion, will be beaten down, and, of course, this House is going to throw out the amendment to restore to the committee bill the licensing feature. When that is all over, then this whole question should be recommitted to the committee for them to write a bill in keeping with what is apparently the sentiment of this House and of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article or a chart by the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Foreign Crops and Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, December 1, at the conclusion of all business on the Speaker's desk and after all other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Russell Fisher and an analysis of the price-control bill by the Cotton Manufacturers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by Mr. Baruch, and also to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

There was no objection.

ENEMIES OF OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I gave the House a partial record of some of the key figures in the Price Administration, and I asked every Member to read my speech in today's RECORD as well as the evidence submitted in that speech.

The only answer that Mr. Henderson ever gave to that was to state to the Banking and Currency Committee that I was not a responsible Member of Congress. Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of the arrogance of the bureaucrats that have infested this Government, and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote to recommit this bill because I refuse to put into the hands of the enemies of this country vast powers to strangle our whole economic and political system.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEON HENDERSON

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from saying just one thing at this point. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Texas so far as Communists are concerned. Any one who is a Communist should not be employed any place in our Government. I do not believe that anybody who is a Nazi or Fascist should be employed anywhere in our Government. But so far as Mr. Leon Henderson is concerned, I do not think the gentleman from Texas intended to give a wrong impression. There are a lot of things I do not agree with Mr. Henderson about. He has bawled me out plenty on more than one occasion, because I did not agree with him, but I do not think the gentleman from Texas wants to leave the impression that he thinks Mr. Henderson is an enemy of the United States. Does he?

Mr. DIES. No; and I did not say that. We have submitted certain names to the President and I have stated that if he would act we would submit 50 other names in the Price Administration. I have submitted to the President the names of 1,126 members of subversive organizations employed by this Government and in addition I am sending to the White House the names of 15,000 Nazis, many of whom hold positions in our defense industries. I am sick and tired of this. I have a responsibility to my country and I am going to carry that responsibility out. As far as I am concerned I am going to use all the power at my command to get the White House to take whatever action is necessary.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Every Member of this House has a responsibility to his country. We have a responsibility, I believe, first to see that no enemies of the United States, as the gentleman puts it, are in Government employ. But we also have a responsibility to make a distinction between people who are really subservient to foreign governments or to foreign systems and under the discipline of those governments, on the one hand, and people, on the other hand, who, whether we agree with them or not about what they believe or may not believe, we know perfectly well are fundamentally loyal and patriotic to our Nation. I think there has got to be in the picture somewhere a recognition of the distinction between those two kinds of things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a few letters and telegrams on the price-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, thank God we have men in the House of Representatives like the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, who want to do the real thing to save America. God bless him. If we do not rid this Government of those people who are Communists and desirous of Russianizing America, we will eventually permit them to undermine our Government and it may be overthrown. I am with the gentleman from Texas, MARTIN DIES, in his desire to rid them out of our Government employment. Let anyone in this country who does not like our form of government get out and go to some other land—a land or country he likes better than America. If, for any reason, they do not want to leave our shores, let us put them in concentration camps. All people who stand for the overthrow of our Government, put them on a ship and send them to some other country, or if they would not be acceptable to any other country, then send them to the South Sea islands. Get Communists out of America.

ENEMIES OF OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Thank God for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. This gentleman has repeatedly submitted to this administration names of persons who are undermining our Government, but he does not get to first base with the administration. The arrogance of these bureaucrats is terrific. We cannot get information from them. They try to shut you out. I do not see any reason why these names have not been investigated and those guilty discharged. We handled the case of one man, David Lasser, by cutting out his salary in an appropriation bill. If we have to do that, I would be willing to cut out the salaries of every one of these enemies whose names have been submitted by the gentleman from Texas when we come to consider the appropriation bills, and stop them dead in their tracks. I believe that the enemy from within is being given his greatest help from the administration itself. As far as I am concerned, I do not believe I can vote for any bill like this until we have stopped these subversive interests.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5990) to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5990, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND AUTHORITY

PURPOSES; TIME LIMIT

SECTION 1. (a) It is hereby declared that it is in the interest of the national defense and security and the purposes of this act are (1) to preserve the value of the national currency against the consequences of price and credit inflation; (2) to stabilize prices and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices and rents; (3) to prevent economic disturbances, labor disputes, burdens upon interstate and foreign commerce, interference with the effective use of the Nation's resources for defense, and impairment of national unity and morale, which would result from unwarranted increases in prices, rents, and the cost of living; (4) to eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency; (5) to prevent prospects of price rises from encouraging the accumulation and withholding of materials needed for national defense, and from impeding long-term commitments for production; (6) to assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices; (7) to obtain the maximum necessary production without undue profits to low-cost producers; (8) to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, wage earners, investors, and persons dependent on life insurance, annuities, and pensions, from undue impairment of their standard of living; (9) to prevent a post-emergency collapse of values; (10) to stabilize agricultural prices in the manner provided in section 3; and (11) to provide procedures for administration and review which will fairly protect the interests of those subject to this act, without endangering the dominant public interest in the accomplishment of the foregoing purposes.

(b) The provisions of this act, and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1943, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security, or upon the date of enactment of an act of Congress terminating such authority, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such regulations, orders and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

(c) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, and the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee if the amendment now being read is identical with the last bill introduced by him, H. R. 6086?

Mr. GORE. It is.

Mr. STEAGALL. I ask this for the purpose of making sure that no points of order are waived. That being the case, no point of order will be made. I just wanted to be sure about it.

Mr. GORE. May I say to the gentleman that it is identical with the bill which was sent to the office of every Member yesterday morning. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that amendments to the amendment be considered in the order of the sections to which they apply.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the last part of the request. I wish the gentleman would restate his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that amendments to the amendment be considered in the order of the sections to which they apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that he should state that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is one amendment. Of course, amendments to the amendment would be in order to any part of the amendment.

Mr. GORE. The request I submitted, Mr. Chairman, was that the amendments to the amendment be considered in the order of the sections of the amendment to which they apply.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object to any unanimous-consent request not in conformance with the rules of the House.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the latter part of my request and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment offered by him be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, as I understand, this amendment is the language contained in the bill, H. R. 6086, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee the day before yesterday. Several Members have expressed to me an interest in the bill. They have not had time to read it. It presents an entirely different philosophy of price control than that found in the bill reported by the committee. Although I have no desire to delay the proceedings, I think that for the present moment I must insist that the amendment be read.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEWIS. Is this the appropriate time to move that the time allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on his amendment be extended beyond the 5 minutes allowed him under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. This is not the proper time, under the rules of the House. There must be some debate on the amendment before a motion is in order to limit debate.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have an amendment to offer to the section of H. R. 5990 which has been read. As I understand, full opportunity will be provided for offering that amendment following the consideration of the Gore amendment, if I am recognized at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be helpful if the Chair at this point invites attention to page 6 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, where there appears a diagram showing the order of consideration of amendments and substitute amendments. An amendment may be offered and a substitute may be offered. An amendment to the amendment may be offered and an amendment to the substitute may be offered.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. The Chair has satisfactorily answered my inquiry.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. When the first section of the substitute has been read and is open for amendment, suppose the amendment prevails, is it then in order to move to strike out the remainder of the reported bill and offer the other measure, or does it come up for consideration section by section?

The CHAIRMAN. The entire amendment, as offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], will have to be reported, and then it is open to amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Suppose it prevails, what is done with the rest of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The rest of the bill would have to be read and the succeeding sections stricken out.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: Page 3, line 18, strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following as a substitute for the bill:

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, PURPOSES OF ACT, DEFINITIONS, AND OFFICE OF INFLATION CONTROL

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the Emergency Inflation Control Act.

PURPOSES OF ACT

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared that it is in the interest of the national defense and security and the purposes of this act are (a) to preserve the value of the national currency against the consequences of price and credit inflation; (b) to stabilize prices, wages, rents, and salaries and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases therein; (c) to prevent economic disturbances, labor disputes, burdens upon interstate and foreign commerce, interference with the effective use of the Nation's resources for defense, and impairment of national unity and morale, which would result from unwarranted increases in prices, wages, rents, salaries, and the cost of living; (d) to eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency; (e) to prevent prospects of increases in prices, rents, wages, and salaries from encouraging the accumulation and withholding of materials needed for national defense, and from impeding long-term commitments for production; (f) to assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices, wages, and salaries; (g) to obtain the maximum necessary production without undue profits to low-cost producers; (h) to protect persons with relatively fixed incomes, investors, and persons dependent on life insurance, annuities, and pensions, from undue impairment of their standard of living; (i) to prevent a post-emergency collapse of values, and the reappearance of price and cost disparities for farmers and other primary producers; and (k) to provide procedures for administration and review which will fairly protect the interests of those subject to this act, without endangering the dominant public interest in the accomplishment of the foregoing purposes.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons, or any receiver, trustee, or other legal representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States, any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Territory, District, or possession of the United States.

(b) "Article" means any article, product, material, or commodity.

(c) "Services" means any service, operation, or function performed otherwise than as an employee by a person (other than a State or political subdivision thereof) for any other person for compensation.

(d) "Labor" means any function performed by an individual as an employee of a person other than a State or political subdivision thereof.

(e) An article shall be deemed the "same" article as another article if it is identical in every respect with such other article.

(f) An article shall be deemed "similar" to another article if it is not the same article but is an article of the same kind and of the same or substantially the same quality as such other article.

(g) An article shall be deemed a "new" article if neither the same article nor a similar article was sold at wholesale during the base period.

(h) Services shall be deemed the "same" services as other services if they consist of the same or substantially the same operations or functions as such other services.

(i) Services shall be deemed "new" services if the same services were not performed during the base period.

(j) Labor shall be deemed the "same" labor as other labor if it consists of the same or substantially the same functions and duties as such other labor.

(k) Labor shall be deemed "new" labor if the same labor was not performed during the base period.

(l) "Dwelling accommodations" means living quarters rented or leased for the residence of one or more people.

(m) "Sale" means any disposition, exchange, lease, or other transfer, or any contract to do any of the foregoing, and "sell," "selling," "seller," "buy," and "buyer," shall be construed accordingly.

(n) "Sale at wholesale" of an article means (1) any sale of such article for resale by the buyer, or (2) in the case of a sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such article for consumption or use by the buyer, such sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer; except that wherever specific reference is made to a "sale at wholesale of an agricultural commodity", such sale shall be deemed to refer only to a sale of such commodity by the farmer who produced such commodity.

(o) "Price" means the consideration received or receivable in connection with the sale of an article or for the performance of services.

(p) "Wage" means the rate of consideration received or receivable for the performance of labor, whether in the form of wages, salary, or any other form.

(q) "Rent" means (1) the consideration received or receivable for the lease of dwelling accommodations, or (2) the making of a lease contract for dwelling accommodations.

(r) "Ceiling" means the maximum price for which an article may be sold or which may be received for the performance of services, or the maximum wage which may be paid for labor, or the maximum rent for dwelling accommodations.

(s) "Agricultural commodity" includes only an agricultural commodity in the form in which it is customarily marketed by farmers.

(t) "Base period" means the period November 24, 1941, to November 29, 1941, both inclusive.

(u) "Comparable" means substantially the same real, utility, and neighborhood value.

(v) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Office of Inflation Control created by section 4 of this act.

ADMINISTRATOR OF OFFICE OF INFLATION CONTROL

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Inflation Control, which shall be under the direction of an Administrator, to be known as the Administrator of the Office of Inflation Control (in this act referred to as the "Administrator"). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

(b) The Administrator may establish and utilize such advisory, regional, local, industry, or other groups or agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated service, as may from time to time be needed. The Administrator shall give due consideration to the recommendations of such groups, committees, or other agencies appointed under this section, and he shall utilize, insofar as practicable, local agencies to the end that compliance with the act may be effectuated.

(c) The Administrator may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Administrator in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of Inflation Control no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

(d) The principal office of the Administrator shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or his duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

(e) The Administrator shall submit to Congress a quarterly report covering his activities for the preceding quarter and including such information and data, and recommendations with respect to matters covered by this act, as he may find advisable.

TITLE II. PRICE, RENT, AND WAGE CEILINGS

PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 201. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, or other obligation, for any person knowingly to sell or deliver, or to buy or accept delivery of, any article at a price in excess of the ceiling applicable to such sale.

(b) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, or other obligation, for any person knowingly to receive or pay, or to enter into any contract, agreement, or other obligation under which he is entitled or required, or under which he purports to be entitled or required, to receive or pay for the performance of any services a price in excess of the ceiling applicable to such services.

(c) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, or other obligation, for any person knowingly to pay for any labor a wage in excess of the ceiling applicable in respect of such labor.

(d) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, or other obligation, for any person knowingly to pay or receive for dwelling accommodations, or enter into contract to pay or by which he is entitled to receive for dwelling accommodations, rent in excess of the ceiling applicable to such rent for such dwelling accommodations.

CEILINGS APPLICABLE TO SALES OF ARTICLES

SEC. 202. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) and section 206, the ceiling applicable to the sale of an article by any person shall be—

(1) in case the sale is at wholesale and the article is the same article as an article sold at wholesale by such person during the base period, the lowest price at which it was so sold by such person during the base period;

(2) in case the sale is at wholesale and the article is not the same article as an article sold at wholesale by such person during the base period, but is similar to an article so sold by such person during the base period, the lowest price at which such similar article was so sold by such person during the base period;

(3) in case the sale is at wholesale and the article is not the same article as, nor an article similar to, an article sold at wholesale by such person during the base period, the lowest price at which the same article was regularly so sold by any other person during the base period, or if the same article was not regularly so sold by any other person during the base period, the lowest price at which a similar article was regularly so sold by any other person during the base period;

(4) in the case of any article to the sale of which paragraph (1), (2), or (3) is applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207. Any such ceiling so prescribed shall be in lieu of the ceiling applicable under such paragraph; and

(5) in the case of a new article, and in the case of any article to the sale of which paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) is not applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207.

(b) Wherever reference is made in subsection (a) to the lowest price at which the same article or a similar article was sold during the base period, such price shall in no event be deemed to exceed the ceiling or maximum price, if any, in effect with respect to such same article or similar article under any regulation or order of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply.

(c) The ceiling applicable tc the sale at wholesale of an agricultural commodity shall in no case be less than the parity price therefor, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with other provisions of law.

CEILINGS APPLICABLE TO SERVICES

SEC. 203. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and section 206, the ceiling applicable to services performed by any person shall be—

(1) in case such services are the same services as services performed by such person during the base period, the lowest price for which such services were so performed by such person during the base period;

(2) in case such services are not the same services as services performed by such person during the base period (or in case such person did not perform any services during the base period), the lowest price for which the same services were regularly performed by any other person within the same county or parish, or within the same State if there be no such other person within the same county or parish, during the base period;

(3) in the case of any services to which paragraph (1) or (2) is applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207. The ceiling so prescribed shall be in lieu of the ceiling applicable to such services under such paragraph; and

(4) in the case of new services and in the case of services to which paragraph (1), (2), or (3) is not applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207.

(b) Wherever reference is made in subsection (2) to the lowest price for which services were performed during the base period, such price shall in no case be deemed to exceed the ceiling or maximum price, if any, in effect with respect to such services under any regulation or order of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply.

CEILINGS APPLICABLE TO WAGES AND SALARIES

SEC. 204. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and section 206, the ceiling applicable in respect of labor performed by an individual shall be—

(1) in case such labor is the same labor as labor performed, whether or not by him, for his employer during the base period, the highest wage paid by his employer during the base period, at the place of employment where such individual is employed, for the same labor to an employee with the same seniority rights and length of service;

(2) in case the same labor was not performed either by him or any other employee, for his employer during the base period, at the place of employment where such individual is employed, the highest wage paid for the same labor by any other employer within the same county or parish, or within the same State, if there be no such other employer within the same county or parish, during the base period to an employee with the same seniority rights and length of service;

(3) in the case of any labor in respect of which paragraph (1) or (2) is applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207. Any such ceiling so prescribed shall be in lieu of the ceiling applicable in respect of such labor under such paragraph; and

(4) in case such labor is new labor, and in the case of labor to which paragraph (1), (2), or (3) is not applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207.

(b) The ceiling applicable in respect of any labor shall in no case be less than the minimum compensation prescribed therefor in or pursuant to any law of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof, or of any Territory, District, or possession of the United States.

CEILINGS APPLICABLE TO THE RENT FOR DWELLING ACCOMMODATIONS

SEC. 205. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) and section 207, the ceiling applicable to the rent for dwelling accommodations by any person shall be—

(1) in case the dwelling accommodations are the same dwelling accommodations as the dwelling accommodations rented or offered for rent by such person during the base period, the lowest rent charged by such person for such dwelling accommodations during the base period;

(2) in case the dwelling accommodations are not the same dwelling accommodations as dwelling accommodations rented or offered for rent by such person during the base period, but are comparable dwelling accommodations to dwelling accommodations rented or offered for rent by such person during the base period, the lowest rent for which such comparable dwelling accommodations were so rented or offered for rent by such person during the base period;

(3) in case the dwelling accommodations are not the same dwelling accommodations, nor dwelling accommodations similar to dwelling accommodations rented or offered for rent by such person during the base period, the lowest rent for which the same or comparable dwelling facilities were rented during the base period by any other person within the same municipality;

(4) in the case of dwelling accommodations to the rent of which paragraph (1), (2), or (3) is applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207. Any such ceiling so prescribed shall be in lieu of the ceiling applicable under such paragraph; and

(5) in the case of dwelling accommodations to the rent of which paragraph (1), (2), or (3) is not applicable, such ceiling as the Administrator may prescribe pursuant to section 207.

(b) Paragraph (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall in no case apply to the rent of dwelling accommodations in rural areas or in municipalities having a population of fewer than 10,000 people according to the Federal census of 1940.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 206. (a) The Administrator may by regulation or order exempt from the provisions of sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 articles, services, labor, and dwelling accommodations, with respect to which he makes a finding of fact that—

(1) such exemption is necessary to promote the national defense; and

(2) it is unnecessary that ceilings be applicable to such articles, services, labor, or dwelling accommodations in order to preserve the Nation's price structure and to prevent a rise in the cost of living.

(b) No ceiling shall in any case be applicable to any labor performed for a person who regularly employs less than eight individuals.

POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR WITH RESPECT TO CEILINGS

SEC. 207. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order establish such ceiling or ceilings as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable to buyers and sellers of the article or articles in question, or to the person or persons performing the services in question and the person or persons for whom they are performed, or to the employees and employer or employers in question, or to the lessor and lessee of dwelling accommodations, as the case may be, and will effectuate the purposes of this act. So far as practicable, in establishing a ceiling for any specified article, services, dwelling accommodations, or labor, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the prices prevailing for such article or services, or the wages prevailing for such labor, or the rent prevailing for such dwelling accommodations, as the case may be, during the base period, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine to be of general applicability in respect of such article, services, rents, or wages, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of transportation, general increase or decrease in cost of maintenance and operation, general increases or decreases in costs of living, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the article, persons performing such services, employers for whom such labor is performed, and lessors of such dwelling accommodations during and subsequent to the year ending October 12, 1941. Every regulation or order establishing any ceiling under this subsection shall be accompanied by a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order.

(b) Any ceiling or ceilings may be established under this section in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments, as in the judgment of the Administrator are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any such ceiling may be established in terms of price, wages, margins, commissions, fees, charges, allowances, or other terms. Except as provided in section 202 (c) (relating to agricultural commodities) the Administrator may establish a ceiling or ceilings under this section with respect to articles, services, dwelling accommodations below the general market price for the article or articles or services, or the rent for the dwelling accommodations, in effect at the time of the establishment of such ceiling or ceilings.

(c) The Administrator shall exercise his powers under subsections (a) and (b) with respect to agricultural commodities, and with respect to articles derived in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities,

in such manner as to support prices to farmers for such agricultural commodities at such levels as may be necessary to enable farmers to receive therefor average year-around prices not less than parity.

POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR WITH RESPECT TO MARKET PRACTICES

SEC. 208. Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit, with respect to any article, speculative or manipulative practices, selling, marketing, or inventory practices (including practices relating to changes in form or quality), hoarding, or other practices which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

PROCEDURE

SEC. 209. (a) Regulations or orders establishing any ceiling or ceilings may be issued after such inquiry as the Administrator deems necessary or proper. Within a period of 60 days after the issuance of any such regulation or order any person subject to the provisions thereof may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to such regulation or order and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. At any time after the expiration of such 60 days any person subject to the provisions of such regulation or order may file such a protest based solely on grounds arising after the expiration of such 60 days. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this subsection, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing or 90 days after the issuance of the regulation or order in respect of which the protest is filed, whichever occurs later, the Administrator shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provided an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith.

(b) In any proceedings under this act the Administrator may take official notice of economic and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under section 212, and may limit such proceedings to the filing of affidavits or other written evidence, or the filing of briefs.

REVIEW

SEC. 210. (a) Any protestant who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest, may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the emergency court of appeals, created pursuant to subsection (c), praying that the regulation or order protested be set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the Administrator who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of the proceedings in connection with the protest which shall include a statement of the materials of which the Administrator has taken official notice. Upon the filing of such transcript the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside such regulation or order, in whole or in part, or to remand the proceeding, except that the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the Administrator at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to any regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the Administrator and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the Administrator, and the court determines that such evidence is material, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the Administrator. The Administrator shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof, and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof, except that on request by the Administrator, any such additional evidence may be presented directly to the court.

(b) No such regulation or order shall be set aside, in whole or in part, unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation or order is not in accordance with law or is arbitrary or capricious The effectiveness of a judgment of the court setting aside in whole or in part any such regulation or order shall be postponed until the expiration of 30 days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (d) within such 30 days, the effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the case by the Supreme Court.

(c) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the emergency court of appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of United States district courts and courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the emergency court of appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act, except that it shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

(d) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment, interlocutory or final, by the emergency court of appeals a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The emergency court of appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments of the emergency court of appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any ceiling under this act and of the provisions of this act authorizing any regulation or order establishing any ceiling. Except as provided in this section, no court—Federal, State, or territorial—shall have power to consider such validity, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any such provision of this act, or any provision of any such regulation or order.

OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 211. (a) The Administrator may make such studies and investigations, and obtain or require the furnishing of such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, and in the administration and enforcement of this act, and regulations and orders thereunder. For such purposes the Administrator may administer oaths and affirmations, may require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documents at any designated place, may require persons to permit the inspection and copying of documents, and the inspection of inventories, and may, by regulation or order, require the making and keeping of records and other documents and the making of reports. No person shall be excused from complying with any requirement under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(b) The Administrator shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that he deems confidential unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the interest of the national defense and security.

REGULATIONS AND ORDERS

SEC. 212. The Administrator may, from time to time, issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act, and to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof. Any regulation or order issued under this act may be amended or rescinded by the Administrator whenever in his opinion such action is necessary or proper in order to carry out the provisions of this act or to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 213. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of this act, or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with this act or such regulation, order, or requirement, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond. In cases of actual controversy, a like application may be made by any interested person, and upon a proper showing a like order or decree shall be granted.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, and any person who willfully falsifies in any material respect a document or report required to be kept or filed thereunder, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. Whenever the Administrator has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

(c) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of violations of this act and of regulations, orders, or requirements thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all civil proceedings to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of, this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder. Such civil proceedings and any criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Any such civil proceedings may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. No costs shall be assessed against the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

(d) No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be

done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order, or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. The Administrator may intervene in any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

TITLE III—APPROPRIATIONS, SEPARABILITY, EFFECTIVE DATE, AND TERMINATION DATE

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 302. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 303. This act shall become effective on day following the day on which it is enacted, except that title III shall be effective with respect to all defense contracts completed within taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 304. This act shall cease to be in effect after June 30, 1943.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

(The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, since the request has been made, and, of course, I do not object, but I rise for the purpose of suggesting that it would be entirely agreeable if the gentleman from Tennessee so desires to arrange for longer debate than will be allowed under the rule, although I have no desire to urge this.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, is this coming out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It comes out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. GORE. Then I must decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, we are faced with two unwelcome alternatives. It is an unpleasant choice between these two alternatives. They are, one, to risk a wild inflation with all its disastrous consequences or, two, to institute controls sufficient to combat that danger.

It does no good to say that the rise in farm prices has not caused inflation or to say that wage increases have no bearing on inflation or to say that any element of our economy, whether it be wages, prices, profits, rents, commission, fees, or whatever the element might be, and to say that it is the one guilty culprit. Nobody has said that, and it would do no good to say it. We know that they all contribute.

All of us know that this threat of inflation arises out of our national-defense program itself. In order to have more tanks we must produce fewer automobiles. More and more of our normal civilian productive capacity must be converted to the production of implements of war. That we may have more aluminum for airplanes we must use less in consumer goods. Because we have to have more war machines we can make fewer washing machines. Thus it is that the operations of the law of supply and demand, which in normal times regulates production, is thrown completely askew because, as we thus curtail, and drastically curtail consumer goods, we are greatly adding to purchasing power, which makes up the demand by our unprecedented expenditures. Daily new factories are completed, tooled up, and filled wtih employees. More and more people have more money in their pockets, yet we are having fewer and fewer, and we must have fewer and fewer, of the durable or consumer goods which people with money in their pockets want to buy.

To risk the danger of runaway inflation is to take a reckless chance of wrecking our whole economy, a reckless chance of impeding national defense, a reckless chance of bringing suffering, deprivation, and want to millions and millions of people in our Nation who use the greater part of their meager income to purchase the necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter.

Let us turn to the alternative to risking a runaway inflation—the institution of controls which will be necessary. And, mind you, we must substitute the workings of the law of supply and demand with regulation and control if we are to attain the ends of national defense with efficiency and certainty. There is no alternative, because the workings of supply and demand cannot operate normally, and therefore we must consider what kind of controls it is necessary to institute.

If I did not entertain a deep and abiding conviction that it is necessary to inaugurate drastic controls in order to be effective, and that a weak-kneed, piecemeal, half-hearted bill might bring about, well might bring about, more inequities, more disparities, more dislocation, and more suffering than we already unfortunately have with us, I would not be here offering a substitute for a bill which embodies the deliberate judgment of the majority of the great committee on which I have the privilege of serving.

The over-all plan and the selective plan have been presented here for the last 2 days, the two conflicting schools of thought as to the method of price control. The over-all plan I readily admit is not a perfect approach. I do not contend that the proposal which I now submit is a perfect bill, not at all; but I am laboring under a deep conviction that it is, in comparison with the committee bill, a fairer, a more fundamental approach to the problem. Of course, as is true of the committee bill, as is true of any bill so wide in scope as to affect the economy of an entire nation, this proposal can be subjected to criticism. The chaff of any proposal can be fanned into a straw stack if you use a magnifyirg glass, but I hope that the strategy of confusion will not be so successful as to becloud the principles and the issues between the over-all and the selective methods of approach. By the selective method, by the committee bill, no ceiling is placed on any price. Authority is conferred upon the Administrator to select prices. Whatever commodity he wants, whatever commodity he thinks should be selected, subject to the restrictions in the bill, he would select, and, with a statement of fact, publicize a regulation that a ceiling had been placed upon the price of that commodity by administrative decree. Nowhere would there be an attempt made to control the general price level, and, mind you, the cost of living runs along with the general price level. By the over-all method we attempt to place a general ceiling by law upon the price of all commodities, and from that point allow the Administrator to make adjustments up or down as necessity might require. There you would call a halt to the rise in general prices. It should be remembered that inflation does not come about because of a rise in the price of a few selected commodities. Inflation is the product of a general price runaway, and if we are to prevent inflation, we must somewhere, somehow, call a halt to general price rises.

The history of every nation which has tried it shows that the selective method does not halt the general price level rise. That has proved true in our own Nation in the last war, and so far in this war. It has proved to be true in Great Britain in two wars. Canada has already discarded the selective method and adopted the over-all. Every nation which has tried it has demonstrated that the selective method is wholly ineffective. To try to halt general price levels by placing a ceiling on selective commodities is like trying to impound the water of a stream by building a dam only halfway across it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. And in all these cases to which the gentleman refers, they have even gone so far as to put on drastic penalties, even to fine and imprisonment and in some cases death, if you go back in history far enough, and yet it did not stop it.

Mr. GORE. You cannot outlaw the inevitable. I contend that you cannot place a ceiling on a commodity at a price of $20, and hold it there, and let the cost go to $25. I do not think you have to be an economist to know that. To try to do that reminds me of a boy who broke his leg trying to spell "Tommy" without a "T."

By the over-all ceiling we effectively call a halt to a general price level, and I believe it is administratively more feasible because of several reasons. For

one, by the selective method, on whom do you place the burden of proof that a ceiling should be applied? You place it upon the Government, and when you go out and place a ceiling upon the product of one man, or of one industry, how does he feel? He feels that he has been discriminated against, and therefore he will try to get around it if he can. By the over-all method we place the burden of proof on the man who wants an adjustment. We call a halt, and from that date we begin to make adjustments.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. No; excuse me, please. A great point has been made as to the date when we should start. My daddy used to tell me, "Son, always start from where you are at," and I propose that the ceiling be applied this week. Of course, inequities will exist, disparities will be shown, but the longer you wait, the worse they will be. The demands upon our economy are uneven, and the longer we wait to institute an over-all control, an effective control, the worse our situation will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 10 additional minutes.

Mr. GORE. Five minutes will be sufficient, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The gentleman at the outset stated that there were two very definite alternatives—one, wild inflation, or second, legislation?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I think those of us who are opposed to wild inflation subscribe whole-heartedly to the indictment the gentleman has written as to that alternative. I am wondering, if the proposal which the gentleman presents is voted down, if he feels that the other alternative which you have so severely indicted is better for the country than the proposal which the committee presents to us.

Mr. GORE. I stated at the outset that I entertained a deep conviction that a half-way measure might magnify, a half-way measure might increase the inequities, might only urge on the inflationary spiral, and I will be very glad to explain to the gentleman why I think so. When you once place a ceiling upon one commodity, the pressure is immediately transferred to a substitute, to an allied commodity on which there is no ceiling. Then the speculator comes out and he starts hoarding and cornering the market, and the inflationary psychology is encouraged. The gentleman knows that the psychological element in inflation is one of the great component parts of the spiral. It is encouraged and augmented as people get into their heads the idea that things are going up next week or next month; and a piecemeal approach, in my opinion, augments and increases the inflationary psychology.

There are more reasons than that I think the committee bill would invite inflation. I think it would encourage prices to rise to the restricted levels, and before those prices get to the restricted levels on agriculture, other prices would be coming up and the parity formula would be changed. The race would be on. The farmer would be trying to catch up with labor and industry, labor trying to catch up with the cost of living, prices rising. We would all catch up with one another over the precipice in the greatest pit and abyss of depression that this country has ever seen.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I hope the gentleman will excuse me. My time is limited, and I do not want to ask for additional time.

This reminds me of the fellow who has been told by his doctor that unless he has all of his teeth pulled it will wreck his system. But what does he do? He decides he will go along and risk the wrecking of his system, and finally he goes about and looks for another doctor. Mind you, inflation is economic high blood pressure which, unless checked, will eventually wreck our entire system, and it does no good, as committee members have done, to acknowledge that we face a tremendous task, and then say it is too hard to handle. That is defeatism. That indicts the potency of Congress. It is like the child who, when told that he has to take medicine, gets under the table and cries, "It tastes too bad." We must be men. We have conscripted young men all over this country and taken them into the Army, and they are today in South America, in Iceland, in Shanghai, and on the high seas, where the Germans are shooting at us, and we are shooting at them. Call it war? It is a question of definition.

Somebody yesterday wanted to look into the whites of somebody's eyes. I want to look into the whites of the eyes of the man who is willing to vote to take young men into the Army and then vote to keep them there another year and a half, and then is unwilling to vote to require some uniformity of sacrifice from the other groups, rather than go on as we are going now, letting every group seek selfish ends and make a profit out of national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

IN OPPOSITION TO THE GORE AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be not interrupted until I have finished my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said about ruinous inflation. It is a question of the best method to use in stopping inflation.

I hate this kind of a bill. Under ordinary circumstances I would not vote for any such proposal, but the emergency necessitates a proposal that will prevent ruinous inflation. This is in effect very much of an economic dictatorship. I concede that. It is only justified in times of great emergency. When we talk about dealing with prices we talk about fixing the prices on 1,800,000 different commodities. Whenever you talk about fixing the wage scale you are talking about fixing the wage level of 3,000,000 different wage scales. So when you talk about a bill that covers all, you talk about establishing someone in authority who can control approximately 5,000,000 different items and wage scales. Can you conceive of any board or group being set up in a reasonable length of time that could intelligently and properly pass upon such big questions and such a large number of questions as would be involved? The N. R. A. would be nothing compared to this proposal.

The committee bill is a well-considered bill. We spent 3 months considering the committee bill. It has not been perfected, because the committee has two amendments it desires to offer that it has agreed to recommend. If the Gore substitute were adopted, it would deprive the committee of its opportunity to perfect its bill, and the House would accept a bill which has not been considered. The logical thing to do would be to send it back to the committee and let the committee go over the administrative features and see if it is sound. Our bill has been passed upon by 25 members of the committee. The substitute has been passed on by 1 member of the committee. To show you that the gentleman from Tennessee—as sincere and enthusiastic as he is—has been changing his mind on this bill all along, on October 6 he introduced a bill, H. R. 5760, in which he said the base period to determine the price level should be October 6 to 12, 1941. Then on November 10 he introduced a bill, H. R. 5997, stating that the base period should be the calendar week within which this bill is enacted. And then on November 24 he introduced another bill, in which he said the base period should be November 24 to November 29, inclusive. And then, to show you that he has changed his mind—just his mind, because it was not considered by the committee—let us see how he dealt with strikes.

On October 6 he said in his bill that nothing in the bill should prevent an organization of workers from striking.

On November 10 he still reserved the right of workers to strike, but on November 24 the bill that he has now offered he has stricken out that provision which would allow the workers to strike. This shows that he has been changing his mind, but it is just one mind. I am not commenting on the merits or demerits of this proposal. I do not know its effect.

The committee spent night and day for weeks, sometimes on Saturdays, going over this bill, word by word, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, to

make sure that we had a sound, well-considered bill; and I feel that we have.

Now, then, to show you that the bill offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is not well considered, he stated on page 2 of his bill that one of the purposes is to obtain the maximum necessary production without undue profits to low-cost producers. In other words, he copied that part of the committee bill dealing with purposes, but he did not follow it up, as we did in the committee bill, by making provisions for the high-cost producer to be protected. There is only one way to protect the high-cost producer, and that is through buying and selling. Under that, your copper mines in the West, and your zinc mines, and your lead mines, can commence operating under the provisions of buying and selling; but the Gore bill does not have any such provision. So, insofar as that provision is concerned, the bill is sailing under false colors. A purpose is declared but no provisions in the bill are inserted to carry it out.

Permit me to invite your attention also to the fact that it is not an all-over bill. The gentleman has made a very forceful and logical argument to the effect that to control inflation you must put everything in and make it compulsory. I invite your attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the largest item in our economy affecting inflation is retail prices. Our national income now is at the rate of $92,000,000,000 a year; probably it will be the highest in history; and retail prices this year approximate $50,000,000,000—more than half the national income. I say that the largest item, several times as big as wages, several times as big as installment buying, is not included in the Gore bill. It cannot, therefore, be an over-all bill; it is not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any opinion as to how many employees will be required to enforce the Gore bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Judging by Canada, the number of people Canada has working on this thing now—and they have not got it started yet—comparing our country with Canada in the matter of population and industrial production and the number of employees compared to Canada, it would take a million men and women in this country, all over the Nation, to enforce this bill if you want to put it into effect.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman reached the point in his discussion where he is willing to yield for questions?

Mr. PATMAN. I have not. If the gentleman will bear with me, I would like to proceed. I have just got started.

Do not forget that retail prices are not included in the compulsory provisions of the Gore bill. The biggest item in America is left out. You will notice that he defines wholesale price, but nowhere in the bill does it require the placing of retail prices; neither does it even contain a definition of retail prices. This is a serious defect in the bill.

Furthermore, if you freeze wages—and do not overlook this fact, Mr. Chairman—where they are today, you might just as well stop your national defense. When you build a plant somewhere in this country you expect to get the workers from some other place, because they are all employed now—I mean the skilled workers and mechanics; they are all employed. Are you going to get them to leave their homes, their firesides, their neighbors, their friends, their schools, where their children are in school to go to some defense plant to work for exactly the same wages they are receiving or have been receiving? They will not do it; you should not expect it. You might just as well stop your national defense when you freeze wages where they are, because you would not have the workers to carry on your national defense.

The point has been raised that this bill is the Baruch idea; and because of Mr. Baruch's experience he naturally demands consideration, and consideration has been given to him. But Mr. Baruch said this, Mr. Chairman, that any bill is insufficient that does not carry with it a provision for the Administrator to buy and sell.

The Gore bill does not have that provision in it. Therefore, Mr. Baruch in effect says this bill is insufficient. Mr. Baruch says that no bill is sufficient that does not include retail prices over-all.

The Gore bill does not include retail prices and, therefore, it cannot be over-all.

Mr. Baruch says that no bill is sufficient that does not carry the licensing provision in it. The Gore bill does not carry the licensing provision in it. There are the three main essentials laid down by Mr. Baruch that are not contained in the substitute bill.

The question is should we put everything under it. Do you want to fix a price on diamonds? Do you want to fix a price on luxuries? No; we want to encourage people to spend money on something that does not come in competition with national-defense items, if they must spend their money. That is one of the objects of the selective bill, but under the substitute you would discourage prices on luxuries going up the same as you would anything else.

Mr. GORE said our bill was a weak-kneed bill. I do not think it is. I think it is as strong a bill as this committee can write unless you want to put wages in and involve 38,000,000 workers, with a set-up of more than a million people to administer it. That, I believe, this House will not do. Furthermore, this Gore bill only permits the farmer to receive parity prices based on 1909 to 1914. The President and the Department of Agriculture have said that was not sufficient, that at least 110 percent should be given; but if you vote for the Gore bill you vote for parity only, not 110, because that is what the bill provides.

The bill further provides for the fixing of commissions and fees for services and labor. Notice the RECORD of day before yesterday, and you will see the hundreds and thousands of different people and different trades, professions, and occupations that would have their wages fixed under the terms of this bill. Take a bootblack charging 5 cents for a shine during the base period provided in this bill. He would have to come to Washington or get consent from the Price Administrator in Washington to increase his price to 10 cents. Talk about bureaucracy. There would not be room enough here in the District of Columbia to build hotels 20 stories high to house the people who would have to come here in connection with problems involved in an over-all bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman points out that the Gore amendment is weak in that it does not contain the sell-and-buy provision and the licensing clause in the committee bill. Those two provisions were in the original committee bill, is that true?

Mr. PATMAN. That is true.

Mr. COX. The committee voted them out?

Mr. PATMAN. Not both of them.

Mr. COX. They voted out the licensing provision?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. COX. Now they have voted it back?

Mr. PATMAN. They voted it out by reason of a lack of understanding.

Mr. COX. By reason of pressure brought to bear?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. COX. So the committee, including the gentleman, has likewise been busy changing its mind?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not like the gentleman to state that pressure was brought to bear on me to change my mind, because it is not a correct statement.

Mr. COX. The gentleman changed his mind, did he not?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman means I changed my mind?

Mr. COX. Did you not vote to strike out the licensing clause?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman's information is incorrect. If all of the gentleman's information is as incorrect as that statement the gentleman does not have a leg to stand on.

Mr. COX. But you did vote to put back the licensing provision under pressure?

Mr. PATMAN. Not me.

Mr. COX. The committee did.

Mr. PATMAN. I deny that.

Mr. COX. It was demanded that you put it back and you did vote to put it back?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield all my time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, may I inquire if they expect to cut the debate on the Gore substitute to 45 minutes or an hour, or will other Members be permitted to talk on this amendment? Can the Chairman of

the Committee give us information on that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot control that. The gentleman might direct his inquiry to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency care to make a statement on that?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is not coming out of my time, is it?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, there is no desire to cut the time of debate down.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a question has been asked and it is a very important one. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has prestige and standing in this House and he should have, because he is a man of integrity and ability. I respect his opinions. When he makes a statement I must consider that statement and answer it if I can. He asked me if the committee had pressure brought to bear to put back the licensing provision. First he stated that his information was both the buy-and-sell and licensing provisions were stricken out by the committee, which is not correct. But on a vote in the committee, through lack of understanding by the members of that committee, it eliminated the licensing provision. That is true. But the members came over here and heard the Honorable Barney Baruch, that the gentleman from Georgia had come down here, and he convinced those members that no bill is good that does not have the licensing provision in it. The committee then voted to put it back in.

Mr. COX. Was the gentleman influenced even slightly by the statement of Mr. Baruch?

Mr. PATMAN. No. I was for it anyway. I opposed striking it out in the first place.

Mr. COX. Was any other member of the committee, taking the same position the gentleman is now taking, influenced in the slightest by the Baruch view?

Mr. PATMAN. Since I have shown the gentleman that he is in error, I think that is sufficient.

Mr. COX. But the gentleman concedes that he, too, has been busy changing his mind?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I have not.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is charging the author of the Gore amendment with vacillating. The committee has been shifting, too, has it not?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the committee has not been shifting. The committee has been considering this bill. They have been making up their minds, and when they did they stayed there, except on one point—licensing—and they found out they were in error about that. Mr. Baruch doubtless helped to convince them they were in error, and they put it back in. The Gore bill does not have licensing in it.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. I call the attention of the members of the Committee to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of April 9, 1935, on page 5325. There was pending at that time a bill which passed this House with 15 votes against it, I believe the count shows. The bill was H. R. 5529, a bill designed to take the profits out of war, and so forth. The House passed it without any limitations. There was carried in that bill every provision to which objection has been lodged against the present House bill, without the limitations in the House bill—broad, unlimited powers to control the entire economic life of this Nation, with all the criminal provisions, and no restraints except any authority that the Chief Executive might see fit to set up. There is not an objection that has been lodged against this bill that did not obtain against the bill that was passed by the House at that time. My beloved friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is on record as voting for that bill in time of peace. I ask the Members of the House to read the RECORD.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PATMAN. Briefly.

Mr. COX. You did not have Leon Henderson in that case, did you?

Mr. PATMAN. The Gore bill fixes the fees of lawyers, doctors, and of ministers. It fixes bonuses. It fixes compensation. You would not be able to give your preacher a Christmas present unless you had orders from Washington. The stockholders of a corporation would not be able to give a bonus to their employees who had been so faithful and diligent and had worked so hard during the past year, regardless of the enormous profits, unless they got an order first from Washington permitting them to do it. Mr. Chairman, this bill goes too far.

Mr. GIFFORD and Mr. BARRY rose.

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment I will yield.

In connection with the fees, let us take the case of a doctor. Suppose this week he has only charity cases and his fees are very low. Next week he has rich patients and he would like to collect up. He has to fix his fees according to the charity cases. Other doctors in that community would have to do the same thing if they were situated in a position similar to his.

These cases can be multiplied a thousand times, by a thousand different professions. This bill would not work. It would bog down. It would destroy our democratic government, because you cannot enforce such a thing involving 1,800,000 commodities and 3,000,000 wage scales.

Mr. Henderson has fixed prices by the banging-on-the-table method. I will admit that he has a commanding personality and has gotten along with business. I heard the gentleman from Georgia admit that before the Committee on Rules, that the business interests seemed to be pleased with Mr. Henderson.

Mr. COX. Since the gentleman has referred to what I said before the Committee on Rules——

Mr. PATMAN. I withdraw it, if it takes up any time.

Mr. COX. It is a case of "Step into my parlor, said the spider to the fly." In other words, he did not have the power to enforce his demands or his orders, and had to be reasonable to get anything.

Mr. PATMAN. It is strange to me that the gentleman does not want to trust Mr. Henderson with the power we are giving him, yet he is willing to give him a thousand times that much power under the Gore substitute. I cannot understand it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. Not just now. I should like to yield to my friend, but I have two more points I must cover. Then I will yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for an additional 5 minutes. He is making a very interesting discussion of this important amendment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield to the gentleman before it is over.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am going to stand on my feet until then.

Mr. PATMAN. I will motion to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. BOREN. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman has already proceeded for 5 minutes longer than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was given to discuss this issue.

Mr. PATMAN. We will give him more time if he wants it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Texas has been very kind in yielding to Members on both sides of this question. I believe he is entitled to more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield before I am through. I will yield to the gentleman first. That is a promise.

So Mr. Henderson has set out to keep down the cost of national defense. Mr. Henderson has saved this Government billions and billions of dollars by fixing the prices on copper and lead and zinc and steel and aluminum and other strategic and critical materials, and chemicals as well.

Did you know that the first $60,000,000,000 that we are spending would cost us $20,000,000,000 more were it not for the price fixing by Leon Henderson? That is an enormous amount of savings through price fixing. Their records will disclose that, but the time has come when he possibly cannot further enforce his orders and suggestions by the banging-on-the-desk methods and keep the prices down without a law passed by the Congress to support him, and that is the object of this bill, and this bill will keep down the cost of national defense. It

includes metals, it includes chemicals, it includes imports, it includes rents in defense areas, it includes everything that is vital to national defense at this time. Are you going to throw it down and pick up a bill that has never been considered by any committee of this House? Have you not heard it said so often here that we cannot legislate on the floor; that we must send a bill to the committee and seriously consider it there and bring it back? That is what we have done, and now you are asked to take a bill that has never been considered by any committee of this House. It would certainly violate a rule of long standing.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just one moment—just stand on your feet.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have heard that before.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to make just this one point. Many countries have tried fixing wages and fixing prices, but no country on the face of the earth has put prices and wages in the same bill or under the same administrator, not excepting Canada, not excepting England, not excepting Germany even. No country has ever attempted and will not attempt it, because it is not a practical approach to a difficult problem.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman has made a splendid speech. He said we put back the licensing clause because of the testimony of Mr. Baruch. Did we not delete the licensing clause in executive session after Mr. Baruch testified before the committee?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has his own opinion about it. We did restore it after Mr. Baruch impressed upon us how absolutely necessary it was.

Mr. GIFFORD. Did we not delete it afterward?

Mr. PATMAN. My opinion is that Mr. Baruch influenced the members on that licensing provision. And do not overlook this fact. He told the Rules Committee that it is absolutely necessary and that no bill is any good without it, and the Gore bill that you are asked to adopt does not contain it.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is pretty fairly accurate, but I want the House to know that after listening to Mr. Baruch, the committee, in executive session, deleted the licensing provision of the bill, regardless of the effect of his criticisms on the Rules Committee.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I can endorse the gentleman's statement 100 percent except for one thing. The gentleman said that parity shall be the price, but as to grain farmers—I do not know with respect to the cotton farmers—this will give our farmers more than parity, only every farmer will get a different price when you buy corn on the market.

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot understand the lady when she says that they will get more by getting 100 percent of parity on grain instead of 110 percent.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Under the Gore bill they will have to pay parity to the farmer——

Mr. PATMAN. And under our bill, too.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It would throw the whole thing into chaos.

Mr. PATMAN. I understand the gentlewoman's point, but I cannot agree with her.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Is it not true that while the Gore bill purports to be an over-all price-fixing bill it neglects to fix a ceiling on profits?

Mr. PATMAN. It does, and how are you going to justify fixing the wages of a man making 50 cents a day, a dollar a day, or $400 a year, or $1,000 a year, and then when you go back home he will say, "Yes; you fixed my wages, but what about this man drawing $300,000." The Gore bill freezes it just where it is. They cannot reduce that amount at all. He stays exactly where he is now and it is frozen as of that date. Furthermore, they will say, "You fixed my wages, but you let the profits of this concern I am working for go out the roof, and the sky is the limit for them." How are you going to answer that? Consider that for a moment.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. First, with reference to the gentleman's remarks that the House should not adopt the Gore bill until it has been considered by a committee. If the bill has not been considered by the committee, it is the committee's fault, because it has been before the gentleman's committee all the time.

Mr. PATMAN. But, listen, we gave Mr. GORE 2 hours' time to explain that bill. We did not afford that courtesy to any other member of the committee. He explained it and we interrogated him about it and after it was all over he only received two votes on the Democratic side and only three on the Republican side. Those men were honest; they were doing what they believed was right. They heard every word he said and he answered every question and only convinced one other man on the Democratic side of the committee besides himself.

Mr. BOREN. Then it has been considered and the House is the proper place to consider it now. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Go right ahead.

Mr. BOREN. A moment ago the gentleman remarked that this price ought to be fixed. If the price is to be fixed, why did not the committee have the courage to fix all the prices instead of leaving it to an arbitrary individual in a bureau?

Mr. PATMAN. We are doing that in a systematic, intelligent way, a way that will stop inflation, and if people want to spend their money on diamonds, high-class hotels, let them do it. We do not care if they are bound to spend it. All of them will not invest in bonds. We are not trying to keep down the price of luxuries or of nonessentials. We are dealing with essentials in national defense and inflation.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. I think the gentleman should correct his statement, because he said that Mr. GORE's suggestion had not been considered.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I said that. I said the only thing the committee considered about Mr. GORE's bill was the matter of wages. That is the only thing we considered. If you want to put wages in the legislation, there is no use of adopting the Gore substitute. Just wait until we reach that provision in the committee bill and move to strike out the exemption of wages. Then you will have the question directly before you in a well-considered bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman said in reference to a question that it would cost a hundred million dollars to administer the Gore bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I did not intend to say that. I intended to say it would take a million people.

Mr. COLMER. I just wanted to get that straightened out. Can the gentleman give us some idea about what it would cost to administer the committee bill?

Mr. PATMAN. There was an estimate made before the committee, but I do not now recall exactly what it was.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. But the Gore bill freezes both profits and profiteering.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, it does not freeze profits at all. It does not touch profits. That is the point they will have to explain. The question will be, "Why fix my wages and not fix the profits of the concern I am working for that is making millions of dollars a year?"

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. But the profiteer would profiteer right along and never get stopped.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. His profiteering will continue. It freezes them exactly where they are. And that is one of the most unfair things about it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman justify in his committee bill the provision which fixes the price of farm products and at the same time permits the Government to pay farmers $1,000,000 subsidy?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, it would take me a longer time than I have to do that, but I just want to say that there is plenty of justification for the present farm program.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; for just one more question, and that is the last.

Mr. BOREN. I ask the gentleman how profits can go up if the price is fixed?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, through velocity of the turn-over. There are lots of ways that profits can go up. They can save in other ways, and they can have mass production. There are a lot of ways, but you want to fix the wages of the men working in the factories and do nothing about the profits of the concern for whom the men are working, whose wages you fix.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ask the indulgence of the Committee members not to ask me to yield until I have at least completed a discussion of some of the issues that have been raised against the Gore bill by the last speaker. There is no reason for getting hot or bothered, or for implying that any Member of this Congress has a selfish personal interest in legislation. I think we all can admit that we are here to try to get a bill that will do the job and prevent disastrous inflation from wiping out the life savings and, if you please, the wage values of the workers of this country.

To begin with, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] asked the question how any price administrator could regulate 1,800,000 prices. That is the number that he said exists in our price structure, and yet Mr Henderson, by his own testimony, proposes to do just that thing, to regulate the 1,800,000 prices by working on how many? By working on from 75 to 100 prices. I say that is obviously impossible.

The second point of attack upon the Gore bill is the fact that the Gore bill was ill-considered and hastily written. It is true that the committee had hearings for 2 months, but when the committee got ready to act—and the gentleman from Texas and every member of the committee knows it—we worked for only 2 full days on the rewriting of the bill, changing the bill, discussing the bill—2 whole days. When we finished, what did we find?

HENDERSON SALARY

We found that the well-considered committee bill had inadvertently regulated wages that is, had inadvertently regulated the wages of Mr. Henderson, because we had reduced his salary from $12,000 to $10,000. We also found that we had in this well-considered committee bill we inadvertently placed under absolute control of Mr. Henderson the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its kindred defense activities in purchasing defense supplies. We had also put under Mr. Henderson the A. A. A., the Surplus Marketing, and these other valuable farm agencies.

To be fair, I must say the committee is rectifying their mistakes. There will be amendments put in here this afternoon to correct those, and they are good amendments.

But I wanted to say that the Gore bill has not been hastily drawn and ill considered. The basis for the Gore bill, if you please, was the experience in the last war by Mr. Baruch. Mr. Baruch knows the problems even better than Mr. Henderson does.

NO BUREAU AID

There is criticism attaching to the Gore bill, a blight that I am afraid may kill it, according to the popular conception on Capitol Hill, and that is that the Gore bill originated in Congress. The Gore bill was drafted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] with the help of the congressional legislative drafting service, and no other person other than Members of Congress have had a hand in the direction and drafting of that bill. It is a bill designed to meet the situation and the evils of inflation.

The committee is adding two things to the bill—the licensing provisions and the buying-and-selling provision. Personally I do not think they will help the committee bill. The committee insists that those things are necessary if the committee bill is to work. The Gore bill does not require the licensing provisions to be placed in it. Why? Because we trust more to local enforcement, to putting the enforcement back into the States and in the communities, if you please, where these prices are violated so that a man can be taken into his own district court and face his home court on a trial by injunction to prevent violation of these price ceilings.

I do not care for the buying-and-selling provisions that were placed back into the committee bill. Perhaps Mr. Henderson must have the right to buy and sell. They are so broad, however, that it will enable them to institute any kind of merchandising set-up or wholesaling set-up or storing set-up in competition with other well-established Government agencies. I still think we could get along with the excellent job now being done in this regard by Mr. Jesse Jones, the A. A. A., and the other regularly established institutions of our Government.

RULES PREVENTED PROFITS CLAUSE

Now, we come to a criticism that is a little humorous, the fact that the profit limitations have been taken out of the Gore bill. I am sure that we all know that the profit limitation was in the Gore bill and that the advocates of the Gore bill have pleaded to get the profits limitation before the Congress. Yet the man who asked the question why the limitations were taken out is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and he well knows that under the rules of this House his own committee would have made a point of order against the entire Gore bill if the Banking and Currency Committee had tried to violate the sanctity of the taxing prerogatives of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. If you will allow me to proceed a little further.

Mr. PATMAN. Did the gentleman make any effort to write an amendment that would be in order on profits?

Mr. MONRONEY. We were told there was no way we can write an amendment on profits. We tried hard to do that in the Gore bill. I will say to the gentleman that the sponsors of the Gore bill will be here, ready, willing, waiting, and urging that the Ways and Means Committee at the earliest possible time, bring in sufficient legislation to curb all war profiteering.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the gentleman think that probably we will soon get an opportunity to vote for as much profit-tax legislation as our hearts may desire?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will those taxes reach the fixed charges of Barney Baruch and these other Wall Street bankers?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly hope they will.

ENFORCEMENT IS FAIR

I want to go now into the claim that was made of the vast, vast army that would be required to enforce this Gore over-all bill. I do not see how in the world anyone who heard the testimony in the committee when I asked Mr. Henderson about this can have any doubt as many or more would be required for his bill. I said, "Mr. Henderson, how many employees and officials will be required to enforce your bill?" Mr. Henderson said, "I don't know." I said, "Mr. Henderson, will it require 1,300—that is the number you have now—will it require 13,000, 130,000, or 1,300,000?" He said, "I don't know. I will try to put it in the record." He has not put it in the record.

So when you say the Gore bill will require a great army in every nook and corner of the country to enforce the ceiling you have the admission by the administrator of this act, who says he does not know how many men will be required for his own bill's enforcement.

I personally think the Gore bill will be easier of enforcement than the committee bill, because it is an over-all bill, and it is human nature to respect fair, equitable, over-all treatment. But if you favor one man economically against his neighbor—and that is what the selective price-control bill does—you will invite bootlegging. You will invite evasion of the law, and you will have a difficult time in trying to keep this thing from becoming the worst mockery that the Congress has ever passed.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If you pass either of these bills, then you will have to ration purchases.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that will be necessary except on the items of scarcity. In those items of scarcity you will have to go to rationing.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If you go to rationing, the person who goes to the store to buy anything from a pair of shoestrings to an automobile must carry a ration card. Has the gentleman figured how many hundreds of thousands it would take to enforce that kind of program?

Mr. MONRONEY. The rationing would not follow from price control but would follow from our national-defense program that is demanding most of our resources. We have no control over material shortages.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. What would happen if you had no controls? It would be rationing according to the biggest pocketbook, and the poor people of the country would not be able to get even the necessities of life.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that no country yet except a totalitarian state per se has ever attempted to fix prices except where there was a scarcity.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the gentleman from Mississippi contend that the Henderson bill is less objectionable than the Gore bill?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think one is high popolarum and the other is low popohirum. They are just as bad as they can be, both of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I have the highest regard and greatest respect for the gentleman. He is one of the most valuable members of our committee. I am glad he is on the committee and glad he is a Member of this House; but I would like to know how he justifies arguing for an over-all and yet not put the biggest item of all—fifty billions of retailing—in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. The way it was brought out by the gentleman in his earlier discussion I hardly thought was becoming. I happen to be in the retail business and I want to assure every Member here I have no personal financial interest in what kind of price control we get.

Mr. PATMAN. I want the gentleman to know that I was not referring to him. I never thought of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. It was indicated on the floor, but we will let that go.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXPLAINS CEILING

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from Texas asked the perfectly logical question why the over-all ceiling stops at the wholesale line. The reason for that was because anybody who knows the trend of prices knows that wholesale prices have already advanced to such a point that retailers are absorbing these advances from inventory they own at lower figures. The retail price-level statistics will show that this is in many cases—in most cases—slightly above today's wholesale level.

Were you to freeze retail prices at today's levels you would lock the door of every retail store in this country. You would throw out of employment these men. They could not pay expenses and still replace their stocks. Instead of doing that, and in order not to let any single item of our economy go untouched, in order to make the over-all ceiling workable, we have had to trust to Mr. Henderson, who is to administer the bill, to limit retail margins to such a point that there would be no profiteering, that only normal, reasonable profits would be maintained in the retail field.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. How does the gentleman propose to protect the consumer unless he controls the retail price the consumer has to pay?

Mr. MONRONEY. We are giving the Administrator the power to control the retail margins against profiteering. Now, if the Administrator cannot be trusted to control the retail margins, how in the world are you going to trust him with a bill that gives him power to control the whole economy of this Nation?

Mr. COOLEY. If he controls retail margins, why is not he by that same method controlling the retail price?

Mr. MONRONEY. He is controlling the retail price, but you cannot freeze the retail price as of today because your wholesale prices in many cases have already gone up to almost today's retail prices.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman states, then, that the Gore bill does attempt to control retail prices.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill certainly does control retail prices.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from Oklahoma who is now addressing us have stated that this bill provides an over-all ceiling. We discussed it yesterday, when the floor was not so crowded. Will not the gentleman admit that under section 206 the Administrator can lift the ceiling on everything that he does not think necessary for the carrying out of the purposes of this bill? So, in reality, it is a selective price control that the gentleman is advocating.

EXPLAINS EXEMPTIONS

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very glad I have the opportunity to talk to the Members today on that subject, because it is the point of greatest confusion. This provision in the Gore bill to permit exceptions from the blanket over-all ceiling that it places on prices is for the purpose: First, of taking care of necessary defense production, and I believe everybody will agree that is a good exception; and, second, it gives him the right to exempt the nonessential things that have absolutely no influence on inflation. Mr. PATMAN'S minister's Christmas present that he was worrying about, Mr. PATMAN'S bootblack that he was worrying about; the divorce-case lawyer's fee: Those do not contribute to a rise in the cost of living; I do not think they do.

Mr. BARRY. Can the gentleman tell me one solitary item that Mr. Henderson could not exempt under section 206?

Mr. MONRONEY. If he violates his oath of office, if he disregards the mandate of this Congress, he can disrupt this bill; but if you cannot trust the man you want to administer this Henderson bill to be honest in making proper exemptions, then how in the world is he fitted to have authority to regulate the entire economy of this country that you would place in his hands under the committee bill?

Mr. BARRY. That is not the purpose at all. He believes he can carry out the purposes of this bill by placing a ceiling over a limited number of prices. In carrying out the provisions of this bill he would do the same thing and have no intent of evading his office, but will be carrying out his own ideas.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the gentleman misstates the safety valve of this bill for the main entrance, and that is the main argument.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the substitute bill. I am for it because I am against inflation and because I honestly want to keep down the cost of living.

The Gore bill will be effective. The Steagall bill will not be effective.

There has been a great deal of criticism of the labor provisions in the Gore bill. Some who spoke yesterday said that it would interfere with collective bargaining and the rights of labor. This is not at all true.

Read the bill and you will find that what it does is to recognize that there is a public interest in wage negotiations.

The practical effect of the bill, as I study it, is to provide that the Administrator, as representing the Government and the public, will hold a veto power on any wage increases which he feels would injure the public interest by causing an undue price rise.

Labor and industry could bargain as usual, but when an agreement had been arrived at they would have to go to the Administrator and say, "By the process of collective bargaining we have arrived at the following decision. Is there anything in this contract so contrary to the public interest that it would cause an undue price rise?"

And then Mr. Henderson, in accordance with sections 206 and 207 of the Gore bill, would probably in 99 out of 100 cases say, "The new labor contract is satisfactory. Either the company is making a large profit and this wage rise can be absorbed, or a slight rise in the cost of the product is justified. I will interpose no objection."

The one hundredth case might be that referred to by Mr. Henderson in answer to a question by the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in the hearings, where he stated that "in case an industry granted entirely unjustified wage increases which would make it impossible for them to earn a profit, there was nothing he could do under the Steagall bill except to grant them a rise in price."

The substitute bill would entirely plug up this leak.

It is fair to labor and, what is vitally important, it is an effective bill which will keep down the cost of things which workmen have to buy and so, in the long run, be greatly to their benefit.

And the good effect on the morale of all the people if we pass an over-all bill will be tremendous.

The history of prohibition proved that a law which the public considers unfair cannot be enforced. Only a bill which treats all elements of our population equally and fairly will be accepted wholeheartedly by the American people.

Enforcement of price control will be so difficult that it is only through self-enforcement by public opinion that it can be made effective.

We must have a united people to win this economic war. We must not let a piecemeal, half-hearted bill hamper our defense efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the substitute bill will be adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Under this definition of services in the Steagall bill, may I ask the gentleman if it is not possible for the Administrator to regulate to the same extent the trades and professions and the incomes of the people so engaged as it is under the Gore bill?

Mr. KEAN. I believe that is quite possible.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, under both bills they could regulate fees, salaries, and commissions?

Mr. KEAN. Indirectly through the Steagall bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. How does the gentleman propose to control bootleg and unfair practices without some type of license provision?

Mr. KEAN. If the over-all bill is passed, there are the criminal provisions.

Mr. BOGGS. In other words, the gentleman would favor sending a man to the penitentiary rather than revoking a license?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge it is not pleasant to vote for a bill that puts the economic destiny of the people of America in the hands of one man. We have to grant great and unusual powers if we are going to serve the purpose in view. I am in favor of granting enough power to the Administrator to effectuate the purpose, but I am not in favor of granting him any more power than is necessary. Every power we grant him is a derogation of the usual rights and privileges of the American citizen. It takes away our constitutional rights, it is revolutionary, and it could not be justified except by the emergency that now threatens the very existence of our country and our institutions.

I want to read a section of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and give you my interpretation of what it does. Many of my colleagues have said they do not want to delegate power to Mr. Henderson. They criticize him, and they hesitate to grant him the powers under the bill reported by the committee, yet they are willing to grant him powers under the Gore bill which are far greater powers without limitation and definition. Here is the section in the Gore bill I want to read to you, and I want you to consider it:

(b) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, or other obligation, for any person knowingly to receive or pay, or to enter into any contract, agreement, or other obligation under which he is entitled or required, or under which he purports to be entitled or required, to receive or pay, for the performance of any services a price in excess of the ceiling applicable to such services.

That provision not only applies to the bootblack and to the barber shop and to the beauty parlor but it applies to every public service corporation in the United States. The Administrator under this act could regulate the rates on railroads, he could regulate the rates on interurbans, he could regulate the rates on street railroads, and he could regulate the rates of every light, heat, or power company. He could regulate the rates of every utility of every description in the United States. There is no limitation to the powers that are granted under this section.

If you want to grant this power to a man who will be burdened with the duties of fixing the price of commodities throughout this great land of ours, the greatest Nation in the world, with more diversified industries, with more diversified economic conditions, more diversified conditions of agriculture and of labor, I repeat, if you want to grant this immense power in addition to those already granted, that is your privilege. Do you not think that would be a dangerous power placed in the hands of any one man? I do not think it could be administered intelligently or effectively, and I think the very statement of the proposition makes it ridiculous.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Henderson in his own community, Millville, N. J., where he went to school, where everybody knew him, got the title of "Dub." Anybody who is called a dub in his own community should not be lauded here in the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this is too big a question to approach it with personalities being predominant. It is a question of the greatest moment to the people of America. Irrespective of who the administrator is I do not think we should impose upon him these duties which cannot be administered by him, and which are highly technical, and which can be administered intelligently only after great study and investigation. There are commissions regulating public service corporation rates in the cities, there are commissions regulating rates in the States, and there are the various Federal regulatory commissions. All those regulatory bodies would be destroyed, they have been developed through the years, under laws which have had constant consideration and development. The lawbooks are full of decisions on the subject. All these things would be destroyed by this one section of the bill, and the judgment, the ipse dixit of one man would take their place.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who is fundamentally opposed to the committee bill because of the fact that the committee bill in its present form establishes an economic czar, anyone who is opposed to the committee bill for the reason that there is no review of the equities of the ceilings established over prices, cannot consistently vote for the Gore bill, regardless of whether or not it provides a different philosophy of price fixing, because there are two fundamental objections—at least two—to the Gore bill which exist in the committee bill:

The first is that there is no check whatever upon the zeal and enthusiasm of the Administrator in respect to the manipulation of price ceilings. There is no check whatever—no remedy whatever—from the mistakes of judgment which he might make under the Gore bill. There is no review provided in the Gore bill whereby a protestant—an aggrieved person—might have the justness and equity of a ceiling reviewed. The only review contemplated in the Gore bill—and I believe this transcends all other subjects—is a review to determine if the Administrator had the authority to set the ceiling, or perhaps whether the Congress in the first instance had the authority to set the ceiling.

It has been commented upon that there is no ceiling on retail prices. I did not want to get into the merits of the Gore bill in that particular, but there is no ceiling on retail prices, and there are many and various items which enter into retail prices other than the wholesale price of the commodity which the retailer sells.

Are we willing in the one instance to vote to turn this broad authority to control the economic destiny of the Nation over to an individual and then in another respect say that we are not willing to? Those of you who feel keenly about this fundamental question by the solution of which today we might determine whether the form of this Government of ours is to be perpetuated must view both of these bills as they presently exist in the same light, that they are both equally bad in that they turn the destiny of 132,000,000 people over to a single individual without any adequate review.

The Gore bill differs in its operation as it is presently set up only in its enforcement. As I understand, no attempt will

be made to write into the Gore bill the licensing provisions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. So after the adjustments have been made by the Administrator, after he has been confirmed, then I say without fear of successful contradiction that the modus operandi of the two bills is almost identical, and in the meantime you embarrass the whole situation by creating millions of individual lawsuits and hearings to the point, probably, where you would so encumber the office of the Administrator with so many demands and protests against the ceilings which the Congress has by fiat set as to at lea' han per him in the establishment of needed ceilings

Do you realize that in a Sears, Roebuck catalog alone there are, I have been told, something over 50,000 different products, and they are manufactured by somebody? Sears, Roebuck buys them and retails them. Every manufacturer who is affected by a wholesale price established by the fiat of the Congress is immediately upon the enactment of this bill going to file his protest with the Administrator.

There is an interim period between the effectiveness of this act and the administration of the act. The Gore bill rightfully states that the Senate must confirm the appointment of the administrator. I believe we are dealing with policies and not individuals; but assuming, as we must, that Mr. Henderson is nominated by the President as the Administrator, and assuming that only half the things are true that have been said about him, surely we cannot expect the Senate to confirm him immediately. They will have hearings upon the character of this man, his intentions and his viewpoints, and it will take possibly weeks before they can agree upon an administrator. What happens in the meantime? Wages and prices are frozen right there.

Let me cite one instance wherein you might encourage hundreds of strikes in this Nation to the prejudice of the defense program. The scale of wages in the airplane industry today is lower than it is in the automotive industry, yet we will all agree that the airplane industry is perhaps more important to our national defense than the automotive industry. The scale of wages in the airplane industry is frozen, let us say, as of this date. It does not make any difference whether they go under mass production, it does not make any difference what the profits are, those men cannot disturb the situation.

What is going to happen in this interim period? They are either going to strike for higher wages or they are going to abandon the airplane industry in favor of some other industry which pays a higher scale of wages. You may cripple your whole defense industry by voting for the Gore bill and by fiat of Congress establishing a scale of wages which perhaps may before the confirmation of the administrator be wholly out of line with the cost of living. Whose fault would it be? It would not be the fault of any administrator. The chaos would result from the action of this Congress without the power in anyone's hands to correct any of the interim inequalities or inequities.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me ask the gentleman from Michigan if it is not a fact and if it has not been the experience of every country in the world that where you fix prices by law you also have to ration purchases?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I just read yesterday a very interesting article with respect to the Black Market of Europe, and in the face of the fact that the Nazi or German Government has military control over the occupied areas and can, I guess, if they want to, put men to death for bootlegging supplies and equipment, nevertheless about 40 percent of the trade in the occupied countries today is done through what they call the Black Market, to circumvent the ceilings which have been placed by Germany in the occupied areas. Now, if Germany, under military control, cannot enforce these provisions, how can we expect an administrator in this country to do it under an over-all system of administration?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the course of debate probably we have lost, to some extent, the purpose of the bill before us. The purpose is to curb the inflationary trend. It is not the purpose in anywise to interfere with business insofar as a fair profit is concerned where there has been no spiral of prices, where there has been no great increase in price in those commodities that are essential to the life of the people, and therefore we are faced today with the bill that has been proposed by the committee and the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee. It seems to me it should be the policy of this Congress to retain as far as possible the economic life of the country. It does not seem to me to be reasonable that because there is a spiraling condition today in some of the things that are necessary for the welfare of our country that therefore we should indiscriminately place a ceiling upon the prices of all commodities, upon rents, and upon wages. Therefore it seems to me that the Gore amendment is absolutely unnecessary.

There should be no desire on the part of anyone to impose a ceiling on those things that are luxuries in life or those commodities that are not absolutely necessary for the welfare or defense of our country, and I think if we were to adopt the Gore amendment we should in the first instance put a ceiling on those things that are not necessary, that are luxuries, we would go far beyond what the intent of the Congress and the people of the country desire.

In addition to that we are confronted also, insofar as the Gore amendment is concerned, with a question of commissions for services or pay for services. Let us take a simple case of a man employed by a company who has made during the past year $3,000 on commissions. What happens under the Gore plan? When the man has made the $3,000 this year, under the Gore plan, what must he do? He cannot work any more without getting the special permission of the Administrator in Washington as to whether or not he is entitled to more commissions if he continues to work. Is that a sensible way to do business? What happens insofar as the attorneys or professional men are concerned who last year made $5,000 or $10,000? This year when they make $5,000 or $10,000 and they come up, say, to the month of July 1942, and they have made in those 6 months as much as they made the year before, what must they do under the Gore plan?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. In just a moment.

Under the Gore plan, as it stands, he must be excused by the Administrator or on the other hand he must cease to do work and must throw the people in his employ out.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the Steagall bill or the committee bill contain exactly the same view or the same provision that the gentleman is now discussing?

Mr. LYNCH. Not at all.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will look on page 21, under the definition of "service," it says that it includes—

services rendered otherwise than as an employee in connection with the processing, distribution, storage, installation, repair, or negotiation of purchases or sales, of a commodity, or in connection with the operation of any service establishment

Mr. LYNCH. That does not mean, under the interpretation given by Mr. Henderson, the wages of those men who might be employed. It had to do particularly, insofar as that is concerned, as I remember it, with those services that are rendered in connection with processing, marketing, and distribution.

Mr. COOLEY. How about an accountant or bookkeeper?

Mr. LYNCH. I should say, under the Steagall plan, without question there is no question of wages involved one way or another, but under the Gore plan such a situation does develop.

Mr. COOLEY. How about fees and commissions?

Mr. LYNCH. Fees and commissions are not here involved. A careful reading of that provision will demonstrate that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LYNCH. I want to proceed further now.

With respect to the question of wages let me say this. If we are going to adopt a policy in this House that labor is a commodity and that we are going to tie up labor and the rewards of labor with the cost of a commodity, it seems to me we are abandoning the principle that Congress has in the past repeatedly set forth that labor is not a commodity.

We are faced, then, with a situation where, under the Gore amendment, we consider the question of a ceiling on wages but no ceiling or limitation of any kind on profits. Under the Gore amendment, labor will be limited in its earnings, but industry will have no limitation on its profits. It has been said repeatedly before the Committee that this bill of itself or whatever bill is passed will not curb inflation when inflation once gets started. There must be further bills with respect to territory and more control and the like. If this bill should be passed with the wage element in it, what situation would you have? You would have a situation where all of the wages of all of the people in the country are frozen at a certain level, even though there is no guaranty in the bill that there would not be an increase in the price of commodities. There would be one thing certain under this bill if amended in accordance with the Gore amendment, and that is that the only thing that would be definitely frozen would be wages and nothing else. I say it is palpably unfair to those people working for wages to so fix their wage that when there is no guaranty that inflation will stop they will still have their wages fixed by statute.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. If we freeze the wages of an individual, would we not be freezing the income, and would it not apply to any income?

Mr. LYNCH. No; I would say that wages are not the only income because I imagine that there are many people in this country who get their income from stocks and bonds, and let me tell you with respect to those people, although you would freeze the wages of the working people those people who have other income would in no wise be affected.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I mean the wages of a worker are his income.

Mr. LYNCH. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And if we freeze that, I do not think there is any warrant of law by which this Congress could pass a bill that would fix the income of an individual.

Mr. LYNCH. I agree with the gentleman perfectly, and also I say that when that wage is fixed under this amendment, there is no guaranty that prices are not going to go higher, ror is there any guaranty that prices will not go higher under any such bill we pass, unless we have a great deal of supplementary legislation.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I am going to take only a few minutes to emphasize two points that I raised yesterday in opposition to the Gore bill. I seriously urge the Members of the House to read section 206 of the Gore bill, and they will find that under that section all this talk about a price ceiling is a fiction, and that the only difference is in the method of approach, because under the Steagall bill the Administrator can immediately set a price ceiling over everything. Under the Gore bill the Congress puts a price ceiling over everything. But under the Gore bill the Administrator can exempt the prices all along the line. Just like in the Steagall bill, he can increase the prices; so in little respect does the selective price bill we are now discussing differ very much in operation from the Gore bill. The Gore bill is not the Baruch plan at all, and if the Administrator believes that he can accomplish the curbing of prices by selecting articles, it is inevitable from his point of view that he is finally going to reach the same result and put a ceiling on the same amount of articles as he would under the Steagall bill. So I think, so far as reality is concerned, that it is much ado about nothing. There is not a single article that he cannot exempt under section 206. Insofar as the question of putting a ceiling on labor is concerned, I repeat what I said yesterday, and I want to be frank to say that I am not too much impressed about this business of labor not being a commodity. Of course, it is not a commodity, but that is not necessarily a reason for not placing a ceiling upon it. The drafted boys in the camps only get a certain amount of money, and they are told what to eat and what to wear, and they are not commodities. The thing that perhaps decided me against this proposition is what happened during the election in Kentucky, and other places with the W. P. A. I know what happened in New York, and I know what happens in this Congress or in any other place whenever the administration is in a pinch, and they want votes to swing an election.

I say to you when you give the administration the power to raise the wages of 30,000,000 people you are just putting a noose around your neck if sometime you come into conflict with the administration, because you know as an actual fact if the heat is on, if the pressure is on, the Administrator can turn to these labor leaders and say, "Here, now, if you want a raise of wages, you support this measure or you oppose it." Or, " I want to get rid of John Smith, or Eugene Cox, or Barry, because he opposes my policy." Labor can be told to go out and knock him off in that election. When you grant the power to increase wages, you also grant the power to control the wage earners' votes. Do not forget that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it possible or practicable to fix any price or any ceiling on any commodity without giving consideration to the cost of producing that commodity and the labor involved?

Mr. BARRY. Absolutely not. To say that labor does not enter into the cost of the finished product is to just make a silly statement; but I would rather take a gamble on what may happen by not controlling the wage factor than to put Nazi regimentation over 30,000,000 workers.

The Gore bill will put into the lap of the Administrator the difficult problem of looking over hundreds of thousands of commodities and deciding whether or not to lift the ceiling. When you do that, you will require possibly tens of thousands of workers to examine into every commodity on which a ceiling has been placed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. We are now faced with the choice of knowing that if we do nothing a rise of prices is inevitable. I do not believe anyone knows whether or not any bill is going to curb the law of supply and demand and prevent inflation. My opinion is that it will simply put into the hands of the Administrator the power to stop chiselers and grafters, and therefore in certain instances curb price rises. I am reluctant to vote for any bill, because there is no question in my mind, and there should not be any question in the mind of anybody, that it is a vast step in the direction of economic regimentation and dictatorship. I have finally decided to vote for the least obnoxious of all, and that is the Steagall bill. I think it has as much chance of curbing rising prices as any other bill that we should adopt at this time.

Therefore I urge support of the Steagall bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in our discussion this morning it occurs to me that two very important matters which came before the committee in the consideration of this legislation have not been discussed. During the course of our long deliberations we took time to study the systems which have been employed and are being employed by other nations throughout the world today to regulate inflation. We made some very interesting discoveries. First we discovered that no nation today, whether it be at peace or at war, is without some type of price-control legislation. Secondly, we discovered that no nation has attempted to regulate both prices and wages under one administration. Third, we discovered that the only nation which has adopted a plan which embodies the principles of the substitute bill is Nazi Germany. Even in Nazi Germany, regulated and regimented as the society there is, there have been over 12,000 exceptions made to the overall bill, in a period of a very few years. As a matter of fact, within the last several years, since the inauguration of the war the plan has been abandoned for another one.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In every one of those totalitarian countries where this price-fixing program is working at

all, they have also fixed the volume of their money, have they not?

Mr. BOGGS. I think generally that is true.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In this country we can have wild inflation, if they want it, through the Federal Reserve System, without restriction. This bill does not touch the volume of money whatsoever.

Mr. BOGGS. My answer to the gentleman from Mississippi is simply this, and it also is pertinent to the Gore bill: For anyone to stand on this floor and maintain that a price-control bill, standing alone, can control inflation, is to be ridiculous. I may not conform to the monetary ideas of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], but it is fundamental that there must be credit control. There must be expansion of supply. There must be control of imports and exports. There must be a system of savings instituted. There must be a program of substitution instituted. There must be a continuation of the program of priorities and allocations for us to effectively control inflation in the United States. Hence to say that the Gore bill, standing alone, will do the job is to be palpably ridiculous.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In other words, if the Gore bill or the Steagall bill, or both of them, pass, unless there is some method of controlling the volume of our currency it will likely bring disaster to the country?

Mr. BOGGS. I am not going to admit the gentleman's contention. There must be price control plus other measures to control inflation.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thought that was the logic of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. BOGGS. I do believe that some credit control must be instituted. Whether it should be the type that you advocate or the type somebody else advocates is another matter to be studied by another committee.

The best evidence of the effectiveness of the selective system is in what has already been accomplished. There has been little discussion of the functions of the Office of Price Administration during the last 10 months. I firmly believe that had it not been for the selective control used by that office recently that the cost of living, in place of having advanced 10 percent, would undoubtedly have advanced 20 or 30 or even 40 percent; but by the voluntary strategic control of approximately 40 commodities, mind you, 40 commodities out of a total of two, three, or four million in this Nation, we have been able to keep the cost of living down to a moderate rise of about 10 percent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. I think the Members of the House should know a little something about the functioning of the Office of Price Administration to date, and what commodities have been controlled in such fashion that they have affected the entire price level. There have been a total of 42 ceilings imposed since February 1941. These ceilings represent 22 percent of the aggregate value in exchange of the total of over 900 commodities in the B. L. S. Index of Wholesale Prices. It must stand to reason that if we regulate the price of steel we help to control the price of buildings, of automobiles, of trucks, of all the numerous multitude of commodities which use steel, and on down the line. I say that the selective price-control system intelligently administered in such fashion that it touches at the root of the economic system can do this job without the multitude of administrators that must be required under the other system.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Without approving or disapproving what has already been done by way of price fixing, I would like to ask the gentleman why either of these bills should be passed? Why not continue as we have during recent months, as we have had some degree of control?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad the gentleman brought the question up. The reason the Office of Price Control has been able to function heretofore is because it has controlled industries where there have been few producers, few dealers: For instance, the steel industry the copper industry, the lead industry, the zinc industry. But when they tried to regulate scrap metal which became tremendously important as the shortage of steel developed in the Nation, it was literally impossible because there are tens upon tens of thousands of scrap dealers throughout the Nation and it was impossible to bring them all in a room and ask them voluntarily to conform to a ruling of a Government agency.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to commend the gentleman's very informative statement. How many members are there on the Committee on Banking and Currency which considered this bill?

Mr. BOGGS. Twenty-five.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The members of that committee had unusual opportunity to get information for a number of weeks from the leading people of this country.

Mr. BOGGS. Three months.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And from Mr. Henderson, too.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many members of the gentleman's committee voted for the committee bill and how many voted for the Gore bill?

Mr. BOGGS. I believe several members were absent. As I recall, however, 18 members of the committee voted for the committee bill and 5 voted for the Gore bill.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Does the gentleman think there are more scrap iron dealers than there are filling stations? Mr. Ickes did a good job on regulating the filling stations, and I believe the gentleman will agree that there are more filling stations than there are scrap iron dealers.

Mr. BOGGS. In other words, the point the gentleman is making is that in the case of the filling stations it was a voluntary action and proved fairly successful. I quite agree that there are thousands upon thousands of patriotic people in our Nation who will conform voluntarily to certain regulations in a national emergency. But I say this further, that the experience of all nations is that when you come to the question of price control of the entire structure, in fairness to those who do conform you must have some type of legislative control.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. If the gentleman has some preconceived idea about the danger of scrap-iron dealers not getting together or conforming, perhaps we should pass some criminal bill in this House now.

Mr. BOGGS. This bill carries criminal penalties, if that is what the gentleman is driving at.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I think we should have a straight criminal bill, then.

Mr. BOGGS. No. That is the reason for the licensing provision in the bill. It is not fair because a man violates one ceiling to send him to the penitentiary. I asked the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], a member of the committee, that question this morning. It is unfair to fine him $5,000; but it may not be unfair to protect the thousands upon thousands who are conforming to require him to have a license provided you surround that license with certain protective devices, such as we have done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Gladly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Louisiana has said that any selective price-control system will work if it is intelligently administered. This, it seems to me, begs the question, because the gentleman also has admitted that in having price control of itself we must have a control of the flow of money, the reserve ratio, control of the flow of credit and these other things. How can you have intelligent administration of a price-control system unless you have a centralized control not merely of prices but these other things that go into the price structure—credit, money, and so forth—and centralize the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce? And then how are you to achieve intelligent administration or find anybody or any group intelligent enough to administer all these functions and insure the harmony that is necessary?

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will bear with me, that question of intelligent administration is simply this: It does not have any effect upon the price structure if certain costs rise; as a matter of fact, it would be a good thing if more people started spending excess purchasing power at resort hotels or on railroad fares, or going to their dentists to have their teeth fixed, or buying expensive

foods, if they can afford them; in other words, as long as they are not competing with the essential articles in the country or with the articles that are required to maintain the standard of living, then it is all right for them to go on a spending spree because this helps to prevent inflation by absorbing excess purchasing power. Intelligent administration means that there must be the proper selection of commodities, and the Gore bill prohibits that type of selection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this so-called price-control bill is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation that has come before the Congress since I have been a Member of the House and one that carries the greatest threat to our farmers, to our businessmen, to our form of government, to our institutions, and to our way of life. It means dictatorship, totalitarian government. Do not deceive yourselves. This is the pattern that is being followed in both Russia and Germany and in all the other totalitarian countries of the Old World. It means a dying democracy and probably the end of our free institutions.

When you fix prices and make them effective you are bound to ration purchases, so that everyone must have a permit to buy even the smallest article. Whenever you do that, then you have a totalitarian government, and our system of free institutions and free enterprises will probably be gone forever.

As I said on yesterday, the danger in this bill, boiled down to a few words, is that it embraces the philosophy of scarcity and regimentation, which means totalitarianism, which means communism, nazi-ism, or fascism, whichever you desire to call it: They are all symptoms of the same disease. They all create an atmosphere in which free institutions cannot survive. It substitutes this deadly philosophy for the philosophy of abundance that has been preached by wise men from Moses to the present day and forms the basis of liberty and free enterprise throughout the world.

Remember that there is not a single country that has ever adopted a policy of this kind that did not first admit the failure of its free institutions. If we pass this measure we admit our failure to perpetuate our system of liberty and freedom in America. I fear it will mean peonage for the farmers of our country, and especially for the cotton farmers of the South.

The advocates of this measure have already driven the price of cotton down something like 3 cents a pound by their propaganda. That has cost the cotton farmers of the South about $15 a bale, or around $150,000,000 on this year's crop. Wheat, corn, cattle, and poultry farmers have suffered accordingly.

According to the prices manufactured articles are bringing and the wages being paid to industrial labor, cotton should be bringing at least 40 cents a pound, and the prices of other agricultural commodities should advance in proportion.

A cotton farmer makes, on an average, 1 cent an hour for every cent per pound he receives for his lint cotton. Today cotton is selling at 16 cents a pound, which means that the farmer who toils in the hot sun to make and gather his crop gets 16 cents an hour for his work—provided he makes a normal crop.

Now compare that with industrial wages fixed by the Labor Board. The most poorly paid industrial laborer, the Negro charwoman who sweeps the floor of the garment factory in my home town, has her wages fixed by the Labor Board at 40 cents an hour, or two and one-half times as much as the average farmer in the county makes plowing, chopping, and picking cotton in the hot sun. Yet the Wall Street bankers who are demanding this legislation are saying that cotton is too high and have been beating down the price in every conceivable way. But I will get to them in a minute.

I have a telegram from the C. I. O. representing the automobile workers in Detroit, Mich., advocating the passage of this measure, but urging us not to "put any shackles upon wages." In other words, they want us to impose this monstrosity upon the farmers of the Nation but to leave them out of it. I looked up the wages these automobile workers get, and found that they averaged $1.08½ cents an hour. If the cotton farmer were paid in proportion for his work, he would get more than $1 a pound for his cotton, or $500 a bale.

They will tell you that the agricultural program has done so much for the cotton farmers. But the fact remains that it has failed to raise the price. On the other hand, it has increased the production of cotton in other countries. For instance, in 1932 the world produced 24,000,000 bales of cotton, of which we produced 13,000,000 bales. Last year, 1940, the world produced 30,000,000, and we produced only 12,000,000 of it. While the rest of the world was increasing its production by 7,000,000 bales a year we were reducing ours by 1,000,000 bales a year. For the first time in history, the United States failed to lead all the rest of the world in the exportation of cotton. It actually fell to third place, Egypt and British India both going ahead of us.

In 1932 the State of São Paulo in Brazil produced only 99,000 bales of cotton. Last year it produced 1,260,000 bales, or more than the State of Mississippi, which up to that time, was the second cotton-growing State in the world, being surpassed only by the State of Texas.

Instead of curing this situation, this measure would likely make it infinitely worse. We have no assurance that the ones in charge of this program would not be just as ruthless in their treatment of agriculture as the priorities division of the O. P. M. has been toward the R. E. A.

You are going at this thing entirely backward. You are attempting to water the tree at the top. This movement is being inspired by those elements that have their wealth invested in tax-exempt securities or whose incomes are derived from fixed charges. The more you hold down the price of cotton, wheat, corn, cattle, hogs, land, lumber, and other raw materials, the more purchasing power the dollars of those men, those Wall Street bankers, represented by such men as Mr. Barney Baruch, will have. I have not changed my mind about Mr. Baruch and the Wall Street financiers he represents. Eight years ago, in 1933, when we had this problem before the House, when we were trying to cure the depression by a reasonably controlled expansion of the currency, he came into this capital and lobbied against us. In referring to him then I used these words:

> On yesterday there appeared in this Capitol a Wall Street international banker, Mr. Barney Baruch, one of the three wise men from the east.
>
> If the policies of these shylocks of finance were carried out indefinitely, this panic would last for a thousand years. There is absolutely no hope of relief in anything that any one of them advocates, but, on the other hand, the very policies for which they stand are responsible for the present condition of wreck and ruin.

That was in 1933. Today this pressure is being brought by those same financiers—by the same international bankers—who coined their fortunes out of the blood and tears of the suffering men, women, and children of the world during the last war, and who have their money invested in tax-exempt securities, or in such securities as bring them fixed returns. They want to hold down the prices of farm commodities to keep them from advancing to their normal levels.

If this measure passes, the farmers will have no chance to speak from now on. The reason I am speaking now is that I am the only voice the 250,000 people in my district have now, and, after this bill is passed, they might not have any chance at all.

When Antonio was pleading to Shylock to let him settle his debt and not to exact the pound of flesh from nearest his heart, which he had given as security, he was given the same answer these shylocks will give to the farmers of the Nation when Shylock said:

> I'll have my bond; I'll not hear thee speak.
> I'll not be made a soft and dull-eyed fool,
> To shake the head, relent, and sigh, and yield
> To Christian intercessors. * * *
> I will have my bond.

The mouths of your people will be closed whenever this bill is put into effect, and these financiers will collect the interest on their bonds for generations to come, or until the people rise in revolt.

The trouble is in our monetary system. The prices of commodities are regulated by two things—the volume of a nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. Every totalitarian country yet that has fixed prices has also fixed the volume of its money. You do not attempt to do that in this bill but leave the Federal Reserve System unrestrained as to either inflation or deflation.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. D'd the gentleman vote for a measure passed by the House in

1935 to regulate everything in our economy, which was more drastic than the bill before the House?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am not sure what was in that bill at this late date.

Mr. BOGGS. I have read it. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman is recorded as voting for it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. For what?

Mr. BOGGS. For an act that passed this House on Tuesday, April 19, 1935, conferring emergency powers on the President in time of war.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If we made one mistake, that is no reason for making another one—and especially one as drastic and dangerous as this proposed measure.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman believe that the farmers of this country gained anything from the inflationary period of the last war?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Louisiana does not seem to understand just what happened. It was not the inflation that hurt the farmers, but the deflation that followed. In 1920, when cotton, wheat, and corn had risen to the levels justified by the volume of currency and the velocity of its circulation, when cotton was 30 or 35 cents a pound, wheat $2.50 or $3 a bushel, and other farm prices had gone up in proportion, these Wall Street bankers went down to the Federal Reserve Board, when Woodrow Wilson was in bed sick, and got W. P. G. Harding, the Governor of the Board, to issue an order raising the rediscount rate and calling in loans in the agricultural States. That drove prices down. That is what broke the farmer. If we had had a law then to prevent them from doing such a thing or making it impossible for them to do so, as we must have if we ever restore normal conditions in this country and guarantee security to the farmers of the Nation we might have avoided the depression of 1920 as well as that of 1929. We might have had prosperity all these years without any relief rolls, without any regimentation, and without piling up a national debt of something like $65,000,000,000, on which these financiers want to make the American people pay them interest for generations to come. We never can pay this debt; we cannot even pay the interest on it, with the present price levels.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the other side should point out in calling attention to this vote in 1935 that that vote rested on a time of war. There has been no declaration of war by the Congress, and under such conditions that law would not be operative. At no time, however, have they developed that point in these interrogations that have been submitted to the Members who voted for that bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Michigan is right.

Let me tell the gentleman from Louisiana also that if this bill is passed in its present form, or even if you put the Gore amendment on it, in my opinion, it will result in disaster, and probably in the repudiation of the entire national debt.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is this not a step toward socialization of America?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. GIFFORD. I must finish that question, and I welcome the gentleman's answer. I now ask the gentleman to recant on the T. V. A., the most perfect socialized activity we have.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he needs some light, and I shall give it to him some day, and then he will be for the T. V. A. If the people of Massachusetts had a T. V. A. to guarantee them proper elecrtic light and power rates, they would now be saving more than $50,000,000 a year on their light and power bills alone.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman stated that he was unfamiliar with the contents of the bill passed in 1935.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I said I do not remember all its contents at this moment.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to read section 2 of that act.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No, Mr. Chairman; let him read that in his own time. I suggest that he also do some reading on this money question, upon a proper solution of which may depend the destiny of this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, who owns this gold buried in the ground in Kentucky? If you will investigate that proposition I think you will find that some of it, at least, is owned by certain international financiers, who are in favor of fixing the prices on farm commodities and holding them down below the cost of production.

If you want to restore prosperity to this country, let Congress take back the powers vested in it by the Constitution to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." Remonetize gold and silver on a reasonable ratio, and issue currency, instead of borrowing money from these financiers for the American people to pay back with compound interest for the next 50 or the next 100 or the next 500 or the next 1,000 years.

As I said, if you pass this bill, you are going to have to ration purchasing. Then you will have a totalitarian system in full. Then what are we supposed to be fighting for? What are we complaining about totalitarianism and dictatorships for if we are going to adopt the same system by an act of Congress and shut the door of hope in the faces of the people of this Nation, and especially of the farmers, probably for all time to come?

Mr. Chairman, let Congress assert itself, take back its powers, reassume its constitutional duties, prerogatives, and responsibilities, and say to these international financiers, in the words of William Jennings Bryan:

> You shall not press down upon the brow of the American farmer this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify this Nation upon a cross of gold.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, this may not shed any particular light on this subject, but sometimes we can learn by going back and considering the experience of others with various phases of fiscal policy and financial policy.

Way back from 1790 to about 1795 there was a great period of inflation in France. They had indulged in many of the schemes that have been promoted in the last few years in connection with our Government. I thought you might be interested to see just what the possibilities of inflation are during a short period of 5 years, so I have here reduced to American currency the change of prices during that 5 years on a few products.

In 1790 in France a bushel of flour was worth 40 cents. In 1795 a bushel of flour was worth $45. A bushel of oats in 1790 was worth 18 cents, and 5 years later it was worth $10. A cartload of wood was $4, and 5 years later it was $500. A bushel of coal was 7 cents, and 5 years later it was $2. A pound of sugar was 18 cents, and 5 years later it was $12.50. A pound of soap was worth 18 cents, and 5 years later it was worth $8. A pound of candles was worth 18 cents, and 5 years later it was worth $8. One cabbage was worth 8 cents, and 5 years later it was worth $5.50. A pair of horseshoes was worth $1, and 5 years later they were worth $40. Twenty-five eggs were worth 24 cents, and 5 years later they were worth $5.

This gives you just a little idea of how far price inflation can go.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me make the suggestion that in those countries they were doing just what we are now proposing, in trying to fix the prices of other things without regulating the volume of their money. They had uncontrolled inflation of their money, and there is nothing in this bill that will keep the Federal Reserve banks from issuing $50,000,000,000 of money if they want to do so.

Mr. REED of New York. What I had in mind is this. I have great confidence in the committee that brought in this bill, but whether it is the Gore amendment or the other measure, it is a piecemeal, political bill. These are times that are so grave that it seems to me this Congress might divorce itself from political considerations. There is not a man on the committee who has not the intelligence and the knowledge, working with his colleagues who are equally intelligent, to bring in a bill here starting at the beginning. You are not going to get anywhere so long as these great powers of inflation are invested in the Executive. Even the Federal Reserve which, of course, is friendly to the administration, has urged this and it has repeatedly urged that these powers be repealed.

I am sure if you really meant business and would come in here with a bill starting at the beginning and going the whole length, while I do not suppose you could check inflation any more than they have in the other countries with their various devices, at the same time you could put on the brakes, you could slow it down, hoping that some time we could get back to a situation of normalcy, if I may use that much-abused word.

Now, what happened over there after this inflation? A complete moral and political demoralization of France resulted. Their industrial structure was absolutely demoralized and it took them from 50 to 75 years to reestablish it. It was simply the result of a lot of dreamers and theorists of that time and continued to devastate France until finally a man rode into Paris on a white horse and took charge of everything, but he had learned his lesson, and he conducted a 20-year war without tampering with the currency, without inflating it, but, instead, he put it upon a sound basis with a metallic base.

I believe in justice to the American people. This committee should take this bill back and settle right down to a study of the matter without political considerations and without pressure from the administration. Such a bill framed by the representatives of the American people may meet the situation without destroying our economic structure.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, some things have been said here this afternoon, both in the cloakroom and on the floor, which indicated that some members of this committee from agricultural districts thought that, perhaps, a little inflation might be a good thing. I simply want to take this opportunity to say that, in my opinion, no group or class in this country will suffer as much from inflation as those who are engaged in agriculture. They are not going to suffer right now. We will go right up to the peak of whatever inflationary period we may have, and agricultural prices will probably advance as rapidly as all other prices. This happened in 1920 when we reached the peak of that inflationary period. Agricultural prices were 105 percent of parity. In September of this year agricultural prices were 105 percent of parity. So I do not think we have anything to fear as long as this inflationary progress is going on, but where agriculture gets it is when the inevitable deflation begins. You do not have to refer to any figures. Every one of you can recall the deflation that took place in 1921, when agricultural prices dropped to almost one-half of what they were, but wages did not decline in any considerable degree at that time. The cost of living did not go down nearly as fast as agricultural prices. The same thing happened in 1929.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I would rather not yield right now.

Farmers and other producers of raw materials were the ones who took the brunt. I have not much time, but I want just briefly to call your attention to the fact that in 1920 agricultural prices were 211 percent of what they were during the 1909–14 period. Industrial wages were 222 as compared with the same period.

In 1921, after the deflation, industrial wages were 203, just a slight drop, and agricultural prices had dropped from 211 to 125.

The same thing happened in 1929. Agricultural prices then were 146 and by 1932 they had dropped to 65.

This is what always happens and this is what will happen in this particular case. What we are looking for, as far as agricultural prices are concerned, is parity and stability.

I favor the Gore amendment because I believe it will be more effective in maintaining stability of prices.

I favor it also because I believe it is fairer, and that an over-all control is the only effective and fair way to approach this problem. The higher the price the bigger the drops are going to be, as far as agricultural producers are concerned. Agricultural prices are in a good relationship now, though not perfect. We want some prices to get nearer parity. Unless agriculture is to be again deflated at the end of this period of rising prices, something must be done to keep down the general price level. I do not think the committee bill will effectively do this. Instead, all prices will continue to go up. The farmer's relationship will not be changed while this upward rise is going on, but when the inevitable depression comes, he will suffer as he has at the end of every other inflationary period.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think that the machinery which is already provided by the farm program is sufficient to prevent inflation of prices of farm commodities?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I think it will have that effect, to a certain degree, but what I want to do is to keep those prices in line with other prices, or rather, other prices in line with agricultural commodities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the American way of life is the real issue involved in this legislation. Our Government may not, in its present form, be a paragon of political purity, but at least we believe that it is worth defending. Long years ago this Government of ours was dedicated to the high and holy ethics of civilization and to the gentle arts of peace which minister to the welfare and progress of mankind. We have dedicated the genius of our generation and the rich resources of our Nation to the gigantic task of defending and preserving our ancient and beloved institutions of freedom. That is a gigantic task. We have heard much in the past 8 years about dictatorship, and the terrible thing about the present situation and the present hour is the fact that the Congress of the United States is here and now facing the issue of dictatorship on the one hand or the free American way of life on the other. There is not any mistake about that. Strange as it may seem to you and me who have long enjoyed the great heritage which has come down to us, Members of this House stand here and boldly assert that under these bills, or either of them, we will be establishing an economic dictatorship in America. When we establish an economic dictatorship in America, at that moment we establish a social dictatorship, because when you control a man's livelihood, you control his social status. I for one do not believe that the emergencies of this hour require us to surrender, or even to momentarily suspend the free institutions of this Republic. There is no compromise on the issue of dictatorship. You gentlemen on the left for 8 long years have talked about a dictatorship. Bless your souls, you are now face to face with the issue. This bill contemplates a regulation, a regimentation of every phase of American life. It destroys the competitive system, and the system of free enterprise and free commerce and establishes in its stead a controlled, yea, a completely controlled and managed economy. There never has lived a man great enough nor wise enough to administer the powers which these bills seek to confer. We are preparing to defend our institutions with our lives and our resources, and yet here we are asked to surrender by our vote that which we are by armed force preparing to defend, and that which is most dear to the heart of every American. But they say they are asking us to surrender it only for the duration of the emergency. Only God himself in His wisdom knows how long this emergency shall continue; but it occurs to me that if we surrender our rights and privileges under this bill as contemplated by it, we shall have very little left to defend. We will not have a Hitler nor a Stalin, but we will have a Leon Henderson or a Ginsburg. Let us face the issue and bring it to its practical application. The laws of my commonwealth require guardians and administrators and others in fiduciary capacity to rent real property at the high dollar at public auction and to sell personal property at public auction at the high dollar. Think of how this law will clash with the laws of my State and with the laws of other States of the Union.

This legislation has a thousand objectionable features. It is unworkable, unconstitutional, and un-American. It will completely destroy the farm program. I wish that time would permit a detailed discussion of this objection to the pending legislation.

The greatest agricultural crop of my section is sold on public-auction warehouse floors, and is sold as the result of competitive bidding. All of that will pass away with the enactment of this law. There will be no more public auctioning of tobacco. Oh, no. The auctioneer will have sung his last song. Mr. Henderson will say, "This you shall pay for this pile of tobacco. This and no more." Even though the companies may be willing to

pay more, he will by his edict say, "Oh, no." So the auction system goes out.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Briefly.

Mr. BUCK. Would your same observation apply to the public auctioning of fruit?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know. I am not familiar with the method of selling fruits and vegetables.

Mr. BUCK. Fruits are generally sold in the major cities of the United States at public auction.

Mr. COOLEY. I assume that what I have said would be applicable to that situation.

Mr. BUCK. I should like very much to know that before I vote on this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. The fact remains that if Mr. Henderson fixes the sale price upon any commodity you may put it up at auction, and the minute it reaches that price level the auctioneer's hammer must fall. The sale is consummated, whether it brings a fair price or not.

Now, if we are not satisfied with America, if we are not satisfied with our way of life, if we must remake America, pray God, let us first preserve America, then remake it. This is an important bill. It is the most far-reaching and the most dangerous bill that has ever been introduced in the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOLEY. Not now. In just a moment I will yield. The gentleman who just requested me to yield stood here this morning and denounced the Gore bill and admitted frankly that he did not like this type of legislation, and he said to us, "Yes. It is economic dictatorship." The distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], on yesterday, said "Yes. It is economic dictatorship. You cannot have price control without dictatorship."

Now you have the question before you. Are you going back home to your districts and say, "I have embraced dictatorship. I have abandoned the American way of life. I have destroyed the free institutions of America"? I, for one, am not willing to embrace either of these bills.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I was extremely pleased with the expression of my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. He tells us now that we are facing a dictatorship in the United States if this bill is enacted into law. He also reminds us that we have been talking against dictatorship for the past 8 years. I am happy that he has seen the light and that he is now joining with other Americans to keep the American way of life for our people.

I am inclined to go along with the philosophy of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] on this bill. I feel that this legislation does not get at the source of the causes for inflation. If there were no danger of inflation this bill would not be before us, unless it is for the purpose of taking away the power from Congress and giving it to some bureaucrat in the Government service.

The proposed committee bill does not remove the direct cause which may bring inflation. If we fear inflation, and I do, Congress should recommit this bill to the committee. A new bill should be reported removing the causes for inflation. The new bill, to be effective, should contain the following mandatory provisions: First, repeal the authority which gives the President the power to further devalue the dollar; second, repeal the law which gives the President the authority to issue $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks; and, third, limit the amount of Government obligations held by any bank, thereby limiting the loanable reserves in banks. The full power to fix and regulate the value of money should be definitely restored to Congress, as provided in the Constitution.

In my opinion, the greatest inflationary threat now confronting the country is the power lodged in the President to devalue the dollar to 50 percent of its original value. We now have more than 650,000,000 ounces of gold under control of the administration. By a stroke of the pen the President can clip another 9 cents from the value of the dollar and take a profit of over $5,000,000,000 by boosting the price of gold. This manipulation at the expense of the American people, plus the silver-purchase fiasco, plus the power to print $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks, is the main inflationary threat and the real cause for inflation. The repeal of these powers will remove the threat of inflation. The price-control bill before us will be of no value in the stopping of inflation if the action I have suggested is not taken.

I understand that the administration is proposing a licensing system so that every individual engaged in marketing—in buying or selling of commodities, will be placed under Federal license. In my opinion, the power of any official to issue or revoke a license is the power to destroy. The edict of one individual, without any review, can put any businessman or farmer completely out of business.

I am not so much concerned about the men in big business in our country. They will take care of themselves. But I am concerned with 184,000 small businessmen engaged in the manufacture of products for the American people. I am concerned with several hundred thousand small wholesalers and retailers who are trying to eke out an existence from the small business that they do. All of them will be put under a license by a Federal bureau which license may be revoked if they do not do exactly according to the edicts of Mr. Henderson or whoever may administer the law.

It looks to me that some of our bureaucrats who have the idea that they must remake America, are reaching out through this legislation to accomplish their objective. For if they control the business of an individual and have the power to put him out of business, knowing that he does not have the wherewithal to go to the courts, the recognize that they can absolutely do away with his existence in our society. Possibly the big businessmen would welcome having the small operators go out of business, because then they would become larger and do business on a larger scale. Perhaps that is what the administration wants in this legislation. Perhaps they just want to make this as a part of the priority system, where they are denying materials to small manufacturers who are engaged in civilian production, and putting them out of business, which of course will make the big fellows bigger. They now come with this licensing system and price control, which also place a penalty upon the small businessman who is unable to protect himself. If they want to make the big businessman bigger, which they will do with this legislation and with the priority system, they will have the big businessman just where they want him. Most of the big businessmen have surrendered to the policies of the New Deal, anyway, for selfish or other reasons.

When the time comes to put the screws on, the bureaucrats then will tell the big businessmen, "Now, you do as we tell you or else—or else we will take you over." That is a part of the dictatorial scheme to remake Americe. All of this power and authority centralized in the bureaucrats down here has been gradually eked out of Congress, not according to the intent of Congress but after laws have been passed by the subservient majority here, these bureaucrats have interpreted the law according to the way they want it, and their decrees have the force and effect of law. Those bureaucrats are now running the affairs of America.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with the remark the gentleman just made, I think one of the strongest supports it is possible to find for his contention is in the statement made by Mr. Purcell, a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, before the Detroit Economic Club only a few days ago. Certainly if they can bring industry within the hands of a few corporations, it will facilitate the entire approach which Mr. Purcell strongly recommended.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Our business as Representatives of the people should be to protect our great American middle class, the backbone of our country. If we do not do that now, God pity the future of America.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the licensing provision of this bill it would affect the small merchant, the shoemaker, and also the farmer who occasionally goes to the edge of his property to sell some of his produce at the roadside?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Everybody who deals in a commodity upon which a price ceiling is put by the

Administrator—and that would take in everybody, because they are going to reach out into every part of our economic structure.

For 9 years now this administration has sought to bring about inflation by every conceivable policy. They have reduced the acreage of farm products by more than 50,000,000 acres, and it is not necessary for me to repeat that some 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 pigs were killed in order to bring about a scarcity. This was all done to bring about an inflation, but in spite of this and the unsound monetary policies the administration could not bring about an inflation psychology. The price levels did start up in 1936 and 1937. But you will recall that along in March 1937 the President made a speech and said that the prices of commodities were going too high, and they started to go down. It did not take any legislation in Congress to do that. We went into a recession and the recession stayed with us until we came into this new war era which we are now in and which faces the American people.

There is no scarcity of farm commodities in this country. We have 2 years' supply of wheat on hand, and if the price of wheat goes too far above the parity limit—wheat is selling in Canada for 38 cents under our market—Mr. Morgenthau has threatened to cut the tariff on Canadian wheat from 42 to 21 cents a bushel and throw Canadian wheat on our markets to halt price rises. We have over 20,000,000 bales of cotton. We have plenty of tobacco. We have over 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn. The beef and pork reserves are the highest in the history of the Nation. The only thing on which there may be a scarcity is dairy products and eggs, because we are called to ship those products to England under the lend-lease program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman made the statement that beef was higher than at any time in history. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to say that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I meant the largest volume of beef and pork in the history of the country.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry, I have only 2 minutes.

Let me point out another thing, that we have had an inflationary policy in connection with the operation of the Federal Government. There has been no scarcity of Government workers. When the New Deal took over control in March 1933, we had 540,000 employees. In March 1940 we had 949,000. In September of this year we had 1,444,000 as against 540,000 in March 1933. So, in addition to putting on a large personnel, maybe for governmental purposes—but we are somewhat suspicious about that—there has been a decided inflation in Government personnel as well as in Government expenditures, and today we are operating under the highest expenditures in the history of the country both for nondefense and defense items to make America strong.

It is estimated that we shall have at least 2,000,000 Federal employees before the end of the year. If we are to have inflation and if there is a threat of inflation, one would almost think there should be a scarcity in this country. There is, however, no scarcity of farm products and there is no likelihood of there being a scarcity.

It therefore looks to me that those who are advocating this legislation are doing so to secure additional power and control over the affairs of the American people. This Government of ours does not belong to the Chief Executive or to the bureaucrats; no, it does not belong to them. It belongs to 130,000,000 Americans, and we should save it for them and defeat the plans of those who seek to remake our American way of life into one of regimentation and dictatorship.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised at the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] when he said that he was interested in retaining the American way of life and because of that he was opposed to this method of regimentation. I want to recall the day of August 5, 1941, when he and others placed on the statute books of this Nation a bill which, in my opinion, started us on the way to national socialism. I refer to the property-seizure bill. He did not seem to worry about the American way of life then.

We have gone step by step toward the war, bringing this Nation to the point where we must recognize, if we are reasonable men, that we are to all intents and purposes in this war at the present time. Of course, it puts me in mind of an iceberg—only three-tenths shows above the surface and seven-tenths is below the surface. The three-tenths is actual physical conflict and seven-tenths is economic warfare. You want to remember that there are practically four systems of government.

There is national socialism, fascism, communism, and democracy. For the matter of argument, fascism and national socialism can be placed in the same category. The state controls all, the individual has nothing to say, but they do recognize the right of profit and the capital system. In communism they do not recognize the right of property, they do not recognize the right of capital, but the state controls all and the individual has no standing. But in a democracy we the people are supposed to have something to say.

What brings about national socialism? What brings about fascism? An economy of scarcity. This condition exists and has existed in central and southern Europe for the last century. A democracy can only exist in an economy of abundance, such as we have in America. Our natural resources must be conserved so as to maintain an abundance. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota when he said there was no scarcity of farm products. Well, if there is no scarcity in the necessities of life, then we should, in order to stop these high profits and the high kiting of prices, put something on the books that will hold the prices to within reason. I submit that if there is no scarcity, then there is no reason for the increase in cost of living; therefore the necessity for this bill.

I have fought against this trend toward national socialism, but, as I say, step by step we have come to the point where we must meet the issue, and in order to meet that issue we must realize that in this great national-defense program we are going to be faced with an economy of scarcity, and in an economy of scarcity we must put the brakes on the profiteer. There is only one way to control the prices in this Nation, and that is through drastic measures, and by just the sort of measure that is presented by the Banking and Currency Committee today.

I did not want to see it come. Many of us did not want to see it come. We tried to fight against it, but we are faced with reality today; we are faced with the problem of fighting for and building a national defense; we are faced with the proposition that our Nation must meet that thing which we have stepped into; and there is only one way to meet it, and that is with drastic measures, as is presented by this bill today. I grant that this bill will give the Administrator and his staff the authority to control the economic destiny during this national emergency.

I am not being misled into the thought that this legislation, or the administration of it alone, will effectively control prices, but realize that the people themselves—the wage earner, the consumer, the grocer, and the average American citizen—will be in himself or herself the real policing power which will make it effective. I say that, because the War Industries Board in itself was not so effective, but the people themselves who reported to the officials in charge of the activities of their neighbors whom they thought were, in an un-American way, doing things which were destined to destroy the purposes of the legislation.

We must have this legislation to save the middle class of taxpayers, or the small businessmen, if you please, because if we do not have a control of prices the burden of taxes will be such as will destroy them. What good will it do for us to appropriate money for guns, ammunition, lease-lend, or anything else if the prices and profits go so high that we can get very little for our money?

Oh, some say we must have control of wages. To those let me say if we have control of prices and control of the cost of living, so that the housewife will be able to manage and feed her little flock, we need no control over wages. The laborer and wage earner is not a profiteer, he is not unreasonable, he is patriotic and will not strike if his wages are

such as will give him a decent and honest living. Therefore, if you wish to stop strikes, stop the rise in the cost of living and give the laborer a fair wage for his services. This will mold national morale in the interest of national defense. Let us enact this legislation without wage control and at least give us a start toward solving this high cost of living. I want to warn this House, however, I will not support any legislation which will carry control over wages, which, in my opinion, will take away the right of strike. I favor the committee bill as is. I am opposed to the Gore amendment. The committee bill should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, may we not reach an understanding as to the time to be used in debate on this amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman suggest a time?

Mr. STEAGALL. May I ask the gentleman if we can agree on 30 minutes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wonder if we may not find out how many want to speak on the amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. How much time does the gentleman want on his side?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have suggested as a guide to that that we have a showing of the hands by those who want to speak on the Gore amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I have an amendment to the amendment that I desire to offer. I thought perhaps the gentleman would like to take that into account.

Mr. STEAGALL. Can we say that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes?

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman confine the request to this amendment? Somebody might want to offer a very important amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. I am wondering if we may not have an understanding as to when the debate will end.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Can it not be arranged that each of the gentlemen on their feet receive 5 minutes? If there are only eight, I am agreeable to 40 minutes personally.

Mr. RAYBURN. May I suggest to the gentleman that I know of one member of the committee who has not had time on this bill or any amendment thereto. If the gentleman from Alabama feels like it, and it is agreeable to the House, I would like him to include in his request enough time for the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] so that he may have 10 minutes. I would suggest that if we get to a vote on this matter by 4 o'clock it would be satisfactory.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I suggest in that connection that the gentleman from Arkansas have 15 minutes.

Mr. GORE. I believe the gentleman from Arkansas should have it and he will make a wonderful and able contribution. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has likewise not spoken and he is a member of the committee. Would not the gentleman accord him the same treatment?

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] has spoken and he only wants 5 minutes.

Mr. GORE. He has not spoken on this amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. He only wants 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to submit a suggestion to the gentleman. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock, the last 15 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. STEAGALL. That is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, with the understanding that the gentlemen standing will have the balance of the time among them.

The CHAIRMAN. In reply, the Chair will say that a list is being made of those standing; and if an agreement is reached, the Chair will call the names of those listed. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Gore amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER to the amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 26, lines 13 and 14, after the word "after", in line 13, strike out "June 30, 1943" and insert "December 31, 1942."

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is germane to the Gore amendment to the Steagall bill and also to the Steagall bill Further, in the event the Gore amendment is not adopted, I will again offer this amendment when the main bill is again taken up for consideration by the House.

At first blush this may appear to be a minor amendment, but there are certain compelling reasons for its adoption. These reasons are such as should be convincing to the gentlemen and gentlewomen on both sides of the aisle, and my appeal is so addressed.

I hope you will not think I am immodest in making the statement that I am injecting one new thought into this debate in connection with the period of time within which this act shall be effective. I have not heard a speaker during the last 2 days of debate who has not vigorously and earnestly decried the necessity of enacting legislation of this sort which in its very nature is diametrically opposed to our free American system of government. Assuming that we all see eye to eye on the premise that such a drastic bill is made necessary by the exigencies of the moment and to cope with the existing emergency and that it is a bitter pill for the American people to swallow, it seems elementary to me that we are charged with the duty of holding a tight rein on the time within which all business transactions of our country are to be regimented—and I pause here to say that both the Steagall bill and the Gore amendment are replete with plain, stark regimentation. I am convinced that we will rue this day if we provide that the emergency powers embodied in this legislation shall extend to the distant date of June 30, 1943.

We are getting ready to blaze a trail through a virgin forest. In my judgment, we should not vest any administration with such unexampled and dictatorial powers for longer than one calendar year. This particularly applies to an administration like the third New Deal, which has many times given unmistakable evidence of the fact that it has a penchant for making use of a measure like this as a many-seated vehicle for excursions into the field of socialistic experimentation.

The statement was made during debate yesterday that there would be no "blue eagles" fluttering from the windows. Perhaps not, but the purple buzzards or the yellow hawks, or whatever you care to call them will be flapping their wings over every home, shop, and factory of our country when the licensing feature of this price-control measure is placed in operation under a bureaucratic administrator. The small businesses of America are still licking the wounds inflicted by the moribund N. R. A., and here we are preparing to saddle the country with an even more horrendous system of government regulation.

Coming down to the second reason for my amendment, may I point out a fact that may have escaped the attention of the Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with its decision that this legislation should remain in life until the end of the Government fiscal year 1942 instead of the end of the calendar year 1942. This bill is for the regulation and supervision of the small business of this country as well as of the large business. How many small businessmen do you know who keep their books or conduct their affairs on the basis of a fiscal year? In truth and in fact the great majority of them make their contracts, establish their budgets and conduct all their other operations on a calendar-year basis. Why saddle them with the needless burden of having to make their plans to operate under a bill which expires in the very middle of their calendar year?

In the name of common justice and in the name of common sense, it occurs to me that we should, for the purpose of preventing economic dislocation and confusion in the ranks of business, enact this measure for only 1 calendar year. Have it expire at the end of 1942, and then let us make a resurvey of the situation to see whether it should be extended for 1 more calendar year. I anticipate that it will be argued, in opposition to my amendment, that I am conjuring up eventualities which will never eventuate, in view of the fact that the committee, or Steagall bill contains a proviso that the powers thereunder shall terminate prior to June 30, 1943, on proclamation by the President or by action of the Congress. That would no doubt ordinarily be sound reasoning, but I consider it a specious argument in the light of the country's bitter experience that once extraordinary powers are vested in the New Deal

administration, they are never surrendered, despite any change in economic conditions. The feasibility of either of the price-control bills before us this afternoon must necessarily be determined by a process of trial and error. If my amendment is adopted, this Congress will be in position to perfect and refurbish this same legislation in the light of the experience gained during the 12 months of its administration and reenact it in suitable form in ample time before the beginning of the 1943 calendar year, providing the emergency conditions of the present day then still obtain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I should like both my Democratic and Republican friends to give some attention to what has been proposed, both in the Gore amendment and in the committee bill itself. I have before me at the moment only the committee bill. I am going to discuss the question of what is going to be done to agricultural commodities.

If you have a copy of the bill before you, I ask you to turn to the bottom of page 7 and read the following:

That in the case of any agricultural commodity other than the basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco—the Secretary shall determine and publish a comparable price whenever he finds, after investigation and public hearing, that the production and consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities.

You know we went through a period when grapes, which are produced very largely in California, were worth practically nothing because of the prohibition era. This was true in New York, it was true in Michigan, and it was true in other States. Now, let us be honest about it. How is the Secretary going to find any comparable price on a commodity such as that? I am here to tell you today that you cannot by this legislation do justice to the grape grower under any circumstances whatsoever.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I will if the gentleman will give me a little more time.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no power to give time. Is grape an agricultural commodity—it is, is it not?

Mr. BUCK. Yes, grapes are an agricultural commodity and so is wine, because there is no commodity that is produced that is more agricultural than wine. You know very well there is not even water added to the grape product. It is an agricultural commodity that has not anything added to it, not even water, as beer has.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has three protections under this bill, the price October 1, 1941, parity price, 1909–14, and the average price between 1919 and 1929, and one of those prices should certainly take care of the gentleman's product.

Mr. BUCK. It certainly would not. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Texas, but the gentleman knows very well that the grape products of California, New York, Illinois, and other States have suffered under the effects of prohibition for 15 years. They are just beginning to get back to the place where they can make a little money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, 10 months ago there were many of us here in the House who voted against the lend-lease bill. For what reason? Not because we did not want to give all possible aid to democracies fighting aggression but because of the vast power contained in that measure. We felt it delegated to one man the authority to drag this Nation into undeclared warfare. Today we are practically at war. The occupation of Iceland without sanction of Congress was justified because of implied authority delegated to the President under the Lend-Lease Act.

Today we are asked by the administration to place in the hands of one man, later to be appointed by the President, sufficient power and authority to practically kill all private initiative in our Nation. Yes; we are asked to give Leon Henderson this power—power which may well drag our Nation into economic chaos.

The remarks yesterday by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] relative to the Communists holding high positions in the organization of Leon Henderson should be very carefully weighed here today.

After listening patiently for nearly 3 days to the debate on this proposed legislation, I am absolutely convinced that this one-man dictatorial control of our economy is foreign to the American way of life. It is too much in line with the teachings of Communists and Fascists, hundreds of whom today, unfortunately, work for our Federal Government, while it has been difficult for real Americans to make a living.

This bill, in my opinion, gives to the administration a strangle grip over small business, agriculture, labor, and economy in general in America. It does make one exception, however. The cloak of sacredness is thrown over large industry and the bill does nothing whatsoever to take care of excess profits. I want all business to get a fair return on the investment. I do not want to tax business out of existence. Industry is entitled to 10 percent on its investment just as well as the farmer is entitled to a little profit—yes; even 110 percent of parity. I cannot agree to vote for a ceiling on the farmers and wage earners, as in this Gore amendment, while no provision has been made in this bill to keep industry's profits down to a reasonable level.

Are profits for big business so sacred to this House—to the representatives of the American people—that you fear, my friends, to include a provision here that would clamp the lid on such? Will you, without compunction, see to it that the small fellow is kept penned up while the large hog runs wild?

We have heard here a lot of talk about high prices of agricultural products. The corn I have on our home farm in Minnesota would sell today for 56 cents per bushel. Parity for corn is now at least 82 cents per bushel. Surely you men who claim agriculture today is enjoying high prices are, to say the least, misinformed as to the true facts.

We also have a few hundred bushels of wheat in the granary on that farm. What is our local elevator able to pay me for that wheat today? Not the much talked of 110 percent of parity, or $1.32 per bushel. No, my fellow Members; that wheat will today sell for 97 cents, which is considerably below parity, let alone 110 percent of parity.

And yet you see editorials without end in the eastern press, editorials written by men who in all probability have never known what it is to try to make a decent living on farms, nen who in this particular case know very little about what they are writing, expressing the opinions that farmers today are profiteers and are receiving great, high, speculative prices for what we produce. I have yet to see any editorials in this press suggesting the advisability of holding down the new crop of war millionaires springing up in America today.

I see nothing in this bill that prevents collapse of prices of farm commodities. You talk about a ceiling, but is there any guaranty to agriculture or labor that fair prices will be maintained and fair wages paid? I have heard the assurance that excess profits will be taken care of in later legislation. I heard the same kind of assurance last week concerning legislation designed to prevent strikes in defense industries. I am becoming pessimistic about these promises.

This proposed legislation before us today can very well wait until the great Ways and Means Committee, in my opinion, shows some willingness at least to see to it that excess profits on these billions of war contracts are returned to the United States Treasury. If such a provision were in this bill, I would be willing to go along and say, "Yes; you can also place a limit on wages and farm commodities as long as you are treating all groups alike. We are willing to do our part."

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against both of these proposals, the Gore amendment and the Steagall bill, because they are both unfair to the wage earner, to the farmer, and to the small businessman, while industry's profits run riot. Furthermore, this is totalitarianism. We in America want no one-man control of our destiny.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, after listening to 2 days of debate on the subject of which form of price control, either the Steagall or committee bill, or the so-called Gore bill, should be adopted, I am impressed with one outstanding thought. Most proponents of either of these bills are simply assuming that inflation is the most horrible thing that could happen to any nation or society of people. The chairman of the committee took a great deal of time on this floor to speak in generalities and fur-

nished little argument, if any, to justify a movement on the part of this Congress to establish an over-all management of the last free phase of our economy. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] today presents the form of his bill in the form of an amendment to the committee bill. Yet Monday, in his detailed explanation of the reasons for his bill, one was forced to come to the conclusion that his was a situation where a smattering of knowledge proved more dangerous than full comprehension of the subject. I certainly do not want this House to think I am holding myself out as an economist, and I do not. But in seeking a solution for this problem I have first tried to determine what is the problem. The problem is apparently a tremendous fear on the part of the administration of inflation. This fear has been built up in the public mind by the press as though it was the most disastrous thing that could befall any nation.

The facts are that this administration has made move after move to cause inflation before and during the war effort. Controls over our money and credit systems now lodged in the President are inflationary and were intended as such. The absolute disregard for the rapidly increasing debt is inflationary.

It has been the intention of this administration from the beginning to bring about certain forms of inflation. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] pointed out on the floor of this House, the administration has spent billions of dollars to bring about inflation. Now, suddenly there is a great popular feeling expressed in certain quarters that the horrible orgy of inflation is about to overtake the economy of this Nation.

There are two economists in America—by citing two I do not mean there are not more—but there are two for whom I have a great deal of respect on this subject. To these two men I have recently addressed an inquiry, as follows:

Do you believe it wise to enact any price-control legislation at the present time?

If any price control—should it, in your opinion, embrace commodities, wages, rents, and services?

These questions were addressed to Dr. Melchior Palyi, of Chicago, Ill., and to Dr. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University, and secretary, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. Both of these gentlemen are members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy and both are recognized as men of intense experience and ability in the field of economy and finance. In the order which these men have been named, I extend their replies to my questions:

Dr. Palyi:

1. Price control is necessary for all articles which are short (and would therefore rise in price) and which are essential from the point of view of consumption or defense.

2. What is short or not is difficult to define. For practical purposes, price control can be avoided in most cases by the appropriate control of inventories. If the Army, the Navy and the large industrial firms would be compelled to relinquish their inventories of raw and similar materials over and above what they need for actual production within, say, 2 or 3 months, we would not need price control, except in a few fields, for some time to come.

3. Price control, so far as needed at all, is only effective if it is combined with rationing, or systematic allocation of the products among those who deserve receiving them. Either priorities or direct allocation is essential to keep controlled prices from running away—for some time.

4. Price control is definitely disadvantageous in industries in which the production of vitally important articles could be stimulated by higher prices. In such industries, price inflation would help to create more production, and thereby to eliminate shortages and to avoid more inflation. In other words, inflation is sometimes the best medicine against inflation—paradoxical as this may sound. For example, if one permits the copper price to rise, there would be more copper produced, which would eliminate the shortage in a number of industries, which in turn would reduce the fear of shortages, and the inflation trend in general.

5. Price control is absolutely necessary where the Government itself raises prices, such as in the agricultural field. Imposing a ceiling there is the most important thing to be done to prevent much more inflation.

6. As to wages, the situation is somewhat similar to that of farm prices. The trouble is that an absolute ceiling is nonworkable, and that under our political conditions no ceiling would create the risk of unlimited wage raises. The answer is to make wages absolutely dependent on the cost of living, in accordance with the theory that nobody should profit by the war emergency, but that living standards should be approximately maintained.

7. Rents need to be controlled only where there is a shortage of housing. In other words, discretionary powers must be given someone to apply a ceiling on rents in one place and not in another.

In short, some amount of price control is necessary but the bureaucratic method of all-around ceiling as applied in Canada is, in my opinion, just silly.

Prof. Walter E. Spahr:

It is my opinion that it would be wise to enact price-control legislation at this time if the legislation provides for selective price control, and if this control be exercised only where it is clearly established that a rise in prices will not induce greater production. I know of no principle regarding price control that is defensible, even in an emergency, except the one I have stated, and I shall use it to answer your other questions. The basic consideration is greater production, both defense and nondefense; it is not a stable price level.

Wages should not be fixed in those cases in which there are unemployed people who can be drawn into the wage groups where price fixing is contemplated, and in no event should it be applied except in those industries in which the prices of the products have been fixed. I should apply price fixing to rents only in those housing areas where there is no good reason for increasing housing facilities because of the temporary character of the housing shortage and where, consequently, the owners have a monopolistic advantage.

After a careful scrutiny of both the Steagall and Gore bills, I find that neither satisfy the apparent needs without the setting up of evils far more damaging than any of the benefits expected or hoped for.

I came to this sort of a conclusion: With a managed currency, with the establishment of priority control over material supply, the establishment of a price-control system would now bring to an absolute end the free economy upon which the American prosperity has been built in the past. Productive incentive would naturally come to an end. The over-all plan is most destructive, with priority closing out nondefense industry. We as a nation are playing a game of an over-all war economy, which to me seems to threaten us more than probable injurious results brought about through the reasons for and perils of inflation. It would seem to me that we had better "run the rapids" of inflation with limited controls than to risk the "coma" of over-all management. In this debate the case for price control has been very poorly made. It is not supported by historical precedent. Conversely, history gives us every reason to believe it cannot succeed. Even the arguments presented by our economists throw particular light on a very paradoxical situation. If the sincere purpose of those who have espoused the cause of inflation is now to control inflation, then why not take the A B C steps by repealing the inflationary laws that are on the statute books at the moment:

First. Drastic reduction of nondefense expenditures. I believe firmly that every dollar of nondefense expenditures that is not necessary should be immediately eliminated. The proponents of price fixing in this House have done absolutely nothing in this direction. The proponents of price fixing in the administration have done nothing in this direction.

Second. Every possible encouragement should be given to production in nondefense as well as defense industry. This, in my opinion, calls for a percentage allocation such as I have recently recommended for the Office of Production Management. It should not be forgotten that a rising price index is a very definite encouragement to production.

Third. In the program of heavy taxation which has already begun and which will necessarily follow in greater proportions, we must be careful not to let it either take the form or weight that will prevent an expansion in production. Taxation can be just as destructive as a sharp rise in prices, resulting from a weakening of a currency. Moreover, Prof. Walter Spahr points out, and I believe it to be true, that taxation as a means of fighting inflation may become a destructive obsession, as it already appears to be in this country.

Fourth. We should immediately repeal all of the inflationary monetary laws on the statute books. This has been repeatedly called to the attention of the Congress, the administration, and the people by leading economists and leading business authorities. On September 30, 1941, 54 monetary economists recommended "again the repeal of the greenback law of May 12, 1933, the law authorizing bimetalism, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, the law providing for the purchase of domestic silver above the market price, and the laws authorizing the devaluation of our metallic currency." In this current year the Congress has been guilty of reenactment of these inflationary statutes. It is certainly strange that a government that cries out in fear of inflation refuses to strike from the statute

books monetary laws which are feeders for inflation.

Fifth. There are instruments of control at the discretion of the Federal Reserve authorities. These instruments should be employed according to conventional principles of good central banking to keep inflation within bounds.

Sixth. The debt. There is no attempt on the part of this administration to hold down the rapid increase of the Federal debt.

In conclusion I again call your attention to the fact that there is no historical background that justifies any modern-day belief in price control legislation for this Nation. On the other hand, there is much to learn from history to teach us that such controls will inevitably result in a chaotic condition.

I have some fear of inflation, but it is minor to my fear of the destruction of our present free economy, once this Nation enters into a full nationalistic course of over-all price control and economic management.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, during the past 50 years we have witnessed many changes in the political and social economy of the United States. Almost unnoticed, however, has been the encroachment of government upon the rights and liberties of the people guaranteed by the ninth amendment to our Constitution.

The ninth amendment unequivocally provides:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the cornerstone of individual initiative and free enterprise. It is the barrier that stands between a free people and some form of the socialistic state. Yet in spite of this barrier, for over 50 years the people have been losing their liberties by judicial decisions and by legislative enactments.

Today, sir, if "we the people" remain indifferent to the centralization of nonnational powers in the National Government, or some one or more bureaucratic agencies of the National Government, we will in truth approach that status which Jefferson and Madison both described as "precisely the definition of despotic government."

Mr. Chairman, in the early days of the New Deal there were men high in the councils of the administration who believed that the American system of free enterprise was outmoded. I remember well how the Government was persuaded to invest $65,000 a few years ago so that Mr. Tugwell's Resettlement Administration could set up a pants factory in the Westmoreland homestead project at Mount Pleasant, Pa., 30 miles southeast of Pittsburgh.

In those days the social planners wanted the Government to get into the manufacturing business. When all the schemes of this type proved a failure, the "brain trusters" moved to new and perhaps more fertile fields. Now that it is apparent that the Government has no present intention of going into business, on any appreciable scale, the next step in the socialization of America would be for the Government to control all business. Now it is apparent, too, that there can be no control without price control. Since I am unalterably opposed to any form of either socialism or totalitarianism, I am opposed to price control as now proposed.

AN AMERICAN POLICY NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, the great need in this tragic hour is an American economic policy. A policy based upon the natural resources of the Nation and the productive capacity and the inventive genius of the American people.

I distrust and fear these alien ideologies that are creeping into our social and economic system. I have every confidence in the ability of the American people to produce all the food, all the tools, all the guns, and all the ammunition necessary to defend our Nation against any aggressor or combination of aggressors. But, Mr. Chairman, if we are to revamp our whole economic life, if we are to regiment the American farmer and businessman, just to engage in military or social adventures across the oceans, if we are to set up in this Nation a counterpart of the totalitarian system, if we are to bleed the American people white for the benefit of other peoples, then we had better abandon our undeclared war against Herr Hitler and devote our energies to preventing a civil war right here at home.

I do not believe the American people are ready for regimentation, state socialism or any "ism," other than Americanism. We must cling to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We must reassure the American people that their liberties are not going to be sacrificed upon the altar of a new imperialism.

In the past 2 days several Members of this House have voiced their confidence in the men who will head this office of price control, should this measure be enacted into law. I am sorry I cannot share in that confidence. After listening to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], I can say with all candor I have no confidence that this act will be administered in the interests of the American people and the republic, but I fear it will be administered much after the style of Joe Stalin.

There is an old Latin adage, Mr. Chairman, "Obsta principis"—resist the first beginnings. Do not let tyranny of government get a fresh start. Thomas Jefferson recognized the grave dangers which were in store for the Nation when he wrote:

> In question of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to the ninth amendment. I believe, if we cling to the Constitution, to the ninth amendment, we will be wise. I cannot in conscience support this legislation.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter having to do with 4–H Clubs.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-five Members present, a quorum.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago I made my position clear on this price-control legislation. I fear the arbitrary power that will be delegated under this bill to one man. It will be such dictatorial power that we may lose our system of free enterprise completely. Under this bill I fear we will gradually move into a controlled economy similar to that which they have in Nazi Germany today. None of us wants inflation, but as between the threat of inflation or the threat of a controlled economy, from which we may never extricate ourselves, I will choose the threat of inflation. We know that practically every time this Congress has delegated power to meet an emergency, that power has gone far beyond the intent of Congress.

I fear this legislation. I am against both bills. Let me call to your attention now an example of how this may adversely affect a good many livestock producers and feeders. Seventy percent less cattle are going into the feed lots in the Corn Belt this fall than last fall. Why? Because cattle feeders fear the future market. This fear is influenced by this threat of price control. They are afraid to buy cattle and put them in their feed lots. Many farmers prefer to sell their corn to the Government. Unless we can give those feeders some assurance that they will not be forced to sell their fat cattle or lambs at a loss they are not going to take the chance. Who will be the loser? The public. The Secretary of Agriculture has already indicated that he wants increased marketing of livestock. The parity-price formula does not fit the livestock industry, because it gives no consideration to the cost of the cattle purchased to be fattened and sold. Most of the cattle purchased this fall were at prices above parity price and cannot be sold without loss under the provisions of either of these bills. The Corn Belt feeders are naturally fearful of this legislation. If they lose their shirts this year, the western cattlemen may lose theirs next year. Let us not try to repeal the economic law of demand and supply. There is no particular reason for being afraid of inflation in agricultural products. We have a 2 years' supply of wheat on hand and a 2 years' supply of cotton, and most of the other agricultural products are just beginning to reach a normal price level. Heavy fat cattle are now selling for a third less than they did in 1937. Do you realize that the value of all the farm lands and buildings in the United States today is $1,000,000,000 less than it was in 1910? What is the situation on the stock market? The stock market is lower than it was last year. The people remember what happened in the disastrous deflation after the last war. That memory of the disastrous effect of deflation that followed the last war is a

thing that will do more to control prices than anything else. I grant you that there are certain strategic metals and certain other articles that may need price control, but such vast powers as delegated under these bills are not only unnecessary but unwise. These bills will regiment our economy but will not control inflation. Let us kill both these bills and protect our American system of free enterprise.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain telegrams which I have just received from the workers in my home town, all brief, and a statement which I made before the Commodity Club of New York City on this question of marketing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman that the permission to include the articles referred to should be obtained in the House. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the party who today speaks for the administration a very specific question. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took such an important part in the discussion of this particular amendment, perhaps he can answer this question.

In last evening's Times-Herald there appeared on the front page an article, "Bill To Control Inflationary Wage Rises." It states:

> The administration's decision to seek limited wage control as part of its program to combat inflation presumably was made known to congressional leaders at last night's White House conference on labor. Democratic Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, announced after that conference that price control had been discussed.

The statement also says:

> It was not immediately decided whether the wage amendment would be sent to the Banking Committee for consideration as a formal committee amendment or would be offered on the floor when a final House vote on the measure approaches late this week. It was seen as an administration bid for farm-bloc support in strengthening the bill, which, in its present form, would exempt farm prices from regulation until they have reached their 1909 to 1929 levels.

Such an amendment was not sent to the committee to be placed in the bill in the form of a committee amendment, and it has not been mentioned on the floor. I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] whether or not the administration has committed itself to the effect that it will have the amendment offered to this bill, including a wage-ceiling approach, in the event the Gore amendment is defeated. Would either one of those gentlemen give us that information?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, of course I cannot speak for the administration. I have not been in touch with the President and do not know what plan he has. I do not know anything at all about it. I have no knowledge of any such amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If such an agreement has been made with the floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I think this House is entitled to that information before voting on the Gore amendment which has been offered. But, of course, if the leadership does not feel that that information should not be divulged at this time, there is not anything we can do about it perhaps.

In today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, page 1, we also find this information:

> Mr. Henderson agreed with the other experts—that is, the nine experts referred to in this article—that he must have outside help in fighting price rises. He said that he wants higher taxes (including a withholding levy), more voluntary savings for defense bonds, tighter credit controls over nondefense borrowing, a labor policy that will permit wage rises only on the basis of a cost-of-living rise, and increased production of consumer goods wherever possible.

With those two showings I am going to assume that the administration, in order to enact H. R. 5479, will later, if the Gore substitute is defeated, offer an amendment to bring wage ceiling control into this bill.

These telegrams which I hold in my hands and which I have received are from organized C. I. O. workers in my home town, of which there are probably 25,000 or 26,000. In every telegram they insist that we defeat H. R. 5479—the Steagall bill—which is about to appear before Congress. They say, "This bill would freeze wage rates at present levels and strangle organized labor." They also take the position that the bill is ineffective, in that it would not control prices and would injure every transmission worker—this is from a particular group—that is engaged in work in that particular locality.

TELEGRAMS FROM CONSTITUENTS

Under permission granted by the House, I submit for the RECORD telegrams which I have today received from workers in my home city:

SAGINAW, MICH., *November 25, 1941.*
Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Saginaw Steering Gear, Local 434, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, representing 2,500 workers, urges that you vote "no" on bill H. R. 5479 which is about to appear before Congress. This bill would freeze wage rates at present levels and strangle organized labor. We will watch your action in this matter with deep interest.

OMER LEVI,
Recording Secretary,
Local No. 434, U. A. W., C. I. O.

SAGINAW, MICH., *November 25, 1941.*
Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Saginaw Amalgamated Local 455, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, representing 3,000 workers, requests that you vote "no" on H. R. 5479. This antilabor bill would freeze wages while prices are racing upward and threatens the living standards of our members. We ask your cooperation in defeating this legislation.

CHARLES OSWALD,
Recording Secretary,
Local No. 455, U. A. W., C. I. O.

SAGINAW, MICH., *November 25, 1941.*
Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Chevrolet Transmission Local 467, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, representing 1,400 workers, asks you to vote "no" on H. R. 5479. This vicious legislation would keep down wages without controlling prices and would injure every transmission worker. We hope you will assist us by voting "no" on this bill.

WILLIAM POWELT,
Recording Secretary,
Local No. 467, U. A. W., C. I. O.

MARKETS—THE PEOPLE'S PRICE FORUM

And for the record I submit certain observations pertaining to free markets:

In going up a lonely foot trail thousands of feet above sea level in a mountain province of the Philippine Islands 3 years ago, I passed a half-civilized Igorrote walking down the slope with a rooster under his arm. My companion was a man learned in the ways of the natives, and I asked him where the native was going. My friend replied, "He is on his way to market." This reply aroused my curiosity still more, and these questions passed through my mind: Where was the market? What kind of a deal would the native make? On what basis would he bargain, and for what, when he reached the market?

Before all these questions could be answered by my friend, we met other Igorrotes returning from market. I noticed some of them carrying bottled soda pop and chewing gum. I learned that they would walk miles and miles over foot trails, up and down the mountainsides, through rain and heat, for what? Merely to trade a rooster for a package of gum and a bottle or two of pop.

These half-civilized natives knew nothing of the mechanism of markets, the system which brought chewing gum and pop to the little shop at the seaside and would take their fowls in exchange.

This incident gives you a primitive illustration of how markets function, providing the agency through which people all over the world exchange what they produce for something they want and can use.

Of course, the economist might insist that the Igorrote should have traded his rooster for a shirt or some other article classed as a necessity, but the native preferred chewing gum and soda pop. He made his own free choice, and it is just such transactions that keep the world going. The Igorrote by thus exchanging his rooster aided in giving employment to those who produced chewing gum and soda pop, and who, by their wages, could buy the things they also wanted.

* * * Markets, indeed, belong to the people. The people possess them by inalienable right, for it is the people who produce, who consume, and who, whether we like it or not, will exercise their own judgment in buying and selling.

It was just from such simple beginnings as I have described that mankind over the centuries has built the mechanism that operates today throughout the entire civilized world. This mechanism is the commodity market. It has required centuries of toil and study to bring about the degree of market perfection we have witnessed in recent generations. The machinery of the commodity markets today functions so continuously that too many of our people are inclined to assume that the problems involved in the exchange of goods never existed. Others, however, misconstrue those problems and hold that government, instead of tending to its own business in the field of a properly planned money system, must regulate, if not actually operate, the commodity markets.

Now, the industrial revolution has multiplied immeasurably the variety of goods and services which we today accept as mere

commonplaces. The list of necessities and luxuries has expanded by leaps and bounds. Thousands of new occupations have been created. Millions of workers throughout the world today do not use the things they produce in mines and mills and factories. They trade their production for money wages and in turn their wages for things they want. In order to do this they must have a free market.

When you come right down to it, the market is merely the link between the producer and the consumer. It is the mechanism or instrument of exchange, and is just as important as the medium of exchange through which it functions. In spite of its far-flung ramifications, reaching out into every country on the globe, it is a delicate piece of machinery, and any attempt to control its operation or to divert it from its true purpose will prove just as destructive as tossing a monkey wrench into the transmission box of an automobile.

In our specialized productive economy today, with its vast multitude of goods and services seeking a market, we have come to registering our opinion of value of the desirability of consummating an exchange, through the price system.

Price is the vox populi of world economic life. It is the peoples' ballot box, perhaps the only true democracy in the world today. It will tolerate no despot, no autocrat. Price should tell the farmer whether he ought to produce more wheat or cotton, or curtail his production. Price tells the consumer whether he can or should buy. It is automatic in its operation. It is the subconscious response of hundreds of millions of people from London to Shanghai, from New York to Singapore.

All of us, whether we be farmers, miners, manufacturers, merchants, or housewives, all have varying and even conflicting ideas of prices, as to whether they are too low or too high. All these groups are influenced by their own economic self-interest.

But when the final consummation is reached, these antagonisms should normally cancel out, so that the price system that weights all these interests gives paramount place to the general welfare and represents the highest social and economic objective. It is the free-functioning price system that passes goods and services into the channels of trade so that goods may be freely consumed and labor may be fully employed. Nor has civilized man ever been able to attain these objectives except through such a system of free enterprise.

Now, if what I have said appeals to your common sense, it probably is time to ask why we have governments trying to regulate prices and markets through the exercise of a central authority. Why has what we call planned economy stepped into the picture? I think the answer is perfectly clear, and I might say, also, that the intentions and objectives should not be harshly criticized. As I have pointed out, we have a multitude of conflicting interests in our economic life and particularly when it comes to the question of price. Producers all want higher prices. Why shouldn't they? Higher prices mean more buying power, and for the manufacturer they usually mean larger profits. On the other hand, we have the ultimate consumer, and in between the producer and the final consumer we have the merchant, the middleman, the go-between, who wonders when he buys at a high price whether he can pass this increase on to his buyer.

Then it is easy enough to see why government takes a hand; particularly in a country where the laws, with regulations proceeding from these statutes, are made by elected representatives. To put it more bluntly, politics is injected into our economic life.

* * * * *

Government after government, including our own, has tried price fixing, regimentation of production, attempts at marketing control, promulgating quotas, and what not. Yet, in spite of all these strivings, the desired equilibrium between agricultural and industrial prices evades us like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

It hardly is necessary for me to go into detail about the classic example of price control and market regulation furnished by our neighbor republic, Brazil. What tragedy could have been more colossal? In the 10 years, or thereabouts, over which Brazil tried to control supply by the burning of her coffee, almost 66,000,000 bags have been destroyed. This is equivalent to 2½ years of world consumption, with some countries finding coffee too costly a luxury for general consumption. Yet it is estimated that if Brazil had sold these millions of bags at a price the world would have paid, she could have discharged her external debt.

Another will-o'-the-wisp chased by government is "price stability." This concept also had behind it an appealing motive. Sometimes when markets fluctuate violently, we think we would like to be relieved from these disturbing movements up and down. We feel that it would be a great thing if stability could be obtained through Government decree.

We forget that prices change for two major reasons: First, because of the activity of the people who produce more or less or consume more or less; and second, because money is not of constant purchasing power. We struggle with the problem of finding a way to eliminate this disturbing monetary influence; but that way is not the way of governmental pegging of prices or meddling with markets. When we get that kind of price stability we find that what we have attained is not a desirable equilibrium, but paralysis. The very hour we begin to fear the mechanics of the market, at that moment the blood stream of trade circulation begins to clog.

Whatever methods may be considered in maintaining free, healthy markets on either the commodity or monetary side, let us weigh well the principle enunciated by our distinguished Assistant Secretary of State, Dr. Adolf Berle, Jr., when he addressed some suggestions to our temporary economic committee last summer, as follows:

"Regulation is always inherently dangerous. Finally there is always the certainty that * * * the regulations will be used for purposes which are either corrupt, political, or doctrinaire. Any of these three may produce violent and extremely unhealthy results."

Government intervention in markets and prices calls forth endless regulations and restrictions. I have before me a copy of the Federal Register, the issue of May 2, 1939. In page after page it lists the regulations pertaining to the cotton-marketing quotas for the current season. If you will look over this puzzling exhibit, you will wonder how the farmer can have the time to answer the questionnaire and conform to the regulations and still produce a cotton crop. Yet, no doubt, if we are to have supervision over markets and prices, we shall have attempts to control farm production and marketing—all of which will continue to prove utterly futile.

If and when legislators favorably act on measures giving a planning board the power to fix quotas, set prices and fiddle with the market, these same legislators will later press the planning board to reduce quotas in order to increase prices or increase quotas to affect prices downward. For factual support to this statement, I cite recent developments in some of our control systems. No capital structure or proprietor, partnership, or privately owned corporation can survive the constant jiggling of quotas and prices operated in slide-rule fashion by an administrator or a planning board. Producers and sellers, consumers and purchasers are too smart to participate in such a game.

Owners and operators of private property should not be compelled to go groping along in a maze of uncertainty, with a feeling that a planning board is lurking behind every rock and tree, ready, on and in response to impulse, however generated, to put prices up or down to their disadvantage.

The ownership and operation of private property is our greatest institution. It is the very basis of our system of taxation. It is the financial source of Federal and State sovereignty. Its successful operation is the reason for our people enjoying the highest standard of living attained by any race on earth.

To maintain this institution of private property, we must have buyers who will buy, sellers who will sell, lenders who will lend. They must not be afraid.

There must be confidence. I go to my attorney and he tells me what is the law. When the administrator or the planning board is authorized by law to jiggle the price and the quotas, the law becomes inconsequential. What the people then want to know is, What will the administration do? Not knowing what will be the next impulse of the jiggler, the market becomes a mere gambling den. Finally, the would-be buyer withdraws from the scene, the equation is broken, goods cease to move, and paralysis prevails.

Through the free market and its mechanisms, the products of specialized labor and capital are given values of time and place which could not otherwise exist. Without such creation of values through unhampered trading, industry finds itself subject to creeping paralysis and cannot fully employ all of our manpower and capital.

In case of war, when the life of the Nation is at stake, and freedom faces catastrophe anyway, government probably is justified in exercising a certain amount of control over prices and markets. In normal times, when the free flow of goods into the channels of trade is vital to the general welfare, such exercise of authority not only is unnecessary and restrictive, but scheduled for failure.

If you want to know why, here is my answer: Government planners who issue regulations and control decrees make the mistake of believing they are dealing with things. They are not. They are dealing with human beings, and those human beings are dealing with the stern realities of their existence and their environment. Those realities are planned, not by men, but by infinite Nature herself in ways which, however mysterious, cannot be changed by majority mandates or by bureaucrats.

Market prices are not governed solely by the statistics of supply and demand. After all, what is supply and what is demand, except the reaction of the people themselves to the conditions of their existence? Human behaviorism is the deciding factor. The market belongs to the people. It is in the market place that they express their judgment on values. The market degenerates into a mere Charlie McCarthy when it gets into the hands of government. Its imperative requirement is freedom. Nowhere else is liberty more precious. The people will submit to conscription of their youth for war, to taxes amounting to confiscation, but they will take a final stand on their judgment of prices, for when they speak it is not as individuals but as the people—all the people over the whole of our mechanized, monetary world of trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I did not wish to speak against the bill offered by my friend and did not intend to do so until now that I have noticed that so many on our side intend to vote for this bill as a gesture, with the idea of voting against it when it comes up in the House, or else voting to re-

commit it. The Gore bill is not very different from the Henderson bill, because it omits retail control. A large portion of the consumers of the United States buy at retail.

In respect to the wage scale, it gives Administrator Henderson the right to release wages immediately after the bill is passed, and if he is consistent with his testimony before our committee, he cannot do anything but release wages, because he has already said he could not administer them as a practical matter in connection with price control and that this is not the way to control wages.

The reason I do not want to see a large vote for the Gore bill is that the Gore bill has been advertised on this floor, on the radio, and in the press as an over-all price dictatorship, covering everything. I am against it, not because the administration is against it, but because I think the administration intends within 18 months to bring before this Congress an over-all price dictatorship, covering everything in the United States.

After the last war we had, as the result of the war, communism in Germany, communism in Russia, and belief in communism in France, in England, and in strategic groups in America. Today our worst fight, in my opinion, is not so much against one dictator abroad who cannot even speak English, as it is against the idea of communism and dictatorship, the idea which has penetrated so deeply among our people that every wage, every salary, every enterprise should be regulated from a central authority in Washington.

I have tried to approach the problem of price control from the point of view of the Constitution. It has seemed to me that under our Constitution we have power to take away certain normal rights of citizens in wartime or in preparation for wartime.

We have the right to draft men if it is necessary to have an effective army; but a proper Supreme Court would, I am sure, throw out any universal draft of all men, old and young, in the United States, because such a universal destruction of rights would not be necessary to raise an effective army. Again, we have a right to commandeer private property. We would have the right to take possession of strategic buildings or factories in New York and wherever necessary to defend the country; but we would certainly not have the right under our Constitution to commandeer all the businesses, all the farms, all the lumber mills in the United States. And so with price control. I believe we have the right to control and limit the prices of those things, such as food and clothing, that are necessary to maintain the health of the people through the emergency, but we have not the right, as I interpret the Constitution, to make an over-all price-control dictatorship exactly like Russia, exactly like Germany; and from a practical point of view it is well that we are so limited, because the prices of luxuries, such as diamonds, furs, penthouses, liquors, and other luxuries should be permitted to rise and pay taxes in the traditional American way to help pay for the war effort. In the Gore bill there is no dictatorship over retailing, and so this Gore bill is not a straight-across-the-board control, but because this has been advertised as an over-all dictatorship, as the sort of thing that we all need and ought to have to check inflation, I believe that a substantial vote on the part of the membership would encourage the introduction of the to the country that we here in Congress believe in such a dictatorship, and this would encourage the introduction of a dictatorship bill which, I believe, the New Deal planners wish and expect to foist upon the country as soon as public sentiment becomes ripe for it. Those of you who vote for this Gore bill when the bill comes in demanding more powers, which Mr. Henderson may and, I believe, will demand in the course of a few months, will be in a position of having said that you want it, and I hope you will not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are certain facts that appear to me to be beyond dispute in the consideration of legislation of this kind at this time. The first fact that appeals to me is that we must have legislation. There is the further fact that no matter what kind of price control, or anti-inflation legislation, is passed it is unpopular when we consider it in terms of normal times. There is the further fact that the legislation is necessary, based upon the exigencies and the necessities of the existing conditions. There is the further fact that the defeat of the bill or the recommittal of the bill is not going to be the end. That would not mean that we would not have to consider this legislation at a later date.

This committee has worked very hard, held hearings for months and months, and made studies over that time on price-control legislation. There are some features of the bill with which I am not personally satisfied, but I know that any bill that is reported out of committee cannot satisfy me or satisfy any Member of this House so far as the bill in its entirety is concerned.

We are legislating in an emergency. We are legislating to try to prevent serious conditions arising that will be extremely harmful to our Nation and to our people. This legislation is based upon expediency and necessity, and we have got to approach, as intellectually honest men and women, the consideration of the legislation from that angle. The Gore bill is offered as a substitute. While I profoundly respect the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is a very valuable Member of the House, he has offered his bill as a substitute for the bill that has been reported out after the committee has given weeks and months of profound and deep consideration to it.

In my opinion, the Gore bill would produce an economic strait jacket if it were enacted into law. In my opinion, the bill would defeat its very purposes at the very outset, if enacted into law. The various members of the committee have very pointedly, on both sides of the aisle, presented to the membership of the House the weakness of the Gore bill.

We have got to pass legislation; whether it is today or tomorrow, we have got to pass legislation. The American consuming public have got to be protected. Production for the national defense and for the purpose to which our country is committed in this emergency must be continued. We know that unless we have price-control legislation, it is going to affect seriously our national-defense program. It is only the matter of a few weeks or a few months when the public will catch up with the sharp increase in prices, and then we are going to feel the full effect of a thoroughly aroused public opinion.

Let me speak briefly, if I may, to my friends who represent agricultural districts. I have no farm in my district, but I have stood on this floor and spoken for parity payments and voted for parity payments when it went through by only four or six majority. I have consistently taken the floor and voted to support farm legislation because I think it is a national problem, as I have said repeatedly. I am not viewing the problems of other sections of the country from the limited geographical area of New England wherein I reside, but I like to look at them from the national angle. The problem of the people of other sections of the country are the problems of the Nation. That should be the angle of our approach to this bill. This bill, the bill reported out of the committee, is eminently fair to agriculture. Hysteria and fear should not influence those who represent agricultural districts, but it may be well to consider that if the committee bill is defeated the bill that will come out in future will probably be more drastic in its operations with reference to agriculture. To those who represent agricultural districts I can say—I will say firmly, although I was going to say without contradiction, but that is a strong term for anyone to use—I say firmly that it is my opinion that the committee bill, having in mind the nature of a price-control bill, adequately, properly, and reasonably protects the agricultural interests of this country.

Price-control legislation is necessary. We have to pass it. It must be arbitrary to some extent in order to obtain its objectives. We are considering a price-control bill within the constitutional set-up of our Government, based upon an exigency, based upon necessity.

Our national-defense program also demands the passage of it. If we delay it today it will only be a matter of a few weeks. The bill reported by the committee, with the amendment suggested by it, is a fair bill, it is the best that can be accomplished, and to send this bill back to the committee or to substitute the Gore bill, in my opinion, would be a fatal mistake, not only for the best interests of the country as a whole, not only for the best interests of the American consuming public, not only for the best interests of our national-defense program, but the failure to pass the bill would be very harmful, in my opinion, to the agricultural interests of this country.

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. May I suggest to the gentleman that the great powers that are vested in the Administrator under the bill expire in one and a half years. On June 30, 1943, the powers expire, by the terms of the bill itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

This legislation is not going to end today. If the Gore bill is substituted you know what is going to happen. You know it is unworkable. We admire and respect the high character of the gentleman from Tennessee, and his fine motives, but we are considering a bill, not the gentleman. If the committee bill is defeated or recommitted, we will have to consider legislation in the near future. We have to face the issue because the American public and American public opinion will demand it within the next few months.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] for the remainder of the time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one amendment already pending to the pending amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Well, I offer it, anyway, as a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. After the other is disposed of, it will be in order to offer that one.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] desire that I yield to him?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield so that I may propound a question to the floor leader?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me make my statement. I am sure I will have some time left, and I will be glad to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very, very reluctant during the course of this debate to take issue with my beloved friends the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Oklahoma about the matter of controlling prices as a means of avoiding inflation, but because of some of the statements, because of some of the ideas that have been conveyed by some who have addressed the committee, I cannot longer refrain from pointing out to the committee the reasons that prompted me, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, to determine that our effort to control prices should utilize the method of the selective Henderson plan.

We three on the committee were amazed, along with other members of the committee, when our beloved chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], introduced in the House a bill to temporarily destroy the American way of doing business as usual. Yes; we were all against the proposal. We conducted some hearings. The issue developed in the course of those hearings as to the method that should be adopted by the committee and recommended to the House as the means to be used to control prices.

Mr. Baruch came to our committee as the second witness. He advocated legislation freezing, as he called it, our economy into a status quo for a temporary period or, at least, for the duration of the emergency through which we are passing.

Mr. Henderson, the first witness, came to our committee and said that theoretically it might be preferable to freeze an economy into a status quo, that when he first approached the subject he instructed those working on his staff to proceed to develop legislation which would bring about a freezing or status quo of prices, profits, and wages. I think everyone on the committee will admit that there has never been a witness who appeared before our committee, and very few who ever appeared before any other committees of Congress, who displayed such an enormous amount of information and ability as that gentleman displayed. Mr. Henderson said it was impossible for him and his staff to write into legislative form a bill freezing the economy of this country as Mr. Baruch desired that was capable of administration.

During the course of the hearings my good friend from Tennessee informed the members of the committee that it was his desire to perfect such legislation and present it to the committee for its consideration. He did that. The committee members analyzed his bill, analyzed it with the greatest amount of concern because we all desired to go along with him if we could do so. We began to compare section after section of his bill with the sections in the Henderson bill introduced by Mr. STEAGALL.

We found first of all that the bill which we propose provided in its inception that the price of agricultural commodities should never be placed by ceiling at below 110 percent of parity. The committee agreed to that after consultation with all the advisers we could get in the Department of Agriculture, and aside from the Government, because they convinced us it was necessary that agricultural prices remain at 110 percent of parity or at least not below that figure if a farmer was to receive a seasonal average of 100 percent of parity.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] came along in his bill to do what he considers to be the right thing, and he is to be commended for his sincerity. He said that agricultural commodity ceilings should be placed at 100 percent of parity. He makes an effort in his bill to authorize, to permit, and to instruct the Administrator or the price-control authority to support parity to the farmers. It is a noble gesture, but the limitations placed in the bill will not get farmers parity, in my opinion.

We found out that there was a circumstance, and I would like to call this to the attention of those from the West who may be interested, whereby the passing of legislation enabling prices to be fixed upon critical, essential, strategic, or other minerals, might prevent the production of minerals if other provisions were not included in the bill. Therefore, we put into our bill a provision that the Administrator may, if it becomes necessary, buy from the marginal or high-cost producers the products of such mines or such industry, so that the Nation may obtain those products and they may continue in business.

There is no such provision as that in my friend's bill. You who are interested in labor, see how the two bills treat you. Much to my regret, our bill specifically excludes control of compensation paid by an employer to an employee. Ours is a price bill and not a price-and-wage-control bill. As you know, the bill of my good friend would permit the freezing, as I like to call it, if he does not quite call it that, of wage scales and rates of pay. Yes; it permits the Administrator to come along after we have done something that we should not have done in the beginning and undo what we have done. It provides for that, an exception. But do you not recognize, Mr. Chairman, that when wages are frozen, that then the Administrator must go into all the separate parts of the country answering pleas from those who feel that injustices have been placed upon them, to remove them from the restrictions, and that as a practical matter the Administrator is not going to be doing anything in the world but trying to take out from under the ceiling the wages that we placed under it by the passage of the bill.

I do not believe that my friend can say that this substitute which he has offered today constitutes what he would like to have in the bill. I know my friend well enough to know that it was his original desire not only to freeze prices and wages but to freeze profits. Profits are not frozen. It is not his fault, perhaps. The rule is such that he cannot offer that particular section.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. There is one other ceiling that is not fixed; that is, the ceiling on taxes and on debt.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I was referring, though, to the provision that the gentleman from Tennessee originally introduced, which provided for the freezing of all three—prices, wages, and profits.

Mr. REED of New York. When the tax ceiling is not fixed and cannot be fixed, where is the standard of living?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I say again, I am sure my friend would like to have profits included in the bill. Profits should be in the bill if we are going to freeze everything in this economy outside of profits.

Let us place ourselves in the position of a man in an industrial plant. I do not have any of them in my district. However, I desire to be reasonable with him. Are we going to say to that man that irrespective of his desires and irrespective of the merit of his case, that his wage as of November 24 to November 29

will be frozen? What will he answer to the American Congress? He will say that the industrialist for whom he works is continuing to make a large profit on what he has and that he is not permitted to obtain a share in that increased profit.

I cannot see the justification; I cannot see the fairness of this and, therefore, I do not believe this House for 1 minute would place those in my district dependent upon agriculture, and those in the district of my friend from Ohio dependent upon wages, in an economic strait jacket, and leave the other segment in our economy subject only to taxation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. If it is not too long.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts inform the House whether it is the intention of the administration to have an amendment offered to the Steagall bill, in the event the Gore substitute is defeated, putting a ceiling on wages to any degree whatever?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit, let us let the leader answer that. He is in a position to answer it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is reading from a newspaper item, is he not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I am submitting a question to the floor leader as to whether or not the administration intends to have offered to the Steagall bill an amendment placing a ceiling on wages. The farm people of this country are very much interested in that question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman had better ask that question of the chairman of the committee.

With the adoption of the proposed committee amendment to section 2 (e) of the Steagall bill, that bill will be considerably strengthened and made even more preferable to the Gore bill, which has no such language.

I trust, for these reasons, that the proposal made by the gentleman from Tennessee will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. This is merely a perfecting amendment, in view of the fact that the tax feature of the Gore amendment has been eliminated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON to the amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 26, strike out, in section 303, line 9, the comma and all the remainder of lines 9, 10, and 11, being all of said section after the comma in line 9, not including the period.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 63, noes 218.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: On page 3, lines 4 and 5, after the word "on" in line 4, strike out "June 30, 1943" and insert "December 31, 1942."

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with the amendment which I offered earlier this afternoon to the Gore amendment to the Steagall bill. It in effect makes the life of this measure only 1 calendar year instead of at least 18 months, as the bill is now written. My arguments in connection with the previous amendment apply with equal force to this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield for a question.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman really believe that the Price Administrator could get started by the time the law would expire under his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I will state to the gentleman from Texas that we are dealing with a drastic emergency measure here and we should hold a tight rein on the Administrator and the administration. It matters little if the Administrator never gets started if the emergency ceases to exist. In my judgment, we are giving him too loose a rein in extending his authority until the end of the 1942 fiscal year, because, as I view the situation, there are certain compelling reasons for curtailing the life of this bill, entirely aside from any misgivings or any fear we might have about the abuse of power under this great grant of authority that is being given to the administrator. In the brief time at my disposal I can give you only a capsule review of those reasons, but I shall do my best. They boil down to plain, common horse sense.

This is a bill for the regulation of every small and large business in the country, every landlord and tenant, every professional and nonprofessional man. Ninety percent of the American people transact their business and keep their records on a calendar-year basis instead of a fiscal-year basis. I presume, without having been in on the committee sessions, that the date of June 30, 1943, was fixed by virtue of the fact that that is the end of the Government's fiscal year, but why should there be any magic in that particular date in dealing with a measure that does not have anything to do in any way with Government bookkeeping or with adherence to the principles of the fiscal year? We are dealing with a measure here that is to be applied to 130,000,000 people. Let us get down to concrete examples of the hardships and economic dislocations that might result from asking the American people to so shape their affairs and business as to conform with the fiscal year at the end of which this bill would expire.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] this afternoon said that there are 50,000 different items in the current Sears, Roebuck catalog. That catalog goes out to a multitude of small merchants and homes throughout the country, and it is compiled and its prices are quoted on a calendar-year basis. How in the name of high heaven are the people of this country going to adjust themselves to a price change in commodities, in staples, in household essentials, in rents, or in any one of the many categories covered by this bill if they have to contract on the basis of a certain price level for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1943 without knowing what that price level will be for the remaining 6 months?

Again, let me say I believe it will have a salutary effect upon the administration of this measure and will be beneficial to all the American people if this Congress—the Seventy-seventh Congress—can at about this time next year go over this bill in the light of the experience gained in its administration. Frankly, I am fearful of some of the evils, some of the injustices that are going to be spawned by this measure. I fear it is going to be a super N. R. A. I think we are going to have the blue eagle or its counterpart spreading its wings all over the country. It is not unlikely that we will once again view the sad spectacle of domineering and officious local subagencies putting the thumbscrews on small business and on the man of limited means. It seems to me only fair and right that we should before the end of the next calendar year be given the opportunity to thoroughly investigate the manner and the results of the administration of price control. At that time, if prevailing conditions so warrant, we can then reenact this legislation with an eye to the correction of proven errors and the alleviating of injustices.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 3, line 19, insert a new section 2, as follows:

"(a) The President shall designate as civilian-defense products basic commodities and services necessary to feed, clothe, house, and preserve the health and well-being of the civilian population. In designating such products, the President shall select commodities and services which, while suitable to meet civilian needs, can be produced with the least possible use of materials, facilities, and labor needed for national defense and with the least possible disturbance of existing methods of production and consumption. The President may from time to time designate additional civilian defense products and revoke such designations previously made

"(b) The President shall have power to designate and from time to time to modify the minimum specifications to which each such civilian-defense product shall conform. Such designation shall not prevent any commodity or service from qualifying as a civilian-defense product if such commodity or service is equal to or superior to the minimum specification

for such product; and the President shall have power to deterine whether any commodity or service is equal or superior or inferior in quality to such minimum specification.

"(c) The President shall determine and publicly announce and may from time to time redetermine the quantity of each civilian-defense product necessary to meet the needs of the civilian population during the ensuing year or other appropriate period of time.

"(d) When the President finds that there is danger that any civilian-defense product will be available to the civilian population in insufficient quantity or inadequate quality or that the price of such product will be increased abnormally or that any substantial part of the civilian population will experience increased difficulty in obtaining such product because of the increased price thereof, the President may enter into civilian priority contracts with producers and/or distributors of such product to promote the production and distribution of an adequate supply of such product of adequate quality for sale to the civilian population at reasonable prices. For purposes of this section availability of less than the quantity of such product designated by the President as necessary shall be availability of an insufficient quantity, and quality below the minimum specification designated by the President shall be inadequate quality. The President may, in his discretion, announce his finding that a designated price for any civilian-defense product will involve an abnormal increase in price or an increased difficulty in obtaining such product within the meaning of this section.

"(e) Before entering into any civilian priority contract for a civilian-defense product the President shall, after reasonable notice, receive from prospective producers and/or distributors of such product commitments as to the amount of such product which each will undertake to produce or distribute during a designated future period of time and as to the prices and terms of sale upon which such products will be sold or distributed. If such product will vary from any appropriate minimum specification designated by the President, such commitment shall include the minimum specification to which such product will conform, and shall be received only if the President shall find that such minimum specification is equal to or superior to such minimum specification designated by him for such product. In the President's discretion he may receive commitments as to quantity to be produced or distributed which make exception for designated circumstances tending to interfere with such production or distribution and commitments as to prices which provide for adjustment of such prices upward or downward with variation in the price of a designated means of production.

"(f) After receiving such commitments, the President may enter into civilian priority contracts with producers and/or distributors who have submitted such commitments by which the President undertakes to grant to such producers and/or distributors priorities of materials and other facilities for production, distribution, and transportation sufficient to provide for the production and/or distribution of the quantity of such product designated in such civilian priority contract and by which such producers and/or distributors undertake to produce and/or distribute for civilian use designated quantities of such product for sale at prices and upon terms not less favorable to the buyer than the prices and terms designated in such contract. Such civilian priority contracts for any civilian-defense product shall not cover a total quantity of such product which exceeds by more than 5 percent the quantity of such product found by the President to be necessary to meet the needs of the civilian population.

"(g) In entering into such contracts the President shall give preference to those producers and/or distributors who will undertake to sell such product upon prices and terms most favorable to the buyer: *Provided, however,* That the President shall not contract with a single producer or distributor for the production or distribution of more than one-third of the total quantity of such product to be covered by such contracts except to the extent that the total quantity offered for contract by other producers or distributors falls below the quantity found by the President to be necessary to meet the needs of the civilian population: *And provided further,* That the President shall limit the quantity of any such product covered by any such contract or shall give preference to a commitment which involves a higher price and/or terms of sale less favorable to the buyer when he finds that such action is necessary to prevent the establishment of a monopoly or the breach of any law of the United States: *And provided further,* That the President shall have power to establish similar limitations upon quantity and similar preference as to commitments when he finds that such action is necessary to prevent the payment of less than prevailing wages to labor or of lower prices to farmers for any agricultural product than are provided elsewhere in this act.

"(h) If the President finds that the commitments received for any defense product are insufficient to permit contracts for the quantity of such product necessary to meet civilian needs at prices which will accomplish the purposes of this act, he may enter into such contracts covering a portion of such quantity or may refrain from entering into contracts covering such product.

"(i) No producer or distributor submitting a commitment for a civilian-defense product shall be discriminated against in the acceptance of any such contract because such producer or distributor has offered to supply only a limited quantity of such product.

"(j) The President shall have power to require by regulation or order any producer or distributor or class thereof of any service or material or capital equipment necessary for the production of a civilian-defense product to give preference to producers or distributors of civilian-defense products in selling or leasing such service or material or capital equipment, in accord with the priorities established in such civilian-priority contracts: *Provided,* That the term 'service' as used in this paragraph shall not include work for wages.

"(k) If the President finds that any producer or distributor of any product for civilian use or any class of such producers or distributors is buying, storing, or using any material, inventory, capital equipment, or labor which is necessary to the production of any product essential to national defense or of any civilian-defense product, the President may by regulation or order require such producer or distributor or class thereof to discontinue the purchase or use of any such material or labor, to dispose of any such inventory at reasonable prices designated by the President, and to lease any such capital equipment to any producer or distributor of any product necessary to national defense or of any civilian-defense product.

"(l) Except as specified in paragraph (k) above, nothing in any civilian-priority contract nor in this act shall prevent any producer or distributor not party to such contract from producing or distributing any product for civilian use nor from selling such product, subject to the terms of any price ceilings established in accord with the provisions of this act and of any regulations or orders pursuant to paragraph (j) above, at such prices and upon such terms as he chooses.

"(m) Any service, material, or means of production other than labor which is necessary to produce or distribute a civilian-defense product may, in the discretion of the President, be designated a civilian-defense product and while so designated shall be a civilian-defense product for all purposes of this act."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves all points of order against the amendment. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the text of this amendment is printed in the RECORD of yesterday on page 9133 as a part of the remarks which I made yesterday. I tried very hard on two occasions to be heard, to explain the purposes of this amendment, once before the committee and the other time in general debate. But neither time was I able to get an adequate chance to do that. I realize that it is most difficult to present an amendment as comprehensive as this and expect Members to be able to grasp its full significance in a short 5 minutes. For this is an all-important matter. And the reason that I am taking time now is to make clear what I think the record needs to have on this legislation.

There is only one basic reason why we have this bill here. I do not think there is a Member of the House but agrees fundamentally with the statements made today, urging the preservation of the American way of life and pointing out the dangers in this type of legislation. But we have undertaken to devote about 30 or 40 percent of the productive efforts of America to the production of armament, and as soon as we undertook to do that we created a situation where the supply of certain civilian goods is in danger of being cut down a', the same time that the purchasing power for those goods will be larger than heretofore available. Under those circumstances and in order to prevent a runaway rise in certain prices, where monopolists or speculators are in the position to artificially force them upward, some machinery must be made available to control such prices.

My own view of the matter is that it will be better for us not to go any further with this sort of thing any more than we need to, and I know there are two fundamental things to combat inflation that are more important than price control and that ought to come first. The first of these should be an attempt to increase production of goods for sale to our people, and the second one is monetary control, in order that we might have the right amount of money in circulation and not a runaway creation of private bank credit, though I shall not speak about that now.

In a few words, this amendment proposes to do approximately this. It provides that we shall pick out certain essential commodities and that the President shall have power to determine the specifications for these basic necessities for our people like clothing, essential food products, simple housing, health needs, and things like that; that as to those goods he may enter into what are called priority contracts with producers, who agree to produce not less than a certain quantity of such goods at a fair price.

In other words, the program would be to encourage production at fair prices, and to make contracts with producers, assuring them that they could get the materials they needed to produce these things. This would give us a constructive approach to the problem of inflation on the side of increased production instead of making a regulatory approach exclusively by means of price control. I agree with gentlemen who say that they do not like this sort of legislation. I do not like it myself, but I think if we are going to try to approach the problem of preventing inflation, that certainly consideration should be given to a constructive effort to increase production of goods rather than to just letting it go along to the proposition of trying to control prices by governmental fiat. I am personally of the opinion that it may well be that a sufficient effort along this line, together with a sound monetary program, might be sufficient to prevent any serious inflation, though I see the necessity for, at present, for some authority in the Government controlling prices where either speculation or monopoly is in a position to artificially increase the price. I agree with the selective feature of the committee bill, with these differences, because it makes possible the selection of such prices and their control instead of imposing them upon our whole economy. But neither this price-control bill nor any other price-control bill can solve the fundamental problem of the relationship between goods for sale on the one hand and money to buy them with, on the other. My amendment is far more constructive, far more salutary, far more fundamental than is price control as such.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as brilliant as is our friend from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and as much entitled as he is to a respectful hearing, I know he is not going to get anywhere with his proposal.

It is about another matter that I wish to speak. The Gore amendment fell by the wayside, as was expected, but the effort of our young and brilliant friend has done two things: First, it has firmly established him in the esteem and confidence of his colleagues and of the country as being a young man of perfect integrity and of very great ability. The second thing he has done, the information he has brought to bear upon the question, is to kill the committee bill unless three things are done. The first is to abandon the licensing provision of the bill. Second, to include over-all control; and, third, set up an independent board or commission—not stooges, but people of independent minds—with power to override and to throw out anything the Administrator might do.

You might just as well understand the fact, and it is a fact, that Leon Henderson given unrestrained powers that are set up in this bill, defeats the committee's measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the reservation of his point of order?

Mr. STEAGALL. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRICES, RENTS, AND MARKET AND RENTING PRACTICES

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Price Administrator (provided for in section 201) the price or prices of a commodity or commodities have risen or threaten to rise to an extent or in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order establish such ceiling or ceilings as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act. So far as practicable, in establishing any ceiling, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the prices prevailing for the commodity or commodities included under such ceiling on or about October 1, 1941, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities, during and subsequent to the year ended October 1, 1941. Every regulation or order establishing any ceiling under this subsection shall be accompanied by a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order.

(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall issue declarations setting forth the necessity for, and recommendations with reference to, the stabilization or reduction of rents for defense-area housing accommodations within defense-rental areas. If within 60 days after the issuance of any such recommendations rents for any such accommodations have not in the judgment of the Administrator been stabilized or reduced by State or local regulation, or otherwise, in accordance with the recommendations, the Administrator shall by regulation or order establish such ceiling or ceilings for such accommodations as in his judgment will effectuate the purposes of this act. So far as practicable, in establishing any ceiling for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for the accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1940, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of the accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs, during and subsequent to the year ended April 1, 1940. In designating defense-rental areas, in prescribing ceilings for such accommodations, and in selecting persons to administer such ceilings, the Administrator shall, to such extent as he determines to be practicable, consider any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing or rental conditions in any defense-rental area.

(c) Any ceiling or ceilings may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments, as in the judgment of the Administrator are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act. The Administrator may establish a ceiling or ceilings below the prices prevailing for the commodity or commodities, or below the rent or rents, in effect at the time of the establishment of such ceiling or ceilings.

(d) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices (including practices relating to changes in form or quality) or hoarding in connection with any commodity, and speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession), in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in price or rent increases, as the case may be, inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator it is necessary, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, to obtain the production of marginal or high-cost producers, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy, store, or use, or sell at private or public sale, any commodity produced in the United States by any such producer, upon such terms as he deems necessary.

(f) No power conferred by this section shall be construed to authorize any action contrary to the provisions and purposes of section 3.

(g) The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices or cost practices or methods, means or aids to distribution established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any ceiling established under this act.

(h) Regulations and orders issued under this section may contain such provisions as the Administrator deems necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion of such regulations and orders.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the balance of the section may be dispensed with, and that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I cannot see where any time is to be gained by not reading the bill. Surely this bill is of sufficient importance that every Member should pay very careful attention as every word of it is read. I am in the same position as I was with respect to the Gore amendment, so I am reluctantly forced to object.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the section.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

Committee amendment: On page 6, strike out lines 16 to 23, inclusive, and insert:

"(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to any provision of law requiring competitive bidding, buy, store, or use, or sell at public or private sale, any commodity, upon such terms as he shall deem necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production of marginal or high-cost producers, or to prevent price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act. The proceeds of any sale under this subsection shall be used as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this subsection: *Provided*, That any materials which have been heretofore or may hereafter be defined

as strategic and critical by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, may be bought in order to carry out the purposes of this act only by corporations created or organized pursuant to said section 5d, upon such terms and conditions as they may determine, and only with the approval of the President and the Federal Loan Administrator: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify, suspend, amend, or supersede any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section, or any existing law, shall be construed to authorize any sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity contrary to the provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to add language that would permit the use of the powers conferred to prevent increases in prices inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

Another provision of the amendment would preserve to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies the powers conferred upon those agencies to purchase commodities and strategic and critical materials necessary in connection with the defense program.

Another provision of the amendment would prevent any interference with nullification of legislation embodied in the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

The amendment would preserve existing law for protection of agricultural products. It would prevent the sale of agricultural commodities except as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. These, in short, are the purposes of the substitute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I may say also that this is one of the most controversial sections of the bill, and I hope the Chair will not put the question until we have had adequate debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is pleased to recognize the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is a very fundamental question. I listened with a great deal of interest to the explanation of it by the chairman of the committee, and he indicates that the amendment is made necessary to protect agriculture and to protect domestic producers against any temporary setting aside of any tariff laws.

The amendment does just what the gentleman says it does, but there surely would be no need of the committee amendment if that is all they want to do, because if you will read the language of the bill as it was reported out of the committee you will find that we adequately protected producers in that respect.

What is there behind this amendment? When the bill was originally introduced it authorized the Administrator to go into the open market and buy any product for the purpose of keeping prices down or putting them up, as he saw fit. He told us the reason why he wanted that authority. He wanted the authority to buy products of the high-cost producers and sell them at a lower ceiling which had been placed, in order to encourage production of necessary defense articles.

The example which was used frequently was this: We will say that copper can be produced by the hydraulic method and sold profitably at 10 cents a pound. Hand-mined copper, however, cannot be produced at 10 cents. In order to keep the copper mines open and producing copper for national defense, it might become necessary to pay the hand-mined producers 14 cents, and in order that we might keep our mines working and in full production he wanted authority to buy the high-cost copper at 14 cents and sell it to the consumers at 10 cents. That is perfectly all right with everybody on the committee because we wanted to get all the copper we possibly could even though it resulted in the Government's having to subsidize the difference between selling at what we had to pay the high-cost producer to keep the mines running and defense industry running, and the lower price. That is what he wanted that for; that is what he said. He did not want it for any other reason. So the committee, in its judgment, provided for just that thing as appears from the language of subsection (e) on page 6:

(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator it is necessary, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, to obtain the production of marginal or high-cost producers, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy, store, or use, or sell at private or public sale, any commodity produced in the United States by any such producer, upon such terms as he deems necessary.

That is what he wanted. That is what we gave him. He was not consulted after he testified. We were, however, called into session yesterday and the committee reported out the committee amendment which has been read.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We were told we had not provided any revolving fund. They wanted a revolving fund so they could take the money they received when they sold these things and use it to buy others. We thought that should be within the province of Congress, but we find in this committee amendment, which was written by the Administrator, the following language:

Or to prevent price increases inconsistent with the purposes of the act.

Mr. Chairman, this is the most undemocratic thing that was ever suggested to an intelligent Congress of the United States: To allow any administrative agency of the Government to go into the open market in competition with not one industry, or two, or three, or a hundred, but into competition with all of our industry and all of our business, to buy and sell any goods it sees fit. That is a fundamental question, and I do not see how Democrats, allegedly solicitous of the preservation of democratic principles, can go along with anything like that. Surely anyone who believes in the perpetuation of free enterprise and representative government could not go along with any amendment to this bill which authorizes the administration to go into the open market and buy and sell any commodity under the guise that it is being done to keep prices down.

What of agriculture? What of dairy products? What of Michigan beans? What of the citrus fruit? What of wheat? What of anything? He must take into consideration, of course, the Agricultural Adjustment Act; he must pay the tariff. When he pays the tariff, of course, the money comes right back into the Treasury of the United States. If it should develop that the meat producers of this country were getting a little higher price for their beef than the Administrator thought they should, he could flood the American market with Argentine beef or any other kind of beef. If it developed that the Michigan bean producers were getting more for their beans than the Administrator thought they should get, he could authorize the use of beans as was formerly done, as ballast in boats coming over here from China and flood the market with Chinese beans for the purpose of forcing this market down. Now, the Members, Mr. Chairman, who are solicitous of private business and small business, and agriculture, and, yes, labor, should analyze this bill and see what they are doing if they authorize him to buy and sell competitively in the open market for the purpose of stabilizing prices.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I see in the committee amendment the following words were omitted:

Purchased in the Uni ed States.

Is there any significance in that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We put in the words "produced in the United States" to take care of these domestic marginal producers. The committee purposely left out "domestically produced things or not produced in the United States" to allow him to buy in the foreign markets and flood the domestic market to force prices down.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, none of us should have an objection to the Administrator's operating in such manner as to preserve the marginal producers in the United States; but to reach out into the other parts of the world and bring in goods to sell in the open markets against our own producers and destroy their existence, you might say, to me, is a diabolical scheme, and I do not think we should permit it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The purpose under this is to open the domestic market to every country of the world. It is reprehensible that the Committee on Banking and Currency so belittles itself and its dignity to reach out in such way and offer that to a democratic Congress living under a Constitution which preserves to us the principles of freedom.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does not the gentleman believe it would be sufficient simply to grant subsidies to high-cost producers and allow the product to go on the market to sellers and consumers?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and able gentleman from Michigan stated that this was an undemocratic provision because it would permit the Price Administrator to go into the open market and make certain purchases. May I suggest that we have an open market for Government bonds, and I have never heard of it being questioned as being undemocratic.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the Government goes into the market and purchases securities, whatever the results of that may be apply universally throughout the country; but here it is proposed to give selective power to purchase certain articles, and it applies unequally.

Mr. PATMAN. The open market operations of the Federal Reserve Banks, I presume, are similar to the open market operations that will be carried on by the Price Administrator. But sometimes open market operations are necessary.

Let me tell you why this is in here. It is to help the high-cost producer. It is possible that we will have to go to South America to get certain strategic, critical, and other needed materials. It is possible that we will have to go there to get materials not needed in national defense for the purpose of keeping these small industries continuing in business.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question.

Mr. DEWEY. I would like to answer the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I yield for a question.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman says there are no agencies permitted to buy critical and strategic materials now?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not say that.

Mr. DEWEY. Did the gentleman not say that we may have to go down to South America?

Mr. PATMAN. I said it is possible that the time will come when we will have to go to South America to obtain strategic, critical, and other materials that are needed in the national defense, and also needed not in national defense but to keep our small industries going in the United States.

Mr. DEWEY. Has the gentleman ever heard of the Defense Supplies Corporation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it may do that.

Mr. DEWEY. Which may get these materials.

Mr. PATMAN. I concede that the R. F. C. has the right to purchase strategic and critical materials and that right is specifically reserved in this amendment. That was one of the objections made to it in the committee and that correction has been made. The R. F. C. has reserved to it all the rights, powers, and privileges it has under existing law in this amendment.

The point I wish to make is that we need other materials beside strategic and critical to keep the 100,000 or 200,000 small industries in this country continuing in business, and it is possible that we will have to go to South America or other countries friendly to us, and even develop their mines and encourage their mining, in order to get these valuable materials. How are you going to do that if the Administrator does not have the power to buy and sell?

Mr. Baruch said this power was indispensable.

Let us take copper, for instance. Here is the way it will work. We want extra copper. The price has been fixed at 12 cents. Well, there are certain copper mines that cannot operate on 12-cent copper. It will take 24-cent copper, it will take 30-cent copper, it may take 40-cent copper in order for those mines to operate at a profit. So this provision will allow the Administrator to give that high-cost producer this extra profit. It is better to give him that money than to raise the whole copper price that much, which would cost national defense billions of dollars more. So this will not only help the high-cost producer in the mining of copper, aluminum, lead, zinc, steel, and everything else, but it will help in many other substantial ways.

Let us consider the question of imports. Imports cannot be controlled in any other way unless you give the Administrator the power to buy and sell, with a revolving fund. I agree that this is an enormous power, but this power is insignificant, it is nothing, when compared to the other powers that are granted in this bill. I do not like these powers but they are necessary..

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not like these powers, I dislike to vote to give anybody such power, but we have a national emergency that exists today that requires it. The question is, Are we behind national defense or are we against national defense? If we are against national defense we ought to do everything we can to block such efforts as this which is designed to cause an increase in production. This amendment will cause increased production in materials needed for national defense and to keep small businesses going.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has not suggested how this will help national defense. I wonder if he will try to make that clear.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sure the gentleman was not listening to me.

Mr. TABER. Oh yes, I was.

Mr. PATMAN. This helps national defense to get materials that are needed here in the United States of America by small manufacturers and by people who are engaged in the production of planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition.

Mr. TABER. That is already provided for in the language you have now. The language we have now does not give the power to buy and sell.

Mr. WOLCOTT rose.

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman's point, and I appreciate his standing up, because it recalls to mind that we have the power to sell; but the revolving fund is not there, and it is absolutely essential and necessary in order to carry on the functions that are contemplated by the terms of this provision. We cannot carry it on otherwise.

If you are against the whole program, if you are against the administration, if you are against national defense, if you are against helping small business men, you should be opposed to this amendment; but if you are in favor of national defense, if you are in favor of encouraging production, if you are in favor of supporting the administration's foreign policy, you should be in favor of this amendment.

I know that the minority have a certain duty and obligation, and I commend them for assuming that obligation by pointing out anything that is critical and criticizing any legislation we propose. That is all right. I think it is helpful; I think it is constructive. I know that we have good, sensible men and women on the Republican side who are capable of doing that, and it is in the public interest. But, remember this, they have no responsibility. The responsibility is not on them in this. The responsibility is upon the majority party, the party that is sitting on this side of the aisle. There is where the responsibility is. We may expect them to suggest and propose any kind of an amendment that will be critical or destructive or crippling to a bill that the majority party presents.

Remember this, we are in an emergency now; we are in a situation where everyone is going to be called on to sacrifice. I shudder to think of the millions of good men and women who on next March 15 will be assessed a large amount of income taxes and will not have the money to pay them. The people are behind us in this defense program. They expect us to spend money, and they are willing to pay it; but they want us to do what is necessary to speed this program as rapidly as possible.

I insist that this provision is necessary in the interest of our domestic policy, and especially in the interest of national defense. I hope the amendment is adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we questioned Mr. Henderson rather carefully in the hearings in regard to this buying and selling provision. I will refer to what he said. As a speaker has told us, he used copper as an example, and attempted to reassure us with statements that there were but few such items expected to be dealt with.

Said Mr. Henderson:

I was referring to copper. There may be many companies today that would be glad to buy copper at 15 cents.

That some purchasers would be willing to pay much more than the ceiling price. He implied that he would be willing to let them pay more after the low-priced copper had been exhausted on the market.

We inquired of him whether, although willing to pay a higher price, they could not still sue for the ceiling price. He said, "Yes, it would be possible." He admitted that he must have this power to buy outright from the high-cost producer because we must have the production and protect the seller, both as to reasonable profit and legal entanglements. "We must build storehouses," he said. He suggested that such operations would be on a very large scale.

It is another great venture in putting Government in business. The picture was presented that only copper and few, if any other materials, would be involved. Today an amendment is contemplated to buy and sell anything the Administrator may think necessary to make his ceiling price stick and keep production going. How insignificant will appear Sears Roebuck. Let us pay subsidies if this bill forces such necessity but keep out of business.

Let us consider putting the Government into the business of buying, selling, finding customers, and deliberately selling at a loss and taking the usual credit chances. The producer has his organization and his customers. Let him do the best he can, and then, if by this act of his own Government he suffers losses, we should subsidize those losses. Do not take away his own customers and undertake all his hazards as well. Let us not open this door of a huge merchandising business. Let us not advance the capital and permit a vast revolving fund for pure storekeeping business by our Government. Subsidies, hateful enough to contemplate, are for a lesser evil. Peruse page 387 in the hearings and then consider the amendment to be offered by the committee. Some members voted against section (e) in the committee, yet that now seems very mild compared to the broad power they ask for today. Of course, it would create many more jobs, and that seems a paramount goal in this administration.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Is there anything in this amendment that would prohibit the Administrator from using these funds to operate in the futures markets to raise and lower markets?

Mr. GIFFORD. It does seem so.

By this bill we attempt to give power enough to put out fires that have or may be started, but not appropriate a fire engine to every door, lest a fire might be kindled.

I desire a price-control bill. We should validate what is being or might be done. Business must be protected after acting in good faith in obedience to ceiling prices. But let us not plunge the Nation into a vast storekeeping proposition and supplant the present private activities of store, sales, delivery, and collection.

I repeat, pay subsidies if this bill forces us to do so, but keep out of business. I think my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] has some clear arguments and I trust he will follow me in this discussion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not the gentleman believe, in all sincerity and without any camouflage whatsoever, that under this provision the Administrator could set up vast storehouses in every large industrial city in this country, which takes in all of them, and perform a merchandising business just the same as a corner groceryman or anyone else?

Mr. GIFFORD. That is what I am trying to make clear. The Government would be forced to buy in great quantities and store and display goods over the entire Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened to my distinguished colleague from Texas and his statement that we on the minority side had a position as a watch dog, and I agree with him, and we generally have to maintain that position, but it is not our disposition at this time in any way to upset this bill or take away certain necessary powers from the Price Administrator. The main point that was under discussion in our recent meeting when this amendment was offered as a committee amendment was that it was not necessary to have a revolving fund. No one wished to take away from the Administrator his powers to buy high-cost production materials that were necessary to stimulate production; but, as the Congress well knows, we have various agencies of the Government that are equipped by experience and by unlimited borrowing facilities already given to them by this Congress to do these things, and that in the past month the Price Administrator has been using them and it was the wish of almost a majority of the committee that he continue that function.

There is no doubt that there is necessity to subsidize certain high-cost producers. It was brought out that during the first World War they had a different system of subsidy. The ceilings were applied on what was known as a bulk-line basis. The ceilings were placed at such a point that the highest-cost producers might produce, but what did that do to the low-cost producers? It caused them to make tremendously large profits, and the Government had to pay more for the material. So now, not wishing to follow the old bulk-line theory, it is the idea to give to the administration the right to buy at a higher price from high-cost producers, but that differential between the ceiling and the higher price will be subsidized by the Government; but by the same token we do not want to have the Price Administrator with his numerous other duties have to set up a little R. F. C. or a little Defense Supplies Corporation parallel to those now existing.

In a statement that was sent out by the Price Control Office one paragraph said in commenting upon the taking out of this paragraph from the original bill which is now again under consideration as a committee amendment or as a substitute amendment which I hope to offer later:

> Why these changes are made is difficult to understand. Perhaps, the committee felt that the adequate powers to buy and sell imported products existed in other agencies of the Government, but existing legislation is limited to only strategic or critical materials.

This is not correct because I have here the Government Manual and I have before me the purposes of the Defense Supplies Corporation, one of the corporations of the Federal Loan Agency, and the purpose of this Corporation is to produce, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in strategic and critical materials and supplies, and further on—

> to take such further action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator deem necessary to expedite the national-defense program.

Mr. Chairman, every such power is now held in the Federal Loan Administration. I am in favor—and I think many other members of the minority are in favor—of the Price Administrator having the power to buy high-cost production material, but they are not in favor of having him setting up another little agency similar to the ones already existing and buying and selling at will. This would be an additional burden on the taxpayers and I think would cause utter confusion in the Federal Loan Administration and in other similar agencies.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that power was granted under the Lend-Lease Act to the President to buy any defense article and was not any defense article defined so broadly as to include almost anything?

Mr. DEWEY. That is quite correct and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What makes the gentleman think that the organization will be little? If they treat all people the same and buy all high-cost producers' materials in the same way, it would cost billions of dollars, it seems to me.

Mr. DEWEY. It would set up another large agency and the limits of it would be quite in the hands of the Price Administrator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think earlier in the day the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

PATMAN] left the impression on the House that Mr. Henderson might run the Price Control Administration machinery with $100,000 a year as the total expense.

Mr. DEWEY. I think it was 100,000 men.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not the gentleman believe that this one new division, if it is created, will cost more than $100,000 a year from the standpoint of personnel alone?

Mr. DEWEY. I think there is no doubt of that.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not seriously contend that it will take $100,000 to administer this feature, when the R. F. C. will continue their functions. This will not supplement what the R. F. C. does.

Mr. DEWEY. The gentleman well knows that when any body of the Government secures the appropriation of a revolving fund, it is going to make that fund revolve.

Mr. PATMAN. But the gentleman does not know how much it will be.

Mr. DEWEY. No; but I know how much has already been appropriated for national-defense commissions and bureaus, and I am taking my figures from those.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] mentioned $100,000 as the sum to administer this bill. Further on, he indicated there were 1,300 men at present in O. P. A. C. That would take at least two or three million dollars right there, without any additional men.

Mr. DEWEY. I think $100,000 in such an organization would be very small.

Mr. PATMAN. I must have been referring to something else. I think $100,000 would be too little.

Mr. DEWEY. I think it would be entirely too little. I think 100,000 men would be a more likely figure.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I trust the gentleman recalls that Mr. Henderson said that the people who wanted to buy copper would be glad to pay much more than the ceiling price, and when he was questioned he said that they would be glad to pay much more than the ceiling price, and if they paid it, then they would turn around and sue because they had not lived up to the ceiling price, and he finally decided that he could have only one ceiling price, and in order to prevent profits accruing to the low-cost producer, "we must buy and sell." The gentleman and I thought it meant simply a substitute on a few materials.

Mr. DEWEY. That was the general impression then, but I have changed my mind considerably since that time.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why did they come in here yesterday and upset this bill? Why did the committee come in? Does the gentleman know what happened? What happened that they should come in and ask for this?

Mr. DEWEY. I cannot conceive. The vote was brought up so quickly that I was confused.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was out of the committee room at the moment. I tried to get back in a minute. I was there practically all the morning. Did not the committee assign any reason?

Mr. DEWEY. I think the only reason was that it was 5 minutes to 12 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall rise later to propose the following substitute amendment:

SEC. 2 (e), page 6, strike all of the paragraph (e) commencing on line 16, and insert:

"(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator it is necessary, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, to obtain the production of marginal or high-cost producers, he may so notify the President, and the President may direct any existing agency or agencies of the United States to exercise, and any such agency or agencies shall exercise in accordance with such directions, any authority heretofore or hereafter conferred on them by law to buy, sell, store, or use any commodity produced in the United States by any such producer: *Provided*, That any materials which have been heretofore or may hereafter be defined as strategic and critical materials and supplies by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, may be bought in order to carry out the purposes of this act only by corporations created or organized pursuant to said section 5d, upon such terms and conditions as they may determine, and only with the approval of the President and the Federal Loan Administrator; *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify, suspend, amend, or supersede any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section, or any existing law, shall be construed to authorize any sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity contrary to the provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman imagine anything that would be more apt to promote inflation than the adoption of this amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it would be a great contribution to it. Furthermore, I want to point out that the markets of this country belong to the people of this country. The people possess them by inalienable right, because it is the people who produce, who consume, but who, whether we like it or not, will exercise their own judgment in buying and selling. That will be the situation unless we convert the people to going along with so-called emergency control.

Price is the vox populi of world economic life. It is the people's ballot box, perhaps the only true democracy in the world today. It will tolerate no despot, no autocrat. Price should tell the farmer whether he ought to produce more wheat or cotton or curtail his production. Price tells the consumer whether he can or should buy. It is automatic in its operation.

Government after government, including our own, has tried price fixing, regimentation of production, attempts at marketing control, promulgating quotas, and what not. Yet inspite of all these strivings, the desired equilibrium between agricultural and industrial prices evades us like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow; and we come in here with this proposal to put the Government in business against every producer, every merchandiser in the United States.

The committee first provided that this operation might be brought into form only insofar as domestic products are concerned; but now this amendment comes in as a recommendation of the committee and proposes to extend the powers to reach to all parts of the world; to contact all producers and all consumers.

I cannot imagine anything that is any more destructive or any more confusing to our people than for us to approve an amendment such as is here recommended by the chairman of our committee. I cannot understand why Mr. Henderson and Mr. Ginsburg would promote such an amendment at this time and thus further create disunity in this House and among the people of this country. It is highly un-American. It is undemocratic. It is vicious because it serves notice on everybody that he must compete with the United States Government insofar as the administration of the price-control machinery is concerned. We should defeat this amendment. Certainly we should restrict it to products made in the United States if you do not defeat the amendment in its entirety.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's opinion, is this the beginning of the end of the American market for the American farmer?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe that. Owners and operators of private property should not be compelled to go groping along in a maze of uncertainty, with a feeling that a planning board is lurking behind every rock and tree, ready, on and in response to impulse, however generated, to put prices up or down to their disadvantage.

That is exactly the substance and purpose of this amendment, and therefore we should defeat it, and I hope that will be the vote of the Committee.

For after all what is supply and what is demand except the reaction of the people themselves to the conditions of their existence? Human behaviorism is the deciding factor. The market belongs to the people. It is in the market place that they express their judgment on values. The market degenerates into a mere Charlie McCarthy when it gets into the hands of government. Its imperative requirement is freedom. Nowhere else is liberty more precious. The people will submit to conscription of their youth

for war, to taxes amounting to confiscation, but they will take a final stand on their judgment of prices, for when they speak it is not as individuals but as the people—all the people over the whole of our mechanized, monetary world of trade.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. STEAGALL. I wonder how many Members desire to be heard on this provision.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say there are two amendments on this side which will be offered. I do not know how many there are in addition to that who will want to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair may be indulged a moment, there are three other amendments on the desk to this section. There are two amendments on the desk to the committee amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, it is manifest that it will inconvenience quite a number of Members if we have to sit here much longer tonight. If it is agreeable to the gentleman to withhold his recognition until Friday——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will pardon me, I yielded back my time at 3 o'clock and deferred to the gentleman's side then. I would like to proceed at this time.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will not interrupt the gentleman further.

"THE MUSIC GOES ROUND AND ROUND AND COMES OUT HERE"—SO DOES PURCHASING POWER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the committee bill proposes selective price control. The committee amendment, now pending, proposes to implement selective price control by selective purchasing and sale—bucket-shop operations in commodities by the Government. That is selective price control in its worst form.

To dress the amendment up a bit, to tone down the bad odor, much has been made of a provision in the amendment to preserve the functions of the R. F. C. and the operations of the Tariff Act. Now the simple fact is that if the bill is defeated there is no need for adopting this amendment. If we do not take on this pain in the neck, we will not need the pain killer, which would introduce the worst wallop in the bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in speaking in behalf of the pending committee amendment, tried to find consolation in the fact that at the present time the Government goes into the market in security operations, in the purchase and sale of bonds and Government securities.

I want to emphasize the point I brought out in my interrogation of the gentleman, that there is a vast difference between proposing that the Government go into the market to deal in commodities, and going into the market as it does at present, to deal in its own securities. The difference involves a fiscal question which I thought the gentleman himself would have been the first to appreciate. In times past, he has not been any too complimentary of the Government's discount operations. Yet when the Government is dealing in its own securities, the effects of that dealing, whatever they may be, are diffused impartially to all branches of commerce. But when the Government goes into the market for selective purchasing and sale of commodities the results are not diffused. They strike in spots. And you have given to some administrator and his underlings the power of reward and penalty.

The Government will make or break a market in any commodity at the sweet whim of someone who never made a pay roll in his whole life. That illustrates the evil in the whole principle of selective price control and its most vicious form in selective purchasing.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. If you want to increase your copper production 10 percent, is it not better to pay two or three times as much for that high-cost production than it is to raise the whole copper price structure on the whole 100 percent?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; but you can meet that situation in strategic or essential materials for the Army and Navy under the Buy American Act now on the statute books.

Furthermore, the amendment proposed by the committee does not limit this premium buying and penalty selling to items of that kind. It is all-embracing. It gives to the Administrator the power to go wherever he or his underlings want to go.

Now certainly the committee had its own doubts on this score. They reported the bill without this selective-purchasing and sale provision. The expected administrator, we understand, said the bill would not work without it. So now they offer it and say it is essential. That is the fundamental weakness of this committee bill; it has an appetite for power. Each grant of power given requires another.

The truth is that selective price control cannot work. It cannot work because in the terms of the old song, "The music goes round and round and comes out here."

That is the fundamental weakness of selective price control. They tell us we have more dollars and fewer goods. Dollars compete for goods and the price of wanted goods goes up. So selective price control says we will put a ceiling on those prices. What happens? You have purchasing power and you hold it down here, and what does it do? It seeks an outlet. It wants to buy goods. It breaks out somewhere else.

Either you must provide goods for the money to buy or you must provide some other place for that purchasing power to go.

That is why the suggestion of the gentleman from California that we provide goods has some merit. Another answer that has been suggested is that of deferred income payments or defense-savings bonds.

Effective price control must take into consideration all of the factors that go to make up prices.

A false hope is being held out here in the suggestion that we can have price control and not affect wages. When I was home along in September I said to some of my audiences: "We have a price-control bill introduced down there, and it proposes to control everything except wages." I stopped, and invariably the people laughed, because they knew you could not control prices unless you controlled wages.

You cannot control the prices of raw materials unless you control wages. You cannot control transportation unless you control wages.

Nor can you control these things unless you control the flow of money, unless you control the extension of credit, unless you have an all-embracing proposition involving the rediscount rate, reserve ratios, and all the factors that go into determining prices. Without something of that sort price control cannot work.

Selective price control—there is no such thing. Prices are relationships.

The day the President's price-control message came before the House I had the privilege of offering for the RECORD a letter from my college teacher in economics in which he suggested that Congress should first set up a study for integrating fiscal and monetary policies. He pointed out that if we are going to have any effective price control, we must do two things: First, we must find some outlet for purchasing power when there is a diminished supply of goods; second, we must find some way of integrating the various controls on money with controls on prices.

I hope you will look up that letter. It was put in the July 30 RECORD, 2 days before the committee got its bill, 5 days before hearings began. In fact, I think when we go back into the House I will ask permission to reinsert that letter in my remarks. I hope before we vote on this bill you will read that letter by Dr. Hahne, because it suggests the fundamental principles we should keep in mind.

Among other things Dr. Hahne points out that it would take 35 years of the Defense Tax Act to pay the principal of existing governmental debts on the basis of the present national income. We have added to that debt since July, and soon will add several billions more.

Dr. Hahne raises the question—

Is it better to allow some inflation and the normal economic method of defraying acute indebtedness, or is it better to fix price controls that interfere with the normal workings of the price system?

His letter points out that—

The conscious effort of the past decade to raise prices is now being supplemented by the normal workings of the economic system, and this disturbs those who feel that the situation is getting out of hand because it is no longer subject to their theories of conscious control.

He concludes:

Before conceding control over prices to any single agency, which by virtue of the great

burden must assign details to less and less competent assistants, it is desirable to weigh these relative values.

I am sure you will find the letter of value in your thinking on this problem. I have seen the fundamental principles it states coming up again and again in this debate. I especially urge that you note the sequence of steps taken in Germany and the constructive suggestions with which the letter closes. If we are to have price control, let it be a coordinated system that will preserve and not destroy the capacity of the country to finance the tremendous effort in which it is now engaged.

The letter referred to follows:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Evanston, Ill., July 28, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS H. CASE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: The current discussion of price control for the purpose of preventing inflationary tendencies prompts the following letter, which I hope may assist you in formulating a sound judgment with respect to this extremely important issue.

I am assuming that it is necessary to maintain capitalistic democracy with both sound military and economic measures, and that military measures alone are inadequate.

THE EUROPEAN PATTERN

The experience in European countries where price controls have been used most extensively now shows a vaguely defined pattern or stages of historical development. Those stages have been set forth by eminent German economists as follows:

1. Spot control: Originally intended as temporary price controls for particular prices, but subsequently proving to have been the beginning of a permanent program.

2. Key-price controls: Maximum prices for selected commodities or industries, usually those which have been well cartelized during peacetimes.

3 Antiprofiteering laws: Primarily excess-profits taxes followed shortly by penalty taxes and/or administrative "price-discouragement methods" aimed to discourage evasions and violations of maximum price decrees.

4. Wage and price freezing decrees (Italy, 1927; Germany, 1936; Japan, 1939): Intended to apply generally to the whole economic order, somewhat along the lines of the Baruch plan as outlined by C. O. Hardy in his War-time Control of Prices.

5. Rationing: Beginning with priorities and supplemented with noneconomic sanctions.

6. Centralization and the use of equalization funds: Centralized control for both wholesale and retail prices through buying and selling agencies supplemented with offices which supervise interdependent prices.

Such price-control developments could be followed here in the United States, provided there is an agreement to modify the economic order, and to abandon sound economic principles, and to adopt the policy of conscious control by a few power-using agencies.

It is very desirable that the proposals now being made which look toward the abandonment of sound economic principles be branded and recognized for what they are worth. It is unwise for regulatory agencies, as well as legislative groups to adopt price-control systems that are founded upon fallacies that can be proved to be unsound in advance of opportunistic experimentation.

FALLACY NO. 1

One commonly accepted fallacy is that output can be restricted as a part of the program for preventing inflation.

Take, for example, the proposal to restrict the production of automobiles. Suppose that for purposes of price controls the administration has been able to fix absolutely the total quantity of purchasing power, which, to say the least is a questionable assumption, and that at any given time there is a totality of $200,000,000 that may be spent as purchasing power. All other things remaining the same, a reduction in cars will raise prices; thus if 1,000,000 cars are made then they will sell for $200 each, if 500,000 cars are produced they will sell for $400 each, while 100,000 cars would sell for $2,000 each.

Of course, this is absurdly simple, but not clearly understood, because it is reported in the press that O. P. A. C. S. desires to avoid price increases, and the dangers of inflation, while at the same time they recommend curtailment in the output of cars. The purpose and policy are contradictory.

Unless restriction of output is simultaneously accompanied by similar, or greater, restriction of total purchasing power, price rises will take place. The abnormal war demands automatically disturb industry and inevitably lead to curtailment of output of normal consumer goods. The conscious effort of the past decade to raise prices is now being supplemented by the normal workings of the economic system, and this disturbs those who feel that the situation is getting out of hand because it is no longer subject to their theories of conscious control.

The efforts to raise prices during the thirties were approved by the people at the polls, therefore, a repudiation of that policy today is politically dangerous, at the same time that it is economically unsound.

FALLACY NO. 2

A second common fallacy is that prices can be regulated without regulating incomes

Initial proposals for price controls always assure that there will be no regulation of wages, except in countries where there is a definite attempt to redistribute incomes and wealth. This fallacy is founded upon a failure to recognize the close relationships between incomes, costs, and prices. To wage earners higher wages are desirable because they are incomes; to management higher wages are undesirable because they constitute higher costs; in short, costs are incomes.

Prices are related not to past but to prospective costs, and if prices are controlled by administrative fiat, there must be regard for costs, one of the most important of which is wages.

Whenever Congress grants price-control powers to the administration it impliedly grants powers to control wages, plus interest, plus rents.

Congress cannot separate incomes and costs, neither can any administrator.

But from a tactical viewpoint it is always emphasized that prices are controlled for the sake of the wage earners, while in the long run wages must be fixed if prices are fixed.

Will Congress, after these years of cooperating with the trade-unions of America in securing the rights and recognition of collective bargaining, want to deprive those same trade-unions of their very purpose of existence by taking from them their powers of collective bargaining with respect to wages, hours, and conditions of labor? I doubt if trade-unions want to freeze wages, and especially if that power is lodged in the hands of an administrator that might find it difficult to separate incomes and costs.

A congressional vote to grant price control is a vote to hand wage control over to the administration, perhaps not at once, but insidiously and invidiously.

FALLACY NO. 3

A third common fallacy is that it is possible to check the threat of inflation by controlling particular prices, and that this automatically involves control over the price level.

Unless control over particular prices is accompanied by control over the general level of prices, conflicting economic forces will be set in motion that would lead to the defeat of price controls. That there is a general level of prices different in 1932 than in 1940 cannot be denied, nor can it be denied that the value of money is different than the value of goods.

To regulate the value of money, the general price level, it is necessary to manipulate the rediscount rate, the reserve ratios, the open-market operations, the flow of specie, the extension of bank credit, and these controls must move in harmony with those over particular prices.

This calls for a centralization of powers that is now diffused in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury, the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, and placing these powers in the hands of that central agency which establishes control over particular prices.

To assume perfect harmony, say between the Department of Agriculture with respect to the fair price of farm products and the price administrator, who fixes the prices of the things the farmer buys, requires considerable faith in human nature. Harmony can be best established when the centralized powers of the price administrator include that of fixing all prices.

Moreover, if those now exercising powers over the extension of bank credit should make a move that would upset the apple cart of the interdependent prices fixed by the price administrator, it would be eventually necessary to divest the Federal Reserve Board and Treasury of their controls over credit and lodge such powers in the hands of the Price Administrator.

Do you think that under the American economic system there is anyone, or any group of men, sufficiently omniscient to exercise such control over the economic order?

FALLACY NO. 4

A fourth fallacy now current is that the proposed taxes under the revenue revision of 1941 will prove a sufficiently powerful check upon spending as to prevent inflation.

From 1933 to 1939 taxes and loans were used to finance spending and raise prices; now, with substantially the same taxes, the theory has changed and taxes will lower prices. Since the taxes are the same, the taxpayers the same, the tax incidence the same, it necessarily follows that the effects will be the same. The only variable factor in the situation is the willingness of the people to spend. Thus taxes were used during the great depression to pry people loose from their money, get it into circulation, and assure spending, whereas today it is assumed people are willing to spend and should be prevented from spending.

The funds collected by the 1941 taxes and Treasury loans will be used to buy war needs; then the laborers, managers, and industries supplying these needs get the funds; they will spend the money raised by these taxes. Hence the only difference is found in the time when the spending takes place.

To prevent inflation it is necessary that the taxes be accompanied by some method of absorbing the funds after they accomplish war purchases. Should this be left to the Price Administrator? My suggestion is that it could be much better accomplished through a deferred income plan.

FALLACY NO. 5

In the fifth place, a common current fallacy is that all inflationary measures are undesirable.

The fact is that the problem of price control involves a judgment as to the merits of relative values. Thus on July 24 the House was told that appropriations and contract authorizations for defense purposes would reach $52,000,000,000. We now know that the State and local debts reach about

$19,000,000,000, that the Federal direct and guaranteed debt is about $56,000,000,000, or a total governmental load of $121,000,000,000.

Assuming that the present tax load of $3,500,000,000 proposed in the pending revenue legislation is continued simply to pay the principal of this existing governmental debt, it would take 35 years to pay the principal, let alone the added interest loads that must be borne.

The relative question, then, is this: Is it better to allow some inflation and the normal economic method of defraying acute indebtedness, or is it better to fix price controls that interfere with the normal workings of the price system?

Some reputable economists now regard inflation as a kind of tax, a creditors' tax, a tax on fixed-income receivers. If this view is sound, the issue then centers on the question as to the most desirable form of taxation. Before conceding control over prices to any single agency, which by virtue of the great burden must assign details to less and less competent assistants, it is desirable to weigh these relative values.

TWO SUGGESTIONS

May I offer two suggestions?

First. Congress should give further consideration to the deferred-income plan.

Thus by mopping up the tax and loan funds after they have been used to buy war materials, through the sale of bonds the limit placed on purchasing power becomes direct and effective. Such bonds should not be used as collateral for bank loans, nor should they carry conversion privileges, nor should they be cashed before the end of the military emergency, and then they should be used to buy the peacetime goods which will have experienced a curtailment in demand because of the war program.

England steered away from the deferred-income plan until it became apparent that price controls were breaking down, when the plan was finally adopted. Many sound and reputable economists favor this plan for America.

Second. Congress should at once set up a special committee to investigate and report a program designed to integrate fiscal and monetary policy.

Perhaps this could be done through some of the proposed committees already proposed by several Congressmen. Any intelligent citizen familiar with the overwhelming load imposed upon a diligent Congressman knows that he has neither the time, human endurance, nor inclination to master the complexities surrounding the predicament now caused by depression financing, defense financing, and prospective war financing.

Just as Great Britain called for the Colwyn Debt Committee to help solve the national-debt problem and the Macmillan committee to help solve the monetary problem, so, too, Congress might call for assistance from the reserves of the legal, statistical, accounting, and economic professions. This store of information is equal to that to be found in the different departments and agencies in the administrative branch, and would doubtless be welcomed by many in the different bureaus.

The responsibility belongs to Congress alone; aid can be secured from many untapped sources. Time is of the very essence of the price-control problem and such a committee should be established by Congress immediately.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST H. HAHNE,
Professor of Economics.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 5990, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1941, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert an article from Time magazine of November 24, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper editorial on propaganda in the motion-picture industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter addressed by Senator MCKELLAR to Senator CARTER GLASS on the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in the committee and to include therein a proposed substitute amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in committee this afternoon and to include therein a letter to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement and a letter from General Gregory of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a proposed amendment to the price-fixing bill which has to do with the establishment of a price-control administrator and an administrative board of review, which I will offer as an amendment to the bill when the committee considers it again Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include as a part thereof four short telegrams from organized workers in my home town, as well as a statement I prepared on markets.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, November 28, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, November 27, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 6045, to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended, on Friday, November 28, 1941, at 10 a. m., room 346, House Office Building.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 6056, to regulate in the United States Court of Claims suits for payment for the use of inventions by or for the Government, on Wednesday, December 3, 1941, at 10 a. m., room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs at 10:30 a. m., on Friday, November 28, 1941, for the consideration of amendments to S. 1623 and H. R. 5925.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1099. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 3, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted April 17, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1100. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Ohio River in the vicinity of Bridgeport, Ohio, and Wheeling Island, W. Va., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted August 2, 1939, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted July 18, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1101. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of payments made under the act of August 22, 1911 (37 Stat. 32; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 582), entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments for work already done under public contracts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1102. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 16, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Manchester Harbor, Mass., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted December 22, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 447); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1103. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 3, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Rouses Point Harbor, Lake Champlain, N. Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted October 18, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5727. A bill to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, its Territories and possessions, to authorize the procurement of materials and supplies, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3295. A bill for the relief of Kurt G. Stern; without amendment (Rept. No. 1450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 456. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 6108. A bill to amend the Socis' Security Act, as amended, to provide for the payment to States of an average of $20 per month per capita for all recipients of old-age assistance under the several State plans who are 65 years of age or older and not inmates of a public institution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 6109. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, to provide for the clarification of the dual nationality of certain persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6110. A bill to extend the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 6111. A bill to amend section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 6112. A bill to increase to $50 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans who at time of death were suffering from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6113. A bill to restore payment of full compensation to hospitalized veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 6114. A bill to reduce the interest on loans on United States Government life (converted) insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6115. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes as to World War veterans so as to base it upon an individual rather than an average basis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6116. A bill to provide payment of national service life insurance benefits based upon permanent total disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 6117. A bill to establish a more adequate rate of compensation for certain World War veterans hospitalized for service-connected disability; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H. R. 6118. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6119. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 6120. A bill granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6121. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6122. A bill to establish a uniform definition of "child" for the purposes of laws granting pension or compensation, or accrued amounts thereof, administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6123. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6124. A bill to increase to $60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6125. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $30 to $60 per month; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6126. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the 40th birthday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan introduced a bill (H. R. 6127) for the relief of Mundo Barchi, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2085. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of the Emergency Peace Committee of Tacoma, Attorney Rex S. Roudebush, chairman, Mrs. J. J. Kerwin, of Puyallup, Wash., secretary, stating that the virtual repeal of the Neutrality Act, implicit in the adoption of the Senate amendments, contemplates the possibility of bankruptcy, collapse of the present system, and the end of democracy in America; alleging that modern war per se is the greatest enemy of democracy and should be avoided unless the United States is attacked; averring that Great Britain manifests no interest in democracy outside of England; that her program of imperialism results in ruthless exploitation of China, India, and Africa; pointing out that the Weimar Republic in Germany was destroyed by joint strangling at the hands of Great Britain and France, indicating that Great Britain, by signing a trade treaty with the Nazis in 1938, proposed to divide South American trade to the exclusion of the United States; and therefore insisting that our first duty is to establish the four freedoms in America before undertaking to spread them throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2086. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Petition of Frances Sherrill, national president of the National Legion of Mothers of America, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., signed by approximately 325 persons, petitioning Congress to stop the step-by-step involvement of the

United States into undeclared war by repealing the Lend-Lease Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2087. Also, a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, expressing disapproval of the proposal to abandon or seriously curtail the surplus food stamp plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2088. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Ivan N. Gates, secretary-treasurer, Iowa Jersey Cattle Club, West Liberty, Iowa, protesting against the recent ruling of Administrator Paul McNutt regarding the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in the imitation of butter; to the Committee on Agriculture

2089. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 2243 of the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., requesting that the Raker Act be amended by eliminating therefrom the prohibitions contained therein against the sale for resale of the electric energy generated on the Hetch Hetchy project; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2090. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the N. A. W. of the Congress of Industrial Organizations of Racine, Wis., submitted by the central legislative council of that organization, protesting against the passage of the price-control bill (H. R. 5479); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2091. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Camp No. 54, P. O. of A., Audubon, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1941

Very Rev. ZeBarney Thorne Phillips, D. D., dean of the Washington Cathedral and Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, within whose keeping are all the sons of men and of whose bestowal are all the gifts of life: Help us to make the noblest use of mind and body in the days that lie ahead; apportion Thou our work according to our strength, and, as Thou hast pardoned our transgressions, we beseech Thee to sift the ingatherings of our memory, that evil may grow dim, that good may shine forth clearly until in Thine unhindered light each stain of self may be effaced.

Grant to us, then, new ties of friendship, clear thought, and quiet faith, and, above all, increase our sympathy for those who bear the burdens of the world, for those who do but hear in sorrow's brooding air the anguished cry of suffering and pain, and in the midst of their despair do Thou comfort them with Thine own promise of repose in a ransomed world where peace shall be enthroned and shall reign among all nations. In our blest Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GUFFEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 24, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 210) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of freight forwarders, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEA, Mr. CROSSER, Mr. SOUTH, Mr. PATRICK, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLMES, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 466) for the relief of J. T. Colter.

The message further announced that the House had agreed severally to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas;

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer; and

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1852) for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5694) to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1884) to make provision for the construction activities of the Army, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as additional members of the Special Committee to Investigate the National-Defense Program, authorized by Senate Resolution 175, agreed to October 16, 1941.

UNITED STATES MUHLENBERG BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Also, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] as the members on the part of the Senate of the United States Muhlenberg Bicentennial Commission, established by Public Law 209, approved August 16, 1941.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 124)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $1,280,000, for the Department of Justice (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 125)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $18,631,492 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 126)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department and the naval service, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $1,665,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 127)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $578,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACT PAYMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to payments and partial payments to contractors in amounts not exceeding 30 percent of contract price in the case of Coast Guard contracts, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE NAVY

Two letters from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to divisions of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

NUMBER OF MEN IN ACTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE IN THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, that, on the last day of October 1941, there were 749,780 men in active training and service in the land forces under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Miss Edith Huffman, of San Fernando, Calif., praying for the enactment

of legislation to grant pensions to all nurses who served overseas, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, out of order, I should like to have just a moment to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today is the real Thanksgiving Day; that Gov. William Bradford, back in 1621, established the custom, and Abraham Lincoln, in 1863, designated the last Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Was it the Massachusetts Bay Colony or the Plymouth Colony that took the leadership in instituting Thanksgiving?

Mr. BRIDGES. In 1621, the time referred to, William Bradford was Governor of the Plymouth Colony.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I can play no favorites, and make no exceptions on either side of the aisle. I have stated several times my objection to any procedure at the beginning of the morning hour other than the strict carrying out of the rule pertaining to the routine morning business. After the conclusion of the routine business I shall be very glad to hear the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire, but I insist on the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY BY PRIORITIES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am convinced that the pattern of our economic productivity was cut too small at the time priorities were instituted. We were called upon to do away with some of the long-established needs of civilian life before it has been shown that this sacrifice is necessary. I believe it is time for us to consider again the basic essentials of this problem, thinking not only of the present emergency but also of the days to come.

The only way we are going to have enough revenue to pay the tax bill imposed because of the defense program is to maintain the economic strength of the nondefense industries. It is national suicide to destroy small business and the nondefense industries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred a letter from Mr. Harry R. Lenker, of York, Pa., with which he transmits to me a copy of a resolution adopted by the Central Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

NOVEMBER 22, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Member of Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: As a member of the Central Pennsylvania Chapter, American Institute of Architects, I have been appointed to a special committee, whose purpose is to contact outside organizations and officials relative to the building shut-down ordered by the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board.

This action by the Government is going to work a great hardship upon the building industry, and particularly upon the architectural profession, due to the fact that the small houses permitted by the Priority Board are constructed without an architect, and that any other defense work which may come within the scope of the architect will be of such quantities that the profession will hardly be affected.

The central Pennsylvania chapter adopted a resolution in which they recommend some action by Congress and other officials at Washington relative to finding employment for the persons affected through the rigid curtailment above mentioned.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the resolution adopted by the central Pennsylvania chapter and will appreciate receiving your reaction to this.

Very cordially yours,

HARRY R. LENKER.

Whereas the recent decision of the Federal administration curtailing (and virtually eliminating) all construction activities except for houses costing less than $6,000 will cause the unemployment of many thousands of laborers, craftsmen, and others connected with the construction industry in this chapter's territory; and

Whereas the skills of these people affected by this curtailment in the construction industry are such that there is little demand for their services in industries manufacturing war materials; and

Whereas the housing program under consideration by the Government will not begin to absorb the services of these men unless increased manyfold; and

Whereas this unemployment will place many people on relief and destroy their morale and seriously weaken the country's unity in the war effort; and

Whereas we believe that if curtailment of new defense activities is necessary they should be applied equally to all nondefense industries; and

Whereas our knowledge of the territory embraced by our chapter leads us to believe that by proper regulation such sweeping curtailment would not be justified: Now be it

Resolved, That the Central Pennsylvania Chapter of the American Institute of Architects go on record as follows:

1. That we protest the curtailment in the construction industry as being unnecessary and unwarranted.

2. That if restrictions are applied, such restrictions should apply equally to all nondefense industries and at the same time provision be made to reemploy those who are affected by these restrictions.

3. That the members of this chapter of the American Institute of Architects feel that the morale of the citizens is fully as important as military preparedness and the destruction of the former will impair the latter.

4. That all Congressmen and United States Senators within the territory of the chapter be sent a copy of this resolution and they be requested to do all in their power to have lifted these unwarranted restrictions now placed on the construction industry.

5. That a special committee be formed to call these restrictions which abolish their means of livelihood to the attention of all organizations such as labor unions, general contractors' associations, etc., within the limits of our chapter territory.

6. That the Pennsylvania State Association of Architects be requested to make a similar protest and to request simultaneous action by other State associations and chapters of architects in the United States.

NAMING OF A CRUISER—RESOLUTION OF READING (PA.) CITY COUNCIL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs a letter from Daniel F. McKenna, city clerk of Reading, Pa., transmitting to me a copy of the resolution of the City Council of Reading requesting that one of our new Navy cruisers shall be named "Reading."

There being no objection, letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF READING,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Reading, Pa., November 22, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith find copy of Resolutions Nos. 252 and 254, unanimously passed by the Council of the City of Reading, Pa., on November 19, 1941.

Your interest and support for the attainment of the resolutions' objective will be deeply appreciated and gratefully remembered by our citizens.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL F. MCKENNA,
City Clerk.

Whereas the city of Reading, Pa., founded in 1748 by Thomas and Richard, sons of William Penn, has sent her own sons to meet the enemy challenge on every battlefield on which our Nation's forces have been engaged, from the days of the Revolution to the World War, while her citizens at home loyally and faithfully labored in mill and factory to furnish the materials and equipment upon which fighting men must rely for victory; and

Whereas the true spirit and tradition of our people has ever been in support of a program of national defense that would enable these United States of America to stand as a mighty and invincible bulwark for the protection and preservation of liberty and democracy; and

Whereas the citizens of Reading view with pride the building of a two-ocean Navy, to serve as the first line of defense for the protection of our shores: Now therefore

The Council of the City of Reading hereby resolves as follows:

That this body respectfully requests that a cruiser now under construction or upon which work will soon begin for the Navy of the United States be named "Reading" in honor of our city, and as a just tribute to the patriotism of our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Frank KNOX, Secretary of the Navy, Senators JAMES J. DAVIS and JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, and Congressman GUY L. MOSER.

VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF READING, PA.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, also I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution of the Council of the City of Reading, Pa., relative to recognition of the valiant service and splendid achievements of the volunteer fire department of the city of Reading, Pa.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in March 1943 the volunteer fire department of the city of Reading will celebrate the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of its founding, the first of its units, the Rainbow Fire Company having been organized March 17, 1773, more than 3 years before the adoption by the Continental Congress of the Declaration of American Independence; and

Whereas through the long years from its inception until the present day, the record of the volunteer fire department of the city of Reading has been an epic story of heroic service and unselfish devotion: Now therefore

The Council of the city of Reading hereby resolves as follows: That in appreciation and recognition of the valiant service and splendid achievements of the volunteer fire department of the city of Reading, this body respectfully petitions Postmaster General of the United States to cause a proper commemorative stamp to be prepared and offered for sale during the year 1943, as a fitting tribute to the achievements of the members, past and present, of our volunteer fire department; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General, Senators JAMES J. DAVIS and JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, and Congressman GUY L. MOSER.

RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD—OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution adopted by the Buffalo County (Wis.) Board of Supervisors, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALMA, WIS., *November 15, 1941.*

To the Honorable Members of the Buffalo County Board, Alma, Wis.:

GENTLEMEN: Whereas the Food and Drug Administration under the jurisdiction of the Federal Security Administration, namely, the Honorable Paul McNutt, has approved a new standard favorable to the oleomargarine industry; and

Whereas the Consumers Division of the United States Department of Agriculture has broadcast a program favorable to the oleomargarine industry: Now be it therefore

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, and Congressman MERLIN HULL; and be it further

Resolved, That the dairymen of Buffalo County, Wis., through their representatives of the members of the county board, resent the adoption of a standard for oleomargarine making it comparable to butter, and further resent the use of the office of the Consumers Division for making broadcasts favorable to oleomargarine; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Senators of Wisconsin and Congressman of this congressional district introduce or support any legislation that will abolish the Consumers Division of the United States Department of Agriculture for activity heretofore mentioned; and be it further

Resolved, That the foregoing officials introduce or support any legislation repealing any statute permitting the creation of such an oleomargarine standard such as went into effect on September 5, 1941.

CHRIS BRANGER.
EDMUND HITT.
H. L. MULTHAUP.
WALTER HEIKE.

RESOLUTION OF IRON COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD—DISMISSALS FROM A. C. C. C. CAMP

Mr. WILEY also presented a resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Iron County, Wis., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been called to the attention of the county board of Iron County, Wis., that residents of Iron County have been dismissed from their employment at the Civilian Conservation Corps camp, No. 79–S, at Manitowish, Wis., and that their positions have been filled by people who are nonresidents of Iron County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Iron County Board of Supervisors at a meeting held this 14th day of November 1941, That this county board is unalterably opposed to any and all dismissals of Iron County residents employed at the Civilian Conservation Corps camp, No. 79–S, in Manitowish, Wis., and respectfully request that all dismissals of Iron County residents may be restored and reemployed provided that said residents are capable and qualified of performing the duties of their former employment; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. J. E. Anderson, State Civilian Conservation Corps supervisor, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Antigo, Wis.; Hon. John P. Varda, assemblyman; Hon. James H. Carroll, senator; Hon. B. J. Gehrmann, Member of Congress; Conservation Department of the State of Wisconsin; Hon. Robert M. La Follette, United States Senator; and Hon. Alexander P. Wiley, United States Senator.

RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. WILEY also presented resolutions adopted by Lieutenant Ray Dickop Post, No. 36, the American Legion, of West Bend, and a convention of school board members and teachers of Manitowoc County, all in the State of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Legion has subscribed to a 100-percent defense program as it affects the United States by providing armed forces and war supplies, and requirements in such size, amounts, and efficiency that the thought of invasion of this country by any aggressor nation would be utterly impossible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lieutenant Ray Dickop Post, No. 36, West Bend, Wis., of the American Legion, department of Wisconsin, does hereby petition the national department of the American Legion for an expression of its membership on the issue of another participation of these United States in the present European war; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lieutenant Ray Dickop Post, No. 36, is opposed to any American expeditionary force to be sent into combat on any foreign soil; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of Lieutenant Ray Dickop Post, No. 36, and copies mailed to both United States Senators, WILEY and LA FOLLETTE, Representative FRANK KEEFE, and to our State senator and assemblyman. Also copies be sent to State department and national headquarters of the American Legion.

Whereas we, the school board members and teachers of Manitowoc County, Wis., assembled in convention at Manitowoc, Wis., on November 13, 1941, believe that about 85 percent of our people are opposed to having our country get involved in this war and do not want our soldiers to go and fight on any place outside of our American Continent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we go on record vigorously opposing those 15 percent who, by their propaganda with radio and the press, are trying their best to drive our soldiers into this European slaughterhouse, as was done in 1917, and that we recommend that our soldiers will never again fight in a war outside our Western Hemisphere; be it further

Resolved, That in view of the fact that Canada, who has declared war, gives her draftees only 4 months' training in military camps and returns them to their homes and business, we recommend that our drafted boys be returned to their homes and business when they complete 18 months of training instead of 30 months, as now required by our Government.

COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 24th instant,

The following report of the Committee on the Judiciary was submitted on November 26, 1941:

By Mr. DANAHER:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday; with amendments (Rept. No. 843).

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 298. A bill to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 845)

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. GUFFEY (for Mr. BARKLEY), from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 12 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2071. A bill to authorize the Minnesota & Manitoba Railroad Co. to convey a certain tract of land to the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 111, of Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2072. A bill granting a pension to Clyde C. Delaney; and

S. 2073. A bill granting an increase of pension to Isabell Postlethwait; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 2074. A bill for the relief of Michael Alvin Savenko; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to order to the United States on their statutory leaves of absence officers and employees serving abroad, and to govern the

payment of traveling expenses and duties while on leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2076. A bill granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPENCER:

S. 2077. A bill amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural-conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2078. A bill to establish the National Inventors and Engineers Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5694) to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF COMMERCE IN PETROLEUM—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on November 24 I introduced in the Senate the bill (S. 2066) to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products. The bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Formerly similar measures were first referred to and considered by the Committee on Mines and Mining and later by the Committee on Finance. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 2066 and that it be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Senator TRUMAN published in the Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round column of Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, of November 15, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERALIZATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION PROGRAM — STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR BLOOD

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Robert O. Blood, Governor of New Hampshire, relative to the federalization of unemployment-compensation program, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS ON EDUCATION BY DR. WILLIAM C. COPE

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Some Dangers in Education, delivered by Dr. William C. Cope, president, Drake Colleges of New Jersey, at the Hotel McAlpin, New York City, on November 5, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS — LETTERS FROM MRS. GEORGE M. STUCKEY

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mrs. George M. Stuckey, of Bishopville, S. C., and a letter addressed by Mrs. Stuckey to the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frank R. Kent in his column The Great Game of Politics, published in the Washington Evening Star of November 26, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL BY BERTRAM BENEDICT ON LEAGUE OF NATIONS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "League Membership Could Not Save Peace," written by Bertram Benedict and published in the Washington Evening Star of November 24, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF RENTS IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the routine morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives with regard to the rent-control bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
November 21, 1941.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5890) to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with amendments as follows:

Page 5, after line 15, of the House engrossed bill insert:

"(e) Any tenant may petition the Administrator to adjust the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations on the ground that such maximum-rent ceiling permits the receipt of an unduly high rent; whereupon the Administrator may by order adjust such maximum-rent ceiling in such manner or amount as shall, in his judgment, effectuate the purposes of this act and provide a fair and reasonable rent for such housing accommodations."; and

Page 5, line 16, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when this matter was brought up on Monday, I suggested that it lie over until today, believing that at that time the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] would be present. I am advised that he is absent, and that the matter now is being looked after by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who will present it. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of action on the subject the Vice President be permitted to sign the bill during the vacation of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I move concurrence in the amendments which the House has made to this bill, the rent-control measure, House bill 5890, which the Senate recently passed; but in connection with the motion, and in order that it may be clear what the intent of the only important amendment is, I have prepared a statement which I believe the Senate should hear and which should be in the RECORD.

The House of Representatives has accepted each of the amendments made by the Senate to the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, H. R. 5890. Without, however, sending the bill to conference, the House on November 21, 1941, made a further amendment consisting of a new paragraph, to be known as section 4 (e), reading as follows:

(e) Any tenant may petition the Administrator to adjust the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations on the ground that such maximum-rent ceiling permits the receipt of an unduly high rent; whereupon the Administrator may, by order, adjust such maximum-rent ceiling in such manner or amount as shall, in his judgment, effectuate the purposes of this act and provide a fair and reasonable rent for such housing accommodations.

This new paragraph evidently is intended as a substitute for section 4 (a) as it stood in the bill when originally passed by the House of Representatives on November 3, 1941, but which was stricken out by the Senate, and which still remains out of the bill as now passed by the House. The original section 4 (a), which was known as the Patman amendment, was stricken out by the Senate on the recommendation of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia primarily on the ground that it did not conform to the procedure and purpose of the rest of the act. The House, in its new paragraph 4 (e), has now inserted a paragraph which evidently is intended to conform to such procedure and purpose, and, makes it possible to review the rental of housing accommodations on petition of the tenant that they are unduly high, even though such rental was already in effect on January 1, 1941.

Section 4 (e) gives a tenant the opportunity to have the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations reviewed by the Administrator upon his complaint that it is unduly high. The Administrator may then, by his order, adjust it in such manner or amount as shall, in his judgment, effectuate the purposes of the act and provide a fair and reasonable rent for such housing accommodations. Reading this provision in connection with the rest of the bill, the Administrator can and should review and adjust such rental so as to bring it in line with the scale of rentals recognized in the remainder of the act; namely, by determining a fair and reasonable rent on the readily ascertainable basis of rentals generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations.

It is intended thus to give relief in the case of some rentals which, even on January 1, 1941, already were higher than those generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations. In the light of the purposes of the act, rentals of housing accommodations are not to be determined under the cumbersome and almost endless procedure of determining public-utility rates for service, based upon proofs of original cost, investment value, cost of reproduction less depreciation, or any other complicated rate base. It is intended that there shall be a readily ascertainable standard of rentals determined by those generally prevailing for comparable housing accommodations. It

also is recognized that although there may have been some few unfair and unreasonable variations from a normal standard in individual cases as of January 1, 1941, yet the generally prevailing standards of rental at that time had not then been substantially distorted.

I believe that this amendment should be concurred in by the Senate as being intended to effectuate the purposes of the act in the manner here stated, and as passed by the Senate.

I move concurrence in the amendments of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio to concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] that the Chair be permitted to sign the bill during the vacation of the Senate is also agreed to.

LOUISE HSIEN DJEN LEE LUM

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, out of order, I report favorably from the Committee on Immigration, House bill 1537, and I submit a report (No. 844) thereon. The bill has passed the House, been unanimously approved by the Immigration Committee, and approved by the Department of Justice; and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It provides for the admission as an immigrant, for permanent residence, of a Chinese citizen now resident in Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like 2 or 3 minutes to talk about Thanksgiving Day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will withhold his request until I can have a treaty ratified, I shall be more inclined to join in thanksgiving. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator celebrated Thanksgiving a little more often in regular form, perhaps the country would be better off.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very anxious to have ratified the treaty on which I shall ask the Senate to act. It is on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in regard to the request made by the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], let me say that the matter has been explained to me. This is simply a private bill involving an immigration matter, and I think it should first be considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1537?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1537) for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the date of the approval of this act, Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum, who was admitted into the Territory of Hawaii on June 29, 1934, for a temporary stay and is the Chinese wife of a citizen of the United States and the mother of two children born in the United States, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, this bill merely grants admission as an immigrant, for permanent residence, to a citizen of Hawaii, the wife of an American citizen, with two children. The bill has passed the House, and has been approved by the Senate Immigration Committee and by the Department of Justice. This is an emergency hardship case.

CELEBRATION OF THANKSGIVING DAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word about Thanksgiving. I am speaking on the pending bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds, let me say that the treaty to which I have referred is an executive matter, regularly on the calendar, and will take only a few moments.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall occupy only a moment of the Senate's time. I do not wish to be shut off indefinitely.

I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that today is the real Thanksgiving Day. It was originated in 1621 by Governor William Bradford, of the Plymouth colony. In 1863 Abraham Lincoln made the last Thursday in November the real Thanksgiving Day, and it was celebrated as such until the present President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, changed it to an earlier date in November. I am very glad to say he has now changed it back to the original date, so that next year the holiday will be celebrated in the usual course and order.

I point out that some States which still cling to old traditions are celebrating Thanksgiving today. I think we should not allow this day to pass without it being officially called to the attention of Senators and of the country that today is really Thanskgiving Day.

Mr. HERRING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HERRING. Let me suggest that the morning newspapers yesterday carried statements to the effect that the new Thanksgiving Day will be next Saturday, the third Thanksgiving. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not familiar with everything that has appeared in the morning newspapers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of House bill 1537, which is the pending business.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A FORUM FOR PROTECTION OF LITTLE BUSINESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise merely to announce to the Senate and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that Monday next the Committee on Naval Affairs will meet to consider Senate bill 1847, which was introduced in this body on August 16 last, a bill for the purpose of creating a forum in which little business and civilian business may make known their wants for raw materials.

I am very happy to be able to announce that the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Contracts Under the National Defense Program, and the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who last week submitted a report on behalf of the Truman committee, have indicated to me that they will appear before the Committee on Naval Affairs and give testimony. Those two Members of this body agree in the statements which have been made heretofore to the effect that the policies now being followed by O. P. M.—and, I may add, in the presence of the present presiding officer, by S. P. A. B.—are threatening the very existence of civilian industry.

I had occasion to remark last Thursday evening, in an interview which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System, that civilian industry is the goose that lays the golden egg which will pay for the defense efforts. We cannot hope to meet the bills for arming the Army and the Navy and providing for our lease-lend commitments if we kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Last week the Senate adopted a resolution, which I had the honor of offering, calling upon O. P. M. to tell the Senate what it proposes to do to prevent the destruction of civilian business in this country. The clerk of the Committee on Naval Affairs has advised O. P. M., as well as the Army and the Navy, that these hearings will begin next Monday. It occurs to me that since these organizations no doubt will be represented before the committee, the hearings will afford an excellent opportunity for O. P. M. to tell the Senate and the country what it is proposed to do to prevent this disaster to our fundamental economy.

ATTORNEY GENERAL COMMENTS ON S. 1847

Let me add that, although unfavorable reports were filed upon my bill by O. P. M., the War Department, and the Navy Department, the view of the Department of Justice was somewhat different. A letter was directed to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General, in which, although he suggested a modification of the language of the measure, he expressed the opinion that it appeared to be desirable.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the radio interview broadcast over the Columbia System, as well as the letter of the Attorney General to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the radio interview and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Civilian business is the goose that lays the golden egg which will pay for the defense and the lease-lend program," said Senator O'MAHONEY in a radio interview over the Columbia Broadcasting System Tuesday night, "and if it is destroyed there will be no possible way of paying for the defense program or of maintaining democracy."

Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, was interviewed by a Wyoming radio commentator, Jim Abbe, of KWYO, Sheridan, Wyo., about his bill, S. 1847, to create an agency where businessmen may make application for raw

materials of which they are being deprived by the priorities system.

Asked by Abbe what he expected little businessmen to do to cooperate in their own defense, Senator O'MAHONEY replied:

"Well, I was once First Assistant Postmaster General, and I know that the Post Office Department is one of the most efficient organizations in the world. I would have every businessman who has been compelled to lay off any employees, by reason of material shortages or who sees disaster coming, go to his postmaster and tell his story to the postmaster with the request that he immediately notify Washington.'

"Uncle Sam has a representative in every community of the land; he is the postmaster. He will be glad to report to Washington the danger that threatens his town if the businessmen will make the effort to tell the story."

To Mr. Abbe's question, "What about distribution of defense contracts to little businessmen the bits and pieces program of the Office of Production Management; is that not sufficient?" Senator O'MAHONEY declared:

"More than two-thirds of American business cannot possibly be made over to handle the high-speed precision tools necessary for the mass production of implements of war. Reports which have come to me indicate that scarcely 30 percent of American industry can possibly be geared into the war effort. All the rest of American industry must be kept going to high speed if the defense program is to be a success.

"We are going to pay for the defense program out of taxes or we are not going to pay for it at all. Obviously, if civilian business is hampered or suppressed, the taxpayers on whom Henry Morgenthau is depending for income-tax payments next March will be unable to deliver. Civilian business is, in fact, the goose that lays the golden egg of American income, both national and governmental. No single public agency can be supported without the taxpayer, and if the taxpayers are unable to work they cannot pay the taxes."

Mr. ABBE. Senator, can you visualize what I have seen with my own eyes—a nation completely without little business, without little manufacturers; can you visualize our Nation functioning that way?

Senator O'MAHONEY. You are talking about some totalitarian country—Russia, I suppose?

Mr. ABBE. Russia, Germany, and Italy.

Senator O'MAHONEY. America cannot operate as those countries have operated and remain a democracy. My whole contention is that if we are to preserve democracy in the world, we must first preserve it on the home front.

Mr. ABBE. Do you think it is possible to supply raw materials to little business and, at the same time, deliver the goods under the lend-lease program?

Senator O'MAHONEY. The answer to that is, emphatically, "Yes," and the proof came from the Office of Production Management yesterday. It was announced by Edward Stettinius that lease-lend aid already extended has passed the billion-dollar mark. I am talking about material actually delivered. More than that, Office of Production Management was authority for the statement that the outlay to date for the defense effort is more than $2,000,000,000 greater than America's contribution during the World War. Again I am talking in terms of things delivered, but here is the clincher: Congress has appropriated and authorized for national defense and lease-lend in excess of $57,000,000,000; there has been disbursed to date only $11,000,000,000. With this expenditure of $11,000,000,000 we have made the stupendous contribution of material aid in which Office of Production Management takes a justifiable pride, and we have done it without impairing civilian business to a dangerous degree. What is coming now is this: That raw materials are being withheld from civilian business, not according to the rate of production but to the rate of appropriation and authorization, which, according to the figures of the War Department, cannot be expended, in some instances, for more than a year.

My contention is that civilian business and war business must proceed together. One depends upon the other. We cannot suppress civilian business.

Mr. ABBE. Which shall come first, civilian business or the war effort?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is like the old question, "Which comes first, the chicken or the egg?" They must proceed together. We must carry out all our commitments. True, we must prepare for defense. True; but when we understand that 68 percent of our industry can make no contribution to the war effort except in the form of taxes, the purchase of defense bonds, and the maintenance of civilian morale, we must come to the conclusion that in a democratic nation civilian business comes first.

Mr. ABBE. Well, Senator, isn't it a fact that the defense program is being financed principally by the country going into debt rather than by taxation?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Certainly that is true, but this debt will never be paid off except by production of civilian business, and if we destroy civilian business now in the little communities of the country and in the States I am afraid we will never be able to get back to a democratic economy, much less pay the debt.

Mr. ABBE. But what are the facts with respect to actual shortages of raw materials?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I am convinced that the talk about material shortages has been grossly exaggerated, but in any event I believe it is an imperative part of our defense effort to produce more and to import more of the things that civilian industry needs. The other policy is a defeatist policy. It amounts to a confession that a democratic government cannot function in a national emergency, and that we must throw away all our concepts of a free economy. I do not believe that to be true; but, in any event, we should not lightly surrender to the theory that we have not enough material. The United States is the richest country in natural resources, with the possible exception of Russia, on the face of the globe. We should make a studied effort to develop all of these resources. We should rally all our forces to make these resources available to civilian business, and in this respect I believe that every local community throughout the country should immediately undertake a local study of its own resources. We have been depending too much upon Santa Claus. Little communities have been depending upon either big business or upon the Government. I believe they can do a lot to save themselves.

In any event, the enactment of a law such as that proposed in my bill—S. 1847—will create the machinery by which business and government may work together to preserve our industry, our morale, and our democracy.

Hearings on this bill will begin before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, the chairman advises me, on December 1 at 10:30 a. m.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1941.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman, Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I desire to call your attention to a bill (S. 1847) relating to the power to establish priorities pursuant to the act of June 28, 1940, as amended.

By section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (Public, No. 671, 76th Cong.), it was provided that deliveries pursuant to Army and Navy contracts and orders should, in the discretion of the President, take priority over all deliveries for private account, or for export.

By the act of May 31, 1941 (Public Law No. 89, 77th Cong.), the foregoing provision was amended so as to extend the priorities provided thereby to certain additional contracts, orders, subcontracts, and suborders specified in the amendatory act. The last-mentioned statute also contains a provision authorizing the President to allocate materials as he shall deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to promote the national defense.

The bill under consideration proposes still further to amend the law by according to any person whose business operations are adversely affected by assignment of a priority an opportunity for a hearing and relief by the allocation of necessary materials.

The legislation appears desirable and I recommend its enactment.

I suggest, however, that as a matter of phraseology the second paragraph of the bill be revised to read as follows:

"(3) Any person whose business operations are adversely affected by the assignment of a priority pursuant to the provisions of this section, with respect to any materials used in connection with such operations, may file a petition setting forth such facts, before an officer or agency to be designated by the President for that purpose, and shall be accorded a hearing on such petition by such officer or agency. If such officer or agency finds that as a result of said priority the business operations of the petitioner will be seriously interfered with or substantially curtailed because of a shortage of any material necessary to such operations, and, further, either that his inability to continue business operations will result in a serious unemployment problem for his employees or that the interests of the consumers of the articles produced or manufactured by him will be substantially impaired, a report setting forth such facts shall immediately be submitted to the President by the above-mentioned officer or agency. Thereupon the President may allocate to the petitioner such amounts of the above-mentioned material as in his judgment will be necessary to prevent substantial hardship to the petitioner, his employees, or consumers.

"The President is hereby authorized to delegate to any officer or agency of the United States any authority conferred upon him by this act, and to promulgate rules and regulations to carry the same into effect."

The Bureau of the Budget informs me that it has no objection to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GUFFEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

The nominations of sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The nomination of Capt. Thomas C. Kinkaid to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporry service, to rank from the 17th day of November 1941; and

The nominations of sundry officers for promotion in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive G, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, being the texts of notes, exchanged at Washington on October 27, 1941, between the governments of the United States and Canada, amending in its application article V of the treaty signed on January 11, 1909, between the United States of America and His Britannic Majesty, to permit for the duration of the emergency and in all events subject to reconsideration by both governments on October 1, 1942, an additional diversion for power purposes, of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls, and supplementing the notes which were exchanged on May 20, 1941, and were approved by the Senate on June 12, 1941 (this convention had been recommitted); with a reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 10)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first business on the Executive Calendar.

ADDITIONAL DIVERSION OF WATERS OF NIAGARA RIVER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have just reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations, Executive G, relating to the diversion of waters of Niagara River. This is a proposed arrangement between the United States and Canada, which the Senate considered last Monday. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the proposed arrangement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive G, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, comprising an arrangement between the Governments of the United States of America and Canada to permit an additional temporary diversion, for power purposes, of waters on both sides of the Niagara River above the Falls for the duration of the emergency, and subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, as set forth in notes exchanged at Washington on October 27, 1941, which was read the second time, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 27, 1941.

The Honorable LEIGHTON MCCARTHY, K. C.,
Minister of Canada.

SIR: I have the honor to refer to the exchange of notes of May 20, 1941, regarding increased diversions of water for power purposes at Niagara Falls, and to conversations that have recently taken place between officials of the Governments of the United States and Canada regarding the urgent need for additional power in the Niagara Falls area.

In my note of May 20, with which you agreed on behalf of the Canadian Government, I said, in part:

"In view of the above, and having in mind assurances of engineers that there will be no material adverse effect to the scenic beauty of the Falls, I propose through this exchange of notes that for the duration of the emergency and in all events subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, an additional diversion for power purposes of 5,000 cubic feet per second be utilized on the United States side of the Niagara River above the Falls. In making this proposal, this Government is prepared to give assurances that no objection will be raised to an additional diversion of 3,000 cubic feet per second on the Canadian side of the Niagara River above the Falls. It is also proposed that the engineers of the two Governments be instructed to take such steps as may be necessary with a view to initiating forthwith the construction of works designed to distribute the flow of waters over the Falls in such a manner as to preserve their scenic beauty.

Moreover, the American Government proposes that upon the entry into effect of the agreement for the utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, signed on March 19, 1941, the foregoing arrangements will be subject to the provisions of artivle IX of the agreement, and that it will be open to the Commission appointed under the provisions of the agreement and carrying out the duties imposed upon it, to take such action as may be necessary, and as may come within the scope of the agreement with regard to diversions at Niagara.

I am advised by the defense authorities of this Government and by the Federal Power Commission that, notwithstanding the additional diversions authorized in May, there is now a gravely urgent need for more power in the Niagara Falls area for manufacturing vitally necessary to the United States national-defense and lease-lend programs. I understand that a similar need exists on the Canadian side.

On the United States side in this area there is idle equipment which could at once utilize an additional diversion for power purposes of 7,500 cubic feet per second. I understand that on the Canadian side the existing equipment is in the course of normal operations fully used only in daytime hours and that, if fully used during the night hours, it could utilize an additional diversion amounting, in the daily aggregate, to 6,000 cubic feet per second.

I propose therefore that, for the duration of the emergency and, in any event, subject to reconsideration on October 1, 1942—

1. The Canadian Government will raise no objection to an additional diversion for power purposes of 7,500 cubic feet per second, in terms of the daily aggregate, through existing facilities, on the United States side of the Niagara River above the Falls; and

2. The United States Government will raise no objection to an additional diversion for power purposes of 6,000 cubic feet per second, in terms of the daily aggregate through existing facilities, on the Canadian side of the Niagara River above the Falls.

These diversions would be subject to an operating margin of 1 percent of the total diversions whether authorized by this agreement or otherwise, and could be exceeded to that extent in order to provide for small excesses which may occur at times in the interest of efficient operation.

Upon acceptance of these proposals by your Government, it will be even more important than it was earlier in the year to proceed with the construction, in the 1942 open season, of remedial works. The United States-St. Lawrence Advisory Committee and the Canadian Temporary Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Committee (created pursuant to the exchange of notes of October 14, 1940) should be instructed immediately by the respective Governments to concert for the purpose of jointly recommending to the two Governments—(1) the exact nature and design of the works that should be constructed in 1942, and (2) the allocation of the task of construction as between the two Governments. Upon the recommendations being accepted by the two Governments, and the acceptance notified to each other, the construction would be undertaken pursuant to the recommendations. The total cost of the works would be divided equally between the two Governments, regardless of the allocation of the task of construction.

The United States Government proposes further that, upon the entry into effect of the agreement for the utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin signed on March 19, 1941, the foregoing arrangements will be subject to the provisions of article IX of the agreement, and that it will be open to the Commission appointed under the provisions of the agreement and carrying out the duties imposed upon it to take such action as may be necessary and as may come within the scope of the agreement with regard to diversions at Niagara.

If the foregoing is acceptable to the Government of Canada, this note and your reply thereto, when approved by the Senate, will be regarded as placing on record the agreement of the two Governments concerning this matter.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. A. BERLE, JR.
(For the Secretary of State).

Certified to be a true copy of the signed original.

CORDELL HULL.

No. 651.

CANADIAN LEGATION,
Washington, October 27, 1941.

The Honorable CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that the Canadian Government concurs in the proposals set forth in your note of October 27, 1941, regarding the utilization of water for power purposes at Niagara Falls.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

H. H. WRONG
(For the Minister).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed agreement is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the agreement will be reported to the Senate.

The agreement was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send forward a resolution of ratification, which I should like to have read. It will take but a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive G, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, comprising an arrangement between the Governments of the United States of America and Canada to permit an additional temporary diversion, for power purposes, of waters on both sides of the Niagara River above the Falls for the duration of the emergency, and subject to reconsideration by both Governments on October 1, 1942, as set forth in notes exchanged at Washington on October 27, 1941, subject to the elimination of the paragraph reading: "The United States Government proposes further that, upon the entry into effect of the agreement for the utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, signed on March 19, 1941, the foregoing arrangements will be subject to the provisions of article IX of the agreement, and that it will be open to the commission appointed under the provisions of the agreement and carrying out the duties imposed upon it to take such action as may be necessary and as may come within the scope of the

agreement with regard to diversions at Niagara."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the resolution of ratification refers to the same exchange of notes which was before the Senate last Monday. At that time several Senators raised objection to the particular paragraph in the correspondence which the resolution of ratification directs be deleted.

The agreement was recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and representatives of the Department of State appeared before the committee. After the fullest and most complete examination of the question, all parties agreed that the paragraph might be deleted, and the representatives of the Department of State said that such action was agreeable to the Department and in nowise changed the effect or the meaning of the fundamental agreement between the United States and Canada. In view of that situation, I should like to have the Senate at this time ratify the agreement, deleting the paragraph referred to. I ask for adoption of the resolution of ratification.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. As the matter comes before us today, what is the difference between the present proposal and that which was previously submitted? I am particularly interested in the amount of water which may be diverted by the two Governments for power purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no difference whatever in that respect. As the proposal comes before the Senate today, it permits exactly the same diversion as did the other proposal. The only matter eliminated is the paragraph in the correspondence which made some reference to the St. Lawrence agreement, which has not yet become effective.

Mr. NORRIS. A change has been made, as I am aware, and I do not object to it. I do not care whether that paragraph is in or out. It would not have any legal effect at all, as I see it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Will it not necessitate sending the so-called treaty back to Canada for its agreement to the change we have made?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a fact, but the State Department has already conferred, through its agencies within the department, with the Canadian authorities, and it anticipates no difficulty whatever in securing the consent of Canada to the change.

Mr. NORRIS. How soon, if the Senator knows, will the two governments be able to utilize the power?

Mr. CONNALLY. If I may say so, I am sure that it will be practically instantaneous with the ratification of the exchange of notes.

Mr. NORRIS. After the treaty went back to the committee last Monday, an action to which I was opposed, as the Senator remembers, I took the matter up with the head of the Bureau of Reclamation, who is an expert on water-power matters. I think I could have figured out the amount of water which could be diverted, but I wanted to get better authority. I asked this official to translate the power which in the aggregate could be diverted, 13,500 cubic feet per second, with a head of 165 feet, so that for practical purposes we could have an idea of what could be done if that power were used for national-defense production. Perhaps the most important feature of our national defense is the production of airplanes. Increased production of airplanes means that we must have an increased production of aluminum, which in turn means a need for an additional amount of power, and the additional power will be afforded by the diversion proposed in the meaure pending before us. I asked the question, "How many airplanes can be made with the aluminum produced by a power plant using 13,500 cubic feet per second, with a head of 165 feet?" I suppose 165 feet is substantially correct. As we all know, that is about the height of the Falls.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the water will be diverted above Niagara Falls.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will be turned back into the river below the Falls.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand.

Mr. CONNALLY. So there will be no loss of water in the river at all, except as to the Falls.

Mr. NORRIS. No; there will be no loss of water in the river.

Mr. CONNALLY. The testimony was that the amount of water to be diverted would not be great enough to impair in any way the beauty or the grandeur of the Falls.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, considering the predicament we are in and the emergency which confronts the Government, I should be glad to divert every gallon of water from the Niagara River and convert it into power until the emergency is over, even if such diversion destroyed the beauty of the Falls and the scenery there. On the basis of present production, this diversion would result in power sufficient to produce 120,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year. For the building of a light plane 10,000 pounds of aluminum are required. For the building of a heavy bomber 20,000 pounds of aluminum are required. Therefore, the amount of power resulting from the proposed diversion of the water of the Niagara River would be sufficient to produce enough aluminum to construct 12,000 light planes or 6,000 heavy bombers.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that the speediest way to bring this production about is to ratify the measure now before us.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. CONNALLY. And let the State Department immediately submit it to Canada, and I am sure that Canada will immediately agree, and the matter will come to an end.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the agreement is ratified.

The clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—JAMES H. ROWE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Rowe, of Montana, to be the Assistant to the Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of Mr. James H. Rowe to be the Assistant to the Attorney General, I desire to say that I sponsored and urged the appointment of another candidate for this position, but the Attorney General saw fit to appoint Mr. Rowe. Since he has been appointed, I wish to say that I have no objection to Mr. Rowe. I am sure he is a capable man, and a man of good character. I merely wanted to indicate that my sponsoring of another candidate for the position was in no wise to be construed as any opposition to or complaint against Mr. Rowe.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander M. Campbell to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations on the calendar this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, earlier today from the Naval Affairs Committee there were reported favorably routine nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Thomas C. Kinkaid to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the con-

firmation of the nominations in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. GUFFEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 27, 1941:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY TO MEXICO

George S. Messersmith, of Delaware, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

John O'Keefe, of Pembina, N. Dak., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak. Reappointment.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

First Lt. LeRoy Otten Travis, Medical Corps Reserve, to be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Ralph Bamford Walker, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Clarence Beaver Lober, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. John Kenneth Cannon, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Arthur John Melanson, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Theodore Joseph Koenig, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Grandison Gardner, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Alvan Cleveland Kincaid, Air Crops.
Lt. Col. Omer Osmer Niergarth, Air Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).
Lt. Col. Aubrey Hornsby, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Charles Peter Prime, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Auby Casey Strickland, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. John Martin Clark, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Rowland Charles William Blessley, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Arthur Thomas, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Ulysses Grant Jones, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. John Paul Richter, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Michael Everett McHugo, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. James Lionel Grisham, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Earl Seeley Hoag, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Vincent James Meloy, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Charles Egbert Branshaw, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. Edward Whiting Raley, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. James Troy Hutchison, Air Corps.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. John Wesley Warren, Air Corps.
Maj. Patrick Weston Timberlake, Air Corps.
Maj. Clyde Kenneth Rich, Air Corps.
Maj. Laurence Carbee Craigie, Air Corps.
Maj. Charles White Lawrence, Air Corps.
Maj. Wallace Evan Whitson, Air Corps.
Maj. Russel J. Minty, Air Corps.
Maj. James Francis Joseph Early, Air Corps.
Maj. Alden Rudyard Crawford, Air Corps.
Maj. Thomas Merritt Lowe, Air Corps.
Maj. David Myron Schlatter, Air Corps.
Maj. Charles Trovilla Myers, Air Corps.
Maj. Leslie Page Holcomb, Air Corps.
Maj. Wilfrid Henry Hardy, Air Corps.
Maj. Joseph Smith, Air Corps.
Maj. Joseph Harold Hicks, Air Corps.
Maj. Robert Chaffee Oliver, Air Corps.
Maj. John Maurice Weikert, Air Corps.
Maj. John George Salsman, Air Corps.
Maj. James Michael Fitzmaurice, Air Corps.
Maj. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg, Air Corps.
Maj. Stewart Warren Towle, Jr., Air Corps.
Maj. Walter Cornelius White, Air Corps.
Maj. Glen Clifford Jamison, Air Corps.
Maj. Carl Brown McDaniel, Air Corps.
Maj. Herbert Kenneth Baisley, Air Corps.
Maj. John Kraybill Nissley, Air Corps.
Maj. Archibald Yarborough Smith, Air Corps.
Maj. Charles Goodwin Pearcy, Air Corps.
Maj. Earle Everard Partridge, Air Corps.
Maj. David Jerome Ellinger, Air Corps.
Maj. Cecil Ernest Henry, Air Corps.
Maj. Usal Girard Ent, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).
Maj. Joe L. Loutzenheiser, Air Corps.
Maj. Richard Emmel Nugent, Air Corps.
Maj. John Phillips Kirkendall, Air Corps.
Maj. Robert Roy Selway, Jr., Air Corps.
Maj. John Gilbert Moore, Air Corps.
Maj. Luther Stevens Smith, Air Corps.
Maj. Robert Wells Harper, Air Corps.
Maj. Howard McMath Turner, Air Corps.
Maj. Leonard Henry Rodieck, Air Corps.
Maj. George Hinkle Steel, Air Corps.
Maj. Edward Higgins White, Air Corps
Maj. William Olmstead Eareckson, Air Corps.
Maj. Richard Weigand Gibson, Air Corps.
Maj. John Reynolds Hawkins, Air Corps.
Maj. Ralph Emanuel Fisher, Air Corps.
Maj. James Somers Stowell, Air Corps.
Maj. Arthur LeRoy Bump, Air Corps.
Maj. Demas Thurlow Craw, Air Corps.
Maj. Cornelius W lter Cousland, Air Corps.
Maj. Carl Joseph Crane, Air Corps.
Maj. Howard Eugene Engler, Air Corps.
Maj. William Donald Old, Air Corps.
Maj. Elmer Theodore Rundquist, Air Corps.
Maj. Harold George Peterson, Air Corps.
Maj. George Francis Schulgen, Air Corps.
Maj. Otto Paul Weyland, Air Corps.
Maj. Kirtley Jameson Gregg, Air Corps.
Maj. George Aldridge Whatley, Air Corps.
Maj. Sheldon Brightwell Edwards, Air Corps.
Maj. Clarence Steven Thorpe, Air Corps.
Maj. Howard Hunt Couch, Air Corps.
Maj. Wilfred Joseph Paul, Air Corps.
Maj. Glenn L. Davasher, Air Corps.
Capt. William Ludlow Ritchie, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. John Henry Dulligan, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Walter Grant Bryte, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Russell Edward Randall, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Charles Pearré Cabell, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Clifford Palmer Bradley, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Joseph Cyril Augustin Denniston, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. John Halliday McCormick, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Earl Walter Barnes, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Charles Henry Caldwell, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).
Capt. Edgar Turner Noyes, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).

To be majors

(All officers listed below now hold rank as temporary captain, Army of the United States):

First Lt. Robert Morris Stillman, Air Corps.
First Lt. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, Air Corps.
First Lt. Joseph Gordon Russell, Air Corps.
First Lt. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, Air Corps.
First Lt. Arthur Allison Fickel, Air Corps.
First Lt. Downs Eugene Ingram, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Howard Walsh, Air Corps.
First Lt. Eugene Nall, Air Corps.
First Lt. Willis Fred Chapman, Air Corps.
First Lt. Thomas Wildes, Air Corps.
First Lt. Aaron Warner Tyer, Air Corps.
First Lt. German Pierce Culver, Air Corps.
First Lt. Wilhelm Cunliffe Freudenthal, Air Corps.
First Lt. Charles Jordan Daly, Air Corps.
First Lt. Samuel Cummings Mitchell, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lamont Saxton, Air Corps.
First Lt. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Pelham Davis Glassford, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Robert Hollis Strauss, Air Corps.
First Lt. Jack Roberts, Air Corps.
First Lt. Glenn Curtis Thompson, Air Corps.
First Lt. Samuel Barcus Knowles, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. James Baird Buck, Air Corps.
First Lt. John Trueheart Mosby, Air Corps.
First Lt. Ray Willard Clifton, Air Corps.
First Lt. Randolph Lowry Wood, Air Corps.
First Lt. Arnold Theodore Johnson, Air Corps.
First Lt. Marvin Frederick Stalder, Air Corps.
First Lt. Noel Francis Parrish, Air Corps.
First Lt. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, Air Corps.
First Lt. Carl Swyter, Air Corps.
First Lt. Richard Cole Weller, Air Corps.
First Lt. Edward Morris Gavin, Air Corps.
First Lt. Robert Edward Jarmon, Air Corps.
First Lt. Harry Crutcher, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Jack Mason Malone, Air Corps.
First Lt. Frank Neff Moyers, Air Corps.
First Lt. Edward Schwartz Allee, Air Corps.
First Lt. Harry Noon Renshaw, Air Corps.
First Lt. Joseph Bynum Stanley, Air Corps.
First Lt. Clarence Morice Sartain, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Hughes Price, Air Corps.
First Lt. Joseph Caruthers Moore, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lawrence Scott Fulwider, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lester Stanford Harris, Air Corps.
First Lt. Donald Newman Wackwitz, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Hume Crain Houston, Air Corps.
First Lt. Charles Henry Leitner, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Clair Lawrence Wood, Air Corps.
First Lt. Charles Bennett Harvin, Air Corps.
First Lt. George Henry Macintyre, Air Corps.
First Lt. Bob Arnold, Air Corps.
First Lt. Burton Wilmot Armstrong, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Harold Lee Neely, Air Corps.
First Lt. Erickson Snowden Nichols, Air Corps.
First Lt. Jasper Newton Bell, Air Corps.
First Lt. Russell Lee Waldron, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Foster Day, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Harry Coursey, Air Corps.
First Lt. Daniel Edwin Hooks, Air Corps.
First Lt. Raymond Patten Todd, Air Corps.
First Lt. Opal Ellis Henderson, Air Corps.
First Lt. Daniel Ira Moler, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lawrance Owen Brown, Air Corps.
First Lt. Henry Bishop Fisher, Air Corps.
First Lt. Clayton Baxter Claassen, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Thomas Hudnell, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Harold Lawrence Kreider, Air Corps.
First Lt. John Oman Neal, Air Corps.
First Lt. Henry Agnew Sebastian, Air Corps.
First Lt. Cecil Edward Combs, Air Corps.
First Lt. Richard Rawlins Waugh, Air Corps.

First Lt. Charles Barnard Stewart, Air Corps.
First Lt. Dwight Oliver Monteith, Air Corps.
First Lt. Gordon Harrison Austin, Air Corps.
First Lt. Jay Dean Rutledge, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Robert Dean Gapen, Air Corps.
First Lt. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. John Knox Arnold, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Clinton Dermott Vincent, Air Corps.
First Lt. Seward William Hulse, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Richard Henry Carmichael, Air Corps.
First Lt. Frank Walter Gillespie, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Rutland Gunn, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Nicholas Tate Perkins, Air Corps.
First Lt. Carl Kenneth Bowen, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Albert Patton Clark, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. John Richard Kelly, Air Corps.
First Lt. Norman Calvert Spencer, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Frederick Reynolds Terrell, Air Corps.
First Lt. Fredrick Bell, Air Corps.
First Lt. Charles Milton McCorkle, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Denton Cairnes, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Walter Twaddell, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. William Russell Grohs, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Swinton Steele, Air Corps.
First Lt. John Milton Bartella, Air Corps.
First Lt. Clinton Utterback True, Air Corps.
First Lt. Turner Clifton Rogers, Air Corps.
First Lt. George Paul Champion, Air Corps.
First Lt. Harry Ripley Melton, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. William Garnett Lee, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Carl Theodor Goldenberg, Air Corps.
First Lt. Robert Thomas Crowder, Air Corps.
First Lt. Von Roy Shores, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. William Ellerbe Covington, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Peter McGoldrick, Air Corps.
First Lt. Clark Lewis Hosmer, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Wesley Jones, Air Corps.
First Lt. Joseph James Nazzaro, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Levere Kimball, Air Corps.
First Lt. Ernest Samuel Holmes, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Wallace Conrad Barrett, Air Corps.
First Lt. Conrad Francis Necrason, Air Corps.
First Lt. Charles Berton Root, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Melville Brown, Air Corps.
First Lt. Herman Alfred Schmid, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lloyd Pauahi Hopwood, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Arthur DeMarco, Air Corps.
First Lt. Joseph Day Lee, Jr., Air Corps
First Lt. Leslie Raybold, Air Corps.
First Lt. Wilbur Walter Aring, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Oscar Guthrie, Air Corps.
First Lt. Charles Phillip Hollstein, Air Corps.
First Lt. Jack Lindley Randolph, Air Corps.
First Lt. Homer Astley Boushey, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Don Orville Darrow, Air Corps.
First Lt. Harold Austin Gunn, Air Corps.
First Lt. Francis Leslie Rivard, Air Corps.
First Lt. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Donald Robert Hutchinson, Air Corps.
First Lt. John Allen Hilger, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lawrence Clinton Coddington, Air Corps.
First Lt. Frank Richardson Cook, Air Corps.
First Lt. George Everill Pierce, Air Corps.
First Lt. Paul Engberg Todd, Air Corps.
First Lt. Louis William Proper, Air Corps.
First Lt. Ralph Charles Rockwood, Air Corps.
First Lt. Tom Jefferson Cunningham, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Henry Gist, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Potter Brooks Paige, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Ross Robertson, Jr., Air Corps.
First. Lt. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, Air Corps.
First Lt. James Clyde Selser, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Douglas Ellsworth Williams, Air Corps.
First Lt. Lewis Leo Mundell, Air Corps.
First Lt. Brooke Empie Allen, Air Corps.
First Lt. Oliver Edwin Ford, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. John Beaumont Cornett, Air Corps.
First Lt. John Hal Jeffus, Air Corps.
First Lt. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., Air Corps.
First Lt. Lawrence Worthington Greenbank, Air Corps.
First Lt. Norman Lewis Peterson, Air Corps.
First Lt. Victor Raymond Haugen, Air Corps.
First Lt. Hilmer Cannon Nelson, Air Corps.
First Lt. William Parker Fisher, Air Corps.
First Lt. Robert Windeck Hall, Air Corps.
First Lt. Paul Howard Dane, Air Corps.
First Lt. Graves Hubbard Snyder, Air Corps.
First Lt. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., Air Corps.
First. Lt. John Markward Reynolds, Air Corps.
First Lt. Ralph MacKenzie Kellogg, Air Corps.
First Lt. Jack Norman Donohew, Air Corps.
First Lt. John Dudley Stevenson, Air Corps.
First Lt. Nils Olof Ohman, Air Corps.

NOTE.—The dates of rank are omitted, as the death or other unforeseen change in status of a senior officer might require a change in the dates of rank and necessitate the renomination of these officers.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 27, 1941:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THE ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

James H. Rowe to be The Assistant to the Attorney General.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Alexander M. Campbell to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be a rear admiral

Thomas C. Kinkaid, for temporary service, to rank from the 17th day of November 1941.

MARINE CORPS

To be captains

Frederick E. Leek	Edwin A. Law
William R. Wendt	Robert B. Moore
Odell M. Conoley	Max C. Chapman
Clyde R. Huddleson	Spencer S. Berger
Thomas S. Ivey	George W. Killen
Joseph L. Winecoff	Howard V. Hiett
James S. O'Halloran	Charles J. Seibert 2d

To be a second lieutenant

Linton K. Paulk, a citizen of Georgia.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Henrietta M. Voltz, Verdugo City.

INDIANA

Rachel Pfendler, Acton.
Lena R. Weldy, Hudson.
Jeareld E. Truman, Trafalgar.
Anna J. Trapp, Vernon.
Marshall A. Dismore, Wolcott.

MICHIGAN

John Kennedy, Carsonville.
Edward M. Page, Grand Blanc.
Guy H. Kuhn, Gregory.
Marguerite J. Moore, Linwood.
Arleigh B. Beebe, Montrose.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bonnie E. Henderson, Huntersville.
Grace Freeman, Marshall.
Henry Folger, Mount Airy.
William G. Egerton, Saluda.

OREGON

Henry W. Anderson, Tillamook.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edna H. Burgett, Flaxton.
John H. Case, Wishek.

WISCONSIN

Paul Miodzik, Cudahy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, we praise Thee for Thy sacrifice, for Thy simplicity, for Thy condescension, for Thy infinite tenderness, and for Thy glory. For all that Thou hast brought of comfort, of warmth of heart, and for free and full salvation, we thank Thee. We bless Thee for joy of hearts and for the things which bring us nearer to one another, to our immortal selves, and to our Father in heaven and on earth.

As our times are in Thy hands, we pray Thee to lead us to do good, to give happiness, and to make love the anchor of our redemption. Grant that these songs may tremble in our breasts, putting forth the hand that helps and the heart which cheers, that bread and peace may be the common lot of all.

Consider and hear our prayer, blessed Lord; while our blessings and abundance are manifold, how disturbing are the voices of ingratitude, and many are guilty of timorous avoidance of duty; forgive their neglect and shameful indifference. Bring our people to the realization that this is their Government, and may they never strike their sails to fear nor disloyalty, but speak the brave word and do the brave deed. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of Wednesday, November 26, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Wednesday, November 26, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Anthony O'Hara and Stephen F. Maroney;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Anna and Fred Aebi;

H. R. 3086. An act for the relief of Harold E. Marquis;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of Rhoda J. Blackstone as executrix of the estate of John K. Blackstone, deceased;

H. R. 4226. An act to provide for the construction of a Coast Guard cutter designed for ice breaking and assistance work on the Great Lakes;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Ray C. McMillen; and

H. R. 4795. An act to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, as amended, by amending sections 203 (4), 208 (3), 209, 213, 215, 220, and 222 thereof and by adding thereto a new section to be numbered section 225, all relating to the powers, duties, and functions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5890. An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GUFFEY, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD as members on the part of the Senate to the United States Muhlenberg Bicentennial Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law No. 209, approved August 16, 1941.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include certain material. One of the matters I wish to insert in the RECORD exceeds the limit by one-third of a page and the other by one-half of a page. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding this, they may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD regarding the control of inflation at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief letter which appeared in a recent issue of the Brooklyn Tablet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Farmers' Union in opposition to the emergency price-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent editions of the press there have appeared two interesting letters, one written by Col. Robert McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, to Lord Kemsley, of the London Sketch. In one of the paragraphs of the letter written by Mr. McCormick he states that he might be willing to fight to save Britain. Some of my friends asked me what this meant, and I wired Colonel McCormick and received a telegram in response. Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, recently placed Lord Kemsley's letter of response in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the two telegrams, the one I sent to Mr. McCormick and his reply, and also Mr. McCormick's original letter to Lord Kemsley, so that the correspondence will be complete.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AMERICA'S DESTINY

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

FLIMSY STRIKE LAW ANTICIPATED

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Washington Post of November 27 by Westbrook Pegler entitled "Flimsy Strike Law Anticipated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I made last week to the Negro miners in the captive mines, a telegram I have received from a labor organization on the subject, and my answer to that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement of the West Virginia Coal Association on the subject of social-security taxes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and of personal privilege, too, and I ask recognition for the purpose of stating the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit his resolution to the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the business before the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in connection with the resolution, which I now offer. I shall reserve the resolution until Monday, if I may.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution and the remarks will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The resolution (H. Res. 349) is as follows:

Whereas in the Washington Post of this morning there appeared an article by Westbrook Pegler, which is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of November 25, 1941]

"FAIR ENOUGH

"(By Westbrook Pegler)

"CONGRESS EVADES STRIKE LEGISLATION

"What a miserable, fumbling, timid aggregation of political trimmers and panhandlers our Congress is these days when it is openly said and never denied, because it is wretchedly true, that the lawmaking body of a nation which purports to be the greatest republic on earth is afraid to pass any law that would place decent restraints on an organized mob of racketeers and dictators because the President won't give the high sign.

"The President of the United States is not the legislative body. He is the Executive, the general manager, the chairman of the board, and he has no right to give orders to Congress, but a duty to take orders and execute them. Congress has a duty to issue such orders, and the Members of both Houses are guilty of a crime against the people and the American form of government when they deliberately refuse to perform their job. The President's advice may be sought and respected, but there was no intention ever that he should tell Congress what laws it must pass and what laws it must refrain from passing.

"Nevertheless the National Legislature of the United States, under the rule of President Roosevelt has abdicated its powers. Its duty and all but the petty rewards of office are now so far gone, in whining, yellow submission to the rule of the boss that the Members openly admit that all legislation must have the approval of the White House. The French Parliament was rotten at the end and perished of its own poison but the pathetic

crowd of flabby political slobs who are selling out the American people today at the price of their contemptible patronage jobs and Treasury hand-outs with which to buy their own reelection, aren't much better, if any. They talk of the robbery, extortion, physical brutality, and arrogant suppression of citizen's plain rights by groups of thugs, thieves, and anti-American conspirators in the service of the Kremlin and they conduct investigations which prove their worst gossip and suspicions. But, in all the years of the Roosevelt Presidencies, not one law have they had the honor and manhood to enact which would trim the powers of these undisguised rascals. They send out flycops to the ends of the country to dig up evidence which can be found in any newspaper any day. They drag witnesses to Washington to give irrefutable and undisputed evidence of the viciousness which is corrupting the whole Nation; they draft bills. They argue and then, having discovered the foul truth they whimper like a kennel of curs because the President won't give them his gracious permission to do their obvious duty. There are said to be some men in both houses in whom self-respect and honesty are not quite dead but if so they are so inexcusably docile or dumb that all few of them together can't even raise a row. And all of those appaling frauds who clown it before the country as friends of labor are, on the contrary, traitors to the interests and rights of the very people whom they profess to serve best and have sold them down the river to as vile and greedy a lot of slave drivers as ever laid the lash on the cringing Uncle Toms of ante bellum days.

"For years now they have known that the Congress of Industrial Organizations was a political organization which courted the Communists and raised them to positions of dangerous power over millions of decent American citizens. They observed that the Congress of Industrial Organizations unions were knifing American soldiers and sailors and the American people in the back with fraudulent strikes and slow-downs up to the time of Hitler's attack on Russia, but then turned to with gaudy cries of patriotic purpose. They saw Mrs. Roosevelt come into their midst and deliberately insult them and the people whom they are supposed to represent by coddling a batch of fractious colts of the Trojan horse. They know and admit that millions of dollars have been wrung from the sweaty grasp of common breadwinners by the most audacious and rapacious gang of thieves that ever preyed on human kind. They know that the laws known as labor's gains are, in fact, labor's chains, and that the so-called labor policy of the President is a policy of political conspiracy with the bosses of the unions.

"It isn't that the United States Congress lacks information or the authority to restore freedom to the people and destroy this monstrous ourage. These aren't the lack. What the United States Congress lacks is guts, and when the flag of the new order is unfuried it should contain a broad yellow streak in memory of the men who sold their country out for a few lousy jobs."

Whereas the Labor Committee of the House is charged with the duty of passing and reporting upon proposed labor legislation submitted to the House; and

Whereas several bills have been submitted to the House and referred to said committee; and

Whereas said article of Westbrook Pegler charges the Congress of the United States with lacking courage, with being "yellow," with having "sold the country out for a few lousy jobs," and with protecting Communists, and with having been guilty of aiding in "the robbery, extortion, physical brutality, and arrogant suppression of citizens' plain rights by groups of thugs, thieves, and anti-American conspirators in the service of the Kremlin," and of "whining yellow submission" to the administrative branch of the Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the said Westbrook Pegler be requested to appear before the Labor Committee and set forth at large, and for the benefit of the public and the Congress, facts and circumstances upon which his charges are based.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of personal privilege and privilege of the House which I raise and to which I offer a resolution which has been sent to the Clerk's desk, I wish to discuss on Monday next. In view of the business today before the House, I waive the right at this time to be heard on this occasion. On Monday next I will ask recognition on this question of privilege of the House and personal privilege and speak in support of the resolution which I offer.

Under the rules of the House there are two classes of privilege: First, affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; and second, affecting the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity only—Third Edition, Hinds' Precedents, pages 2557, 2521, 2687.

Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1890, the then Speaker of the House, Mr. Reed, said:

> The rights and privileges of the Members of the House, in the discharge of their functions, are sacred and the House can undertake no higher duty than the conservation of those rights and privileges intact. Even if the case arises under dubious circumstances, it is proper for the House to pause and give suitable heed to any question which any Member raises with regard to his rights and privileges as a Member. It is for the House alone to determine what they are.

In Tuesday's Washington Post there appeared an article which is set forth in the resolution sent to the Clerk's desk. That article challenges the action of the House and reflects upon the dignity and integrity of the proceedings of the House.

That article charges in substance that this House is, and I quote, "a miserable, fumbling, timid aggregation of political trimmers and panhandlers."

It charges that the House, as a whole, is governed by fear, and it states further that the House is "afraid to pass any law that would place decent restraints on an organized mob of racketeers and dictators."

It charges that we are afraid to protect citizens of the Republic because we refuse to exercise our constitutional duty to legislate for the protection of citizens of the Republic until the President has given his permission.

It charges that the Members of the House are "guilty of a crime against the American form of government" because we refuse to perform what the writer states is our duty.

It further charges that this House has "abdicated its powers."

It charges that this House is "now so far gone in whining, yellow submission to the rule of the boss that the Members openly admit that all legislation must have the approval of the White House."

It charges that the Members of the House are a "pathetic crowd of flabby political slobs who are selling out the American people today at the price of their contemptible patronage jobs and Treasury hand-outs with which to buy their own reelection."

The author charges Members of the House of lacking the "honor and manhood" to enact laws which would prevent "robbery, extortion, physical brutality, and arrogant suppression of citizens' plain rights by groups of thugs, thieves, and anti-American conspirators in the service of the Kremlin."

The author of the article, Westbrook Pegler, charges that the Members of the House having discovered the viciousness which is corrupting the whole Nation, "they whimper like a kennel of curs because the President won't give them his gracious permission to do their obvious duty."

The article charges that some Members of the House are "traitors to the interest and rights of the very people whom they profess to serve best and have sold them down the river to as vile and greedy a lot of slave drivers as ever laid the lash on the cringing Uncle Toms of ante bellum day."

It is charged in this column that the Members of the House have known for years "that the C. I. O. was a political organization which courted the Communists and raised them to positions of dangerous power over millions of decent American citizens."

It is further charged that the Members of the House have "observed that the C. I. O. unions were knifing American soldiers and sailors and the American people in the back with fraudulent strikes and slow-downs, up to the time of Hitler's attack on Russia."

The article concludes with the charge that, knowing all of the foregoing, this House lacked "guts" and that "when the flag of the new order is unfurled, it should contain a broad yellow streak in memory of the men who sold their country out for a few lousy jobs." This is a charge that the Members of the House, the House as a whole, and every Member of the House lacks patriotism and has betrayed his country.

These charges which on Tuesday were published in many of the papers of the country were but the expression in forceful and picturesque language of the opinions which have come to some of us in letters from our constituents.

Charges such as the foregoing reflect upon the integrity of the House, tend to create disrespect for and lack of confidence in the House, the individual Members of the House. Those charges are not only reflected upon the House as a whole but upon each and every Member of the House. The only words in the whole article, almost a column long, which even suggests exemption of any Member of the House from these serious charges of malfeasance in office are the following:

> There are said to be some men in both Houses in whom self-respect and honesty are not quite dead; but if so, they are so inexcusably docile or dumb that all few of them together can't even raise a row.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can Members of this House expect to retain the confidence of the people if we permit to go unchallenged an article of this kind, published here in the city of Washington and cir-

culated in other newspapers throughout the country?

Is it true that we are so cowardly that we dare not challenge Mr. Pegler to produce the evidence to sustain his charges, or is it true that the House will evade the issue and hide behind some construction of the rules of the House to the effect that this article does not raise a question of personal privilege or question of privilege of the House? Can it be that, giving all possible latitude to the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech, that the House will submit in silence when silence is a confession of guilt?

I do not suggest that we take action to suppress the gentleman or prevent the publication of his articles, but rather that we call him before a committee of the House, there to give to the public the facts and the circumstances upon which he bases his charges. Certainly, if those charges be true, those of the House who are guilty should at the earliest opportunity—I suggest March of next year through adoption of the Jones bill—submit our competency, our fitness as Representatives of our people, to our electors, the people of our district.

If the charges are not true, then Mr. Pegler should be called upon to retract his statements or from the floor of the House be branded as a disseminator of falsehood.

Mr. Speaker, in these days when it is said that the safety of the Nation hangs in the balance, the people must have confidence in their representatives. Charges of the kind just cited tend to destroy that confidence. Even if these charges are false, nevertheless a certain number of people will believe them, and it is imperative that the number of possible believers be reduced, if possible, by dissemination of the facts.

If Mr. Pegler can prove his charges—and heretofore in his column most people concede that he has been accurate in his statements and rendered a great service to his country in exposing the criminals, Communists, racketeers, and grafters in union organizations—then we, as a body, and as individuals who have been subjected to the criticism voiced in this article, should repent in sackcloth and ashes and mend our ways.

Mr. Speaker, in view of established precedent by the Senate on March 12, 1846—3 Hinds', 1835—where the Senate raised a select committee to investigate a charge of corruptness in the Senate by a Washington newspaper, and which charge mentioned no individual but charged that a portion of the Senate had sold out to England in the settlement of the Oregon boundary dispute, can it be said that a charge that the House has sold out to the administration, has sold out to the Communists, to criminals, does not raise a question of privilege of the House?

To the same effect was the ruling of June 1862, when the Committee on the Judiciary was instructed forthwith to inquire by whom and on what authority the New York Tribune charged the "offers of a pecuniary nature had been made for the purpose of obtaining action of the House" as improper, corruptible, and criminal.

On December 5, 1879—3 Hinds', 1834—this House ordered an investigation of a charge made by a Washington newspaper that there had been corruption in connection with the passage of certain District of Columbia legislation and named a Vermont Representative, a Chicago Member, and a Maryland Member, but did not mention any Member by name.

On May 24, 1882—3 Hinds', 2606—where a newspaper charged that the Committee on Elections was guilty of improper conduct, it was held that a question of personal privilege was involved, even though no member of the committee was named.

Sixth Cannon's Precedents, 576, reads as follows:

Charges published as newspaper advertising that "Bad bills pass without reading" and "Steals are attempted" were held so to reflect upon the integrity of the proceeding of the House as to support a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that this article charges, in so many words, that to secure political support, this House has gone along with "an organized mob of racketeers" in opposition to legislation. It charges that "we are guilty of a crime." It charges that we are traitors to the interest and rights of our constituents. And it puts the cap sheaf on its charges by one that we have backed an organization which is tied up with Communists, and that by our failure to act, we approve of sabotaging the national-defense program.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this Congress are guilty of any one of the charges made, then God forgive us and create in us a new heart and a new spirit so that once again we may have here in America a representative form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I have no criticism of Westbrook Pegler for the publication of this article. Mr. Pegler has rendered outstanding service to the American people in the past, and if, by the words which I have quoted, he has brought out into the open charges which have been smouldering, in such a manner that the public may at last know the truth, then he has once again rendered a distinct service to the country. I, for one, have nothing in my legislative record, while here in the House, which I wish to conceal from the pitiless light of publicity. These charges having been publicly made, having been read throughout the country, there is no reason, as I see it, why every Member of the House should not be willing to meet them with equal publicity.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask for the adoption of the resolution in order that it may not be truthfully said that when the honesty, the integrity, and loyalty to our constituents and to our country is openly challenged, we lacked the courage to meet the charge out in the open.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on price fixing by the Farmers' Union and the Farm Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Mr. R. A. Trovatten, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Board of Supervisors of Richmond County, Wis., protesting against the recent order of the Federal Security Administration pertaining to the manufacture of oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Progressive magazine, of Madison, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—KULA SANATORIUM (H. DOC. NO. 448)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 734, for the relief of Kula Sanatorium.

The bill would direct payment of $176.85 to Kula Sanatorium, Waiakoa, Maui, T. H., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for services in extending emergency medical treatment from March 21, 1940, to March 27, 1940, to Joe S. Texeira, a World War veteran.

Regulations of the Veterans' Administration governing hospitalization of veterans in contract hospitals necessarily are very definite and provide that authority for treatment may not be retrodated, and since the Veterans' Administration was not informed of this veteran's need for emergency treatment until March 27, 1940, authority to cover the services rendered prior to that date could not be issued. Reimbursement of unauthorized medical treatment may be made by the Veterans' Administration when there is an emergency requiring treatment for a service-connected disability of a compensable degree, provided there is no Government facility feasibly available and the veteran's condition was so emergent that delay would have been hazardous. There is no doubt as to the seriousness of the veteran's condition when he was admitted to the Kula Sana-

torium on March 21, 1940, and the Veterans' Administration does not question the emergency. However, the requirement that the condition be service-connected and of a compensable degree is not shown to have been met.

Inasmuch as the Kula Sanatorium in its capacity as a county institution furnishes hospitalization to individuals other than veterans, the charges for treatment would necessarily be against a person securing such treatment except where the institution, in accordance with approved practice, obtains proper authority for treatment of the veteran from the Veterans' Administration. The expenses involved in treatment for the period between the date of admission and the date authority for treatment as a beneficiary of the Veterans' Administration was obtained, do not appear to be a proper charge against the Federal Government.

I do not feel, therefore, that I would be justified in approving the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 28, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FURTHER VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—RAYMOND J. McMAHON (H. DOC. NO. 451)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3731, "For the relief of Raymond J. McMahon."

It is the purpose of the bill to authorize the appointment of Raymond J. McMahon, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, to the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, and, immediately upon such appointment, to place him on the retired list of the Navy.

Ensign McMahon was injured in the performance of his duty, having lost his left arm above the elbow in an airplane accident on July 9, 1937.

Under the provisions of the act of June 25, 1938, Ensign McMahon would be entitled, upon his release from active duty, to the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act, and, should his claim be allowed, would be entitled to compensation according to the degree of disability, not to exceed $96 per month.

Approval of the bill would entitle Ensign McMahon to retirement pay of 75 percent of the amount of his active pay as lieutenant, junior grade. The Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940 provided the same rate of disability and retirement pay to naval and marine reserves as was provided prior thereto for the regular personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps. Ensign McMahon, however, was injured prior to the approval of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, and he is not entitled to the benefits thereof.

In view of the relief afforded Ensign McMahon by existing law, and of the fact that other Reserve personnel who may have been injured prior to the 1940 act would be equally entitled to receive the same relief as is proposed in the bill under consideration, I do not feel that I would be justified in approving the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 28, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message, together with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—W. L. B. VAN DYKE (H. DOC. NO. 450)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4117, a bill for the relief of W. L. B. Van Dyke.

It is the purpose of the bill to refund to W. L. B. Van Dyke, out of any money available in the Federal Treasury for the payment of money orders more than 1 year old, the amount of money orders held by Van Dyke and upon which refunds have not been made by the Treasury Department.

According to the facts stated in the report of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives, the National Conference on Legalizing Lotteries, Inc., was organized in January 1936 by a number of private citizens as a means of supporting welfare activities without public taxation. Van Dyke was engaged to handle the advertising for this enterprise. Copy for a proposed advertisement to be inserted in a weekly publication was submitted to the Post Office Department in February 1936, and the publication was advised by one of the solicitors for the Department that "copies of the paper containing this advertisement will not be refused admission to the mails, it being understood that full responsibility for any violation of law involved will rest with the senders." It is stated that Van Dyke accepted employment in reliance on this action of the Post Office Department and in the belief that the enterprise was lawful.

On April 28, 1936, the Postmaster General, on the basis of evidence that the scheme was a lottery, issued a so-called fraud order, which required the postmaster general of New York City not to certify any postal money orders in favor of the lottery corporation, and to notify remitters that their money would be returned upon presentation of duplicate money orders, in accordance with departmental regulations. Further mail deliveries to the organization were suspended.

Litigation was instituted by the National Conference on Legalizing Lotteries, Inc., on April 29, 1936, against the postoffice authorities to enjoin enforcement of the order. After extended litigation, the order of the Postmaster General was upheld. In the meantime money orders amounting to nearly $18,000 had accumulated in the hands of the lottery corporation, and some of these orders, it is understood, were transferred to Van Dyke and others in payment for services and advances. They constitute the subject matter of this legislation. It is estimated that approximately 90 percent of the amount represented by these orders has been remitted to the purchasers. The balance is held in the Treasury subject to the issuance of any further warrants in favor of remitters.

It is evident that the statement in the letter of the departmental solicitor contained no assurance that the scheme itself was a lawful enterprise. On the contrary, it contained a plain warning that those interested were proceeding at their own risk. In any case, it could hardly be contended that the Government was estopped thereby from enforcing the law against the activities of the lottery corporation or from withholding payment of money orders (including those already on hand) forwarded to it in pursuance of the unlawful scheme, in accordance with its established policy in such cases. While the position of Van Dyke and other creditors who had made advances and performed services for the organization without receiving payment therefor might well be viewed as unfortunate, the Government is not called upon to make good the obligations of the lottery corporation to its creditors or waive enforcement of its regulations in order to enable that organization to collect the amount of the money orders on hand and use the proceeds to pay Van Dyke and other creditors.

By subsequently transferring the money orders to Van Dyke to compensate him for his services, the lottery corporation could not alter their character or enlarge the moral obligation of the Government with respect to them. In performing services and extending credit to the lottery corporation, neither Van Dyke nor any of the other creditors was entitled to infer from the Solicitor's letter that the scheme was lawful or assume that the Government would protect them against loss. They were in no better position than the lottery corporation. If the Government was right in suspending payment of the orders in the first place, as can hardly be doubted, no equity was created in favor of Van Dyke by the subsequent transfer of the orders to him or by the circumstance that a number of persons who were entitled to a refund under the regulations of the Department have not applied for a refund and may not do so.

To authorize payment of these orders to Van Dyke, even within the limitations stated in the bill, would encourage appeals for relief in similar cases where creditors of lottery enterprises have been left without recourse, would be construed as a precedent for relief in other cases, and would tend to weaken efforts of the Government to curb activities of this nature.

For these reasons, and on grounds of broad policy, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from this measure.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 28, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon

the Journal and the message, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ELIZABETH AYERS (H. DOC. NO. 449)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4246, "For the relief of Elizabeth Ayers."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $1,163.95 to Elizabeth Ayers of Mount Vernon, Ohio, in settlement of her claims against the United States for hospital bills, doctors' bills, and funeral expenses of her husband, Richard R. Ayers, a former employee of the Emergency Relief Administration at Mount Vernon, Ohio, who was injured June 1, 1935, by the caving in of a sewer project on which he was working, and who died August 22, 1935.

The act of June 22, 1936, provided compensation for disability and death in the case of employees of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and Mrs. Ayers has, since that date, been paid compensation by reason of the death of her husband. The provisions of this act, however, were not retroactive in effect; and, since the injury in the case under consideration occurred on June 1, 1935, relief could not be granted under that act.

I do not believe that I would be justified in approving a private relief bill in this case, since there doubtless were many other employees of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration who were either injured or killed prior to the act of June 22, 1936, and for whom no relief has been provided.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 28, 1941.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message, together with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very splendid and well-deserved editorial on that great statesman, United States Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the representatives of the Rural Electrification Cooperatives in the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and insert extracts from a release by the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

SITUATION OF FRUIT FARMERS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has delivered a very important and somewhat impassioned appeal on account of some southern farm commodities. I wonder how many people who are here know what the fruit growers, particularly the grape growers of California, will suffer if this bill is passed as it stands at the present time. Later in the afternoon I propose to offer an amendment which at least will take care of some of the difficulties that beset the grape growers of Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, New York, and Illinois, as well as Californians suffer. I ask the Members on the floor of the House to try to understand the situation and why we cannot accept the bill as it stands.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

LEAVE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have until midnight tonight to file a report upon the bill H. R. 6128.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Is there a minority report on this?

Mr. LANHAM. No; there is no division.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If anyone desires to file minority views, I suppose he may do so.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is no one on the committee who would have any objection to the filing of this report.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Would the gentleman object to including the filing of minority views in his request?

Mr. LANHAM. No. Mr. Speaker, I include in my request the right to file minority views by those who desire to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "Defense Scandal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5990) to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5990, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. A committee amendment is pending.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there be stricken from the pending amendment the following language:

Or to prevent price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act. The proceeds of any sale under this subsection shall be used as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this subsection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object for a moment, I think I shall object——

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. I wish to state that this is a committee amendment and the request is——

Mr. WOLCOTT. Which is the committee amendment?

Mr. STEAGALL. In the RECORD introduced on Wednesday, on page 9175 of Wednesday's RECORD.

The purpose of striking the language indicated is to remove from the provision authority for the use of funds as a revolving fund. The other language which I have asked to strike provides for the use of the powers conveyed by the provision for the general purpose of obtaining price increases. With these two provisions eliminated I think the amendment would represent substantially the agreed judgment of all members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say it is my purpose to offer two additional amendments to this bill. One would create a board for the administration of the law, the board to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, with salaries of $10,000 a year, with the direction that the board select

a chairman. The other provision directs the President to consider geographical locations and varying business interests of the Nation in selecting appointees, and to name not more than one member from any one Federal Reserve district.

Later we expect to offer an amendment removing some of the objections that have been quite clearly indicated by Members of the House to an amendment which the Committee on Banking and Currency adopted, creating powers for a licensing system in the administration of the act.

I make this statement, Mr. Chairman, in order that Members of the House may understand the deep and abiding conviction on the part of the Banking and Currency Committee that this legislation is of transcendent importance to the national economy and the future welfare of the Nation, and observing the trend of opinion in the House as expressed on the floor during the debate that has taken place prior to today, the Banking and Currency Committee members desire, I am sure, to respect the judgment and views of Members of the House, because we are simply servants of the House. The amendments suggested are for the purpose of meeting the views of the House, removing objections that have been indicated in the discussion here, so as to remove such objections as may endanger favorable action on the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman from Alabama knows that no one in the House feels more deeply the necessity of a price-control bill than I. I have studied the subject for a long time. I feel that the country is going to be absolutely ruined if we do not take action, but the gentleman knows that I and numerous others represent splendid agricultural sections. The farmers of those sections are willing to support a price-control bill if it is to be effective, but they know that Mr. Henderson testified before your committee that no bill could be effective unless all the elements of cost were covered in some way. In bringing these perfecting amendments to the House and endeavoring to meet the problems of various groups, may I ask the distinguished chairman if his committee proposes to offer an amendment that will touch wages in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say to the gentleman that the bill embodies a labor provision exempting wages. The matter was gone over very fully by the committee, and the proceedings, I am sure, are quite well known to my good friend from Virginia. Of course, that matter will be open for whatever action the House may see fit to take under the rules of the House. There is no difficulty in securing expression of the judgment of the House on that question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I will offer on behalf of the Farm Bureau Federation, which prepared it, a very mild amendment dealing with wages when we reach section 2 of the bill. I put the House on notice now that that amendment will be offered. It is about as mild an amendment dealing with wages as anybody knew how to draw it if it is to be touched at all.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment upon the manner in which the licensing provisions of the committee amendment have been modified in the amendment which the gentleman expects to present?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that for the moment he permit me to refer him to the legislative counsel who is making the final draft of that provision in order that we may be sure of our accuracy in what we say about it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the gentleman also to discuss for a moment the function of the board which he proposes to set up under the amendment which he will offer? Is it an advisory board or an administrative board to which aggrieved persons may go for redress or any alleged wrong?

Mr. STEAGALL. It would not be in any sense an advisory board. It is a legal, independent board, to be created by the Congress, the members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What provision is there in the proposal which the gentleman has offered to allow aggrieved persons to appear before the board?

Mr. STEAGALL. There is no provision with reference to that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say, then, that would be wholly unsatisfactory.

Mr. STEAGALL. What we contemplate by the amendment is the establishment of a board to take the place of the Administrator provided for in the pending bill. All the powers conferred under the pending bill upon an administrator and all the methods of the application of those powers and the enforcement of the orders issued in pursuance to an exercise of the powers would be conferred upon the board instead of the Administrator.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then I may say to the gentleman at this point in respect to this procedure that I had hoped the gentleman from Alabama, the legislative counsel, the leadership, the President, and Mr. Henderson might get together and offer some constructive compromise. The gentleman should not expect after the debates which have transpired on this floor that any reasonable, intelligent Member of Congress is going to consent to the setting up of a dummy board controlled by a chairman who will operate as an administrator.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let me say in reply, if my friend desires me to express myself in this connection, that personally I do not see how there can be any efficacious administration of this law if there is to be a board of review to consume weeks or months of time reviewing orders. What is contemplated by the amendment I have indicated is that the President will select a board with due regard for geographical locations and the varied business and agricultural interests of the Nation. This board will sit at all times as a body bringing into the council the varying views and the viewpoints entertained by the different members of that board, and that board will represent the various business interests of the entire Nation so that any interest involved in an order affecting prices would not be left to the routine difficult procedure of some appeal to a reviewing board, but their views would be expressed at the time the order is to be made by someone entirely familiar with the interests involved; so that at all times throughout the proceeding until an order is issued and enforced, the various business interests of the country will have a board with knowledge broad enough properly to express the views of those involved in the action about to be taken.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then may I say under my reservation of objection——

The CHAIRMAN. The question, of course, is on the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Alabama affecting the pending amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and I have reserved the right to object. May I suggest that, in view of the fact none of us as yet has seen the proposal of the gentleman on the establishment of a board or on the creation of an authority to issue or revoke licenses, that we confine our efforts for the present to the pending amendment to authorize the Administrator to buy and sell commodities?

I think there are certain parts of the amendment which the gentleman says he will offer which should be adopted; but at the present moment I believe that, for the purpose of allowing the issue to crystallize a little further, I should object to the gentleman's request. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] has had an amendment pending at the desk since Wednesday which I understand he wants to offer at the present moment, and he is about to be recognized for that purpose. So for the time being, in order that we may have full debate and find out what this is all about, I will object to the gentleman's request.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered to the pending amendment: Strike out the comma following the word "producers" and the language as follows: "or prevent price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act. The proceeds of any sale under this subsection shall be used as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is it in order now to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment could be offered in the nature of a substitute, but the vote would come first on the amendment to the pending committee amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But an amendment in the nature of a substitute could be

offered to the pending committee amendment. Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment could be offered in the nature of a substitute for the pending committee amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, if I may be recognized briefly, I wish to suggest to the gentleman that I desire only to have this amendment pending to keep this matter clear. I hope the gentleman will not feel that I desire to shut off debate or discussion.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, then, the gentleman from Alabama has not offered this as an amendment, but merely offers it to have it pending?

Mr. STEAGALL. I offered it as an amendment. I am not asking for an immediate vote on it. I would like to have discussion of the whole matter. I will ask for a vote on it later.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the committee amendment now pending.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEWEY offers an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment. Strike out of section 2, subsection (e), page 6, all of the paragraph commencing in line 16 and insert:

"(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator it is necessary, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, to obtain the production of marginal or high-cost producers, he may so notify the President, and the President may direct any existing agency or agencies of the United States to exercise, and any such agency or agencies shall exercise in accordance with such directions, any authority heretofore or hereafter conferred on them by law to buy, sell, store, or use any commodity produced in the United States by any such producers: *Provided*, That any materials which have been heretofore or may hereafter be defined as strategic and critical materials and supplies by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, may be bought in order to carry out the purposes of this act only by corporations created or organized pursuant to said section 5d, upon such terms and conditions as they may determine, and only with the approval of the President and the Federal Loan Administrator: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify, suspend, amend, or supersede any provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section, or any existing law, shall be construed to authorize any sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity contrary to the provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman leave out of his amendment the provision that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency suggested be left out of the pending amendment?

Mr. DEWEY. My amendment is substantially the same as the pending committee amendment, leaving out the revolving fund and the right to buy and sell to stabilize prices.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think there is much difference between what the gentleman proposes and what the committee has suggested.

Mr. DEWEY. There are one or two little differences.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman's amendment include imported articles?

Mr. DEWEY. It does cover that point.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of both of these amendments and the amendment which was originally discussed in committee was to permit increased production of certain critical materials and supplies from high-cost producers. As I mentioned when speaking the other day, during the last war the Price Administrator adhered to what was known as the bulk-line method in setting ceilings; he set the prices of commodities at a height that the high-cost producers might make a profit and produce or might not lose money and produce. That, of course, put the prices high and gave great profits to the low-cost producers.

The more modern and scientific method is to place the price ceilings at a lower price, and the purpose of the new method of setting ceilings is that the prices may not be elevated for all of these commodities to accommodate the high-cost producers. They shall be accommodated by a subsidy from the Government representing a differential between the low-cost producer and the high-cost producer.

As has been mentioned a number of times, copper is a good example. The cost of producing copper under the hydraulic method is about 10 cents, but in the Michigan mines and other mines where it is hand produced, the cost of production is about 3½ to 4 cents greater.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit the Price Administrator or the Board to pay this differential in order to stimulate the production of copper, but it was thought that we have already established in the Federal Loan Administrator and the R. F. C. various corporations which have for a number of years been doing this very business and are equipped to do it. They know the mines, they know the methods of procedure; therefore this amendment permits the Administrator or the Board that may be set up upon notification to the President of the United States, who shall make the request of the existing agency or agencies, to buy these high-cost products at a higher price than is normal for the market.

The amendment and the committee amendment both permit that, but the amendment I have offered reserves the right for these purchasers to domestic material and does not permit the Administrator or Board to go abroad and probably bring in foreign products to break the markets of our own American products. It was not contemplated that he should do this in the committee hearings, and I think it would have a bad effect, as do many of my associates and colleagues, on our economy.

There is another factor here that I think should be taken into consideration. Under the committee amendment the Price Administrator or Board may direct these purchases to be made. I do not think the Price Administrator or the Board should have the right to direct the Federal Loan Administrator to perform certain functions. The Price Administrator or Board should notify the President, and the President should notify those agencies over which he has general jurisdiction. One other item that is not in my amendment, yet it is in the committee amendment, which I do not think is necessary.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STEAGALL. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to remove from the bill the particular language indicated in the amendment I submitted to the committee amendment?

Mr. DEWEY. That is correct.

Mr. STEAGALL. But it would place the powers conferred by the provision in the hands of the President instead of the Administrator?

Mr. DEWEY. Upon notification to the President.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I say to the gentleman the two provisions are so similar and so substantially the same, there would be no objection to the adoption of the gentleman's substitute to the pending amendment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Since the gentleman has 10 minutes, may I make this suggestion, and I am wondering why the committee has not made this suggestion before. I believe before this bill is finally enacted and sent to the President the pooling of copper and such commodities will be suggested. This would probably save all subsidies and cost to the Government. Let high-cost and low-cost producers pool their copper, find a price for everybody to pay, and then pay each his proper profit. Then there would be no subsidy by the Government. Has the gentleman considered this suggestion?

Mr. DEWEY. My own opinion about that is that the Federal Loan Agency, which, among others, includes the Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and the Defense Supply Corporation, have had such great experience and knowledge that it would be best to leave such matters in their hands for administration.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman believe they would have authority to order all the copper producers to pool their interests?

Mr. DEWEY. I am not informed on that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I believe this is a new thought that has not been considered by the committee. I ask the House to consider it and see if it would not save all subsidies to pool supplies and pay everyone his proper profit, everyone pay-

ing the same price for the articles. I hope the gentleman will give this suggestion his attention.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it is identical with the committee amendment in that it prohibits the purchase of imported commodities and confines purchases to domestic commodities.

Mr. DEWEY. My amendment deals with domestic commodities, and the chairman has agreed that my amendment deals only with domestic production.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there anything in the gentleman's amendment with regard to a bipartisan board?

Mr. DEWEY. This has nothing to do with a bipartisan board. This is only one section, pertaining to the purchase of high-cost products.

Mr. STEFAN. It also relates to making reports directly to the President after the request.

Mr. DEWEY. After the request?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman's amendment would not have the effect, would it, of preventing the purchase abroad of critical materials where there may be an actual shortage of certain things?

Mr. DEWEY. Those powers are already held by the Defense Supply Corporation, which is a part of the Federal Loan Agency, and under the purposes for which that Corporation was set up they may do about anything. They may produce, acquire, carry, or sell, or otherwise deal in strategic and critical materials and supplies. Also, they may take such further action as the President and the Federal Loan Administrator deem necessary to expedite the national-defense program.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; but does the gentleman's amendment affect that power?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment to the pending committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, if the substitute is agreed to, does that mean that the amendment itself is adopted, or is there then a separate vote on whether or not the amendment as amended shall be adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. If the substitute amendment is agreed to, then the question will recur on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. To which amendment?

Mr. McINTYRE. To the amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the gentleman's amendment is in order at this time. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, if the amendment is adopted, it cannot then be amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands he cannot offer an amendment to a substitute when the substitute has been adopted.

Mr. McINTYRE. I understand that the substitute has been adopted.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment to the amendment as originally offered by the committee. Is that amendment now in order?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand the situation, Mr. Chairman, the substitute for the committee amendment has been adopted. The only amendment which would have been in order was an amendment to the substitute. Inasmuch as the substitute has been adopted, it is now too late to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the House in its consideration of this bill, but I do want sufficient time to discuss this matter. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, all of us agree that inflation is a great evil and must be prevented. It is, however, obvious to any student of the question that the principal causes of inflation are huge deficit spending, unbalanced budgets, debasement of the currency, and widespread strikes. The proponents of the present bill concede this to be true. Unless we deal effectively with these historic and fundamental causes of inflation, the only purpose that can be served by a price-fixing bill is to enable bureaucrats to regiment our economy. No price-fixing bill will be of any substantial help in preventing inflation until we drastically reduce nondefense expenditures, increase the revenues of the Government, eliminate the scandalous waste in defense and nondefense expenditures, and put the defense program upon an efficient and nonpolitical basis.

We need not speculate on this question. We have the experiences of all other countries to demonstrate the truth of my statement. For instance, from 1519 to 1602 the price level in Spain increased 500 percent. With the rising cost of living the rich grew richer and the poor more sullen and rebellious. In an effort to suppress the growing revolts the Government devised a schedule of fixed prices on everything, and the weaver, the fuller, the armorer, the potter, the shoemaker, were told exactly how to do their own work. All this did not bear its full fruit during the reign of the Catholic sovereigns, but by the end of the sixteenth century it had reduced Spain to a state of Byzantine regulation in which every kind of work had to be done under the eye and subject to the interference of a vast swarm of government officials, all ill paid and often not paid, all therefore necessitous and corrupt. The great resource of the treasury was the excise taxes of 5 or 10 percent on an article every time it was sold—on the ox when sold to the butcher, on the hide when sold to the tanner, on the dressed hide sold to the shoemaker, and on his shoes. This plan of taxation—advocated these days by Dr. Townsend—soon made Spain and Portugal the two most beggarly nations in Europe.

In the last days of the Roman Empire the Emperor decreed a schedule of prices on all goods and commodities and services. He put to death anyone who violated his price-fixing law, but he failed to correct the loose fiscal policies and his price-fixing law was a complete failure.

During the inflationary periods in France, between the years of 1786 and 1789, attempts were made to fix the price of grain and other foodstuffs, but it required armed bands to induce the owners to give them up. Mills, granaries, houses, and barns were looted, shops broken into. The severest penalties were inflicted upon those who disobeyed price-fixing regulations as to goods or labor. Ten years in irons for millers and farmers; death for all those who refused to labor, or resisted confiscation of their goods. The price-fixing law of France was a complete failure because the Government continued piling up huge deficits.

I could cite many more instances in history if I had the time, but I think all of us will agree that price fixing is of no value as a preventive of inflation unless it is accompanied by sound fiscal policies.

For years we have followed an inflationary policy. We have spent vast sums of money on almost everything. What assurance do we have that the necessary fiscal and monetary policies will be followed in the future to prevent inflation? I am convinced that there is great waste and inefficiency in the defense program; that this Government is needlessly spending a vast amount of money. I

am further convinced that lobbyists and profiteers are thriving at the expense of the taxpayers. Men like Tommy Corcoran and Charles West. I am further convinced that defense money has been deliberately and knowingly used for political purposes. I demand, therefore, that these abuses be corrected or that we have definite assurances that they will be corrected before any price-fixing bill is enacted. Furthermore, I demand that before any price-fixing bill is passed we have definite assurance that those to be charged with the administration of the act shall be loyal, patriotic Americans who believe in our system of free enterprise and who will seek to preserve it.

We have declared that Germany is our enemy. Germany represents a planned or regimented economy. American democracy is based upon free enterprise. I will never vote to place the destiny of free enterprise in America in the hands of men and women who have declared repeatedly that they do not believe in free enterprise and that they want to destroy it. I shall vote to recommit, and by that vote I shall send a message to the executive department that insofar as I am concerned my vote represents a protest against the coddling of totalitarians in the United States. There is no other recourse left to me. I have pleaded with the executive department for action. My pleas have been spurned and ignored. I shall no longer plead. As the Representative of an American constituency I shall exert what little influence I have as a Member of Congress to compel the executive department to do what should have been done months and years ago. Clean house, and restore the confidence of Congress in the ability, the loyalty, and soundness of the men who are selected to administer the laws of our land.

Mr. Chairman, once more I wish to call the attention of the House to the manner in which certain Government bureaucrats in Washington deal with evidence of the gravest moment which has been brought to their attention by the work of this House.

I have heretofore given you, briefly, the evidence collected by our committee with reference to four of the key figures in the Price Administration. You have had the opportunity to read that evidence for yourselves and to determine whether or not there can be any question with reference to these people. I now give you another typical example, because I think you should know the attitude of the executive department of this Government and I therefore speak frankly, for I am convinced that only by a determined and aroused Congress can we ever correct this situation.

On November 18 I wrote a letter to the Honorable James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and apprised him of certain facts and evidence in the possession of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. In my communication to Chairman Fly, I made it abundantly clear that our committee had documentary evidence to establish two facts: First, that Goodwin Watson, chief broadcast analyst of the Federal Communications Commission, had publicly associated himself with a large number of front organizations of the Communist Party; and second, that Goodwin Watson had for years been a propagandist for communism and the Soviet Union. I now hold in my hand copies of documents which establish beyond any possibility of dispute the truth of the charges which I made to Chairman Fly concerning his subordinate, Goodwin Watson.

In order that Mr. Fly might have every opportunity to judge for himself the nature and value of the evidence in our possession, I wrote to him as follows:

> If you desire to have one of your representatives study the evidence in our committee's files which bears upon the matter of Watson's connections with Communist front organizations, I shall be happy to offer you every facility for that purpose.

Chairman Fly absolutely ignored my offer to show him the evidence. Instead of availing himself of the opportunity to inspect the evidence in our possession, Chairman Fly replied to my letter on the very next day, stating that he had taken pains to make a full inquiry into the subject and that as a result of his inquiry he had found my charges against Watson to be baseless. Instead of looking at our evidence, Chairman Fly wrote to me that Goodwin Watson is a man "of tenth generation American ancestry." It is my understanding that Earl Browder also describes his American ancestry in some such quantitative terms. I am not concerned about the ancestry of Goodwin Watson or Earl Browder. I have never brought any charges against either one of them on the grounds of his forebears. I charged categorically that Goodwin Watson had been publicly associated with a large number of Communist-front organizations. I repeat that charge at this time. I hold in my hand unimpeachable documents to establish the charge, and I intend to have a show-down with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Honorable James Lawrence Fly, as to the truth or untruth of this charge. I further charged, and I now repeat it, that Goodwin Watson has for years been a propagandist for communism and the Soviet Union. I have Watson's undisputed writings to prove that charge, and I intend to have a showdown with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Honorable James Lawrence Fly, as to the truth or untruth of this charge.

Instead of giving one moment's consideration to the evidence in our possession, Chairman Fly replied to me that Goodwin Watson holds the degree of doctor of philosophy from Columbia University. One of the most prolific writers of Communist literature in the United States, a man who was a publicly avowed member of the Communist Party, also held the degree of doctor of philosophy from Columbia University. His name was M. J. Olgin. I have not held it against Goodwin Watson or M. J. Olgin that they did or did not have degrees of the highest academic rating from Columbia University.

I do not have sufficient time at my disposal today to give anything more than a few excerpts from the writings of Goodwin Watson, but I offer a few which are typical of what Watson has put into print under his own name during the past years.

Speaking on the mistake of the Austrian Socialist Party in supporting measures of gradual socialization, Goodwin Watson wrote:

> Again a people learned in tragedy that there is no safe compromise with capitalism.

According to Dr. Watson, the Austrian Socialists "took the deceptively attractive highway of gradualism." Lest anyone misunderstand him, Dr. Watson did his utmost to make it clear that he supported a sharp and sudden break with capitalism, which is usually described by the word "revolution," and that he rejected the customary Socialist procedure to attain Socialist ends by gradual measures. In other words, Dr. Watson not only made it perfectly clear that he advocated the destruction of capitalism, but that he also advocated the Communist rather than the Socialist method of destruction. At the conclusion of his article from which I have quoted, Dr. Watson wrote:

> Only Soviet Russia has gone up to the left, in an ox cart that was nearly wrecked before the trip started, but they report now that the road is growing better. Our machines are more powerful but more delicate than ox carts. Can't we stand the rough beginning if we prepare the road, the cars, the drivers, and the passengers?

In another article in which he dealt with the question of gradualism or revolution, Goodwin Watson wrote:

> The Austrian Socialists actually did the things F. D. R. makes speeches about. They provided real social security, built cooperative houses, set up health insurance and enriched life generally for the forgotten man. The Socialists were sure that they had chosen the peaceful, gradual, practical way. They wanted to avoid bloodshed, even at the last, when they were disarmed by ruthless reactionaries and shot down in the 5-day battle in Vienna streets.

Dr. Watson proceeded at once in this article to show how the gradualism of the Austrian Socialists had failed. He said:

> Only emptiness ahead. Is that what my children will experience in America, after the failure of gradualism and the apparently inevitable rise of American fascism?

Could anything be clearer than Dr. Watson's own words that he rejected a program of gradual socialization for America and put himself on the side of revolution? Indeed, I quote his exact words:

> We must choose the swift, total transformation.

I offer only one more excerpt from the writings of this tenth generation American who is a doctor of philosophy from Columbia University. But first I call your attention to the fact that he is a high official in a Government agency which administers laws affecting radio. In a speech before the National Education Association, Dr. Watson called for public ownership of great newspapers and radios, and in that same speech he declared:

> Our Government, and that of France and England, may pretend to be democracies, but they are in truth plutocracies. In the pres-

ent economic crisis, foreign policies of all capitalist nations will necessarily be far more concerned to keep plutocrats in power than to build world democracy.

Lest there be any misunderstanding in any quarter, I wish to say that when it comes to the question of permitting Communists to hold high Government positions in this Capital City of the Nation, I have just begun to fight.

Mr. Chairman, some months ago I wired the President of the United States that I would be glad to confer with him about "fifth columnists," both of the Nazi and Communist varieties, in the United States. The President of the United States contacted me at my home in the city of Orange and asked me to come to Washington for the purpose of conferring with him. With my family, I left, and after a long and tedious trip I arrived in Washington, having an engagement with the Chief Executive at 12 o'clock. As I walked into the anteroom I found a man there who has one of the longest records of activity in Communist-front organizations of any man in this country; the man who admitted he had put up the money to buy the letters that attempted to link me with William Dudley Pelley. I sat there for 45 minutes while that man, contrary to the engagement that the President had phoned me at my home in Orange, promising an interview at 12 o'clock—I sat there 45 minutes cooling my heels, waiting so that this man, with a long record—and I here and now place his full record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the House.

The matter referred to follows:

GARDNER JACKSON, PRINCIPAL ECONOMIST, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, $5,600

Chairman, speaker at dinner, Committee for Pan American Democracy. (Clipping, possibly New York Times, February 21, 1940.)

Sponsor, Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America. (Program leaflet, Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7, 1940, p. 4.)

Sponsor, Conference on Pan American Democracy. (Letterhead, November 16, 1938.)

Signer of call, Congress of Youth. (Proceedings, July 1–5, 1939, p. 2.)

Sponsor, Consumers' Union. (Undated circular.)

Chairman, Council for Pan American Democracy. (Letterhead, dated July 11, 1940.)

Legislative representative, Council of United States Veterans, Inc. (Letterhead, December 30, 1938.)

Member, executive board, Council of United States Veterans, Inc. (Letterhead, December 30, 1938.)

Vice president, Film Audiences for Democracy. (Film Survey, June 1939, p. 4.)

Vice president, Films for Democracy. (Films for Democracy, April 1939, p. 2.)

Member, advisory board, Frontier Films. (Undated letterhead.)

Member, Labor's Non-Partisan League. (Equal Justice, April 1938, p. 4.)

Representative at Workers Alliance conference, Labor's Non-Partisan League (Daily Worker, March 21, 1938, p. 4.)

Entertained at national convention in New York City, League of Women Shoppers, Inc. (News letter, Washington League of Women Shoppers, May 1940, p. 2.)

Signer, letter protesting ban on Communists in American Civil Liberties Union. (Daily Worker, March 19, 1940, p. 4.)

Sponsor, National Council to Aid Agricultural Labor. (Help America First, p. 4.)

Signer of open letter on Dies committee, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights. (Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1, 5.)

Member, National Peoples Committee Against Hearst. (Letterhead, March 16, 1937.)

Member, Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO. (Letterhead, Oct. 3, 1936.)

Endorses the pamphlet, Pamphlet on Mooney Case, by MARCANTONIO. (Equal Justice, April 1938, p. 4.)

Sponsor, Washington Committee for Democratic Action. (Letterhead, April 26, 1940.)

Speaker, Workers Alliance conference. (Daily Worker, March 21, pp. 1, 4.)

Mr. Chairman, after I had sat there for 45 minutes I was finally, after Mr. Gardner Jackson left the President's private office, invited into his office to hold the conference to which I had been invited by the Chief Executive of the United States; and there, sitting across the table, was a court reporter to take down the conversation between the President of my country and myself, after I had worked for more than 3 years—hard, difficult, and discouraging work—in the interest of the American Government.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence was then before the country as to what Gardner Jackson had attempted to do to me, and notwithstanding that fact, and notwithstanding his record, Mr. Gardner Jackson is now the principal economist in the Department of Agriculture, drawing a salary of $5,600 a year.

I sent to the executive department the names of 3,200 Nazi believers and sympathizers, men who had associated themselves with the Nazi movement in America and working in defense industries. I have never heard of the slightest action having been taken on that. I therefore raise the question that should be asked by all thoughtful men, How can this country prepare to defeat the enemies abroad unless we are prepared to defeat the enemies within our own country?

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to delegate those vast powers of life and death control of our system of free enterprise to a group of men who have said to the country that they do not believe in our system, then I say there is no other course for this Congress to pursue except to send this bill back to the committee, and by that action we will announce to America that Congress is not a mere rubber stamp, that Congress has not surrendered its legislative prerogatives and its dignity. We represent independent constituencies, and with the help of God we must sustain our power if American democracy is to survive.

At this point I insert the letter from Watson and others with reference to Earl Browder's case:

NEW YORK CITY, *October 18, 1941.*

DEAR FRIEND: We, who have signed this letter are writing to you because you have been interested for a long time in preserving civil rights in our country. We know that you are opposed to the persecution of any individual because of his political philosophy.

You are no doubt familiar with the facts concerning Mr. Earl Browder's imprisonment. He has already served 7 months of a 4-year sentence and has paid a $2,000 fine imposed upon him because of a technical violation of a passport statute. The records of other cases of similar violations show that ordinarily sentences are suspended, or in the majority of cases, do not exceed 30 to 90 days.

The former Attorney General of the United States has stated that there was no question of moral turpitude involved on Mr. Browder's part. This factor, combined with the severity of Mr. Browder's sentence, has caused us and many other persons to agree with Mr. Wendell Willkie's declaration that "if you truly believe in the protection of civil liberties, you will wonder whether Mr. Browder was sentenced to 4 years in jail and a $2,000 fine because he made a false statement on a passport application, or because he was a Communist Party member."

We firmly believe that in the present world emergency, when national unity is essential, our President will act favorably toward Mr. Browder's case. We believe that the release of Earl Browder will strengthen the conviction of the American people that democracy and justice in America are living realities.

Because we know that you share our belief, we ask you to join us in a conference to discuss Mr. Browder's freedom. The conference will be held on Saturday, November 1, at 2 o'clock at the Riverside Plaza Hotel, 253 West Seventy-third Street, New York City. We will adjourn promptly at 4 o'clock. We will be happy to learn that you will attend.

Cordially yours,

Prof. Dorothy Brewster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Osmond K. Fraenkel, Ben Gold, Aline Davis Hays, Conrad Kaye, Rockwell Kent, Representative Vito Marcantonio, Lewis Merrill, Darwin J. Meserole, Arthur Upham Pope, Harry Reich, Rev. William B. Spofford, Dr. Goodwin Watson, Richard Wright, Dr. Max Yergan, Art Young.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the desk to page 4. I submit a parliamentary inquiry as to whether it would be in order to offer those amendments at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 4 embraces section 2 of the pending bill. Section 2 is now open for amendment. The gentleman's two amendments appear to be to section 2.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments are in order. Does the gentleman desire to ask unanimous consent that both amendments be considered at one time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized to offer an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, how far has the Clerk read in the bill at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. He has completed the reading of section 2.

Mr. BUCK. Then he has not reached section 3, agricultural commodities?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has completed the reading of section 2.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that may I ask this? On Wednesday I submitted an amendment to section 3 which will come at page 8. Is that amendment on the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the Clerk has an amendment offered by the gentleman from California, which is now on the Clerk's desk. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 4, line 6, after the word "ceiling", strike out the words "on or about October 1, 1941" and insert "between the dates of October 1 and October 15, 1941."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering the amendment in this way is to more clearly state the period, or the hitching post to which the Administrator must adhere in taking into consideration certain price conditions. It is my feeling that these dates are not so material, and this is because adjustments are to be made upward or downward. But it is important to units of industry that the Administrator adhere closely to some specific date in order to arrive at the ceiling which he originally announces. Unless we nail it down specifically, it seems to me that the language in the bill is so broad, the words "on or about October 1, 1941," that the Administrator could interpret them at anywhere from 30 to 60 days. We have had some specific cases where firms have been greatly injured by reason of as much as a 30-day split—that is, where one firm of an industry might have a ceiling set on the conditions prevailing as of July 15, while another firm would have its ceiling set on conditions existing, say, on August 15. This amendment is to bring the Administrator into more narrow limits, with more specific language, so that injuries may not follow to specific units of industry.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that I do not see that there is any substantial difference between the amendment the gentleman proposes and the language in the bill, "on or about October 1, 1941." That date may not be the sole standard. Conditions would be considered along with other matters in determining the matter, which would enter into the consideration. So far as I am concerned, I can see no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and the acceptance of the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 4, line 7, after the word "may", insert "without undue burden on the economy."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment I will support with a specific case. A short time ago, I have been informed, the Price Administrator, in operating under his present powers, set a ceiling on the products of a certain firm. Immediately following that the firm was requested to file certain accounting information: For instance, a 5-year balance sheet; 5-year comparative operating statement; a statement showing the margin of profit which the company had marked up between costs and selling prices over a long period of time.

Of course, the company did not have an accounting staff qualified to proceed with such work. For weeks and weeks the company was unable to make any shipments. It became necessary for the company to go into the professional market, obtain the services of high cost accountants, and to have an elaborate financial report submitted for the benefit of the Price Administrator.

It seems to me the purpose of this whole procedure should be made much more acceptable to the country and no such undue burdens as I have described forced upon the economy and various units of industry of the United States. If the Committee feels that the language in the bill at the present time is such as to protect industry against such unusual, extraordinary, and burdensome requests as I have outlined, then I would not ask for the adoption of my amendment. But, personally, I do not agree that the bill in its present form will protect units of industry against such undue burdens.

I am sure that the practice of the Price Administrator up to date has gone in that direction, and I feel that in the absence of restraining language similar to that I have here offered the Administrator will continue to impose undue and costly and burdensome restrictions on the industries of this country, and in many cases make it practically impossible for units of industry to perform by reason of the financial burden placed upon them.

I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not think there is any objection to the amendment. I do not regard it as necessary, but I do not think there is any objection to it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Michigan and shall make some general observations concerning the bill during the time allotted me.

The purpose of this bill, as indicated in its title, is "to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies." I take it that no one is opposed to these objectives. The difficulty arises when we attempt to agree on the best method of accomplishment. The debate has developed that some of us feel that there is already sufficient power lodged in Government agencies, if exercised, to control inflation without further action on the part of the Congress. There are those who feel that prices can be controlled by repealing certain inflationary laws now in existence. Then, there are those who feel that additional price-control legislatio nis essential if ruinous, disastrous inflation is not to bring woe and grief to a vast majority of our people.

We are all agreed that inflation has already set in to a certain extent, that some prices are already too high, and that unless something is done very soon much economic dislocation and suffering are in store for the country. I take it that a majority favors some kind of price-control legislation. The question before us then is: How should we proceed?

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and one of the principal advocates of this measure, in speaking in favor of the bill said, "It is economic dictatorship. You cannot have price control without dictatorship." Generally speaking, this assertion cannot be successfully refuted. This bill, therefore, will create a limited economic dictatorship while the law is in operation. Be it remembered, however, that this is an emergency measure and, by its own terms, it expires not later than June 30, 1943, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the interest of national defense.

Admittedly, this bill contemplates a regulation and a regimentation of the business and economic life of the Nation. It legally destroys for the time being the competitive system and the system of free enterprise and free commerce.

No one dislikes surrendering these economic rights and liberties, even momentarily, more than I do. Yet, it must be realized that in time of war our Government in no way functions as a peacetime democracy. In every war in which our country has participated, the ordinary and accepted rights, liberties, and freedoms of the people have been subrogated to the necessities of national defense and national preservation. During the first World War, President Wilson was given complete dictatorial powers over the economic and political life of the country. He exercised such powers as were necessary in the winning of that war. At the termination of the emergency, he yielded and returned to the people the emergency powers with which he had been entrusted. Again democracy functioned.

Shortly after the first World War, our people, led by the American Legion, embarked upon an endeavor to write a formula to be followed in case we should again be involved in war. This endeavor reached fruition in the McSwain bill, to which years of consideration were given. The bill came to a vote in the House on April 9, 1935, and, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, passed the House on a roll call vote of 368 yeas and 15 nays. All Members of the House today, who were Members in 1935, voted for that bill, with the exception of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

I call attention to these facts to impress upon you what the feeling of the House was when we were not at war when the Congress was planning thoughtfully and without hysteria. The bill which so overwhelmingly passed the House was more inclusive and more drastic than is the bill we are considering today. It gave to the President and his appointees more power than is carried in this bill.

The McSwain bill is found on page 5249 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8, 1936, and is, in part, as follows:

That whenever Congress shall declare war, then, from and after a date prior to such declaration, which date the President is hereby authorized and directed to determine and publicly proclaim, it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, partnership, or corporation to willfully buy, sell, or otherwise contract for any article or thing at a higher rate, rent, price, commission, compensation, or reward than was in effect at the date so determined.

SEC. 2. During the period of any war, whenever in the sole discretion of the President he shall determine that any maximum price, rent, rate, commission, compensation, or reward shall be adjusted either upward or downward he is hereby authorized to make and publicly proclaim such adjustment, and such adjustment shall have the full force and effect under this statute of such price, rent, rate, commission, compensation, or reward before such adjustment.

(b) Furthermore, the President is authorized to close all stock and commodity exchanges in the United States of America if in his sole discretion it becomes desirable in order to curb speculation.

* * * * *

SEC. 4. During the period of any war declared by Congress the President is authorized to determine, and by public proclamation announce, what classes of public service, or of dealers or of manufacturers of any article or commodity, shall be required to operate under licenses, to fix the conditions of such licenses, and to grant licenses under such conditions. After such determination and proclamation by the President, it shall be unlawful for any public service, dealer, or manufacturer in such determined classes willfully to engage in business without such license. This section shall not apply to the publication or distribution of newspapers, periodicals, or books.

SEC. 5. During the period of any war declared by Congress the President is authorized to determine and publicly proclaim the order of priority in which any manufacturer, dealer, or public service in the United States shall fill orders, or transport anything, or furnish power, and after such determination and proclamation, it shall be unlawful for any such manufacturer, dealer, or public service willfully to fill such orders in any other order of priority.

SEC. 6. That during the period of any war declared by Congress the President is empowered to set up such agencies, boards, or commissions, or to designate such persons, to exercise such portion of his powers as he may deem necessary and proper to accomplish the purpose of this act. Likewise, at such time he shall have power to make such rearrangements of departments, and of bureaus and divisions thereof, and to transfer such duties and powers as he may deem necessary for the proper conduct of war.

SEC. 7. That any person, firm, or corporation willfully violating any of the provisions of this act, or willfully violating any publicly proclaimed orders, rules, or regulations made by the President for executing the powers contained in this act, is hereby declared to be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be liable to indictment and trial therefor, and upon conviction thereof shall be sentenced to pay a fine, not exceeding $100,000 or to serve in prison, not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

SEC. 8. That upon the declaration of war, there shall be imposed a tax of 100 percent of all excess war profits that may be earned during said period of war as defined in this act.

* * * * *

Mr. Chairman, that bill was to be effective "whenever Congress shall declare war."

It is true that the Congress has not officially declared war in the constitutional way against Germany or any of the Axis Powers. It is true, however, that beginning with the Lend-Lease Act, the Congress has enacted legislation the effect, if not the purpose, of which is to permit the President to carry on undeclared war against the Axis Powers. The lend-lease law has been implemented by the Congress, and no one will deny that, at the least, the United States is indulging in a naval shooting war with Germany. Our peacetime economy has vanished. A wartime economy prevails throughout the land. Free enterprise and free economy no longer function. The Executive orders of the President, the rules and regulations, edicts, and decrees of the Office of Production Management and the Price Administrator, expressed in priorities, licenses, and what not, supplant the free and competitive commerce and business competition which is the American way of life.

At most the enactment of this price-control bill will be but legalizing and possibly amplifying that which is already being done under Executive order in the name of national defense.

If price control is necessary to prevent ruinous inflation, then there should be no delay on the part of Congress. This does not mean that one bit of authority should be granted to the Executive or any agency of the Government that is not absolutely essential now.

When the McSwain bill was before the House on April 9, 1935, I said in part:

Mr. Speaker, this country wants no more war. Under no circumstances should we ever engage in a war of aggression. * * * The best way to avoid war is to be prepared, and I am satisfied that a majority of the American people are thoroughly convinced that we should at all times be prepared to meet any kind of aggression.

The purpose of this resolution is to equalize the burdens of war. If we must have war, then it should be a people's war; and, regardless of our occupation, our station, or our position in life, we owe our respective obligations to the defense of our country. It is not possible that we all engage in the same activity, but it is possible and necessary that we all engage in some activity to carry on the common cause.

* * * * *

If we must have war, then I believe in drafting not only the young men of the country but industry, agriculture, labor, capital, transportation, and communication. It is unfair to take the young men of the country and place them in the trenches at $30 a month and permit labor in the factory back home to draw $15 to $20 a day. It is unfair to these men who are doing the fighting to permit industry to profit by the suffering of those in the front lines. Legislation bringing about the objectives of this bill would have been enacted long ago, were it not for the fact that labor wants to be exempted from any governmental regulation in time of war; and, by the same token, capital and industry insist on the right to make such profits as are possible in time of national emergency. Both labor and capital are wrong. The masses of the people know of no reason why either of these groups should be exempted from their proportionate share of responsibility when it is necessary for the country to bear arms.

* * * * *

There can be no war without a declaration by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, of the 368 Members of the House who voted for the McSwain bill, all were agreed as to the necessity of price-control legislation in case of war. Were we wrong then?

It is true that the present administration has declared more emergencies and asked for more power than any administration in the history of the Republic. It is true that many of our people are fearful that at the end of the war there will be a disposition on the part of the administration to retain these powers. It is true that many things have happened to justify such fear.

Much has been said in this debate about Leon Henderson, the President's price-control Administrator. It is also true that many of our people believe that Mr. Henderson as price-control Administrator would, at the end of the war, be very reluctant to yield up any powers given to him as the Administrator by this legislation. The fact that he is so impregnated with the New Deal philosophy of making the country over and changing our social system, leads many to believe that he is more interested in permanent control and regulation over our economic life than he is in an emergency anti-inflationary measure. If it were known that the President would appoint an Administrator of this price-control bill in whom all the people of the country have confidence, that fact alone would do much to remove opposition to this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I join with those who advocate the repeal of the causes for inflation now found in the statutes. The authority which gives the President the power to further devaluate the dollar and the law which gives the President the authority to issue $3,000,000,000 in greenbacks should be repealed. It seems to me this action is fundamental. However, even if these laws were repealed at once, the spiral of rising prices would not be halted. More drastic action is demanded now.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill in its present form. I cannot support it if the so-called licensing clause is included. In fact, there are three proposals in connection with this legislation to which I am definitely opposed:

First. The licensing clause.

Second. The market-manipulation provision.

Third. The one-man control policy.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEAGALL], will offer an amendment placing in the bill the licensing clause; that is, power would be given to the Price Administrator to issue licenses for the sale of every commodity on which he places a ceiling. This means every retailer will have to

have a license for each and every commodity he sells, possibly hundreds of individual licenses. The Administrator will be permitted to determine what profit the retailer will be allowed to make on each commodity which he sells under the license and he will even be permitted to determine just what system of bookkeeping each retailer shall use. This will entail a swarm of inspectors, investigators, and so forth—all selected in the discretion of, and working under, the direction of the Price Administrator. Members of the committee who have studied this question have estimated that this new bureau, if the licensing feature is included, will require from 250,000 to 1,000,000 persons to administer it. I am opposed to any such bureaucratic expansion.

I shall not vote for this bill unless the market-manipulation clause is materially altered or eliminated entirely. The Administrator, whether it be Mr. Henderson or some other man, should not be permitted to buy any commodity he desires in any quantity he believes necessary to effectuate price control, and to sell it at any price he wishes to anyone he pleases, at either public or private sale. This could give him power to manipulate markets by creating artificial shortages of commodities, and to control industry and business generally by purchasing and withholding or selling necessary materials.

One man control of price fixing would be ideal if that man were superhuman and always just in his decisions. A benevolent dictator could undoubtedly render the most effective and efficient service. The difficulty is in securing such a dictator. No such vast power over the economic life of the country should be given to any Administrator, especially one entertaining the socialistic views of Mr. Henderson. I shall support the amendment providing for a five-man nonpartisan board of review to which those dissatisfied with the Price Administrator's decisions may appeal for review. When the Administrator realizes that there is such a board presently available, certainly this will have a restraining influence on him.

I repeat that if we are to win the war in which we are now engaged, there must be sacrifice on the part of all our people. The American way of life in peacetime must yield to a regimented way of life, which is necessary if we are to win the war. Under no condition should such legislation be enacted except in case of war. If this law were not to be limited to a given period, I would not support it.

I join with those who insist upon more economy in Federal spending. Tax money should only be spent for essentials during the emergency. The desirable and worth-while advancements and improvements must wait until the life of our Nation is made secure. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. Our taxes will be higher. High taxes and economy in spending by the Government will help much to curtail price inflation.

It is difficult for me to comprehend effective price control without taking into consideration all of the factors entering into the cost of a commodity. For instance, if 60 percent of the cost of a commodity goes for labor and 40 percent of the cost for material, how is a ceiling to be placed on the sale price without taking into consideration the cost of both labor and material?

The fact is the labor cost of a commodity is just as much of a factor as is the material cost. Then again, if a ceiling is to be placed on wages, a ceiling should also be placed on profits. I hope that before this bill reaches a vote all these things will be taken into consideration. I am not yet persuaded that an equitable, workable, and effective price-fixing bill can be written otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 7, after line 11, introduce a new clause to read as follows:

"(i) No price ceiling shall be placed upon any fishery commodity below the average price of such commodity in the year 1941, nor below the average cost of production at the time the ceiling is set."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, when the bill was under consideration I appeared before the committee and offered an amendment which would have been total exclusion for fishery commodities from the operation of the bill. Later that was defeated in the committee. Then there was offered an amendment along the line of the agricultural provision in the bill which provided for a ceiling, but took into consideration parity. Inasmuch as there has been no real determination of parity, that was rejected, and I am now offering this amendment to place a floor on fishery commodities The amendment is that—

No ceiling shall be placed upon any fishery commodity below the average price of such commodity in the year 1941, nor below the average cost of production at the time the ceiling was set.

The evidence produced before the committee showed that there had never been a return from the depression on the part of fisheries. I am going to summarize the reasons why this amendment should be adopted.

I may say that the original amendment had the general support of the fishery industry. One reason for the amendment is that fishery commodities, as a competitive product with agriculture, are controlled by the price of the competing product.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I cannot yield. I only have 5 minutes and I do not desire to ask for additional time.

This is dealing only with fishery products. The price of the fishery products is largely determined by auction sale and consumption. Competition already controls the price. Seventy-nine percent of the total number of vessels engaged in fishing, 72 percent of the total number of men engaged, and 74 percent of the total value of the catch are products of share or lay operations, so that price control would be, in effect, as far as the fisheries are concerned, regulation of wages.

Third, operation of trade agreements, low tariff rates on some items, and freedom of tariffs on most items operate to hold prices down.

Fourth, uncontrollable, unstable, uncertain, unknown, undetermined, and indeterminable factors in the production problem of fishery products make price control unfair, unjust, and unworkable.

No man can decide when fogs are going to be met, what fish are running, what the probabilities are, what the chances are. And it may be that within certain periods there will be no fish at all.

Information not available now nor obtainable within the time required by price control agencies except in the manner prescribed in the amendment, and the area and character of the industry are all such as to make price control impracticable.

The fisheries industry is essential to national defense. Fishing vessels are auxiliaries to the Navy, important facilities for defense purposes, and should be encouraged. Aids are extended by foreign governments to the seafood industry, yet no such aids are extended by our own country. Uncertainty in labor and instability caused by better prices paid in other industries increase the uncertainty of the labor factor and may drive fishery labor to other occupations. In other words, if fishermen are going to receive a better day's pay for a day's labor in the shipyards, or factories, or other plants they are going to leave fishing and go where the pay is better.

Fisheries have generally been regarded as necessary and essential to national defense. It was so regarded in the World War when the Government urged that production should continue and that the building of ships for the fishing industry should continue. I may say in this connection that about 14 trawlers and other ships have now been taken over by the Navy for national defense; and certainly this price level is all right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the committee.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, there is not any objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. I could not imagine that any action would ever be taken contrary to the provisions of the amendment.

There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virgina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia: On page 7, after line 11, insert a new subsection to read as follows:

"(f) In order to prevent inflationary wage increases that will interfere with or prevent the effectuation of the purposes of this act, no agency or official of the United States shall

approve or recommend any wage increase which the Administrator determines to be inflationary nor shall any allowance be made for any wage increase which the Administrator determines to be inflationary, in any ceiling under this act. For the purposes of this act, a wage increase shall be deemed to be inflationary, if the Administrator determines that such increases will require an increase in any ceiling under this act, except where he determines that such increases in such ceiling are justified due to an increase in the workers' cost of living or due to subnormal wage rates that may exist in a particular industry or part thereof."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that the amendment commands and directs other agencies to do or not to do certain things. The amendment is not confined to the particular agency set up in the bill. The language of the bill would direct the President to do or not to do certain things; but the amendment refers to the Labor Relations Board, the Mediation Board, and many other agencies not connected in any way with the administration of the bill. I refer to line 3 of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Texas concluded?

Mr. PATMAN. I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any merit at all in the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment against which the gentleman from Texas makes a point of order, stating as a ground of his point of order, among other things, that the pending amendment refers to other agencies or officials of the United States. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the language of the bill on page 22 under the subject of defintions states the following in lines 21, 22, and 23.

And includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing.

The Chair therefore feels that the amendment is in order, and overrules the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this deals with a new subject not yet considered, and a very vital one, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order that I may answer some questions after I have made a preliminary statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, all of us were thrilled by the eloquent statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], a man whom I admire and whose work I have supported; and I went along with him in his statement right up to his final conclusion that because men we think believe in some "isms" other than Americanism have infiltrated into our Government we should have no price-control legislation until that has been taken care of. I cannot agree with that conclusion. I agree with the chairman of this distinguished committee. He has worked hard over this bill. It is a terrible task. He has been faithful, he has tried to be conciliatory to the conflicting interests he knew were involved. I agree with him that this is a vital matter. I wish every Member of the House could have read the recent article by Dr. Cammerer, of Princeton University, an economist of international reputation, published recently in the Wall Street Journal. He said every major war has been accompanied by inflation. He said every legislative body in the past facing such a situation has taken the easy way out, that they have not realistically faced the situation or attempted to control inflation.

They have done nothing adequate and have fallen back on the old alibi of the law of supply and demand. He said that there were more factors now present to bring about a disastrous inflation than ever before in the history of this Nation, and he predicted that the Congress would do nothing about it. Judging from cloakroom gossip and the comments of colleagues on both sides of this House, I am beginning to fear that before the sun goes down today Professor Cammerer will be proven right.

Mr. Chairman, I am not looking for an out to vote against this bill or to vote to recommit it. I want a bill, but I agree with Mr. Henderson, I agree with all the economists with whom I have discussed the matter, that we cannot have even reasonable success in controlling prices unless we control the various factors that enter into the price equation, of which wage is one—in some industries 50 to 60 percent of what is involved in the cost of manufacture.

So I have presented an amendment dealing with wages that does not have many teeth in it. I hope it has one tooth in it. If I had drawn it myself, I think I would have made it a little stronger—I will be frank to say that, although I want to take this opportunity to say that I am not hostile to labor. My legislative experience started in the State Senate of Virginia in 1916. I supported in that body legislation on behalf of labor that was far in advance of what the average man supported in that day and time. I have always been friendly to labor, and I still am. The fact that I have not supported all the labor legislation in this body in the last 9 years should not by any means be construed as hostility on my part to labor. I do not want to be unfair to labor. However, I hold in my hand a recent Gallup poll showing that the rank and file of labor feel, if we are going to put some ceiling on other prices, that they should have a ceiling put on them too.

This amendment, as I stated, was prepared by the Farm Bureau Federation and presented to me. I am offering it because they have redrafted it six times, and I think they have made it milder in each draft until they got it down to as mild a point as they could and at the same time do any good at all.

Here is a telegram that many of us have received from the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Edward O'Neal:

Respectfully urge Congress to courageously place national welfare above selfish demands of any group and enact legislation that will really control inflation which, unless checked, will wreck our Nation.

He comes out for a bill, and that is my position. I think that is the position of southern agriculture. We want a bill, but we do not want it limited to agriculture or to wholesale prices. We want a bill that will really control prices.

Mr. O'Neal proceeds:

It will impose a crushing debt burden upon us and generations that will follow.

That is absolutely true. In the last war inflation added $15,000,000,000 to the cost of the war and over $45,000,000,000 to the cost of living. In that war we had eighteen and one-half billion dollars of cash and demand deposits in 1918. Now we have fifty-six and one-half billion dollars of cash and demand deposits. In that war we spent a total of $25,000,000,000, including cleaning up in 1919 and 1920 the war contracts. In 1942 we expect to spend in 1 year $30,000,000,000. We have already spent in this undertaking as much as we spent in the same period in the last World War.

We started out with a big debt, while we had practically no debt then. We have every reason to believe that we will have a more rapid increase in the months and years to come in prices than we had then, when they went to 146 percent. We need a price-control bill, and if we are to have one, many of us think it is fair and just that some little restraint be put upon wages, in the absence of which they could dislocate any type of control program.

Mr. O'Neal goes on to say that—

Such legislation, to be fair and to be effective, must provide for control of inflationary wages comparable to control of farm prices and industrial prices and preserve parity relationship. Unless the pending bill can be amended to provide such control we urge you oppose its enactment.

I am not here to oppose enactment of this bill. We have its buying and selling provisions straightened out. The committee, as I understand it, has agreed on the Wolcott amendment providing for a review board. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has stated that he expects to change the licensing features. With a changed licensing provision, with an able, fair, and impartial review, I would not quibble over the licensing features. We had them in the last World War. If properly administered, we have nothing to fear from that. It is undoubtedly true it would be very difficult to get any adequate control if you wait until a man has violated the law. He has then started the prices up beyond what they should be.

You could then get an injunction against him, or you could proceed against one individual violation under the criminal penalties.

Mr. SACKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SACKS. Does not this amendment give the right to the Administrator or whoever will administer this law to suspend or to make inoperative all the other legislation that we have passed in the last few years?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Now, that suggestion, with all due deference to the gentleman, is really absurd. We would not repeal the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Forty Hour Act, and many others, although some changes in those laws should be brought about.

Mr. SACKS. It suspends their operation if the Administrator feels that way?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. No; it does not do so at all. Let me read you the amendment:

> In order to prevent inflationary wage increases that will interfere with or prevent the effectuation of the purposes of this act, no agency or official of the United States—

And so forth. A request for a wage increase is pending before some mediation board or an official of the United States. It is an agency of the United States. If the Administrator who is charged with making a success of this says to some mediation board, "If you grant that wage request, you throw my program out of alinement, and I will have to increase the ceiling," some attention should be paid to that. Where is your control in this bill otherwise? Would you not in the absence of some restriction upon labor in voting for this bill as a price-control bill mislead the public? We have told them that the situation is serious.

We have told them we ought to deal with it. We have told them that in addition to inflation hurting the farmers there is a great middle class—oh, more than the widows and orphans. You have all your school teachers, all your salaried employees, and they will be crushed between the upper and the nether millstones with these increasing prices, while their salaries will not go up.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. As a matter of fact, the gentleman's amendment does clothe the Administrator with the power to negative any agreement that has been arrived at through the orderly processes of collective bargaining, or mediation, or arbitration.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I do not construe it so. It affects no existing wage scale. It states that when a future demand comes that is under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency, the Administrator, if he feels so inclined, can say it is inflationary. I have had some criticism from those who say to me, "Do you think Mr. Henderson is going to say any wage increase will be inflationary? He will not do anything under this." I say we have to trust somebody. I will trust Mr. Henderson to do what is right under this provision. It is very mild, and I will trust Mr. Henderson, when he finds that a wage demand is unreasonable and unconscionable and will cause inflation and a disruption of his previous price ceilings, to say to the Mediation Board, "Gentlemen, you must not go that far. You must not do it."

Mr. HEALEY. But the gentleman does give him the veto power over the findings that have been made by the Mediation Board.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. No. For one thing, we have 16 wage demands in negotiation now. If they are not settled before this law becomes effective, the Administrator could find out from them what they are planning to do, and how much wages they are demanding, and he could indicate to them whether or not it will be inflationary. Now, do you want it inflationary or do you not?

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am quite sure, in connection with the question the gentleman from Massachusetts propounded and in answering which the gentleman from Virginia indicated a control on the part of the Administrator to accept or reject, that that ability certainly carries with it the power of veto if this language is incorporated in the act. Let me point out, with the indulgence of the gentleman from Virginia, that such wage increase is obtained only after a very exhaustive study and approach has been made in connection with any wage negotiation. I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia is willing that such matters rest alone within the veto power, with whomever may be the Administrator.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I think the gentleman means, would it rest with the Mediation Board?

Mr. McKEOUGH. No; it would rest alone with the Administrator under the language of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I would not leave it with the Mediation Board alone, for the simple reason that they have agreed to every wage increase sought in the last 12 months.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Maybe they should have agreed to more.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. But they did not have this price situation to face, and we now have it to face.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The gentleman from Virginia realizes that this imposed rigid requirement, if it is enacted into law, will go into effect prior to the time that a proposed 15-percent pay-roll deduction is made as recently proposed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let me ask the gentleman, if he is not willing to trust Mr. Hendereson, does he believe our farmers ought to trust him?

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am perfectly willing to trust Mr. Henderson, but not to the degree that he has a veto power over every other agency of the Federal Government having to do with wages.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not call this a veto power over any other agency, but if this thing did not have any teeth in it I would not be here offering it. It does very little, but it does something. I believe we have reached the crossing of the roads, where we must have a showdown on whether this Congress is willing to do anything which affects labor or whether it is not. That is the real gist of this situation.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman agree with me that when he gives the Administrator the power to increase wages or pass on increases of wages, he also gives the Administrator the power to control the votes of 30,000,000 laborers?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There is more power in this bill given to the administrator over every other group in the Nation than over labor. I concede the right of others to lead for labor. I want to be fair to labor. I mean that. I think those leading for labor should be fair to the businessmen and to the farmers affected if we are to have a bill. I tell you that it is important to have a bill. and I am giving it to you as my fear that if it does not touch all the elements involved it will be an excuse for a good many to vote to recommit this bill, and we will not have any bill. And the best service anyone could render to labor today is to help frame a bill that will preserve the present purchasing power of present wages.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes, in order to answer questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I merely desire to say, by reason of the kindness of the gentleman from Virginia in yielding to me, that when he propounded the general question as to whether or not the Congress was willing to enact any labor legislation with a view to controlling costs as they reflect themselves out of wage increases, I, for one in the Congress, want to go on record to that general question by saying to the gentleman from Virginia that I am opposed to any legislation by the Congress of my country that in any way violates the fundamental, moral, natural, inherent right of those who toil to obtain for themselves by peaceful means, mediation, conciliation, or negotiation an increase in wages that they must get to pay any added cost of living.

May I point out further to the gentleman from Virginia in connection with the proposal that he listened to in the Committee on Ways and Means, offered

by the Treasury Department, to consider a 15-percent pay-roll deduction as a further tax on those who toil, that I am against it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does my friend favor any legislation on price control?

Mr. McKEOUGH. Yes; I favor it, and I say you can succeed to a great degree without in any way violating the rights of those who toil to seek further betterment in the way of wage increases.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of course, the gentleman is entitled to his view, but I think a sounder position is that in view of the fact that Henderson said there would have to be some action on wage increases and that labor represented from 30 to 60 percent of the cost of the manufactured article, he cannot be expected to do a good job if no limitation be put upon action with respect to wages.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. The gentleman said that the farmer was being put under this bill and that labor was not and that he felt that all groups ought to be put under the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. SACKS. May I point out to the gentleman that under this bill the Congress has not left it to the Administrator to set the value of the farmer's work, but has practically put an inflationary ceiling on farm products, and the way the bill is drawn the farmer cannot be controlled by the Administrator, but the farmer gets a preferential right under this bill granted by the Congress itself.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If you take what is called parity based upon what happened during a certain period with respect to farm prices, the present wages are more above wage parity than the present farm prices are above farm parity, and this amendment does not touch any existing wage schedule. It does not prohibit any inequalities from being wiped out, it does not prohibit any of the advances from being made if reasonable and necessary and not in themselves inflationary. It is as mild an approach as you could possibly get, if you want any approach at all, and if I do not follow my distinguished friend from Chicago who does not want any legislation on wages, he and I will be just as good friends after this is over as we were when it started, but it is simply my view that it will improve this bill if these mild amendments with respect to wages are included.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I read the gentleman's amendment, if the Administrator thinks a wage increase has been inflationary, he shall not take that into consideration in granting an increase in the ceiling. What is that going to do to the businessman who, rightfully or wrongfully, has been subjected to that sort of a wage increase?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is not written into this amendment. The gentleman may have construed it in that way, but that is not what the amendment states. The amendment says that when the Mediation Board is confronted with a wage demand, if the Administrator certified to the Board that the granting of that wage demand will be inflationary and upset all prices, they must not grant that wage demand. That is all that this amendment says.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. Under this bill the prices of farm commodities are based on the parity of 1910–14.

Mr. SACKS. No; 1919–29.

Mr. TERRY. There are three tests, and one of them is the parity of 1910–14.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not so harmless as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] indicated it was. The effect of this amendment will be to freeze wages throughout the length and breadth of this country in every industry, those employing 1 man, those employing 20,000 men, regardless of the kind of business in which they are engaged.

The gentleman from Virginia stated that the Administrator would only have a veto power, but if you will carefully read this amendment you will discover that the Administrator of Price Control would first have to act and O. K. or approve the wage increase or no employer could safely grant it. If you will notice the language—

In order to prevent inflationary wage increases that will interfere with or prevent the effectuation of the purposes of this act, no agency or official of the United States shall approve or recommend any wage increase.

That is the Mediation Board, that is some other organization, and that is a direction to them that they must get the approval of the Price Administrator or it will be unlawful for them to recommend any wage increase. Suppose that Board were to take the attitude that they know a particular increase is justified; there can be no question about it, they do not believe it is inflationary and therefore they grant it to the workers, and the workers then at the end of the week or 2 weeks or a month, when they get their pay, they will fail to receive a check sufficient to take care of that increase, because the next line says—

and no allowance shall be made for any wage increase which the administrator determines to be inflationary.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment, if you please.

So the employer would say, "Now, I would like to pay you men, but I cannot pay you; I cannot make you any allowance, because the Administrator has not said that this is not inflationary, and we must first get his word." Every request for an increase on the part of everyone will have to be submitted to the Administrator and we must get his approval first. Then he has to determine whether or not it is inflationary, and next to determine whether or not it will increase the ceiling on any price that has been fixed by the Administrator. Then, if the ceiling will have to be increased, two other investigations will have to be made. One will be to determine whether or not the workers are receiving a fair wage, and next, whether or not the industry has a subnormal wage rate. There will be at least four investigations to be made for every single request for a wage increase among the 46,000,000 workers in the United States of America, and if we give the price-control Administrator the help that he will need, 2,000 or 3,000 or 5,000 or even 10,000, they will not be sufficient to carry out the purposes of the gentleman's amendment. It will increase the Board 5 to 10 times. You remember we voted on a question of wages here the other day, but it involved only employing 8 people or less. This includes the 46,000,000 workers in the United States. I do not want to say that the time will never come when I will vote to place wages in a price-control bill. Possibly I will. I shall not close the door behind me, but I believe it should be in a separate agency. I do not believe that the same agency that deals in cold inanimate objects as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] said the other day, should also deal with the pulsating human being, whose all is the labor that they produce.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I ask the gentleman to wait until I finish my statement. Then I shall yield. I ask the gentleman to refresh his memory, if he has read the hearings, and he will be bound to see that no country in all the world, not Canada, not England, not even Germany, a dictator country, nor Russia has ever attempted to put wages and prices in the same administration. We will be breaking a world-wide record. Furthermore, I regret that the time has come when representatives of the farmers are taking issue with the working people of this country. People should recognize that the long steps taken by agriculture, which have been taken and taken principally in this Congress, have been accomplished with the help and assistance of the wage earners of the country. They have cooperated together. The people from Chicago and Boston and New York and Detroit and Cleveland and Pittsburgh and all those places have cooperated with the farm representatives, and they have gone further and accomplished more than ever before in the history of this Nation, because we have been working together. Now this amendment is an attempt not only to bog down—that I do not say that it is a deliberate attempt, but the effect of it will be to bog down enforcement of this act, and drive a wedge between two friendly groups in this country who have worked

together in mutual and common interest and have accomplished so much for each other. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not so interpret this amendment. I do not offer an amendment that looks one way and kicks the other.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am referring to what the gentleman said. The amendment reads:

No agency or official shall recommend or approve—

Then you say that the next language means that nobody can pay.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. My construction of that is——

Mr. PATMAN. Now the gentleman is making a speech and not asking a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am explaining——

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want the gentleman to explain, because he has already explained in his own time, and I am explaining now in my time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. But the language is not what the gentleman says it is. It applies only to Government agencies.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; let us see. You say that no agency or official of the United States shall approve or recommend any wage increase which the Administrator determines to be inflationary. That is one.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Drive down a peg there.

Nor shall any allowance be made for any wage increase which the Administrator determines to be inflationary.

In other words, you have two things there. The first is that an agency of the Government shall not recommend it; and if they recommend it, anyway, then no allowance shall be made for it unless the Administrator has approved it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If they recommend it, then you control it by the man saying that he cannot pay.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what I say. You have four investigations to be made on every person among 46,000,000 wage earners of this country who want to justify a wage increase.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment further provides, in trying to defend the word "inflationary" with reference to wages, that any increase shall be presumed to be inflationary.

Mr. PATMAN. As pointed out by the majority leader, the amendment is fatally defective. There is an example. The majority leader of this House does not have a farmer in his district——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The majority leader does not have a farmer in his district. I doubt if he has a farmer within 25 miles of his district. He has worked with the farm group in this House. He has gone along with us and we have all worked together in the interest of the laboring man and the farmer, and we have accomplished more than has ever been accomplished before in the history of this country. I hope it is not disturbed now. So we should overwhelmingly vote down this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to tangle with my very good friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], but when he tries to tell me that because Russia and Germany have never done certain things as an inducement for me to do certain things he has made no argument which convinces me with respect to what I think I ought to do in this democracy.

Addressing an aggregation of sensible men, I ask you after the bill is amended to suit the committee—if and when—why should not the committee have brought it in right in the first place? That they did not do it is a complete and perfect answer. This is no time for partisan politics, no time for political expediency, no time for opportunism, no time for trying to drive an un-American policy through this Congress. I am against this wholesale, unconditional, ill-considered adoption of every amendment which is offered.

There may be grounds for a difference of opinion as to whether or not we should kill this price-control bill after all amendments to perfect it have been made, but there can be no question in the minds of a majority of this House who know what they are talking about, that we should recommit it, for the committee itself has evidenced that it did not know what it was talking about.

With all due respect to Mr. Henderson and Mr. Baruch, and all the economists who admittedly know so much more than I do or can ever hope to know, I take this opportunity to say that without a ceiling on salaries and wages every increase in the rate of employee compensation necessitates a percentage increase in the cost of goods made or services rendered.

The Government cannot freeze prices without freezing wages. The fact is so obviously axiomatic as to require no demonstration.

I realize full well that in this surcharged something-or-nothing atmosphere it is a waste of time for me to talk, for we will either recommit the bill, which we should do, or pass it, which we should not do, for in the latter event it will be consigned to the refrigerator. When served up again as a cold dish, the chemical changes superinduced by its treatment will make it almost unrecognizable.

What I do not understand—and I was never more serious in my life than now—what I do not understand is why 435 men, supposed to intelligently represent their constituencies, should be subject to an inferiority complex, be willing to submit to being submerged by another, under the rules, unmentionable branch of this Congress, and render themselves ineffective and useless as legislators, as those who do not know their own minds. That is why unicameral legislative bodies ineffectively operate. If we right here, 435 of us, do not have the intestinal fortitude, right in this House, and have not the brains to legislate for this country, then we, as Members of the House, should, of course, hibernate—should abdicate, should adjourn—confessing our incapacity and acknowledge that our form of government is a failure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. This I do not propose to admit, whether Mr. Pegler thinks we ought to or not. This is the Congress of the United States. This is the House of Representatives, a constitutional body of which Mr. Pegler, a columnist, without responsibility for legislation, is, or is not, unfortunately, a Member, whether I agree with him in whole or in part in his unmerciful castigation, deserved or undeserved, of this House of Representatives, of which I am proud to be a Member.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few observations on the pending amendment. When my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for whom I have a profound feeling of respect and friendship, having served on the Ways and Means Committee with him for several years, said that this is a mild amendment, I naturally accepted his statement as being correct. I know he would not make that statement unless he personally entertained it. My curiosity prompted me to read the amendment.

I am frank in saying that I am constrained to differ radically with the interpretation of my friend from Virginia of his amendment. In my opinion, it is one of the most drastic amendments that could be offered on this particular subject. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has explained fully the difficulties in connection with the amendment.

For all practical purposes, if this amendment were adopted, it would mean the freezing of the salaries of all the employees of America. It would also mean the suspension of all labor legislation. The right of collective bargaining for all practical purposes, while not specifically suspended in the amendment, would actually be suspended if this amendment were adopted. Under the guise of being aimed at inflationary increases, or increases that will bring about inflation, it brings about a freezing condition; and I am sure even the most rabid critic of organized labor and unorganized labor would hesitate to go that far.

I am rather disturbed about some of the speeches made on the floor today and made last Wednesday. I do hope they will be toned down a little. I am very much disturbed about these inciting messages. They may be made for home consumption, but if their suggestions were

carried into successful operation, they might work against the interests of two great groups of American citizens, the farmers of the country, and the workers of the country. During my years of service here there has been close cooperation in this body between the Members who represent farming districts and those who represent industrial districts. I deplore vigorously the emotional appeals being made by some to passion. We do not want to have the harmonious relationship that has existed for so many years disturbed. So far as I am concerned, there is nothing anyone could say that would disturb my state of mind. I refuse to permit any future vote of mine to be influenced by way of reaction as a consequence of any speeches made here today or that may be made by a few who represent agricultural districts thinking they are making temporary advantages for themselves from a political angle, from the angle of votes, when as a matter of fact they are sending forth a message which, if followed, would be disastrous to the interests they represent, the farmers.

We are going to have up within a few days a very important bill that concerns the farmers of this country, a bill extending the soil-conservation program which expires January 1. That bill may be fought by some, but when that bill comes up, and I am going to permit it to be called up as soon as possible, and if there is a close vote I will speak for its passage, but I am going to vote for its passage, and I know others from industrial areas who feel the same way I do about it. I hope the situation that develops here may not produce a reaction that would result in some people feeling they would have to vote against this bill, and I hope such speeches will not be made this afternoon.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the question of parity came up in the House on an amendment put on a bill in the Senate, it carried by a vote of 183 to 176, a very narrow margin. It carried because the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], another gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Chicago, and a couple from other northern cities voted for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I made a speech for that bill.

Mr. PATMAN. And the gentleman himself made a speech for the bill. If it had not been for what the gentleman did, the parity provision would have been stricken out.

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is unworkable. It is a very drastic amendment. We are going to have labor legislation next week. I share the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas that in a price-control bill relating to property there should not be included control of human beings.

We naturally are concerned about strikes and their control. If the legislation we pass next week does not meet the situation Congress can legislate again. We are going to have labor legislation.

I think the pending amendment is unnecessary, that it is unreasonably drastic, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. We are quite willing to take a spanking from our friend the gentleman from Vermont as long as he is so proud to be one of us and includes himself.

The committee did consider this labor legislation and heard testimony for many days. It has been already thoroughly explained to this House why we did not include it in this bill. It would be useless to send the bill back to the committee for the purpose of having it included, because I think the committee are determined that wage legislation should be controlled by some other agency. It was carefully considered, however.

What I particularly want to say at the moment is, I rejoice in the spirit of liberality and the willingness to retreat shown by the majority members of the committee here today. We should now have hopes that we may write a price-control bill. I wish to sound a warning to some of the Members who rather hostilely seem to have taken too definite a position. I quote James Russell Lowell:

A ginooine statesman should be on his guard,
Ef he must hev belief, not to b'lieve 'em tu hard.

Let us keep our minds open until we learn the full measure of willingness to meet our objections to the controversial portions of the amendment to be considered. It is rather vital that we have some price control.

I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency inasmuch as he seems willing to yield so much. I now feel confident that the Committee, by a good majority, will refuse to accept the licensing amendment. We can then vote for this bill, unless the proposed Board amendment is made to appear too mischievous.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, are not the income and wages of labor reachable by taxation just like the income of anybody else?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, you can kill off anybody with taxation.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOM. Is it in order to ask unanimous consent to have the pending amendment reread?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order by unanimous consent.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Robertson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia) there were—ayes 53, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 7, after line 11, insert a new subsection (i):

"When rents have been established as is herein provided, the same shall be adjusted upward or downward upon the application of the owner or the tenant so as to produce a gross rental which after payment of taxes and other costs of ownership, management, and operation, including depreciation and an allowance for vacancy, will provide a net return which is reasonable upon the value of the property."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like particularly the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. On last Friday we completed action on a rent-control bill for the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. For a time that bill was held up because of objections of the gentleman from Texas. It finally was agreed upon in conference with an amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Texas, providing that where there was a grievance of some kind about the rent and it appeared that the rent was unreasonable, either the owner of the property or the tenant, either one, could make application for review so that a reasonable and fair rental would be determined.

In the present bill there is a yardstick, of course; but, obviously, when a ceiling has been imposed on rentals, somebody is going to get hurt. There are some properties, no doubt, on which a reasonable and fair net return will not accrue. That is all this amendment does. After the ceiling has been imposed, if there is an owner of a property who is not getting a fair return, he can make application and ask for review. If there is a tenant who believes that the rent is still too high and in disproportion to the value of the property, he may also open up the case and get it reviewed, so that a fair net return will be offered. There is nothing prolix about it. The language is not involved. I think it ought to appeal to and persuade itself to the attention of the members of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What does the gentleman think a fair return is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter to be determined by all the factors involved—depreciation, obsolescence, taxes, investment, and every other factor. When a broad ceiling has been imposed, there will be some below the line and some above the line. You have to iron out those inequities, because you cannot say to the owner of the property, "Well, this is a broad ceiling; if you are standing a loss on the property, you will have to take it for the duration of the emergency." On the other hand, a tenant might say, "You have imposed a ceiling, but it is still too high for the property I occupy." We should give a fair net return.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman put it in terms of percentage of the amount of money invested in the property?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reasonable return may be many things. We have an Interstate Commerce Commission that allows a reasonable return on railroad property. We have a Federal Power Commission that allows a reasonable return on gas rates in interstate commerce. Every State in the Union has a utilities commisison to permit a fair return on the investment value of the property. I do not care whether they take 5, 6, or 7 or 4 percent. At least let it be a reasonable return interpreted in the light of what constitutes a reasonable return at this particular time. A few years ago it may have been 6 percent. Maybe 4 persent is a reasonable return now. I am not quarreling about that, but there ought to be some fair net return on the property.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In 6 out of 10 of the cases in the States there is an appeal from the decisions of those boards to some court.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly right. This merely allows the owner or tenant to make that appeal and get action upon the matter if the ceiling is not fair.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

I am really amazed at the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offering this amendment, which I understand is the type of amendment that he opposed in the District Committee of this House on the rent-control bill for the District of Columbia. The statement was made, "We do not want any cost accounting. We do not want to have to go into all these factors. It will be top-heavy with administration."

If I view this amendment correctly, it would do exactly what the gentleman opposed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my friend the gentleman from Texas that we had about 30 minutes on that amendment in the first instance. After due reflection, I think the gentleman from Texas was right in the first instance.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman's amendment goes much further than the amendment I got through on the District bill. The gentleman's amendment will include every factor. The amendment I suggested and which the Senate adopted stated that—

> Any tenant may petition the Administrator to adjust the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations on the ground that such maximum-rent ceiling permits the receipt of an unduly high rent; whereupon the Administrator may by order adjust such maximum-rent ceiling in such manner or amount as shall, in his judgment, effectuate the purposes of this act and provide a fair and reasonable rent for such housing accommodations.

There is no cost accounting, no detailed information involved; there is nothing like that. It is a question of the fair rent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I had it to do over again, I believe I would accept the language of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will do that, I will accept it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We cannot amend it, but I think it will do the same thing we are doing for the District of Columbia.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to change his amendment? I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the language in the amendment just read by the gentleman from Texas for the language I have submitted in my amendment, if the gentleman from Texas will agree.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree to it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 7, after line 11, insert a new subsection, as follows:
>
> "(j) Any tenant may petition the Administrator to adjust the maximum-rent ceiling applicable to his housing accommodations on the ground that such maximum-rent ceiling permits the receipt of an unduly high rent; whereupon the Administrator may by order adjust such maximum-rent ceiling in such manner or amount as shall, in his judgment, effectuate the purposes of this act and provide a fair and reasonable rent for such housing accommodations."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 56, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, according to the information I get, an erroneous impression is going out over the country as to how this bill affects agricultural commodities. It seems that the people generally think we are giving to the farmers parity prices. This is not the case; we are fixing a ceiling, but no bottom is fixed, and it is the bottom that ought to be fixed for agricultural commodities, namely, a price that would not be lower than parity prices.

For instance, we find wheat today below parity, corn below parity, oats below parity, and barley below parity, as well as flaxseed, rice, cotton, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, peanuts, apples, butterfat, live chickens and live turkeys, eggs, hogs, and hay.

Generally speaking, unfortunately, the press has contended that the high cost of living is due to the high cost of farm products. As a matter of fact, the price of farm products is lower than the price of any of the other things people buy that make up their living. Consequently, we have no such thing as inflation with the farmers.

I am not at all alarmed about this inflation except as it applies to certain things over which the farmer has no control. The prices of commodities that are being inflated are the things that the farmers have to buy and that the consumers have to buy other than farm products after these products get into the hands of processors, wholesalers, and retailers.

I have a very interesting letter here from a constituent of mine in Montana. It reads as follows:

> My brother-in-law visited here from Los Angeles in late August. A neighbor of ours had sold his yearling steers for 9 cents per pound. He was talking about that being a pretty fair price. My brother-in-law spoke up and said, "Oh, boy; I wish we could get meat at that price." Beefsteak in Los Angeles is selling for 52 cents a pound, and it is selling for about the same everywhere else.
>
> There is the situation in a nutshell. The farmers who raise feeds and deliver the beef to market get 9 cents per pound and glad to get that. Those who handle it after it leaves the farm get 43 cents per pound before it reaches the consumers' table. Take wheat: 73 cents per bushel in Montana, and flour $3.60 per hundred. There is something radically wrong somewhere. If Congress wants to keep down the cost of living, let them lay the blame where it belongs—not on the farmers but rather on the carriers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers. Let them set the price on them and leave the farmer alone. He has been the goat long enough. The fruit growers in California get 5 cents per dozen for the same oranges that we pay 35 cents a dozen for in the retail stores in Montana.

This letter is signed by a very intelligent lady, Mrs. Nels Amundson, Ismay, Mont.

As a matter of fact, the beef grower today is selling his beef for the first time for years at a price that nets him an amount sufficient to pay his taxes and to pay something on the principal he owes and on the back interest he has not been able to pay. The same is true of the wool grower. Within the last few years I have seen good beef sell over the scales in Montana for 2 and 3 cents per pound, and during the same time I have seen sheep sell for 75 cents a head and wool at 9 cents per pound. The cattlemen and sheepmen took a terrible licking during those years, and it is just within the last 3 or 4 years that they have been getting a decent price for their beef, lambs, and wool. Now the formula constituting parity now used by the Agricultural Department would take 2 cents off on beef as the stock growers sell it. The formula used is wrong in that it does not take into account the cost of the animal or the feeder that is being fed nor the high cost of raising such an animal as the price of labor has increased, likewise taxes and all operating expenses have gone up. Consequently, if we pass this bill as is, it would wreck the cattle-feeding industry.

As a matter of fact, beef today is much lower than it was on January 1, 1941. At the same time, your meat markets and your restaurants everywhere are raising the price of what they sell and serve you on the basis of the fact that beef has gone up, when the contrary is true.

The farmer is still the goat. This bill ought to be recommitted and write a

bottom on farm prices that would guarantee cost of production and a little profit, which would adversely affect the consumer but very little. If farm prices go above parity, which they are not now, it will be plenty of time to deal with that subject.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think section 3 should remain in this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As far as inflationary prices in farm products are concerned, we have a 2-year supply of wheat on hand, we have a 2-year supply of cotton, we have the largest beef and pork supply in the history of the country, and we have an abundance of everything. Inflationary prices are brought about by scarcity, and, certainly, with a new crop coming on, there will be no scarcity.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is no possibility of inflation with the farmers under the present conditions, and I cannot see where this bill will help the farmers. It would give somebody the power to place a ceiling on what he raises and sells, but what the farmer ought to have is a bottom placed on what he raises and sells. It would give to him parity prices for his commodities. I am strongly in favor of a bill fixing prices on metals, and so forth, that go into carrying out our defense program. I am in favor of fixing prices on manufactured articles and wholesale prices as well as retail prices when they get out of line. I also favor fixing prices on imports into this country. Now, when parity prices for farm products have been reached, if they ever are, that subject can be dealt with at such time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr SAUTHOFF: Page 7, line 7, after the word "Act", strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following: "no ceiling shall be established less the cost of production of such commodity, cost of production to include a reasonable profit."

Mr STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment provides is that the Administrator shall not be empowered to fix a ceiling lower than the cost of production, that is all. This certainly is fair, because in granting such vast powers to one man, we do not want him to have the power to completely wreck a business by fixing a ceiling lower than the cost of production I trust the Committee will accept this amendment, because it seems to me the amendment is absolutely fair, and there is no provision in the bill that grants this particular cost-of-production figure to industry, agriculture, and labor, and we ought to have it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The Committee did accept, a moment ago, a cost-of-production amendment as to fisheries, did it not?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; so why not have it for everything else? That is only fair.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to see the gentleman modify his amendment so that the farmers would get cost of production, plus a fair profit.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is already in the amendment.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. But cost of production is so hard to estimate and cannot you provide for parity, which is ascertainable by the department, while cost of production varies?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I realize that, but manufacturing costs must also be considered and therefore inasmuch as manufacturing costs constantly vary, the amendment provides that all the costs shall go in plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The question I have been asking here is why the necessity of fixing a ceiling on farm prices and at the same time paying a billion dollars a year in farm subsidies.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is correct, and I may add that farm prices have not even reached parity yet.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I have sent to the Clerk's desk an amendment to go into section 3 to add an additional formula. In section 3 we have three formulas under which they fix a ceiling on farm prices and I have added a fourth formula providing for cost of production plus a fair profit. I would like to support the gentleman's amendment and I hope when we come to section 3 the gentleman will support mine.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman think it is as easy to figure cost production as it is to figure parity, because I have not found anybody yet who really knows what parity is?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. We have been roaming in the wilds and labyrinths of parity for many years, but have not reached a definite understanding of that matter yet.

Mr. JOHNS. Does the gentleman think there is any danger of inflation with the farmers when in the first 6 months of 1941 we exported only $242,793,000 worth of agricultural products, while at the same time in the same year we imported $965,668,000 worth of agricultural products, and of that amount $443,000 were competitive products, which could be raised in this country?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not think there is any danger of that. We have heard considerable about farm prices. We have also read editorials on farm prices, and some of the metropolitan newspapers have been conducting a rather vigorous campaign against farm prices and the farm bloc. Let us see who is making the money and getting the fat salaries, and how many farmers you find among them:

Gary Cooper, movie actor	$482,820
Thomas J. Watson, International Business Machines	442,560
George W. Hill, American Tobacco Co	420,299
F. A. Countway, Lever Bros. (soap)	383,210
William S. Knudsen, General Motors	372,366
James Cagney, movie actor	368,333
John Ford, Twentieth Century-Fox	320,000
A. A. Somerville, R. T. Vanderbilt, Inc	278,486
Edward C. Stone, United States branch of Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Ltd	272,336
E. G. Grace, Bethlehem Steel	271,224
Edward G. Robinson, movie actor	255,000
Bing Crosby, movie actor	250,000
Sonja Henie, movie actress	249,500
Fred McMurray, movie actor	240,333
Ginger Rogers, movie actress	219,500
Errol Flynn, movie actor	213,333
Carole Lombard, movie actress	211,111
Picture executives:	
H. B. Wallis, Warner Bros	265,000
Darryl F. Zanuck, Twentieth Century-Fox	255,000
General Motors:	
Charles F. Kettering	250,506
Albert Bradley	236,684
Charles E. Wilson	236,584
Marvin E. Coyle	230,684
Donaldson Brown	217,908
Alfred P. Sloan, Jr	200,450
Broadcasting companies:	
William M. Paley, of Columbia	204,270
David Sarnoff, Radio Corporation	100,240
Vincent Riggio, American Tobacco Co	230,179
Paul Hahn, American Tobacco Co	230,179
Charles F. Vincent, American Tobacco Co	230,179
C. S. Woolman, Hales & Hunter Co	222,929
W. B. Bell, American Cyanid Co	215,514
W. S. Gifford, American Telephone & Telegraph	209,550
W. P. Chrysler, Chrysler Corporation	200,000
R. T. Vanderbilt, R. T. Vanderbilt Co	200,000
Floyd B. Odlum, Atlas Corporation	200,000
Sir Douglas Alexander, Singer Manufacturing Co	200,000
H. F. Sinclair, Consolidated Oil Corporation	200,290

There are a number of others receiving salaries under $200,000 a year whom I have not mentioned. I felt the list was too long to put in these brief remarks. But one fact sticks out very plainly—you can search this list and scrutinize it with a magnifying glass and you will not be able to find an entry to this effect: Eli Perkins, farmer, $400,000, or $200,000, or $100,000, or $50,000. No; you will not find any farmers listed here with a large income; yet we have had editorials in the Washington papers again and again about holding down farm prices.

Let us see what the newspapermen are getting:

Joseph Pulitzer, Pulitzer Publishing Co. of St. Louis	$196,753
W. E. MacFarlane, of the Chicago Tribune	111,419
L. H. Rose, of the Chicago Tribune	100,000
R. C. Holliss, of the News Syndicate	110,205
F. M. Flynn	110,205
M. Annenberg	110,205
William Randolph Hearst	100,000
Victor H. Hansen, Birmingham News	95,400
Kenneth W. Payne, of Reader's Digest	99,500

In this list, published on August 1, 1941, there are 64 names listed, all receiving salaries greater than that of the President of the United States, and yet the President of the United States is carrying a tremendous load, as everyone must realize. He is carrying, in all probability, the fourth heaviest load in the world today. There are only 3 men, in my judgment, who have greater worries and problems than he has—Churchill, Hitler, and Stalin. In my judgment, during the time of national emergency, these salaries are indefensible. If I were going to put a ceiling on the earnings of labor I would start with the proviso in this bill that no one could receive a salary, including commissions, bonuses, and so forth, in excess of the President of the United States, and I would safeguard that by not permitting the earning of someone else in the family, or a split contract by which he could get $75,000 from one company and $75,000 from another, and so on.

Let us have no more editorials from newspaper executives drawing $100,000 a year about the high prices for farm products. The farmer has not had an even break for over a generation, and even today, when his prices have risen and somewhat improved his condition, his position is still below parity in regard to most of the outstanding agricultural products. I trust that this amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama withdraw his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 59, noes 71.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. SAUTHOFF and Mr. PATMAN were appointed tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported ayes 70, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 3. (a) No ceiling shall be established for any agricultural commodity below (1) the market price equivalent to 110 percent of the parity price or comparable price for such commodity, adjusted for grade, location, and seasonal differentials, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture; nor (2) the market price prevailing for such commodity on October 1, 1941; nor (3) the average price for such commodity during the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929.

(b) For the purposes of this act, parity prices shall be determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture as authorized by law: *Provided*, That in the case of any agricultural commodity other than the basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco—the Secretary shall determine and publish a comparable price, whenever he finds, after investigation and public hearing, that the production and consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities.

(c) Any ceiling established on any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity shall be consistent with the purposes set forth in subsection (a) herein and shall not be established in any manner as to circumvent, vitiate, or prevent the effectuation of such purposes.

(d) No provision of this act or of any existing law shall be construed to authorize any action contrary to the provisions and purposes of this section.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: Page 7, line 19, after the figures "1941", strike out "nor (3) the average price for such commodity during the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929."

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to strike out of this section that amendment which was adopted in committee known as the Brown amendment. I dislike to offer this amendment, because I have great affection for my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], but I cannot see how this amendment in a bill that is supposed to curb inflation can possibly be justified. Today we know that a majority of agricultural commodities are below parity. We had and still have in this bill before the Brown amendment was adopted a provision which prevented the administrator from setting a ceiling below 110 percent of parity. Therefore, we said to the American people that we would allow at least 10 percent inflation. The Brown amendment goes beyond that and selects the most inflationary period in American history, between 1919 and 1929, that period when we had that crazy era leading up to the collapse of the stock market. So actually with the Brown amendment, we say to the American wage earner, in whose budget food is the greatest item, "We are going to allow farm prices to go up to an inflationary period such as we had between 1919 and 1929, and then when the prices are inflationary, we will give the Administrator the right to curb them." I cannot see how we can justify this Brown amendment. The other provisions might be justified on the ground that 110 percent of parity is actually a softer blow to the wage earners than 120 percent of parity, which would be permitted under the Brown amendment.

Mr. PACE. I cannot understand the gentleman's statement to that effect, when the 110 percent on parity would be $1.34 a bushel, and under the Brown amendment it would be only $1.32.

Mr. BARRY. I went over the list that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] had, and some items would be less, but the main items would be greater, and probably approach about 120 percent of parity, based on a period which is the highest inflationary period in the history of our country.

Mr. PACE. I wish the gentleman would recheck the list.

Mr. BARRY. I rechecked it recently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. BARRY] made two or three speeches here trying to keep labor out of this bill, and now he wants to include in the bill the farmers who receive less than 9 percent of the national income. Certainly he ought to be fair enough to go along with us so as to fix at least a reasonable ceiling for farmers.

That was a year after the war—1919. 1929 is the year when we had the greatest deflation. Those 10 years represent a period of free farm economy and the only 10 years we should use. Prices in those years were not inflationary.

We have three provisos or formulas in the agricultural section of the bill. One is 110 percent of parity; another the prevailing prices as of October 1, 1941; and the third, the Brown amendment, the average price during the period July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929. 110-percent parity is justified for this reason: Take cotton, for instance, as one commodity. There might be a few months where it would sell at 85 percent of parity. Then for the next few months you would have to sell at 115 percent of parity in order to attain parity the year around. Now, you fix October 1, 1941—prevailing prices. That represents many of the commodities selling around 130 or 140 or 150 percent of parity—beef cattle, for instance, and wool and oils, and many other things. Therefore, it is necessary to put the Brown amendment in in order to give equality to all agricultural producers.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Was not 1926 the year set by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as being the desirable year for all commodities and labor prices?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes; that is the average for the 10-year period of 1919 to 1929.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Is it not a fact that the general average of 110 percent of parity is higher than the prices in 1919–29?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The prevailing price on October 1, 1941, is a higher price for more commodities than any one exception we have. Unless the Brown amendment is adopted, it simply means that prices of many of the commodities will be much lower than the prevailing prices of October 1, 1941, and lower than 110 percent of parity on others. It does raise about three basic commodities to some extent. One of those is cotton. Another is potatoes, and the other is butterfat. There you are, two of the largest agricultural groups in the country, the producers of cotton and the producers of butterfat, will not be on an equality with other agricultural producers unless the Brown amendment is adopted.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do the farmers of the country, as a general rule, accept section 3 of this bill?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think they do, if agricultural commodities must remain in the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. You think it is necessary in this particular type of legislation to control the price of farm products while we are still paying a billion-dollar-a-year subsidy?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I will be fair with the gentleman. We have surpluses of wheat, of corn, and of cotton; but if a ceiling is to be placed on farm commodities, I want to see that the price is such that we can still retain the law of supply and demand. People are not going to stand for any rigid law. Unless you can give some room for the law of supply and demand to operate, the law will certainly be unfair and unsatisfactory. The Brown amendment is necessary in order to give equality to all these classes. I do not think you ought to have a rigid bill where the law of supply and demand will be destroyed entirely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that, according to the statistics of the Labor Department, wages have risen six and one-half times more than agricultural prices since the parity period 1910–14?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am informed that is correct. I have a list of commodity prices which was furnished by the Department of Agriculture. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] put it in the RECORD the other day. You will notice that only three of the main commodities are raised by the Brown amendment. The amount of the increase on a few other commodities is very small.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing unfair about this provision. In other words, to pass any price-fixing bill including agriculture without the Brown amendment in it would certainly do an injustice to a great many of the large agricultural producers of this country.

As far as exception No. 2 is concerned, you have several commodities that are more than 130 or 140 percent of parity. In all the bills that have been presented, and from everybody who has suggested anything about the control of prices, all agree that you cannot bring a commodity below the price it is today. When you do that you cannot get equality among agricultural groups unless you have it in the form we have here. You must have the Brown amendment in order to take the most recent 10 years of free farm economy in this country. After all, none of these formulas raises the commodity prices beyond 118½ percent.

I want to stress this fact: Not a single witness testified that the average prices of 1919 to 1929 were inflationary. Then if they are not inflationary, why not give room for supply and demand to operate as it always has done?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that during no year between 1920 and 1929 was the level of agricultural prices at parity? In other words, they were below parity during all of that time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not true that agricultural prices were below parity during all the period between 1920 and 1929?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No; that is not true.

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe the gentleman understood my question.

Mr. PACE. I think the gentleman means market price.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Market prices were below parity?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Market prices were below parity.

Mr. HOPE. During all those years I was speaking of except 1919?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is so.

Mr. HOPE. And is it not also true that that was the period during which Congress was considering many important measures to raise agricultural prices, such as the McNary-Haugen Act?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is true.

Mr. HOPE. That, of course, does not indicate there was any inflation in agricultural prices.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is true; and not a single witness said this price would be inflationary. If prices do not involve inflation, why should we destroy the law of supply and demand? I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anybody could vote for the amendment presented by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman think there is no danger of the Administrator appointed under this bill setting a ceiling that is less than 10 percent above parity?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Under the bill, of course, he cannot set a ceiling below the average of 1919 to 1929.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, belong to the farm group of this House. In my district is grown one of the most important farm products raised in this country. I know the farmers' troubles, I know the conditions they face, and I believe I know what they expect and want from the Congress. They do not ask for this average price of 1919 to 1929. As a matter of fact, outstanding farm groups in the interest of the farmers are protesting inflationary prices for farm products, although I will state that a cotton exchange broker in New York City wrote me in opposition to the whole bill before us. He does not want any price control at all.

Under the bill as originally presented, 110 percent of parity was made a ceiling. How many farmers' Representatives in this House can at the moment claim that their farmers are today receiving 110 percent?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I have a statement to make, and I ask that I be permitted to continue. I will answer after I am through.

The farmers seek a fair return for their labor and product, and should have it. That is amply and generously provided in the first two provisions of this section, namely, the 110 percent of parity price and the establishment of a price level which obtained as of October 1, 1941. Beyond that, any incentive for further increase of agricultural prices paves the way for inflation. Farmers who prospered during the World War inflation period and the few years following suffered the effects of that inflation by a depression which thoroughly disorganized American agriculture to a degree which everyone, farmers and nonfarmers alike, painfully remember. Agricultural legislation enacted during the past 9 years was pointed at stabilizing American agriculture to the end that the suffering and disaster that visited the farmers during the depression years would not recur. Agriculture is more stabilized today than it ever has been in this country. If we permit prices to rise to the 1919–29 period in addition to the 110-percent parity ceiling and the October 1 level, whichever is higher, we will be creating a condition which will repeat the calamities suffered by the farmers during the depression. The high-price ceilings permitted in this particular provision are directly inflationary.

Today, now, we must be ever on guard lest a so-called defense prosperity get out of hand and bring in its tide when the emergency is over all the evils which afflicted the country during the depression years. That is the purpose for which we should be legislating. The country is looking to us to exercise courage and foresight in building today the protection against inflation.

Unless this amendment is adopted, we will create an immediate dangerous situation. The great majority of the families of the country have not benefited financially by defense activity. Millions of white-collar workers, millions of factory workers have seen no rise in their income. The cost of living has risen sharply. As of October 15 prices, the average working man's family cost for the foods ordinarily consumed in everyday eating was about $360 a year. For millions of families this amounts to a third of the family income. Under this 1919–1929 provision the cost of the most commonly used foodstuffs can rise to as high as $415 a year. This 11 percent additional rise can be borne by the higher-income families, and by the families who are getting a higher income because of defense jobs. But the majority of American

families, I repeat, have not been affected by the defense prosperity and for these a further rise in living costs is going to be a serious and a disastrous blow.

Defense production requires a nation morally, physically, and spiritually strong. All three, the morale, the physical health, and the faith of the rank and file of Americans in democracy will suffer a severe blow unless this Congress acts to protect them as this bill originally intended to protect them. On all sides we hear grumbling because families cannot buy the foods they need. They cannot afford important foods in sufficient amount for ordinary health.

We must send food abroad. That is part of our defense program. How can we justify to Americans that it is important to send food to the battling nations, if we permit prices to get so high that Americans themselves cannot purchase the foods they need?

As an example, a housewife told me that her Thanksgiving dinner in 1940, for seven people, in round figures cost her $9 The same dinner this year, in round figures, cost her $15, with the exception that the turkey was slightly smaller. I am wondering whether that family will have turkey next year if we permit the higher prices to prevail, which my amendment will prevent.

This bill, ladies and gentlemen, is intended as part of our defense structure. Its purpose is for the economic defense of the Nation and the moral defense of the people. Because of this, it is imperative that we do nothing that will further increase the cost of food and clothing.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some figures which the shortness of my time prevents my reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the figures compiled by the gentleman himself?

Mr. KOPPLEMAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that permission, without objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Let me call your attention to some figures. At wholesale there are the following differences between prices of some of the common farmers' commodities at 110-percent parity on the one hand and the 1919–29 prices on the other hand:

Butter, a 10-percent increase.
Cotton, a 13.8-percent increase.
Wool, a 22.66-percent increase.
Chickens, a 22.5-percent increase.
Oranges, a 31.6-percent increase.
Potatoes, a 17.9-percent increase.
Raw sugar, a 12.17-percent increase.

These are just a few of the common commodities that make up every-day living that are required by families, whether they be in the low-income class or the high-income class, whether there are defense workers in the family getting higher pay, or whether, as in most cases, there are no defense workers and the income has not increased over a year or two years ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I gave notice on Tuesday that I would weep as loudly for the farmers as any Member of the House, and that the Republicans would weep with me because we need the votes as badly as the Democrats. I have never yet, however, said I belonged to the farm bloc as the gentleman just did and then proceed to read myself out of that party. I made this weeping statement on Tuesday. I tried to say it in a sort of jocular manner. I finally said that "I trusted my conscience might come to my rescue." My conscience has indeed been wrestling with me over this so-called Brown of Georgia amendment.

One hundred and ten percent of parity would seem enough. This new feature demands the average price from 1919 to 1929 and we do not know what those prices may be. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia to tell me what the lowest price of cotton would be under his amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Every item is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman tell me what is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? I think he knows where cotton would go.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What is your question?

Mr. GIFFORD. What would be the price of cotton?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Twenty-one and six-tenths cents.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I may say that is 21 cents for the cotton and the labor too.

Mr. GIFFORD. I voted for this amendment in committee, because the information I had at hand was that it would not make any particular difference because those prices would be about the parity prices, and it would do no particular harm to let it go in. I now have been told that cotton would go up to more than 21 cents. This is quite a problem for us to consider. There would be certain farm products, not all, that under this third suggestion might rise higher than they ought to be allowed. I think highly of the gentleman from Georgia. We have served together on the committee for years. I could wish that he might win this amendment, because it would be a great personal victory, one of great importance to all cotton producers. It would hurt me to vote against this, although my amendment to protect fish failed to be favored. I said in the committee that it did not matter very much, because when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] took the floor to offer and advocate it there would be few votes against it. This morning my predictions came true. We did attempt to debate, or "chew," over the amendment. You swallowed the fish whole. I am almost in a frame of mind, considering the liberality of the House, to again stretch my conscience and vote for the Brown amendment. I confess I am swaying back and forth a little on this, which is a little bit unusual for me, you will agree. Seriously, we want the farmers' votes for the Republican Party, and I must not want to do anything here to alienate them.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. With 23,000,000 bales of cotton on hand, when we are producing more each year than we can consume and export, how many years does the gentleman think it will be before cotton would ever get up to 21 cents?

Mr. GIFFORD. You have so fixed it. You have done it well. Only a little of storage cotton is allowed to be placed on the market. Indeed, it is on hand, and I will add probably deteriorating, if not in proper storage. You receive a most satisfactory income from the storage of that cotton. The story about storage has been told before. Why should you wish to sell it? The storage business of your section is one of the most profitable businesses you probably have. The Government now owns it. It must, of course, not compete and lower prices.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that some of the cotton the Government owns we are selling to Canada at 3 cents a pound under the price charged American consumers.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is bringing up a question as what to do with cotton by this artificial means to make a falsity of the natural laws of supply and demand. I am still reserving freedom of action on this amendment, having spoken on both sides of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, may we not agree upon the time of debate? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Messrs. MURRAY, BUCK, and BARRY objected.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why does the gentleman object? He has had 10 minutes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I object on another ground. I may withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in not to exceed 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Alabama agree to an equal division of the time?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is left in the hands of the Chairman and you cannot take it out of his hands.

Mr. PATMAN. The Chairman will take the names of all who are standing and will divide the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Permit the Chair to inquire as to the gentlemen seeking recognition on the pending amendment. There is the gentleman from Oklahoma, the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Kansas, and the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUCK. And the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from California seeking recognition on the pending amendment?

Mr. BUCK. I will have to. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me to answer a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to but I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this agricultural provision of the bill, it is true, places a restriction upon the right of the Price Administrator to fix ceilings. We believe it is very, very reasonable. In other words, the committee says in this amendment, section 3, that the Price Administrator shall not fix the prices below 110 percent of parity, nor below the market price on October 1, 1941, nor below the average price between 1919 and 1929.

The Brown amendment is the one in issue here. It is claimed that it raises prices unduly. If you will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will discover that the Brown of Georgia amendment affects the 40 major agricultural products in a very small way. It affects wheat approximately 2 cents a bushel; it affects cotton 2.56 cents a pound, and that is all.

The reason for the Brown of Georgia amendment is to equalize some inequalities existing in these other floors. The gentleman from Connecticut a while ago supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to strike out the Brown of Georgia amendment. Why? Because he does not want the average between 1919 and 1929. In truth and in fact, the gentleman represents a tobacco district, one of the finest tobacco districts in all the world. Of all the Members of this House, the one who can support that amendment with the poorest grace is the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Since the gentleman has mentioned the gentleman from Connecticut, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield to the gentleman when I am through.

The tobacco parity base was just like cotton, wheat, and all the rest of them, 1909 to 1914. The tobacco growers came in here and said that that price was not high enough and they had the base changed to 1919–28, the same thing the gentleman is objecting to for cotton and wheat and everything else now.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. That is not so.

Mr. PATMAN. It will be shown that it is so. Then that was not high enough, so they came in and induced the Congress to raise it to the average price of 1934 to 1938. So he has been taken care of in more ways and more substantially as a representative of the tobacco growers than any other one Member of this House.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield as soon as I finish my general statement.

I hope the people who represent the wage earners, who have been working with the representatives of the farmers for years, will permit me to say and believe that this amendment is vital to many representatives of agricultural sections. It will not hurt the general welfare. If the price of cotton were raised, and that is the only item that amounts to anything, it would be raised only 2½ cents.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not just now.

That will increase the price of a $2 shirt only 1¼ cents, and that is all.

What does 21½ cents for cotton mean? It means that the man who goes out there in the sunshine and the rain and in the cold of winter, and who does the hardest kind of bending and stooping work that is done upon the farm, from daylight to dark, will receive the enormous sum of 21½ cents per hour for his labor. That is all it means. Representatives who have been the beneficiaries of acts that I and Representatives of other farm districts have helped to pass certainly should not try to deny us the privilege of having a law that would give our farmers this small, insignificant sum of 21½ cents per hour.

Remember, this Congress placed on the statute books the Bacon-Davis Act to help the wage earners of this country. Remember, this Congress, with farm votes, placed upon the statute books the Walsh-Healey Act to help wage earners. And remember that we placed upon the statute books the Fair Labor Standards Act, that guarantees 40 cents an hour, to help the wage earner. Will you now be a party to reducing our farmers below 21½ cents per hour for their labor?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I have some definite ideas about the bill itself, and may ask recognition later, but I also have some views about the Brown amendment which is before us at this moment.

This amendment does not raise the price of many farm commodities, as has been represented here.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman will yield, it does not raise the price of any commodity. It permits the price to go to a ceiling, but it does not raise the price.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The gentleman is right. It simply permits the ceiling on butterfat to rise about 4 cents a pound. It will permit the Administrator to raise the price of cotton somewhat, about 4 cents, perhaps a little less. I believe potatoes are affected, too, but hardly anything else. So when gentlemen stand on this floor to argue that it will be a great detriment to labor and will raise the cost of living, they are not speaking by the book, because it will do that only slightly to butter and to cotton.

Let us look at the case of butter. Those who produce butter must always take the brunt. Today its rival has been increased in power. The Administrator, Mr. McNutt, has so arranged it that oleomargarine and kindred products, such as butterine, will take the place of butter; so if the dairyman cannot get this small raise as to his butterfat, he will be injured; but the laborer will not be.

Now, as to cotton, there is no reason why I should be standing on this floor trying to defend it, because I am not interested in the production of that commodity, but I do know that a situation has arisen which makes it important to safeguard cotton farmers. I shall ask some of the lady Members to tell me what percales are. I understand they are a great staple in clothing and are manufactured out of cotton. The price of percales has already gone up from about 11 or 12 cents per yard, for which it was selling last spring, and the textile manufacturers under the present condition have raised the price of percales so that the jobbers and dealers cannot get contracts for future deliveries. They cannot buy it. They will not give you a contract on percales, and the price of that cloth will be about 21 or 22 cents a yard next spring.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I am sorry I cannot yield, but I only have a few minutes.

It seems to me that the cotton and the dairy farmers are entitled to the same consideration that other people are getting. Parity is not doing anything for these people. Furthermore, beef cattle, under parity are $2 a hundred less than they were on October 1, and on 110 percent of parity they are $1.90 less. The same thing practically is true as to hogs. Give dairymen some relief along with other farmers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, if it were not so serious it would surely be entertaining to sit here day after day and listen to the sidewalk farmers of New York and Boston tell how their hearts bleed for our chosen poor and what they are going to do about it. I just want to say to you here today that butter,

during the 10 years you have had control of this House, has averaged only 25½ cents a pound, or less than the 1909 to 1914 average price, to say nothing about parity.

I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] that it surely takes more nerve that I ever expect to have during the time I may be a Member of this House to stand up here and try to oppose the farmers in some other parts of the United States getting the same benefits already accorded the farmers of my own State. This 44-cents-a-pound ceiling for butterfat does not appear high when he understands that the provision in this amendment that the farmers in his State, Connecticut, have had a 75-cent fixed price per pound on butter for several years. I say that for the reason that I also say to my good friend from New York the Honorable Mr. BARRY, that the time is coming in this country when the man who works in the cotton fields of the South is going to be recognized, and his labor is going to be recognized just as much as if he were running some of the elevators in the skyscrapers of New York City. We have had labor legislation and wage-and-hour legislation. I call your attention to the fact that I was one of the few from the rural districts who voted against the Buck amendment to emasculate the Wages and Hours Act.

If the wage-and-hour legislation is good legislation, it should apply to every kind of labor in the whole United States, and the cotton farmer who goes out in the field and produces a bale of cotton is just as much entitled to labor protection as is the man in the warehouse who may load it onto some freight car for local consumption or some ship to be sent to some foreign port.

So I say to you here today that as far as these agricultural ceilings are concerned, this is all camouflage. It does not mean anything because the present administration has complete control over every major agricultural product in the United States, and I ask anyone to stand on the floor here and deny that statement.

The committee that has had consideration of the bill which is now before us had the wisdom and the privilege of bringing in one of the greatest pieces of agricultural constructive legislation I have seen since I have been here in giving the great bulk of the farmers the privilege to borrow 85 percent of parity on their products. The result has been that today 85 percent of parity is just about the present price of wheat. Why should we worry about wheat as long as we have a billion bushels in this country and 500,000,000 bushels in the warehouses in Canada? So I say with respect to the control of the price of agricultural products today, if there is any consumer who is paying a cent more than he should pay, he can put it in the lap of the present administration. This administration is taking the credit for putting the prices up where they are and they should surely take the credit from the consumer for making them pay what they are paying.

I want to say to my friend over here from Massachusetts, the Honorable Mr. GIFFORD, so he will not think I am partisan, that his salty tears over this 44-cent butterfat ceiling for Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other butter farmers, do not make much impression as long as the farmers of his State get a set price of over 75 cents per pound for butterfat, or $3.23 a hundred for milk in their fixed market, which they have been enjoying all these years. The agricultural question before us today is this: How near the costs of producing agricultural products will the present administration allow farm prices to advance?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted it will mean that we will receive 21 cents for cotton. In the last war it was 42 cents. It will mean we will receive $1.25 for wheat. In the World War it was $2.50.

Remember that the committee has not taken the 1914 to 1919 high prices or the war prices. It has endeavored to place a guaranty of 110 percent of parity prices based on the periods set out in this amendment. At this time the farmer is getting 17 cents an hour for his work, and his wife and his children do not get anything for their labors, and may I point out that they are the ones who are wearing the percale, the gingham, and the overalls? They do not have much to eat, but those folks down there are the ones who feed not only themselves but every one of the laborers in both the country and the cities, and I want you to remember that. It is up to the farmers to feed all the people.

A steak that cost you $1.25 is produced and sold by the farmer for only a dime a pound. I say to the laborers and those of you who represent them here that in the interest of themselves they should try to assist the farmers receive at least the cost of producing their product plus a reasonable profit. To you who speak about saving this $214,000,000 of parity money may I say that if you will allow the farmer to receive 110 percent of parity, then that will be all right, and you will thereby save the United States Treasury from such a subsidy. It will raise cotton and wheat a little bit.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. BARRY. It has been pointed out to the House that this amendment does not affect the great majority of the farm products, only a few, so is not the conclusion inevitable, that this is a piece of special legislation?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Let me say that I know what it is to labor. I have labored and worked on the farm, and I think I have picked more cotton, pulled more bolls, and shocked more wheat than any other fellow of my age in this House.

Mr. DONDERO. It is my information that the average daily wage of the farmer in this country is $1.08 per day—that is not per hour.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is correct. The farmers work from sun to sun, but the work of the farmers' wives is never done. The mothers have to do all of the housework, and then take care of a lot of children.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman has made a fine presentation of the farmers' point of view. I would like to add that I hope these prices will necessarily go as high as the figures set out in the amendment, but it should be remembered that we are getting corn from the Argentine and wheat from Canada, and if you will go to New York, down into the proper district, you will find the wharves there loaded with Brazilian cotton.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I hope you gentlemen, in the interest of the public, will vote for this amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been very fair to labor. He spoke in behalf of the laborers, and he now has spoken in behalf of the farmers. I think you laborers ought to give the committee your vote in support of this amendment in the interest of the farmers.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the addresses of these gentlemen who shed tears over the plight of the farmers and who apparently know very little about the real farm problems of this country. My colleague from Connecticut complains of a $15 dinner for one family of seven and says it was high because farm prices have increased so much. If the gentleman will go out to my district I assure him that in any farm neighborhood there he can serve 50 of his friends a better dinner for $15 than they ever had in the State of Connecticut, and I say that knowing something about that splendid State. However, the price I quote will not cover champagne.

It is not the price received by the farmer that is making the price of food so high in this country. Some men talk very learnedly about farm problems, but, in my humble opinion, some of them have very little more knowledge of the farm situation than a certain specialist of the Department of Agriculture who was vacationing in the Ozark Mountains of Missouri this past summer. By the way, that is the proper place for a vacation. It is said that this gentleman stopped at a farm home to inquire his way. The farmer was feeding some fine Chester white hogs. The white-collar farmer I am telling you about became interested in those hogs because he apparently had never seen any white hogs before. After asking a few questions he interrogated the farmer with this further question, "I would like to know how many hams you get from hogs of that size?"

Mr. Chairman, the farmer got on today's market in Missouri about 9½ cents per pound for his hogs. But here in Washington on today's retail market the stores are charging sky-high prices for hams. Why, pork chops are even 45 cents per pound. The highest quotation on the Missouri livestock market today was 10 cents per pound for choice grain-fed cattle. Here in Washington the stores today are charging 55 cents per pound for very ordinary sirloin steaks. I live in a city that is the largest primary poultry market in the world. Today the farmers of my district are being paid 15 cents per pound for heavy hens. I just called District Stores, Inc., here in Washington and

I find that heavy hens are being retailed for 38 cents per pound. Number 1 eggs today at Springfield, Mo., are quoted at 34 cents. District Stores here in Washington are today asking 66 cents as against that 34 cents. Choice Missouri butterfat is bringing a top price of 30 cents to the farmer and the grocery stores here sell butter for 49 cents per pound.

I do not know what we can do for the farmer as this bill is written. His help is being taken away to work on defense projects at high wages. He is having a hard time paying off his mortgage at prevailing farm prices. His harness, his binders, his mower, his plows, his clothes, and everything he has to buy is produced by labor that is higher than ever before in history, yet there seems little or no disposition here to regulate some of these other factors. We must indeed do something for the farmer in this crisis, but unless this bill is amended to provide a square deal for agriculture, I shall certainly vote against its passage. I am not with this group that wants to do things to the farmer rather than for him. Give the farmer a square deal. Stop the importation of competitive farm products. Place a floor under his prices. He is as much entitled to minimum wages for his labor and reasonable return on his investment as other citizens. Build farm-to-market roads. The farmer prefers these things to subsidies. Make the farmer secure and prosperous, and all will be prosperous.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee. I also invite the attention of other men seated on the floor of the House, because I do not believe that this proposed bill covers anything that the gentleman from Iowa or the gentleman from Missouri have in mind.

I call attention to the first portion of section 3:

> No ceiling shall be established for any agricultural commodity below (1) the market price equivalent to 110 percent of parity—

Every speaker in favor of the bill has glided over this question of parity and has spoken as if parity were the law. But following—

> or a comparable price for such commodity, adjusted for grade, location, and seasonal difficulties, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, if that means anything at all it merely means that the Secretary of Agriculture has complete determination of what the prices of agriculture are going to be.

If that language remains in the bill I, for one, am not going to be in a position to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that some of the opponents of the Brown amendment are laboring under a misapprehension as to just what this bill will do as far as farm prices are concerned.

In the first place, as has already been pointed out, this bill does not in any way fix a floor on farm prices. All it does is to fix a ceiling. I wish I had some assurance that the price of farm products like wheat, dairy products, and cotton would go up to the ceilings permitted in this bill. I do not think there is any likelihood, as long as the present supply and demand situation prevails, that cotton, wheat, or our other agricultural products, of which we have a surplus now, are going to go up to this ceiling or approach it very closely.

Then there is something else in connection with the provision as to the 1919–29 ceiling. That is that it is probably only temporary. On the basis of existing prices and parity levels there are only a few products on which it would apply. The most important are cotton and butterfat. At present a ceiling based on the Brown amendment would be 2.7 cents per pound higher on cotton and 3.6 cents per pound higher on butter than a ceiling based on 110 percent of parity. However, if we should have a rise of any consequence in the general price level this would bring the figures for 110 percent of parity on these commodities up to the 1919–29 level. From that time on the Brown amendment would be ineffective as a ceiling. I can illustrate that by pointing out what has happened to sugar beets. In July of this year the parity price for sugar beets per ton was $7.32, whereas during the period 1919–29 the average price received by farmers for sugar beets was $8.34 per ton. Since 110 percent of parity as estimated in July would be only $8.05, the effective price ceiling would be $8.34, the average price for the 1919–29 period, or the highest of the three formulas. The parity price of sugar beets, however, has increased since July, and in October was estimated by the Department of Agriculture at $7.59, 110 percent of which would be $8.35. Thus the increase in parity price during the 3 months, July to October, now makes the 110 percent price proposal the highest of the three alternatives. What has happened during the last 3 months in the case of one commodity without doubt will happen to many commodities during future months. You will find that is going to be true of cotton and butterfat, no doubt, if we have a general increase in the price level. So at most this ceiling would only prevail during a temporary period.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. You do not consider the average in 1919 to 1929 as inflationary, do you?

Mr. HOPE. No. As a matter of fact, during the period 1919 to 1929, with the exception of the years 1919 and 1920, the general level of farm commodities was below parity. You will recall that it was during that time the great farm movement for parity prices began. It was during this period that Congress twice passed the McNary-Haugen legislation. And in 1929 we passed the Farm Board bill, all in recognition of the fact that farm prices were below parity; that there was no inflation of farm prices and that they should be increased as compared with the general level of prices.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. If the gentleman's contention is true about where farm prices stood in 1919–29, and you have already a provision in the bill providing for 110 percent parity, then there is no need for this amendment, is there?

Mr. HOPE. I think perhaps the gentleman is right, if we have a marked rise in the general price level, because that will bring the parity price of these particular commodities up to the 1919–29 level. I myself have some doubts as to the importance of the Brown amendment, because I think, if we have a general price increase, that ceiling will be wiped out and the 110 percent of parity ceiling will take its place. But temporarily I think it is a good thing to have.

In my opinion, no bill will effectively control inflation which does not put a ceiling on wages and on every other element which makes up the cost of any manufactured article. This bill is fatally defective because it does not put a ceiling on wages. In all fairness it should not put a ceiling on farm prices, which in a large part constitute the wages of the farmer. If we are going to put a ceiling on farm prices, however, it should be a liberal one, and I think that the provisions contained in this bill, including the Brown amendment, are liberal. They should not be disturbed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I hope you will never let me do, ask more for myself than I am willing to accord to others. I am at a loss to understand the statement made by the gentleman from Connecticut. Two years ago the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] introduced a bill to change the parity period on tobacco to 1919–29. The gentleman from Connecticut was very much interested in that bill; he supported its passage. I have here a copy of that act fixing the parity period for tobacco at exactly the same period the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] seeks to fix in this bill for other farm commodities. It is a little beyond my comprehension how the gentleman can oppose the Brown amendment.

I see no need for including agricultural commodities in this bill at all, as we now have ample law to control farm prices and supplies, but if they are included I think the 110-percent provision is unfair. We have put a bottom under farm prices at 85 percent of parity, through the method of a loan which is authorized for both basic and nonbasic commodities. It seems to me if the Congress is going to maintain a bottom 15 percent below parity that you should at least accord the producers of this Nation, those who produce the food and the fiber not only needed to feed ourselves and our own people, but those in all parts of the world who are resisting the aggressors, if you are going to place the bottom 15 percent below parity, it seems to me only fair

you should fix the ceiling 15 percent above parity. The Brown amendment does not do that entirely, but it does contribute in a substantial way toward an equalization of the 110-percent provision.

The gentleman from New York stated that the Brown amendment raised the majority of farm commodities. I have here the official figures furnished me yesterday by the Office of Price Administration. The 110-percent figure on wheat is $1.34 a bushel; under the Brown amendment it would be $1.32. So it would not permit the price of wheat to go even as high as 110 percent. The 110-percent figure for corn is 97 cents; under the Brown amendment it would be only 85 cents. On oats the 110-percent figure would be 60 cents; under the Brown amendment it would be only 47 cents a bushel. On barley, under the 110-percent figure, the price would be 93 cents a bushel; under the Brown amendment it would be only 69 cents. Rye would be $1.09 a bushel under the 110-percent figure; under the Brown amendment it would be 97 cents; and so on down through the list. I have here that entire list. There were about 30 items listed. Probably 25 or 26 of them are as much or more under the 110-percent provision than under the Brown amendment.

Now, here is the situation about one particular item, and I am sure the gentleman from Georgia is interested in this item. As you know the parity base period is 1909 to 1914. In 1909 cottonseed was used as a cheap form of fertilizer. It was not realized and appreciated then that the real value of cottonseed lay in the oil that is crushed out of it, like the oil from the soy bean. In 1909 the principal use of cottonseed was as a cheap fertilizer. Consequently when parity for cottonseed is fixed it is at a price when it was used as a cheap fertilizer, something for which it is never used today. Today it is crushed for oil, just like the soy bean and the peanut. The Price Administrator has recognized that $30 per ton for cottonseed is utterly unfair. Cottonseed are now selling for about $60 a ton. Under this amendment it would adjust that figure by fixing the minimum ceiling price of cottonseed at $50—less than it is bringing today. For the life of me I cannot see how objection can be made to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from New York be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] desire recognition?

Mr. CURTIS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has offered an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 7, line 21, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add: "nor for less than the average cost of production plus a fair profit."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are considering and debating here today known as H. R. 5990 has as its objective the checking of speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies—and for other purposes. The Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings for many, many weeks. We have copies of those hearings which contain over 2,000 pages. Many of us have attended those hearings in order to be better acquainted with what we are about to do. We have heard great economists and we have learned that many of them do not agree on this bill. Some of the committee members and some of the economists have agreed that this legislation will not stop inflation and that other similar legislation will have to be passed by this Congress. We are told that some over-all legislation may have to be passed to include all manner of things. We realize suddenly that we are beginning a program of control far beyond the imagination of most American people.

In my opinion this legislation is the most important that we have had to consider. It will put machinery into motion which will create an administrator who will have the economic and social destinies of all of our people in his power. It may be that our country has now found itself in the period of these grave times that something like this must be done.

So to my mind this may be the presentation of the first piecemeal legislation toward something more serious to come. I hope we can include safeguards in this legislation so that when the emergency is over that the people can recapture some of the control their representatives are turning over to individuals. I want something in these piecemeal bills which will help solve the economic war which is bound to come during the postwar period. But at this time I rise to offer an amendment to help that class of people who seem to be the target of some attacks here. I refer to the American farmer.

My district in Nebraska is a purely farming district, Mr. Chairman, and I feel that I know the problem of the farmer because it has been my privilege to have lived in Nebraska for over 56 years. I have endeavored to concentrate in this great legislative body on legislation which in my opinion would help the farmer because the people in my district know that unless the farm problem is not settled we will not have prosperity and that the industrial sections of our country will not prosper.

Our farmers are thankful that prices are better and that we have passed some helpful laws. They know that these prices are artificial now and that something must be done here to safeguard their interests when normal times return to us again. So I am offering what I feel is not only a helpful and constructive amendment but one which I believe will go a long way toward solving a problem which may be of vast benefit to the entire Nation, now and also in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is a very understandable one, and there should be no objection to it. I doubt if any one of you here today feels that the farmers—the producers of our food, food which is our first line of defense in these grave times—should work for less than cost of producing that food. You have agreed with me in this debate that the farmer should be given the same equality that is given to industry, business, and labor. Then there should be no objection to my amendment that he be assured the cost of producing the food and the commodities he produces. I earnestly urge you to turn to page 7 of this bill and read section 3 (a) under the head of "Agriculture commodities." This sets up a formula. In fact, it contains three formulas under which the Administrator can work. It sets up three formulas with regard to ceilings on agricultural products. I offer you a fourth formula. It is just another formula which the Administrator can explore, and which I feel can be just as easily administered with the guidance of the Secretary of Agriculture. My amendment does not tear down anything in this section dealing with agriculture. It merely adds another formula which you have time and again agreed the farmer is entitled to.

There is no complaint, so far as I have learned, regarding the consumers regarding my formula. I know of no consumer who will complain when the producer of his food gets at least the average cost of producing that food. I for one feel that the farmer is entitled not only to the cost of producing the food we eat, but that he is also entitled to a profit. Our consumers know, especially those in our farming communities, that if the farmer could get the cost of production plus some profit, times would be good most of the time in our towns and cities, because the farmers are our best customers. They are the lifeblood of these communities, and when they do not prosper, the laboring, business, and professional people do not prosper. In some parts of my district I can show you many towns—and some of them were once busy, thriving communities—which have been almost deserted because the farmers in their localities were not prosperous. Of course, the drought and depression had much to do with that; but if these farmers were receiving cost of production plus a little profit, these conditions would not have existed, in my opinion.

We have laws today which fix the rates on returns of investment for utilities.

We have labor laws which protect the workers. Big business and small business works on a cost-and-profit basis. If they cannot make a profit, they quit. But the farmer seems to be set apart as something entirely different in our economic structure. Yet he is a combination of everything that fits into that economic structure. He is a common laborer. He is a skilled mechanic. He is a businessman. He is a manufacturer. He is the pilot of the greatest factory of our land—the industry of originating and producing the thing that keeps us alive—food to sustain life and clothing to keep us warm. Yet in the entire economic picture of profits and costs, the farmer is very obscure. To put the farmer on an equality with industry, labor, and business, I feel one approach is the philosophy of the cost of production. I hope the Members of this House will vote to adopt this amendment.

Remember that this amendment tears nothing down in this section. It merely adds one more helpful formula with which I know many of you are familiar as a result of our many studies and conferences on a cost-of-production bill which was once introduced by one of our late colleagues. You say you believe the farmer is entitled to at least the cost of production. Now you have a chance to aid him in getting it by voting for my amendment. By voting for this amendment you let the Administrator know that you would like him to explore this cost-of-production idea so that we can once and for all time put the farmer on an equality with labor, business, and industry.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What connection does the gentleman see between section 3 in this bill and the granting by this Government of a billion-dollar subsidy for farm products every year?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows I was very much interested, and am still interested, in securing appropriations for parity prices, and I know what he has in mind. You give the farmer the average cost of production and a little profit, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, and he will not ask you for any subsidy. The idea of adding a fourth formula in this bill should not meet with any objection. You have three formulas now. Give the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator the opportunity to explore cost of production, to which you all seem to agree the farmer is entitled.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In other words, all that the gentleman from Nebraska is asking is the same for the farmer that the Government, through innumerable defense contracts, has given to big industry? I feel that this amendment would give the farmer a square deal. As a farmer myself, I am much pleased to second this amendment suggested by a real friend of agriculture.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We are giving cost of production and profits to big business and we are doing that by law. We have laws on our statute books protecting labor and helping utilities and big industry. Now, why not put something on the statute books so that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator can explore cost of production and real equality for the farmer?

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman has the average in there?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the average cost of production.

Mr. MURRAY. Is not the gentleman sure it is just as easy to figure cost of production as it is to figure parity?

Mr. STEFAN. Economists say so. If you can figure parity, why cannot costs be figured?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska. I can see no good reason why it should not be adopted.

We have here a bill which expressly provides for certain methods that the Price Control Administrator must take into consideration as to fixing prices on all industrial products. One essential is that he shall not fix a price upon manufactured commodities, in particular, below the cost of production That includes all the various costs which enter into the many products which are being made in the various industries of this country.

This bill, however, does not fix any floor of that kind for agriculture. It does not provide that the farmer shall have his cost of production. The bill naturally assumes that the cost of production in the industries of this country shall include a wage scale based upon a 40-hour week, for instance; that there shall be a minimum wage, and the factory workers shall have the benefit of all the other laws which have been passed here in the last 20 or 25 years for the benefit of labor. But there is nothing of that kind in this measure for agriculture.

The adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] will not put a floor under the prices of agricultural products, as is provided for industrial products. That floor ought to be there, and there ought to be something in this measure at least to say that the farmer shall receive fair remuneration for the expanded production which has been demanded of him. There ought to be something in this bill to guarantee the prices of farm products beyond the next year. At present there are a few prices guaranteed by the Secretary of Agriculture; on some products there is a floor all too low under certain products for 1942. After 1942 no farmer in this country knows just exactly where that floor will be. It ought to be fixed now.

Therefore I hope the House will vote favorably on this amendment, and not try to pass a bill here which will set one standard for agriculture and a far better standard for industry.

Much has been said about the increased returns to agriculture in recent years.

A statement has been issued by the Department of Commerce to the effect that in the year 1940 the corporation dividends in this country amounted to only $500,000,000 less than the entire net cash income of all the 6,000,000 farms of this country. Then a statement for this year shows that the dividends of corporations will run about 40 percent higher than in 1940. In other words, for 1941 we shall have the profits of industry in the form of dividends in an amount greater than the entire cash returns of all the 23 percent of our population living on the farms of our country.

I am not in favor of this bill in its present form. I do not know that I shall be in favor of it even if this amendment is adopted. It does not seem to me that any measure which would restrict agriculture, which would try to hold the farm wage earner down to the levels at which he has been for the last 10 or 15 years, is either fair to agriculture or fair to the country. But I do think that something ought to be done here to recognize what agriculture is doing for this country in providing not only the foodstuffs for our people and the fibers for our industries but also materials to be furnished under our lend-lease program to many other people in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly very glad that the gentleman from Nebraska has introduced this amendment. It would give the farmer the same as the laborer has by the floor under wages as much as it costs the average farmer to produce. Certainly that principle is recognized in every business. No business, large or small, can exist very long unless it gets at least what it costs it to produce.

It is well known how to figure out the formula for the average cost of production. The Department of Agriculture has had that formula for years and every college of agriculture has it. This does not mean that each individual farmer will get what it costs him to produce a pound of butterfat or a bale of cotton or a bushel of wheat. It means the average cost all over the United States. The farmer who cannot produce at that

average cost will simply have to improve b's methods or fall by the wayside.

What I wanted to talk about mainly is that I am very much surprised that certain labor leaders from industrial centers have sent telegrams to all of us—I am sure every one of you has received them—urging us to adopt a bill that would stop any advance in farm prices or in the cost of living but not touch wages.

I was sent here by labor and have always supported labor, and I am going to continue to support it. Personally I am a farmer and have always lived on a farm. I was sent to the legislature by labor and have had labor's support all the time. My record for labor has been 100 percent. They have always supported me. It was mainly labor that got me to run for Congress, and I have supported them, and will continue to support them. I am against any attempt to curtail or put a ceiling on wages, and I have so voted today. I do not believe it to be fair.

On the other hand, I do not believe it is fair of some of the labor leaders in the large industrial centers to urge us to put a ceiling on what the farmer can get and not put a ceiling on their own labor. I hardly think that is fair, but I do not believe they understand the farmer's problem. That is the reason they write us and wire us. They think when they pay 50 cents a pound for butter, that the farmer gets that amount; but the fact is that the farmer gets only 33 or 34 cents a pound, and there is probably the least spread in the price of butter of any commodity.

The same is true of other commodities; they do not know how much the farmer gets. I just checked back in the statistical part of the Agricultural Year Book and found a table there that shows that the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is constantly getting smaller and smaller. It shows that today on 58 commodities the farmer gets less than 39 cents out of the dollar the consumer pays. You must take into consideration the fact that that figure covers the whole United States, and it includes the farmer's own products consumed on the farm. Naturally, in the larger centers, where the cost of doing business is much greater, I doubt whether the farmer gets more than 25 cents out of the dollar that you people in New York City or Philadelphia or Pittsburgh pay to the retailer.

I do not blame the housewives. When they pay out their dollars for groceries, they evidently believe that the farmer must get at least 90 cents of it. There is something wrong in the method of doing business. Do not blame the farmer for it. Find out what is wrong. Either too many services are demanded by the consumer or too many people get a profit from that dollar, or both.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has to say about the spread between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays. On June 27, last, I introduced a resolution seeking to have a congressional committee appointed to investigate the spread in prices. I find that only five Republicans supported that resolution, and I do not find the gentleman's name among them, although now he favors something being done about that spread.

Mr. GEHRMANN. I do not know about his resolution. I certainly would favor that because I have always advocated that, and I certainly will support it if it is an honest attempt to find out the reason for this spread.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman well remembers, as I do, back in the 1920's during certain periods when at times there was a splurge in the price of certain products and day labor on the farm was getting $5 or $6 a day during harvest. I remember that, and I believe this particular amendment will give the Price Administrator the right to make adjustments to take care of just such happenings.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Absolutely; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is also a fact that the farmer does not receive any benefits through social security or unemployment-compensation insurance.

Mr. GEHRMANN. No; and the main thing is that the farmer does not earn, or attempt to earn, his living by only the head of the family working like everybody else in industry. The farmer's whole family is bound to work in order to exist; does labor insist that we must continue to make slaves out of the farmer's family?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 71, noes 62.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BOGGS and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: On page 8, line 1, strike out the word "basic", and on page 8, line 2, after the word "tobacco", insert "grapes."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, and I shall not use the entire 5 minutes to explain it. The commodity of grapes is not treated fairly under this bill. The period which is set out in section 3 (a), (b), and (c) does not deal rightly by the producers of that agricultural commodity. Most grapes are used for wine purposes. If they are not, they must be devoted mostly to use on the table and thereby depress the market. During a large portion of the time between 1919 and 1933 wine making was prohibited by the laws of the United States. Therefore there is no such thing as parity or 110 percent of parity or a comparable price for this commodity. There is no way to measure the standards and do justice to the grape grower.

May I add that wine itself is a pure agricultural commodity. There is not added to the product of the grape one single barrel of water or anything else, and the one who is going to have to stand all the loss and all the depression is going to be the grape grower himself.

I sincerely hope that the committee, in all fairness to the grape growers, situated not only in California but in Ohio, New York, New Jersey, Missouri, and elsewhere, will accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here intently listening to the discussion on this bill. I have sat for practically 7 years in the Committee on Agriculture of this House and have listened to the plight of the farmers. I have listened to the arguments that were put forth in the interest of giving the farmer a fair price for his product; and when men stand on the floor of the House claiming to represent labor, claiming to represent industrial sections, and then speak against legislation in the interest of the farmer, I cannot understand it. If they sat on that committee and listened to stories about the plight of the farmer in the southeastern section of this Nation right today, they would learn that certain farmers in that section this season produced less than 5 percent of their actual crop. This was because of the elements, drought and deluge. Yes; not only in the States of the Carolinas and Georgia and some of the other Southern States, but in the great State of New York, and then to talk about bringing farm products down below parity to me is not understandable. It is not a question of how much or what the actual price is today or tomorrow, but the question is, When do they have failures and when do they have good years? Yes; I remember the days when the farmer representatives came before our committee in the days of the great drought, where there was practically a 100-percent failure of crops. We should hark back to those days and not crucify the farmer on the cross of inflation by allowing the speculator to kite prices in the name of the farmer.

Let us give the farmer of this Nation a chance at least to equalize his prices so that he may get average parity instead of thinking just about parity for today or perhaps tomorrow. I think it is about time that the labor representatives and the farm groups of this House joined together instead of fighting one another. I think it is about time they joined together to fight the profiteer. Also those dollar-a-year men who are handling the

defense program that is getting out of line. I think that is the big issue. I find that our national-defense program has soared $2,090,000,000 above the estimate of what they anticipated, in the last 17 months, and that is for armament alone.

Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, lease-lend, and other agencies in defense spending agree that defense costs have increased, 10, 15, or 25 percent because of increasing prices. This represents lost money, for which no guns, tanks, or ships will be received. Where are all you great patriots who cry "I voted for all appropriations for defense"? What good will your vote be if this keeps up? This bill must pass in the interest of America.

The laborer did not get that $2,090,000,000 but the profiteer and manipulator did. His wages increased very little. The farmer did not get the money, it does not represent farm commodities. Therefore I say that it is about time that our labor groups and our agricultural groups join hands to determine what is happening down here in the O. P. M., what is happening in the Ordnance Department, and why it is that our national-defense program has absorbed $2,090,000,000 above the estimates. Where did that money go? The people want to know. What could be done with that money? Each soldier, sailor, and marine now in service could be paid $200 per month for a whole year. Yet there are those who even oppose giving him free railroad fare to go home for Christmas. We appropriate money for our national-defense program. Do you stop to realize that when that estimate is raised by $2,090,000,000 more than it should have been that they have taken away $2,090,000,000 that should be used for the purpose of armament and for the defense of this Nation? I think it is about time that we watched some of these departments that have been going wild in purchasing matters, instead of our fighting among ourselves. Let us stop inflation. Do not play politics. You Republicans should not vote against it because it is an administration measure.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CREAL: Page 7, line 19, after the figures "1941", add the following words: "but as to tobacco the date considered shall be December 15, 1941."

Mr. CREAL. I rise to call attention to what I think is an unintentional discrimination; what appears to be an oversight. I do not think anyone who will give me attention for 3 or 4 minutes but would say that is an oversight and not intentional discrimination. There are three prohibitions in here. Do not put a ceiling under 110-percent parity; also the prevailing market price on October 1, 1941, must not be lowered. Very well. Suppose this bill becomes law and Mr. Administrator says, "I must not go below a certain figure, and I must know about this on October 1, 1941." What was the price of burley tobacco on October 1, 1941? At that time 8 months had elapsed since any was sold. You would have to go back to October 1940. If you will look at your newspapers, you will find that every other commodity has a market price on October 1, 1941. Tobacco is not being sold in futures or otherwise. None has been sold since last year's crop. The first crop was sold in my State day before yesterday, and many of the markets do not open until December 1. So you see it is just the same as if the bill read that it shall be the prevailing price of all commodities on the 1st of October 1941, except tobacco, and you must go back to 1940 for that. In order to get the price, you must get the price as of December 1, and then you will see what the 1941 price is. Suppose the bill should go into effect right now. There is no October tobacco price for 1941.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Is there not some confusion in the gentleman's mind with reference to the different types of tobacco?

Mr. CREAL. You have got one or two types of tobacco that are sold at an earlier market, and as for the burley market, of which Kentucky and Tennessee produce 72 percent, not a single, solitary market is open at that time; and in the entire State of Kentucky the first market opened was the day before yesterday, and the others open in December. Surely you are not going to make that rank discrimination against the burley tobacco, are you?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I would like to ask one gentleman on the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. KERR. The gentleman's amendment refers only to burley tobacco.

Mr. CREAL. We have no burley-tobacco market as of October 1, 1941; none at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend the amendment by adding the word "burley" before the word "tobacco."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I realize the logic of the statement of the gentleman that there is no tobacco market on October 1. I think if you are going to give tobacco the same privilege that you are giving other products, you will have to go back to last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. What the gentleman says about tobacco and adding the word "burley" eliminates the cigar leaf types of tobacco, does it not?

Mr. CREAL. No.

Mr. HAINES. We are in the same fix that you are complaining about.

Mr. CREAL. You have no market on October 1?

Mr. HAINES. No; not now. I am in entire accord with the gentleman's proposal, but I do not want the cigar leaf types of tobacco stricken out.

Mr. CREAL. Now, the gentleman who interrupted me a moment ago——

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield.

Mr. PACE. What are you going to do about my tobacco that is sold in July and the market closes in August?

Mr. CREAL. Well, you have got a market price for October 1 for tobacco grown in 1941——

Mr. PACE. When the market closes in August?

Mr. CREAL. We go away back to February or December the year before, which is the tobacco grown in 1940. That would be your standard—October 1940. We know the 1941 price will be higher than in 1940 and want 1941 burley tobacco prices considered instead of 1940.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment as amended will be read by the Clerk.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CREAL: On page 7, line 19, after "1941", add the following: "but as to burley tobacco the date considered shall be December 15, 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CREAL) there were—ayes 22, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 8, after line 16, insert a new section, to be designated as section 4:

"SEC. 4. To further effectuate the purposes of this act sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 48, pt. 1, p. 1178), are hereby repealed. The stamp tax imposed by subdivision 10, schedule A, title VIII, of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, pursuant to section 8 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, shall not apply to transfers taking place after the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for 5 minutes?

Mr. STEAGALL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, on this rather somber afternoon in an hour of sober reflection, let me tell the House a little story. On one of the well-traveled earthern country roads in the heart of Illinois is a mudhole where motorists get stuck. Convenient to that mudhole was a man with a team and his little boy to pull out every car that got stuck in the water hole. Ordinarily the motorist would complain about the fact that he had to pay $3 to get out of that hole, but on one occasion a chap was pulled

out and he indicated a desire to stick around and visit. He said to the man with the team, "Do a lot of folks get stuck in that mudhole?" "Oh, yes; quite a few." "I suppose you make a lot of money pulling them out?" "Oh, we do all right. We pull out 18 or 20 a day and charge them $3 apiece." "Do you pull people out of that mudhole at night also?" The man with the team said, "No. My boy and I are busy at night filling up that mudhole with water."

I wonder why we are wasting our time on a price-control bill unless we plug up the source of inflation. I wonder why we are trying to bail out the water hole of inflation and then let it run full again every 24 hours. For instance, under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, according to the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury before the Appropriations Committee, we have bought nearly two and one-half billion dollars' worth of silver. Think of it!

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry.

Mr. WHITE. So am I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have invested $1,300,000,000 in silver. Almost $1,000,000,000 of it is foreign silver. The Secretary has to issue silver certificates against all the silver that we buy. That is a congressional mandate.

I am not alone in opposition to the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. On the last day of 1940, on New Year's eve, the Federal Reserve sent to the White House a message to deal with inflation, and one of the seven items they recommended was the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934. One hundred and fifty leading financial economists of the country say that that ought to be No. 1 on the repeal agenda. The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Appropriations Committee in March and April and said this business of subsidizing silver should stop. It is the most inflationary thing in the whole legislative category today. Yet today we are fussing around for price control and rent control, and the back door is open because the Secretary of the Treasury is still buying silver. He can still issue silver certificates, and that inflationary tendency is still operative today. It is high time, if we are going to bail out the water hole of inflation, that we stop the Treasury from filling the hole up at night.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I presume the gentleman would consider that same statement to apply equally to the purchase of gold and the devaluing of the gold content of the dollar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And the use of Government bonds as security for the issuance of Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. All this amendment does is to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and stop overinflation of our monetary system and give the present act under which we are working a chance to work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama insist on his point of order?

Mr. STEAGALL. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois on the ground that it covers a subject matter clearly coming within the jurisdiction of another standing committee of the House. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment is subject to this point of order and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 8, after line 16, insert a new section as follows:

"To further effectuate the purposes of this act, subsection (2) of subsection (b) of section 43 of the Agricultural Adjustment and Emergency Farm Credit Act approved May 12, 1933, is hereby repealed."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will not the gentleman withhold his point of order to permit me to explain my amendment?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves the point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, back in 1929 in France there was a very well-known general who was minister of war. His name was André Maginot. He is the gentleman who was the impetus for the so-called Maginot line extending from the Swiss border to the North Sea. While the Maginot line did keep out frontal assault from the eastern side, the trouble was that the Nazis flanked the Maginot line, came around each end, and came in from behind the line, and it went down.

Why fool around about price inflation when it is so easy by virtue of the devaluation power still in existing law to sneak around the Maginot barricade of price control? And that is exactly what we are doing today. Back in those ancient and felicitous days before 1933 the dollar used to contain 23.22 grains of gold. Then came the Gold Devaluation Act of 1933 or 1934. What happened? We squeezed out 9.51 grains from the gold content of the dollar. When you squeeze that much gold out of the dollar, the dollar becomes cheaper and it takes more cheap dollars to buy the same amount of merchandise, which is just another way of saying that prices go up.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In just a moment. I ask the gentleman to wait until I have completed my thought on this line.

The President can devalue up to 50 percent. There still remain 2.10 grains that he can squeeze out of the gold dollar. Suppose he does it. We have $22,000,000,000 worth of gold now in the country. When you squeeze out another 2.10 grains from the dollar on this amount, you create another $4,000,000,000, and so $26,000,000,000 in gold will grow where $22,000,000,000 now exists. The temptation under the impetus of a tremendous national debt and huge expenditures of the Congress and the administration gives some impulse toward squeezing out the remaining 2.10 grains, giving a profit of a little over $4,000,000,000, and using that either to pay off part of the national debt or to take care of further expenditures.

Why have a Maginot line of price control when through existing law that we put on the books in 1933 you can still sneak behind and destroy that line and add to the inflationary tendency that is abroad in the country? If you are going to do a job, why not do it and make a complete job of it? The Federal Reserve Board is for its repeal, the economists are for its repeal, and, may I say with all modesty, I am for its repeal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the purchasing power of the dollar today compared with what it was in 1928 or 1929?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I may say to my friend from New York, we are not dealing with purchasing power now. I am talking about the Maginot line and inflation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not true that the measure of a dollar's value is its purchasing power?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be true, and again it may not. It is irrelevant to this discussion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can the gentleman think of anything more useless at the present time than the mining of gold?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very few things.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to say that the gentleman has pointed out serious defects in this bill. He has pointed out that what we are doing is following a program of bank finance instead of a program of savings and investment. If that is to be the program, inflation is inevitable, and this program will carry us right straight to the ultimate end of inflation. Until we correct that we have not corrected the trouble.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me observe that inflation is just as much a result of the distrust of our monetary policies as anything else. We are indulging in a futile effort in this bill unless we are going to take further steps to repeal the Silver Purchase Act and repeal the other inflationary authority that is contained in existing law.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield to my silver authority from the great open spaces.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman talks about inflation; he talks about a system whereby the Federal Reserve System credits the Government with a billion dollars on the books and accepts a bil-

lion dollars in bonds, then pays back on the honor of the Government check. We are paying interest on $50,000,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That does not make any difference. We are not talking about that. I am talking about the inflationary authority in the law.

Mr. WHITE. We have not $2,000,000,000 of silver in circulation, some of which the gentleman fondly handles in his pocket. What has become of the $50,000,000,000 that we pay interest on? Where did it come from and where is it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has gone out into thin air.

Mr. KNUTSON. What has become of the new dealers?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER.) The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the same reasons stated with respect to the last amendment.

This amendment is clearly subject to a point of order, therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, on page 8, line 2, after the word "tobacco", I want to add the word "peanuts." In defining the basic commodities in the act, we only named the five basic commodities, but recently peanuts have been added to the basic commodities by specific act, putting them in the same category as the other five. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this correction may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to include the word "peanuts" after the word "tobacco" at the place indicated. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any agreement, lease, or other obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to sell or deliver any commodity, to demand or receive any rent, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any regulation or order under section 2, or any regulation, order, or requirement under section 202, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to remove or attempt to remove from any defense-area housing accommodations the tenant or occupant thereof or to refuse to renew the lease or agreement for the use of such accommodations, because such tenant or occupant has taken, or proposes to take, action authorized or required by this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Administrator in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this act, or to use any such information for personal benefit.

(d) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity or to offer any accommodations for rent.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby created an Office of Price Control, which shall be under the direction of a Price Administrator (in this act called the Administrator). The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum.

(b) The Administrator may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may establish and utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Administrator in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of Price Control, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

(c) The principal office of the Administrator shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

(d) The Administrator shall have authority to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; for lawbooks and books of reference; and for paper, printing, and binding) as he may deem necessary for the administration and enforcement of this act. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the purchase of supplies and services by the Administrator where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $250.

(e) The Administrator may, from time to time, issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act. Any regulation or order under this act may be issued after such inquiry as the Administrator deems necessary or proper.

(f) In establishing a ceiling for any specified commodity, the Administrator shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be subject to such ceiling. In the case of any commodity for which a ceiling has been established, the Administrator shall, at the request of any substantial portion of the industry subject to such ceiling, appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional, or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members, and shall meet at the call of the chairman. The Administrator shall from time to time, at the request of the committee, advise and consult with the committee with respect to the ceiling, and with respect to the form thereof, and classifications, differentiations, and adjustments therein. The committee may make such recommendations to the Administrator as it deems advisable.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEAGALL: On page 9, strike out lines 19 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established a Price Control Board (in this act called the "Board"), which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members of the Board shall elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. In selecting the members of the Board the President shall have due regard to experience and training and to a fair representation of the various geographical divisions and economic interests of the United States. No more than one member of the Board shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure Members are familiar with this amendment since it was read this morning and explained. I do not see how we can find a less objectionable way for the enforcement of the purposes of this bill than the plan embodied in this amendment.

If we are not willing to trust the Chief Executive of the Nation to make wise appointments and the Senate of the United States to confirm and pass judgment on the appointees, distributed geographically throughout the country, and selected with reference to their financial environment, I do not see what we could do to make that part of the machinery of the bill acceptable. We trust the administration of the great Federal Reserve System to the members of the Federal Reserve Board. We trust the Interstate Commerce Commission. We trust the Federal Trade Commission. We have found no better way in all the history of the Nation by which to safeguard the proper administration of important legislative machinery than by the method employed under the amendment which I have just submitted for consideration. We had hoped that all objections to the bill at this point would be removed by this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. What does the gentleman propose to do later on in the bill with reference to giving this board some power? It will have no powers the way the amendment is drawn.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I say to the gentleman that I expect to ask consent that wherever necessary the proper technical corrections shall be made by which the board that would be established under this amendment would have all the powers that would be conferred upon the Administrator under the existing provisions of the bill. I have some specific amendments to that effect, but the minor and technical amendments I had hoped could be disposed of by unanimous consent. All the powers conferred on the Administrator would be conferred on the board.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT as a substitute: Beginning on page 9, strike out all of section 201 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 201 (a). There is hereby created the Price Control Administration. The President shall appoint a Price Control Administrator, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the duties of the Price Control Administration shall be vested in the Administrator and the Board of Administrative Review (created in sec. 202–A). The Administrator shall receive a salary of $10,000

a year. The Administrator may appoint, subject to the Civil Service Act as amended and the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, such personnel as may from time to time be appropriated for by Congress. The Administrator may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies, and may utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Administrator in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Price Control Administration no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

"(b) The principal office of the Administrator shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

"(c) The Administrator shall have authority to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; for lawbooks and books of reference; and for paper, printing, and binding) as he may deem necessary for the administration and enforcement of this act. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the purchase of supplies and services by the Administrator where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $250.

"(d) The Administrator may, from time to time, issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

"SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby created in the Price Control Administration a Board of Administrative Review to be composed of five members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $10,000 a year. The Board shall choose one of its members to be chairman. The Board shall be completely free and independent of the Price Control Administrator in the performance of all of its duties and functions. The Board may appoint, subject to the Civil Service Act, as amended, and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, such personnel, including commissioners and attorneys, as may from time to time be appropriated for by Congress. Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. The Board may designate individual members, committees of members of the Board or Commissioners, to hold hearings from time to time in such places as may be designated by the Board. All decisions of the Board shall be agreed to by at least a majority of the members thereof.

"(b) The principal office of the Board of Administrative Review shall be in the District of Columbia, but such Board, a member, committee of members, or any duly authorized commissioner or commissioners may meet in any place within the United States or its Territories and possessions to conduct hearings and investigations.

"SEC. 203. (a) The Administrator and the Board of Administrative Review or any member or commissioner thereof may administer oaths and affirmations, may require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documents at any designated place. No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"(b) The Administrator or Board of Administrative Review shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Administrator or Board deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information.

"SEC. 204. Any person who is aggrieved by any order or regulation of the Administrator may, within 30 days after the issuance of such order or regulation, appeal such order or regulation to the previously mentioned Board of Administrative Review. Within 30 days of the filing of such appeal with the Board of Administrative Review the Board shall hold a public hearing on such appeal wherein any person who is affected by such order and who is aggrieved may present testimony. Upon the request of any aggrieved person affected by such order or regulation the Board shall subpena such witnesses as he may designate within a reasonable time after the filing of such protest against any order or regulation, but in no case more than 60 days after the filing of such protest, the Board shall make a determination. The Board is authorized to affirm or amend or modify such order or regulation or may reverse or set aside the same in whole or in part. The determination of the Board of Administrative Review in all such appeals shall entirely supersede and stand in place of the original order or regulation of the Administrator."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment which has just been offered is found in Wednesday's RECORD on page A5369.

I have offered this amendment to prevent the creation of a situation where one man may control the economic destiny of this Nation. I do not accept the so-called modification amendment offered by my worthy chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, to establish a board, because I consider that amendment an insult to the intelligence of this House. I do not know who drafted it. I believe that the same elements are at work in this respect that have humiliated and embarrassed the Committee on Banking and Currency all through its deliberations on price-control legislation.

All the substitute which has been offered by the chairman of the committee provides is that a board be created instead of an Administrator. This board meets and elects a chairman, and from then on that chairman may function as an Administrator, and the board can go off fishing or anywhere it pleases and leave him to function under regulations and orders which it might set up of a procedural nature.

I say that when they tell us that they want to compromise the situation, and offer as a compromise such a monstrosity as that, really, Mr. Chairman, that is an insult to the intelligence of this House. Even a third-grader could see through that. So it cannot be accepted; it just cannot be accepted, because it does not remove from the bill the objectionable features.

There is still no provision for a review of the ceilings established. Under the substitute which I have offered, a board of five is created—it is called the Board of Administrative Review—which has semiadministrative and semijudicial powers in the first instance to affirm or modify or amend or reverse or set aside the ceilings originally established by the Administrator, upon hearings, and therein it is semijudicial. De novo proceedings may be brought expeditiously before the board for a review of the ceilings established by the Administrator. So this board would have a double purpose and objective.

Mr. Chairman, it will be somewhat of a brake upon the enthusiasm of any Administrator who might be named who might be a little ambitious or reckless with respect to the effect which the fixation of a price ceiling may have upon our general economy.

In the next place, it will provide for a review by those who have authority to act to correct any mistakes which have been made. It invites the correction of mistakes which may be made in the establishment of the ceilings.

Carrying on from that, a legal review is provided in the amendment of mistakes in the determinations made by this Board. If this amendment is adopted, I intend to offer amendments in subsection (d) of page 17 to provide that aggrieved persons may petition for a writ of certiorari from the determination of the Board of Administrative Review.

It is perfectly all right with me that the emergency court of appeals stay in the bill. I am not particularly interested. I am, however, interested in this fundamental thing, that there is no individual in the United States mentally and physically capable to control the economic destiny of 132,000,000 people. No other agency of the Government with power over our destiny attempts to function with an individual Administrator. This Congress has on frequent occasions established boards to administer laws which affect a relatively small group of our citizens, upon the premise that it is undemocratic to place in the hands of one individual the economic or social destiny of any large group of people.

Under the bill as it is now written and under the proposal offered by the chairman of the committee, no review is provided for the mistakes made by the administrator. I want that to be considered. Under the bill as it now stands and under the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Alabama, the only question which can be reviewed before the emergency court of appeals or the Supreme Court of the United States is whether the ceiling was originally set in accordance with the law. It specifically states that that ceiling will not be disturbed unless it is shown that it was not set in accordance with the law, or if it was arbitrary or capricious.

The legal definition of the words "arbitrary or capricious" is "not in accordance with law," so the words "arbitrary or capricious" are merely redundant. They are not needed here. Therefore, there is no review whatever before any court or any board of anything but the legal right of the Administrator to set the ceiling. There is no provision that the court must find that the ceiling was based upon substantial evidence. If

there is a scintilla of evidence to justify his actions, then, according to the provisions of this bill, any court must affirm and cannot set aside these proceedings.

My amendment provides that while this proceeding is pending, as a safeguard to the purpose of the act these ceilings shall remain in force. I purposely provide, for expeditious review, that the petition for review shall be filed before a certain time, and the final determination shall be made before a certain time. Instead of compelling every complainant, every aggrieved person, every protestant, to come to Washington or wherever the Emergency Court of Appeals may function——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I provide that this Board of Administrative Review can subdivide itself into committees of a member or members and sit anywhere in the United States.

They may take testimony through commissioners the same as the Court of Claims does and in the same way as district courts function through their Masters in Chancery and their United States Commissioners. Therefore, an aggrieved party in California or Florida or Texas or Maine or Michigan does not have to come to Washington to get justice, he can be heard before a member of this board sitting in the locality in which it is alleged the injustice occurred, or he may have his case heard before a commissioner, who transcribes and sends the testimony with his recommendations to Washington, or any procedure may be followed which this board may deem necessary to give the aggrieved party equity and justice.

I contend that in the amendment I have offered I have removed much of the objection that this bill sets up an economic and social dictator. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that under the form of government under which we live today it cannot be expected that representatives of a free people can vote to put the economic and social destiny of 132,000,000 people into the hands of one individual without some method of administrative and judicial review. My amendment, I believe, establishes all the safeguards which can be established without seriously interfering with the orderly operation of price-control machinery.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, first, I should like to say that this amendment was written by the gentleman who now addresses the House, yesterday, on Thanksgiving Day. I was about to say Sunday, because it was a holiday. If the gentleman can find some sinister or improper influence that had anything to do with that I will take him on a nice pleasure trip to Florida as my guest when we get through with the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised or disappointed, maybe not much surprised, that my good friend finds so much fault with this amendment. It was thought that when we got away from the dangers that had been pointed out by him and others of undue and improper power to be placed in one individual, we had removed one of the chief objections to this bill. I am afraid my good friend is hard to please, but let me remind him that the essential thing for the protection of the individual citizen or of his right in the administration of this measure cannot as a practical matter, be taken care of by any method of appeal. The only practical way by which we can safeguard the administration of this act against arbitrary or unjust methods of enforcement under one-man control, which would be permitted under the gentleman's amendment, is to diffuse that power by having a board as contemplated by this amendment—a board representative of the various business interests of the Nation and geographically distributed. It seems to me the important thing that should be desired by the gentleman from his viewpoint is that every man who, having a matter to be passed upon in the exercise of these powers, should have someone there at the moment the matter is considered and decided to speak his viewpoint, to represent the interest involved in the transaction. I want to ask the gentleman what protection it would be to the small business man to have the right of appeal to a board with an application to be tried out over a period of 90 days before a board composed of the associates of the Administrator. There can be no effective protection to the average small business man unless he is represented and his view is properly presented and considered when the order is being made and an order could not accomplish the purposes of the bill unless it could be put into operation without prolonged delay.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the chairman of the committee advise me whether or not the other sections are amended or will be amended?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; that is contemplated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. What other amendments have you?

Mr. STEAGALL. I expect to make the request, of course, if this amendment is adopted, that all technical corrections be made so that the powers that would be conferred on the administrator by the present bill would be conferred on the board, and there is one amendment which I intend to offer that would permit the board to sit at other places than in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The members of the committee do not know what those other amendments are.

Mr. STEAGALL. They simply make the bill operative under the change or under the amendment that would establish a board instead of an administrator, with no substantial change in the exercise of the powers conferred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Steagall amendment and in favor of the Wolcott substitute. Mr. Chairman, the Steagall amendment, in my opinion, only muddies the water, only adds to inefficiency without in any way improving the bill.

Everyone who appeared before the committee said that a single Administrator was essential for efficient control. Mr. Baruch said:

> I think you should have a single authority, some definite, responsible head, who can make the decisions. If you do not get that, you are not going to get anywhere.

Mr. Patterson, the Assistant Secretary of War, said:

> Any price administration must be coordinated as far as practical under a single head. Committees are good for counsel, but poor for action.

Mr. Eccles said:

> I would leave the problem of price control in the hands of one administrator, giving him ample jurisdiction and discretion.

Mr. Nelson said:

> I do not believe in administrative boards. I have had enough experience with administrative boards.

Either this board will merely be a dummy board giving all the power to Mr. Henderson anyway, or else there will be divided responsibility hamstringing or hampering the Administrator's efforts. Let us place the responsibility where it belongs—on one Administrator — and thus know where the responsibility rests and not let him alibi his mistakes by blaming his associates on the board. You should give him full authority, subject to a review board, as provided by the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Is it not true that the gentleman favored the creation of an administrative board, and not a board of review throughout the committee hearings?

Mr. KEAN. I did not.

Mr. BOGGS. Is it not a fact that a board of review was never mentioned during those hearings?

Mr. KEAN. I asked the questions to find out about it from the testimony of the gentleman testifying before us, and they proved to me that an administrative board would not be satisfactory.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that respect I say to the gentleman who asked the question, that I offered an amendment similar to this in the committee, and that amendment had full discussion.

Mr. KEAN. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I also call attention to the fact that Mr. Baruch advocated the committee behind a single administrator to review any mistakes which might be made. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] brings it out on page 1042 of the hearings, and if the

gentleman will bear with me, I should like very much to read that.

Mr. KEAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The testimony I referred to is as follows. Mr. Baruch being on the stand:

Mr. DEWEY. I wish to ask you one or two questions about your experience. Was any professional appeals board set up in the last war? By professional I mean official men, drafted and paid a salary to sit as a board of appeals to whom individuals that were not quite satisfied with their local boards or with prices might come and have a hearing before they appealed to the courts. Did you have any such board?

Mr. BARUCH. The price-fixing committee fixed prices for every 3 months and invited anybody who had any criticism to appear before them and present their case.

I think it was a good board. I can say that, because I was not a member of it.

There was every opportunity to change any price and to try to correct any injustice or to lessen any hardship. There was a real, honest effort. There was a very remarkable old gentleman who was the head of it, Mr. Brookings.

So, during the World War under a single Administrator, Br. Baruch, they had a board of review, which reviewed his ceilings every 3 months.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. KUNKEL. Is not our experience today with the O. P. M. and the divided authority we have had in all our defense agencies the best single argument against a divided authority in a board in the present Price Administration? Could anybody urge a better or stronger argument against it? I refer to our actual experience in the past year.

Mr. KEAN. I think the gentleman is correct. I think a single Administrator is the only practical way.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. We have two separate and distinct plans of procedure before the committee, and I shall take a moment to outline the difference between those plans. First, we have the committee plan, which has just been offered, which provides for the administration of this act by a five-man board; the board to be appointed by the President, taking into consideration geographical, economic, and other interests throughout the Nation. That board is given complete authority to make decisions and to administer the act. By way of appeal from the board we have set up an emergency court of appeals. That court is not appointed by the President, but by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. He shall select the members of the court from the Federal circuit courts of appeal, and the Federal district courts. No one can deny that that is a completely independent judicial body.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman think it fair to the complainant that the only thing that he can appeal on is that whatever decision is made is contrary to law or capricious. Is that just to the claimant? Does the claimant have any trial de novo at all?

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will bear with me, here is the procedure. After the administrative board has made a decision, 30 days shall elapse, during which time the complainant can file his appeal with the emergency court of review. In saying that he has only an appeal as to whether or not the administrative board has acted according to law, I refer the gentleman back to the act which provides for this in section 2. Section 2 provides that whenever in his judgment the price or prices of a commodity have risen or threaten to rise, and so forth, the administrator shall by regulation or order establish such ceiling or ceilings as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and effectuate the purposes of this act.

And then the act provides:

So far as practicable, in establishing any ceiling, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the prices prevailing for the commodity or commodities included under such ceiling on or about October 1, 1941, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities, during and subsequent to the year ended October 1, 1941. Every regulation or order establishing any ceiling under this subsection shall be accompanied by a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order.

So in saying you have to determine whether he acted according to law you are referred back to all of these factors—the factor of cost, the factors entering into production, the factor of transportation, the factor of speculation, the factor of profiteering; all of the other elements which enter into any price ceiling.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOGGS. No. The gentleman from Michigan had 10 minutes. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. If you do not yield, I will have to take 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. So when you say that he has recourse to determine whether or not he acted according to law, you are covering the whole gamut of all of the factors which enter into production in this country. In addition to that, we have the standard of arbitrary and capricious. When reviewing an administrative decision, the usual standard is to determine whether there is any evidence to sustain or justify the administrative decision. If there is the slightest favorable evidence, the courts have held that the administrative body must be sustained. But in this case we bring into play the further rule of arbitrary and capricious.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for 5 additional minutes by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do you mean to say that under the provision for an appeal to the emergency court the factors set up in section 2, to which you have just referred, which will be considered by the administrative board in its original finding, will be reviewed as to their weight and sufficiency by the court? I do not so understand that.

Mr. BOGGS. These factors will be considered by the court in determining whether or not the law was complied with.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOGGS. Gladly.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am so surprised. I thought there was unanimity of opinion that only the law of a capricious thing would be considered by the court. I had thought that the emergency court of appeals ought to be designated something like this when a aggrieved party went in: "all ye who enter here leave all hope behind." Would not that be the feeling he had?

Mr. BOGGS. I think that is primarily a question of interpretation, but the important consideration before the House is this: The gentleman has stated that he fears dictatorship; that he fears a one-man administration; that he fears the delegating of all this power to one man. We have proposed the creation of a five-man board, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Tariff Commission and all of the other agencies of Government.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BOGGS. No. I must continue. It seems that it must be fundamental that a board of this nature certainly could not have the powers of one man.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a very brief statement. I do not believe there is anyone in this House or in this country any more opposed to strikes than I am. I certainly think there ought to be something done about it. I have felt that way for quite some time. I understand the President and the Congress have decided to do something about it, and a bill will be brought in Monday to curb strikes.

I am hoping that those who represent labor and those who represent the farmers of this country will give me their careful attention. I have never worried about the wages that any wage earner in this country has been earning or that is being earned at this time. I have never heard tell of a wage earner becoming a millionaire or after death leaving an estate of a million dollars. Not many of them have ever been able to send their daughters and sons to college.

Many of them and their families, like many farmers and their families, are living in poverty. The controversy here between two major groups in this House, those who represent labor and those who represent farmers, is the placing of farm commodities in the bill and not placing wages in the bill. I want to say to you under the provisions of this bill, permitting farm commodities to sell at 110 percent of parity, for instance, and the Brown amendment, that would per-

mit cotton to go slightly above 21 cents, I cannot understand how those of us who represent the farmers of this country could ask more.

Let me give you this interesting fact. Sometime ago, with the assistance of Republicans and Democrats who represent consuming districts and those who represent labor and consumers, we passed a bill carrying an 85-percent parity loan and thereby placing an 85-percent bottom under farm products. There was a majority of only 12 votes in the passage of this bill. Cotton at that time was selling for 10 and 11 cents. Immediately the price commenced going up until it reached 18 cents. Wheat was selling for 60 cents and immediately the price of wheat advanced to around $1. For the first time even under this administration we are going to get 100-percent parity for our cotton and our wheat.

Not only have we the 85-percent bottom and the assurance that we will receive 100-percent parity, but under the Brown amendment cotton can go to 21 cents and wheat to $1.32. We have a bill and we have a rule for its consideration next week, extending the Soil Conservation Act under which we will secure $500,000,000 for our farmers and in that bill we extend the 85-percent loan bottom for 3 years and a definite floor under farm prices during this emergency. I can say to you now that we have the definite assurance of the President that he is perfectly willing to have this Congress appropriate the cash to make up any difference between the loan or the price received for cotton and wheat, whichever is the highest, so that the farmer will be able to get a 100-percent-parity price. That is, for the basic farm products. Now what we should be worried about is what will the Department name as parity. This bill does not have anything to do with that. As far as I am concerned the Department is using the wrong formulas in fixing parity prices on farm products. The Department does not add anything for farm labor nor does the Department take into consideration in seeing to it that the parity prices will give the farmers a just proportion of the national income. The job of working out a fair and proper formula is going to be up to my committee. As stated, the thing that we should be interested in Mr. Chairman, is what will be the parity price, because we have every assurance that we will get parity with the possibility of cotton advancing to 21 cents and wheat $1.32 per bushel, which is considerably above the present parity. If wages are increased and if the ceiling on manufactured goods is increased, then of course parity prices on farm products will be advanced accordingly. If they are reduced parity will also be reduced. What I am concerned about if we recommit this bill with all that we have in it for our farmers what assurance do we have that we will get anything better or even as good in any other bill? As I said a while ago, the major problem at this time is the strike problem and I do not believe the rank and file of labor is responsible for these strikes. If you will curb strikes and see that labor gets a square deal in the way of wages we shall have no trouble.

I have not heard anybody say anything about the profits that industry is making today, you do not see anything in the press about this, I want to tell you that these monopolistic groups who have complete charge of our national-defense program are grabbing everything in sight. Six of these large industries have secured one-third of our lend-lease contracts and 56 concerns have secured three-fourths of the total. Small industries, small business concerns, and the small contractors of this country are just as helpless and hopeless as a man on the chain gang. According to the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], made on the floor of the House the other day, during the first 9 months of this year these 460 largest corporations made a profit of 35 percent after setting aside reserves to meet increased taxes and every other item of expense, they made net 35 percent more than they made during the same 9 months last year. What about wages? Are the laborers getting a wage that will enable them to pay taxes, doctors' bills, increased prices on everything they buy, and a net profit of 35 percent?

Mr. Chairman, with what we have in this bill for agriculture and with the possibility we may not be able to get these agriculture provisions in a new bill, I am hoping that the farm group will vote against the recommittal of this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to what, in my opinion, is one of the most timely speeches I have ever heard in 13 years of my membership in this House. I think it is as fine an evidence of leadership as I have ever seen—the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, taking the floor and calling the attention of his colleagues in the House and of those Members from agricultural districts to the fact that under this bill agriculture has received the maximum consideration that it probably would receive.

I am fearful, if this bill is recommitted, that agriculture will not receive the consideration that is contained in this bill at the present time. I do not say that merely as an expression of opinion or of hope; I say that because within the next 6 weeks or 2 months public opinion will catch up with the rise in prices. Public opinion will express itself to those who represent industrial areas, and the great majority of the Members of this House represent industrial areas either in whole or in major part. Then, when the bill comes up again, with public opinion, which is the master of all in a democracy, sound public opinion will assert itself, and I am very fearful that under those circumstances that 110 percent of parity or October 1, 1941, or the Brown amendment, whichever is the highest, one or both will probably be eliminated from any bill reported.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has been very cooperative. I believe if the gentleman will continue to cooperate and remove the issue as to whether the proponents of the bill are more concerned with the control of business than with the control of prices, I can give the gentleman reasonable assurance that there will be no recommittal of this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say to my friend from Michigan is that I think my record in this House has been one of an attempt to obtain for all the elements of our people that practical social justice—notice I say practical social justice—that can be humanly approximated in the conduct of government. I think I am the last man in the world that businessmen can say has any hostile feelings toward them. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will pardon a personal reference, I, a Democrat, am to have the unusual experience of being given a testimonial luncheon by the Boston Chamber of Commerce, the American Retail Trade Association, the Boston Maritime Association, and one other business association in Boston.

I know that this bill is going to be administered in a fair and equitable manner. Somewhere human agency must administer law, no matter what the form of government, and we are—thanks be to God!—living in a democracy. Human agency must administer law, some law, all law and that human agency cannot be the Congress of the United States even if it were permitted by the Constitution of our country. We have got to vest confidence somewhere, and that place must be in some human agency.

The bill reported out proposed an administrator. The committee has reported an amendment setting up a board. The gentleman from Michigan provides for an administrator and a board of review.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman will yield, I know he does not want to misstate the facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope I would never intentionally make a misstatement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is not a committee amendment. He offered it on his own responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will correct that. The gentleman from Alabama is chairman of the committee, and it is fair to assume that he represents the views of a majority, if not all the Democratic members of his committee. He has offered an amendment to provide for a board. Let me now briefly address myself to that.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been much interested in the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina and the remarks now being made by the majority leader immediately following that speech. Do I understand from these two speeches that I am to understand that wages are not to be controlled in this bill; that really there is no control of farm prices because the minimum levels beneath which they may be fixed are so high as to be inoperative?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, asking me an ingenious question, knows that the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Massachusetts made no such statement in relation to farm levels. The gentleman's question is self-answerable.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, coming to the pending amendment, the gentleman from Michigan says that if a board is appointed Mr. Henderson will dominate it. Well, what a ridiculous argument. It is all right to make claims, but let us appeal to reason and let us analyze it through. Why is it that the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission does not dominate the Interstate Commerce Commission? And what about the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. It would be much easier for an administrator to dominate himself than four other men, would it not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. But the gentleman from Michigan says that in this Board Mr. Leon Henderson, as the Chairman, will dominate it. Can anyone conceive of four honorable men being appointed to the Board becoming subservient and submitting their honest convictions and consciences to anyone else? What about every other board we have? Why is it they do not make the same charge that the chairmen of those boards dominate the respective boards? They know such a charge is ridiculous.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only a few seconds left.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know the gentleman wants to be correct in his presentation as to the difference between the agencies he mentions and this Board.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know the gentleman wants to be correct in the analysis he is making.

Mr. McCORMACK. The organizational set-up is substantially the same. They each have an independent vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is what I am asking the gentleman to yield on.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want to take up more of my time?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want the gentleman to make a correct analysis between the S. E. C., the Federal Trade Commission, and some of these other boards.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the organizational set-up they are the same.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is not making a correct analogy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Each member has an individual vote, each member has his own responsibility.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have a lot of respect for the gentleman, and I know he would not make that statement——

Mr. McCORMACK. I like my friend's chastising. He is in a soft, kind mood when he adopts his present atmosphere.

Coming to the gentleman's amendment, they condemned an Administrator up until the time he offered his amendment; but now he wants an Administrator. Prior to that they condemned an administrator. What does he provide in his amendment? A board of review to pass upon the actions of the administrator. Why not have another board of review to pass upon the board of review? Why not have another board of review to pass upon the second board of review?

Why, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is a clever subterfuge to present a political situation in the hope that it might make an emotional appeal to enough Members of the House to constitute a majority. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is sound, it is a constructive amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at no time during the proceedings on this bill have I attacked or opposed the single Administrator idea. Previously I said that the present civilian Administrator and the Price Control Administrator of O. P. M. can in his various controls exercise the power of capital punishment over American industry

Today we are considering the administrative procedure in this bill which is to turn over the economy of our people to a Price Administrator, and I cannot understand why our distinguished floor leader would draw a similarity between that kind of an approach and one where a single industry, such as railroading, is dealt with. There is no comparison between the two, and if we are so loose in our thinking and acting today as to deal with the two in the same manner and in the same concept, I think we will hear from American industry hereafter.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, spoke about the possibility of having a board of review of a board of review of a board of review. May I ask the gentleman whether he thinks that is not very similar to the present situation existing in our courts, where you may go to one court, from there to a higher court, and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States in order to receive justice?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not being an attorney, and not having ever been engaged in a personal lawsuit, but based upon observation, I think the gentleman from California is correct.

The Wolcott amendment, I am sure, will be much more acceptable to the industry of this country if they had a chance to speak on the matter themselves. We have here in the scales today the most diversified and freest operating economy left on the face of the earth. We are proposing to turn it over to a single Administrator

That is something we can well afford to consider very seriously, especially in view of the fact that the consideration which is to be paid back to the American people in the administration of this bill will be extremely ineffective. By that I mean this:

The Government's loan policy is deluding most of our people. It has degenerated through the use of banking credit into inflation. It has raised the prices against consumers, and the Government as well, and these prices will further advance. At the moment the Government, through financing war loans by present methods, is conducting a fragile, deceptive, and costly support. It will fail and develop into inflation. Sophistry and financial legerdemain is the order of the day. It is an operation in banking finance instead of being an operation in saving and investment.

You will get nothing back in return in the form of a fair consideration for the powers you are now proposing to hand over to the Price Administrator.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that either the House of Lords or the House of Commons, under the price-control system now in operation in Britain, may rescind any price ceiling fixed by the board of trade?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, they can do that, yet here we are surrendering all the power.

We may just as well be realistic in this approach. The President has called for a war expenditure of over $100,000,000,000. He is asking that the production be turned out and invoiced up within the next 25 months. The money that is to be issued will bring inflation in spite of what the Price Administrator can do or will do, because this House and the administration are not willing to do the necessary. We are afraid of political reaction. Yet we sit here about to turn over to the administrator the whole of American economy.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Wolcott amendment is adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the question is, Shall we have one Administrator or a board to administer this law? Personally, I have always favored one Administrator, but the chairman of the committee, yielding to what he believes to be and what I believe to be the wishes of the majority of the members of our committee, has offered an amendment providing that we shall have a board to administer this law. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] proposes that we still have the one Administrator but that we have an investigating board above him to investigate everything he does, which will

result in tying up every order and regulation that is made, and it will continue on during the time this law continues in effect. So, the bill would really have no force and effect if the gentleman's amendment were adopted.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield.

Mr. KEAN. The statement the gentleman made is not true.

Mr. PATMAN. May I invite your attention to the fact that this amendment, if carried, will strike out the only provision in this bill that protects small business. There is a provision in section 201 which sets up advisory groups to help the small business institutions that do not have lawyers to send to Washington and the small businessmen who do not have money to come to Washington themselves. Such a group is set up as an advisory committee of the industry itself, which will be conferred with by the board administering this law. This gives to the small businessmen of this country fair protection and equal rights, without their having to come to Washington themselves to get it. They will be represented through their own associations, their own organizations, and the attorneys for their own organizations.

If you pass the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan, however, you will strike out entirely this provision that will help small business. You will strike out the advisory groups and will have nothing left.

As between the two, the board suggested by the gentleman from Alabama and the one administrator suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], with his investigating committee to investigate the investigating committee, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is far preferable because it preserves that one section in the bill that gives small business an advisory group to look after it.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SACKS. May I point out to my colleague that the chief objection to those who favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is that Mr. Henderson might dominate the Board. The President appoints the review board, also, under the proposed amendment, and Mr. Henderson might dominate the review board, so what is the difference if you call it an original board or a review board?

Mr. PATMAN. Not only that, I have always understood that our friends on the other side opposed this bill because there was one administrator. They want a board.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think we should clarify that.

Mr. PATMAN. Just ask me a question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has made a misstatement.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I have not made a misstatement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not say the gentleman knowingly made a misstatement, but the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts have both stated that I have opposed the Administrator. I have never opposed the Administrator, if the bill included a provision for a review of the orders of that administrator in connection with the equity of the ceilings.

Mr. PATMAN. I understood the gentleman from Michigan has always wanted more than one person. Now he comes here and says, "I want only one person, that is, the Administrator."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 123, noes 148.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers, Mr. PATMAN and Mr. WOLCOTT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 117.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 202. (a) The Administrator may make such studies and investigations, and obtain or require the furnishing of such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, and in the administration and enforcement of this act, and regulations and orders thereunder. For such purposes the Administrator may administer oaths and affirmations, may require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documents at any designated place, may require persons to permit the inspection and copying of documents, and the inspection of inventories, and may, by regulation or order, require the making and keeping of records and other documents and the making of reports. No person shall be excused from complying with any requirement under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(b) The Administrator shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that he deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information, unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the interest of the national defense and security.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it was Ralph Waldo Emerson, back in 1855, who said:

If you can write a better book or preach a better sermon or build a better mouse trap than your neighbor, the public will make a beaten path to your door.

If we pass this bill, you will not have to write a better book or preach a better sermon or build a better mouse trap; all you will have to do is to write a book, preach a sermon, or build a mouse trap, and Mr. Henderson will do the rest.

It is now admitted by members of the committee that this bill is just about as broad in its scope as was the Gore bill. About the only difference is that the Gore bill sought to regulate the wages of employees. The bill now under consideration seeks to fix the authority to regulate everything in America and to regiment and regulate every phase of life except those persons engaged as employees in industry. In other words, under the pending measure authority to regulate the wages of strikers and the employees who are now engaged in vital defense industries is not granted, while authority to regulate fees, salaries, commissions, and the compensation of professional men and those engaged in all the vocations and avocations of private life, except persons known and designated as employees, is fully granted. This means that the fees or charges of physicians, dentists, nurses, accountants, lawyers, mechanics, and others may be completely regulated and controlled.

This no one familiar with the bill will deny. In fixing fees and compensation the Administrator will not take into consideration the experience, the skill, or ability, nor the training, the educational qualifications of the doctor or the nurse, the accountant, the teacher, the merchant, or the lawyer. He can set a fee for the doctor who performs an abdominal operation, an eye operation, a tonsil or brain operation, or for an appendectomy, or for various and sundry operations, and all the doctors, regardless of skill or ability, will be paid the same fee or compensation. The same thing applies to those in other professions or vocations—butchers or bakers, bootblacks or barbers. No man nor set of men should be given the authority to regulate or fix the fees, the compensations and the commissions of all of the professional men and women of America; neither should any man nor set of men be given the power and the authority to control the earnings and the livelihoods of the farmers and the tradesmen of this Nation. This is a far-reaching bill with far-reaching ramifications. It is unconstitutional and un-American. It is antidemocratic and it should be defeated.

We are now witnessing a rather strange spectacle as the House of Representatives sits here at this moment seriously considering the adoption and the approval of such legislation as this. It is a rather strange spectacle when a broad and sweeping measure of this kind is being seriously considered in the House of Representatives and not one man has yet been bold enough or audacious enough to even for a moment to question its constitutionality. Where are all of our constitutional lawyers? Oh, gentlemen, it does not take a constitutional lawyer to know that you cannot square this bill with the four corners of the Constitution. When I have asked Members

on the floor, "Where is the constitutional authority for a bill of this kind?" they have answered me by saying, "Oh, where is the Constitution?" I say it is a serious situation when Members of Congress regard a matter of this importance as lightly as this bill is apparently being regarded.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. PATMAN. On the constitutional question.

Mr. COOLEY. You have had an opportunity to discuss the constitutionality of this bill, and no one has dared to even mention it so far. They seem to care little about it, but listen to this just 1 minute:

> It shall be unlawful, regardless of any agreement, lease, or other obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to sell or deliver any commodity or to demand or receive any rent or otherwise to do or omit to do any act in violation of any regulation—

And so forth. There are thousands upon thousands of chattel mortgages upon the records of North Carolina today in which the mortgagors have given liens upon chattels of all kinds—hogs, cattle, and all other sorts of chattels—and in each of those mortgages there is a provision that in default of payment the property therein described shall be sold at public auction for cash to the highest bidder. Now, by one act of Congress, we seek to abrogate all of those chattel mortgages, we seek to set aside all the laws of the commonwealths of this Republic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot, for the life of me, believe that the Members of this House and this Committee have seriously considered that provision, and the members of the Committee, when I call it to their attention say, "Why, of course, we can by act of Congress abrogate individual contracts." I say that by this act we are seeking to set at naught the solemn contracts of individuals made before this legislation was even contemplated, solemn contracts which are the monuments of their agreements.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I must decline to yield as I only have a few minutes.

Not only this but there are laws in the various States of this Union that require certain sales to be held at public auction and property to be sold to the highest bidder for cash. These sales can no longer be held because Mr. Henderson himself will fix the highest price at which any particular commodity may be sold.

I submit that this is a serious problem. We are seeking here by this bill, and you know it as well as I do, and the country knows it—we are seeking here and now to establish a dictatorship here in America and to place the power in the hands of a set of men to control the destiny of the American people. I say that it is unconstitutional; it is un-American; it is repugnant to the very genius of American government, and it ought to be overwhelmingly defeated here in this House today. It is just as vicious, it is just as far-reaching as the Gore bill ever dared to be. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who asked me to yield, admitted on the floor during this debate, "Yes; this is economic dictatorship." The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], of the committee, said, "Yes; this is dictatorship," and I say to you that the American people are not ready to accept dictatorship, not now nor hereafter, because they are preparing to spend their last drop of blood and all of their resources in defense of our institutions of freedom. I submit that this is the most vicious and far-reaching bill that has ever been brought before this House. We are at this moment face to face with the issue of dictatorship. You cannot hide from it. You cannot flee from it. You must here and now face the issue and decide the question. A desperate effort is being made to place and to fix a yoke upon the necks of the American people and to destroy all that our forefathers have fought for through the ages. I, for one, am unwilling to voluntarily surrender our American way of life and to accept in lieu thereof a dictatorship which may prove as despotic and as tyrannical as ever existed in the history of the world.

The present farm program was designed to meet just such a situation as exists today. American agriculture is today ready for war or inflation or any other situation which may arise. We have a surplus of all of the major agricultural commodities. We have a potential capacity for much enlarged production, and in the present situation there just is not any need on earth for this type of legislation. When Secretary Wallace first came before the House Committee on Agriculture advocating the ever-normal granary he stated that it was in the interest of consumers as well as in the interest of producers. A consumer provision was inserted in the act by which the ever-normal granary was created. The price of the major agricultural commodities cannot possibly get out of hand. If cotton goes too high, the Commodity Credit Corporation can release cotton into the market and keep the price down. If this does not prevent an abnormal rise in prices, the Secretary of Agriculture can, under existing law, issue an order increasing the acreage of cotton for the coming year, or may even remove the restrictions upon production altogether. This would certainly prevent an abnormal rise in prices. Even if we should today repeal the law fixing loans at 85 percent of parity, you know and I know that the price of cotton would drop. The silly thing about all of this is that Congress for the past 8 years has done everything in its power to force a rise in the prices of agricultural commodities, and now that prices are about to reach parity some wise men come forward with this proposition to put a ceiling upon agriculture. If you understand the farm program, you will appreciate the absurdity of the suggestion that a ceiling should be imposed for the purpose of preventing an abnormal rise in prices.

To force the prices where they are today the farmers have reduced their crops to about half normal production, and Congress has spent millions upon millions in diversion programs, stamp programs, and various and sundry other programs. We have tried to induce farmers in about every way possible to reduce production. Why, the flue-cured tobacco farmers of this country have reduced production from 1,200,000,000 pounds to 600,000,000 pounds. They have cut their crops 50 percent. Rather than hold prices down on that which they are producing, why not increase production or release tobacco from present storage?

The same thing applies to cotton and the other major crops. If the world needs cotton the American cotton farmer is ready, willing, and anxious to produce it. All that the farmers of America ask is parity. All this talk about a 110 percent of parity is just a lot of bunk. It is for the purpose of getting the farm vote.

Why all this excitement about the rise of farm prices? Is cotton selling too high today? Is wheat selling too high, or corn, or tobacco, or hogs, or hay? This 110 percent of parity is just a sop to the farmer. You know that he will never get it. Are you going to pay the farmer not to produce and then give him 110 percent of parity for that which he produces? Are you going to continue to restrict the farmer in the production of that which you say the Nation needs and the world wants and will buy?

In conclusion, this bill involves fundamental principles of government; it involves our way of life; it involves democracy itself. Most of all, it involves dictatorship, and that I am not yet willing to embrace.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Beginning on page 12, line 5, strike out all of section 202.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in the amendment which the House has recently adopted there are provisions for the Administrator or the board to subpena documents and witnesses for the purpose of obtaining information in respect to the establishment of price ceilings, and a review of price ceilings. Therefore section 202 is redundant, and is not necessary and I might say in that respect that the same is true of the whole of section 203, and of subsections (a), (b), and (c), of section 204, which have been incorporated in the amendment which we have adopted, and they should be stricken from the bill to perfect the bill. Then, if that is done, I propose to offer an amendment to subsection (d) on page 17, to perfect that language, so that an appeal may be taken to the Board of Administrative Review, instead of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and also to strike out the language on page 17, from line 17 to line 22. The lan-

guage of these sections I have mentioned do not seem necessary in view of the action which the committee has just taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment briefly on a subject which I feel has been sadly neglected during the debate on price control. I do so because I believe that a serious and thorough consideration of this subject will impel all of us to vote in favor of an effective system of price stabilization.

I refer to the question of the cost of living. The cost of living is a major concern of every American family today to a greater degree than at any time since the first World War. It is the subject of a great many letters which I have received from my constituents who are interested in the passage of legislation which will help to maintain at least the present living standard and who urge speedy and effective action on Congress.

According to these constituents, the cost of living is skyrocketing. I have undertaken an investigation of their claims, and I assure you, gentlemen, that the result of this investigation has convinced me that skyrocketing is a very mild description indeed.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, the cost of living has increased 9.6 percent from August 1939, before the war began, up to September 20, 1941, the last date at which computations are available. Prices of food, clothing, and rent have gone up precipitously during that period and, along with fuel, housefurnishings, and a few other miscellaneous items, contribute to this 9.6-percent rise in the cost of living.

These prices I refer to are, of course, the retail prices. But retail prices have not advanced nearly so quickly, nor nearly so much, as the wholesale prices of these same commodities.

Food is the most important single item in the cost of living. Let us take food as an example and compare the difference between the rise in the retail price and the rise in the wholesale price. The retail price of food has increased by 15.5 percent since August 1939. The wholesale price of food has increased by 33.8 percent in this same period.

The gap between the wholesale and retail price of food will not and cannot remain constant. That gap will close up, and, when it does, it will close in on the pocketbooks of all Americans, poor people equally with people who can afford it. This is the prospect before us even if we pass effective legislation to place ceilings on prices, and, of course, I hope that we will pass such legislation. I expect that we will pass it.

If we do not begin now, immediately, to set proper ceilings on prices, it will be too late to save much of the standard of living which we have achieved in America. The best we can hope for by this bill is that we can save the American people from ruin.

The wholesale prices of 900 important commodities—important to the national-defense program and also to the consumer—have already increased by 22.6 percent since the beginning of the war. Textiles have gone up 33.6 percent, hides and leather products 20.4 percent, and farm products 50.9 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as of September 20, 1941. These are only a few samples, but these figures are sufficient to convince me that controls are absolutely essential.

We are engaged in a world struggle against Hitlerism. The people of America are engaged in this struggle as they produce materials needed by the armies facing Hitler. We cannot contribute adequately to the defeat of Hitler, even to the extent of sending these necessary supplies, if we do not maintain a standard of living necessary for the collossal job we are engaged in.

In connection with this matter of an American standard of living, I should like to say that I voted Wednesday and today against the proposition that wages should be frozen, that wages should be controlled, along with prices. I voted against that amendment because I had been convinced by a study of the facts that increased wages are not responsible for the increase of prices, and that freezing wages would be a step in the Hitler direction—a step toward the destruction of the rights of the working men and women of America.

Selling prices have risen in advance of wage rates. A comparison of price increases and wage increases in any given period will demonstrate this fact. Since the war began prices have advanced more than 20 percent, while the income of labor has increased less than 6 percent, including income from increased employment and overtime payments.

The prices which have advanced most of all are the prices of commodities least affected by labor costs. Raw material prices have risen by 31.7 percent, semimanufactured goods by 20.1 percent, finished goods by 15.7 percent, and durable goods by 11.2 percent. The greatest increase has been in the price of raw materials, which are least affected by labor costs. The smallest increase has been in the price of durable goods, which are most affected by labor costs. Wages, apparently, are not the factor most responsible for price rises.

The Office of Price Administration has discovered this from the experience to date in setting ceilings on the prices of 33 commodities. From discussions with the representatives of the industries and other information gathered in the process of setting the prices, the Office of Price Administration discovered that the following factors were causing the price disturbances:

	Commodities
Actual shortage of materials	24
Heavy forward buying	10
Hoarding	6
Increased costs	5
Profiteering	3

The only industry which claimed that a wage increase was a major factor was bituminous coal. This is very interesting because the Bituminous Coal Commission, after continuous and thorough study of production costs, reports that during the last 3 years production costs have been reduced by 18 cents a ton. The recent wage increase of $1 a day negotiated by the United Mine Workers of America increases production costs by only 17 cents a ton.

In industry in general, production costs have been lowered during the last few years and are being lowered still further at the present time in the industries with defense contracts. This is one important consideration in my vote against wage control.

The output of workers has increased and continues to increase. This alone is reason enough for increased compensation, even without considering the need for such increase in order to achieve a better living standard. From September 1937 to September 1941 the output per worker has increased by 16 percent according to the Department of Labor. Increased production in defense industries, improved machinery and methods, will further increase the output per worker, and for this reason alone we cannot allow freezing of wages.

I am further convinced that there is no logic to the proposition that wages should be frozen when I consider corporate profits. A glance at reports of the Federal Reserve System shows that 416 large corporations have a net profit increase of 31 percent for the first 9 months of this year, as compared to the first 9 months of 1940. No one can say that the products of labor have not been profitable or that industry cannot afford to pay a just compensation to labor.

Finally, in connection with this question of wage control which would reverse our entire labor policy and destroy collective bargaining, I should like to comment on the relation of wage control to inflation.

We are all opposed to inflation. We are all agreed that measures must be taken to prevent inflation, which would play havoc with our standard of living.

We are also agreed, I think, that inflation may occur when we do not produce sufficient consumer goods to satisfy the purchasing power in the hands of consumers.

However, inflation will not result from placing purchasing power in the hands of the working people, the low-income group, while there are idle plants and more than 5,000,000 unemployed Americans who could produce more of the food, clothing, and housing which are so badly needed.

I am not advocating business as usual so far as durable goods are concerned, because they are made in plants and from materials badly needed in the battle to defeat Hitler. I do advocate, however, that Congress give its attention to the problem of civilian supply and consider this problem in relation to the inflation which is threatening us. I do advocate that the Congress should do everything in its power to help satisfy the consumer demand for basic commodities such as food and clothing and housing. There is no sound reason for limiting the purchasing

power of low-income Americans. Let us at all times remember that we are not using the vast human, natural, and industrial resources of America to full capacity producing our basic necessities.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am somewhat amazed at the tenor of some of the speeches this afternoon, and at some of the contentions that have been made. If some of the things we have been told are true, it seems to me that it is time for us to stop, look, and listen before we go any further with our international policy. If some of the views expressed here are true, I think our Government would find itself so hampered that we could not conduct a contest with a foreign foe of formidable strength, without absolutely disrupting our own free institutions in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to read a little history that I think pertinent in the light of some of the things that have been said in this debate. On April 9, 1935, when this Nation was at peace with the world, there was submitted for the consideration of the Congress a bill that conferred powers on the President of the United States far in excess, in scope and significance of anything embodied in the bill now under consideration. When that bill was before the House we were not at war, there was no threat of war, and there was no provision for conscripting an army in the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Not now. Let me read some of the provisions of that bill:

SEC. 2. During the period of any war, whenever in the sole discretion of the President he shall determine that any maximum price, rent, rate, commission, compensation, or reward shall be adjusted either upward or downward, he is hereby authorized to make and publicly proclaim such adjustment, and such adjustment shall have the full force and effect under this statute of such price, rent, rate, commission, compensation, or reward before such adjustment.

(b) Furthermore, the President is authorized to close all stock and commodity exchanges in the United States of America if in his sole discretion it becomes desirable in order to curb speculation.

SEC. 3. Likewise, during such time of war declared by Congress, the President shall have power to determine and publicly proclaim from time to time the material and financial resources, industrial organizations, and public services over which Government control shall then be necessary and to commandeer same for use by the Government and such control and commandeering shall be exercised by him through agencies then existing or which he may then create for such purposes: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as conscription of those employed in industry.

Mr. Chairman, upon a record vote in the House on that bill, extracts from which I have just read, our esteemed friend from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] voted in the affirmative. That is shown on page 5326 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 9, 1935. Every provision that has been objected to in this bill, without restraints and limitations which this bill carries, was embodied in the bill to which I have called attention, and without any of the limitations and restraints embodied in the pending bill. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who contends that what we are attempting to do now in time of war, at this time when he and others of us have voted to take the blood of the boys of the Nation to defend our flag and the democracies is violative of our constitutional guaranties and our free institutions. He stands here and tells us that we cannot fix the price upon commodities and goods and materials necessary for the support of our Army and our Navy. We can take the farmer's boy by conscription to die in the Nation's defense, but according to his contention we cannot touch his bale of cotton or his bag of wheat. God help us if this country has come to that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I judge that some time or other in your public life you have been on the spot, as it is called. I was home on business and hurried back here, keeping in daily touch with my office as to when this bill would be up for a vote. I left home with the expectation of voting for this bill. I am not going to do it. The reason you have me on the spot is because I represent one of the largest burley-tobacco districts in America. The committee took the attitude that I wanted some sort of exception made for Kentucky; something special that other boys were not getting. I called attention to the fact that, unintentionally on the part of the committee, you had made a discrimination against Kentucky, just as if the bill had said, "This shall apply to all places except Kentucky." What was the reason? I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and am interested in that subject. Everything that comes out of the ground had a market price in the markets of the world on October 1 this year except burley tobacco. We have not sold yet. We open the warehouses next week. You want to freeze this price at what the market price was on October 1, 1941. There has not been any market price for 7 or 8 months. Then you have got to go back to 1940. All of you farm boys and wage people have suffered a slight tilt upward in 1941 over 1940. Just as though it had been done maliciously and you had written in for the purpose of discriminating; I pointed out that that was the effect, and that I was not asking any special favor, but trying to get into your bill for equal protection. But your bill now reads this way in substance, that all farm products shall be appraised as of its prevailing market price on October 1, 1941, except burley tobacco, which shall be October 1, 1940, probably 10 cents below.

Now, if I had not already called your attention to that fact I might have offered the flimsy alibi that I was asleep and that it was an oversight. But having once in this record called to your attention that fact, and then turn around and vote for such a damnable thing—I am not going to do it.

If I come back here, it will be from the Fourth District of Kentucky, and as long as I am here I am going to represent home folks first. That is my program. That is why I am going to vote against this bill.

Now, they think I do not have any sense about the tobacco business because I come from the country. I called your attention to the tobacco-grading business. You did vote it down, and then you discovered you were mistaken, and you came back and put it in. Whenever everybody else under the sun got the processing tax except tobacco people, you turned me down three times in a row, and Senator Minton put it in and you liked it. Now, if this goes to the Senate, it will be corrected, but I am not going to take the risk of voting anywhere for such discrimination.

You are not willing to give any Member of the House credit for anything he says, but readily accept it if it comes from the Senate. That which you have voted down will be in that Senate bill, and you will take it and like it if it comes back here. But for the present I am not going to do it. Farm prices have advanced only 29 percent and wages 300 percent.

You leave the road wide open for the farmer to have to pay higher prices for what he buys and then put a fence across the road if he attempts to move up to keep pace with the high prices he pays. There is no equality in that. Wages are at the other World War figure and farm prices less than half the World War price.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a general misconception on the part of the House relative to this particular provision in the agricultural section of the bill. For the benefit of the gentleman from Kentucky, who just preceded me, let me state there are three standards in this bill which determine the price of agricultural products. The first is 110 percent of parity. Now, in that provision there is a conception of parity established by law for all of the various grades and types of tobacco. The second is the price prevailing on October 1, 1941. There are any number of commodities, not along this particular type of tobacco, which were not being marketed on October 1, 1941. The reason that provision was put in the bill was to take care of many commodities which were selling at above 110 percent of parity, so that their price would not be depressed. There are several fine examples: Cottonseed oil, beef, eggs, and several other things. The third standard in the bill—and this, too, would be applicable to tobacco—is the average price prevailing from 1919 to 1929. So tobacco of all types and grades, as well as every other agricultural commodity, is covered in this bill as it is now written.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. CREAL. Then by the gentleman's own statement he admits that for all agricultural commodities except burley there are three yardsticks, but for burley tobacco only two?

Mr. BOGGS. That is not true; there are three yardsticks which are put in the bill in such fashion that we can be fair

to all types of agricultural commodities.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I also come from Kentucky, and the main crop of my people is tobacco. I told the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] that when we go into conference—and I think I shall be one of the conferees—I will try to put that back in the bill, and I hope we shall be able to do it.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I believe a study of this bill will reveal that there are many commodities which do not come under the October 1, 1941, provision. If we write in this particular type of tobacco, we would have to write in many other commodities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The last word has been stricken out five or six times. The gentleman rises in opposition to the pro forma amendment and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I observe, Mr. Chairman, that the last word has been stricken out a great many times, and some of the distinguished gentlemen who happen to be privileged to be members of this committee have stricken it out a great many times.

This happens to be the first time that I have assumed the privilege of attempting to speak on this important bill, and I would not say a word now—I have been a good listener—were it not for the fact that the distinguished chairman of this Committee on Banking and Currency saw fit to attempt to castigate, may I say, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]; and in that rather frantic attempt to belittle the statements made by the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman had before him and read from H. R. 5529 an act that was passed by the House of Representatives in 1935. The gentleman from Alabama referred to the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina voted for this specific act, and then he read from it and attempted to demonstrate that this act contained more far-reaching powers than the bill now under consideration. The thing the distinguished chairman failed to mention—and I assume it was through inadvertence and excitement, from his manner of speech—was to read the first part of this bill, which states; listen:

> That whenever Congress shall declare war, from and after a date prior to such declaration which date the President is hereby authorized and directed to determine and publicly proclaim—

Such and such powers are given to the President of the United States.

Now, I want to ask the distinguished chairman: Does he contend that the Congress has in some subtle manner declared war? If so, his argument would have some potency and some logic. I do not recall that the Congress has yet declared war or that the President has issued any such proclamation; and I, for one, am not going to give the powers vested in that act which failed of passage, by the way, in the Senate; I am not going to give those powers unless and until the time comes when the Congress of the United States, in its discretion, sees fit, perchance, to make a declaration of war in a constitutional manner. And so I call it to your attention in order that the record may be clear. When the gentleman from North Carolina voted for that bill, as did many other Members of this House, he was voting for a bill which would become effective only after the Congress of the United States, by formal action, had declared war. I am astonished that the distinguished chairman of the committee would attempt, by his remarks, to leave the impression that there is any similarity between that bill and the bill that is under present consideration.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin requesting additional time?

Mr. KEEFE. I will request 1 additional minute in order to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. There has been a great deal of misinformation spread around here about the bill to which the gentleman referred. That was the bill that the Legion, the service men of the country, sponsored to take the profits out of war. Their argument was that if we waited until we declared war the war profiteers would see that we never did reach them, and that is the reason that bill passed the House. It was to take the profits out of war, to stop the profiteering in war that we had during the last World War. It was sponsored by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman will recall that by the very terms of the bill itself it did not become effective until after a formal declaration of war had been passed by the Congress in a constitutional manner.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is correct, and the reason they undertook to pass that in advance was this: They said if we waited until the declaration of war, then we might have difficulty in passing a law to take the profits out of war.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the full statement of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, we are asked to vest those same powers now in this bill. I, for one, cannot do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I get some satisfaction out of arising here and saying, "I told you so." I am going to recall, probably unpleasantly to many of you, that I introduced a resolution on June 27, 1941, not for Mr. Henderson, not for any dictators, not for anybody outside of the Congress, but for our own congressional committee to investigate the increasing spiral rise in prices. I have the record vote here.

I am a little tired of listening to these unconstitutional objections, these big, brave words we hear about half-baked bills. The proposition is this: Do you want inflation or do you not? I do not believe you know the meaning or the consequences of inflation.

The gentleman from North Carolina talked about unconstitutionality; he talked about Henderson and dictators; he talked about protecting and preserving America. Why, on June 27, he did not know there was danger from inflation. On page 5744 he asked me if I thought there was going to be a rise in prices in this emergency. He thought it was incredulous that there was going to be a rise in prices because of an emergency. On page 5748, June 27, he asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who was speaking, "Would not the efforts of this committee to investigate rises in prices duplicate the organization headed by Leon Henderson?" In other words, he used Henderson's organization to block that vote in the interests of the consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I cannot yield. If the gentleman wants to say I misquote him, I yield

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows I am not rising to say that he misquoted me. If he declines to yield for other purposes, that is all right.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. My basis is sound. My logic or my reasoning may be open to question but my statements are accurate.

There is an inability, a failure to grasp the consequences of doing something to balk inflation. There are labor groups, farm groups, Republican politics, all rearing their heads in this proposition. I would vote for the Gore bill, I would vote for the Steagall bill, I would vote for whatever bill comes out of this committee which would tell the consumers of this country that at least this Congress has not abdicated in time of crisis.

Why, the minority leader, for the Republican Party stated, "I cannot vote for this bill because it is half-baked." I want the country to know that the Republican Party in this House, under the whip of its leadership, is voting to block price control because they are playing party politics with the welfare of the American people.

On June 27, 1941, there were but six members of the Republican Party voted for an investigation in the rise in prices, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the gentlewoman from

Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the gentlewoman from Montana [Miss RANKIN], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. These women know something about the problems of the housewife.

They are playing politics here, Mr. Chairman. They say this is half-baked. If this bill is half-baked, the Gore bill was not half-baked. You did not support that. You had the Casey bill for an investigation of rising prices. You did not support that. Make your record. There were three chances to do something for the consumer; there were three chances to protect the public. You have made a record, but it is a negative one. Three strikes are all you are allowed. If you had a choice of strawberry, vanilla, and chocolate, you do not like the ice cream. You do not like this kind of legislation. You are willing to risk inflation for party politics.

When you go back to your districts and speak on the Fourth of July about "We the people," the people, knowing of your lack of interest at this time, are going to say, "You did not mean 'we the people.' You meant 'Whee! the people.'"

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances I would only have the highest regard for the opinions of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, but after the deliberate statements he has made by which he was willing to cast aside all regard for the basic law, the constitutional restraints and limitations, in order to provide a way and a means to cure or cope with inflation, I must confess that I am not only aggrieved, I am exceedingly disturbed.

Knowing that the gentleman is a distinguished lawyer from the State of Massachusetts, I wonder if he were gracing at the present time or if he will grace in the near future the Federal bench——

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to answer that.

Mr. DITTER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is making an unfair statement and it is rather cowardly not to yield.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, to take up after the point of interruption, knowing the gentleman as I do, I wonder if he were gracing the Federal bench and if this present bill were to come before him and he were to pass on the constitutionality of the measure, whether he would cast aside with the same disdain and disregard the requirements of the basic law of the land as that which characterizes the appeal he has just made?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. DITTER. I have not asked the gentleman a question and I do not yield.

I want to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts, were he to come to that elevation, that Justice Cardozo on one occasion in a case that I believe is on all fours with this, when delegation of power was made by this Congress in the days of the N. R. A., characterized it as "vagrant and unconfirmed power," as "power running riot," and in no uncertain terms that liberal jurist defended the basic law of the land. He refused to approve the philosophy that the distinguished gentleman from Masschusetts has just espoused, that the end justifies the means. I believe that is a pernicious philosophy. I believe it is a dangerous philosophy. I believe it is the kind of philosophy out of which dictatorships come. If democratic principles, if the American philosophy is to prevail, then there must be some regard for the landmarks and the constitutional provisions that have been given to us as heritages.

I deplore the day that in this Chamber we should come to the low level that constitutional restraints can be cast to the winds, that dictatorship can be accepted as a necessary means to an end, that the danger of inflation is such that we must embrace any and all cures that can be offered, either by the majority or by parts of the majority, as a means of curing the ills from which we presently suffer or those that threaten.

I want to quote just one word, and I quote it to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. I do this to confirm, if there is any uncertainty with reference to this law, what Mr. Henderson himself says about this proposal. I take this out of the mouth of the Administrator in the course of the hearings on the second deficiency appropriation bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I object.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me in order to correct some statements he has made, if he gets these 2 minutes?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, after I have finished the quotation, if I have made any misstatement I shall certainly yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts for a correction.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Having Mr. Henderson under examination, this was my question:

> But insofar, sir, as the voluntary element steps out and the compulsory element steps in, the necessity of the projection of controls becomes greater, does it not?

We were referring to price control.

Mr. Henderson's answer:

> That is correct. But I would like to say this: That you can get acceptance of a ceiling and get voluntary compliance, and if you do not get that general acquiescence by the major producers there is no system of control short of an antidemocratic control that could keep prices in line.

My further question:

> But that is what you have characterized as an anti-American plan?

Mr. Henderson's answer:

> That is correct.

That is the admission of Henderson himself, an un-American plan, an antidemocratic plan, is the measure that you are presently sponsoring and that my distinguished friend from Massachusetts has just pleaded for in such eloquent terms.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman for a correction of any misstatement I may have made.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I ask the gentleman this question. What constitutional question is involved in a congressional committee named by the Congress to investigate prices?

Mr. DITTER. I did not refer to that matter.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. But the gentleman voted against it.

Mr. DITTER. I am referring to the present bill, which has for its purpose more than the investigation.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. The gentleman voted against every bill, regardless of constitutionality.

Mr. DITTER. It has for its purpose the control of prices and the breaking down of every protection of our American way of life.

Mr. Chairman, on July 30, the President, in a special message to the Congress urged the enactment of price-control legislation. We warned the country at that time that inflationary price rises and increases in the cost of living are today threatening to undermine our defense effort. I believe the President was wise in sounding the warning, even though a bit tardy in reaching the conclusion. I believe much could and should have been done at an earlier day to avoid the dangers of which the President warned. It is this failure which makes inflation the ominous threat that it is today.

We need not dwell at length on a discussion of the effects of the inflationary trends today. Every housewife and every household provider has already felt the effects. They are not interested in the academic phase of the problem as experts may explore it. They know the problem more intimately and acutely in terms of soaring prices and in decreasing purchasing power. They know it as they figure how much butter and how many eggs can be provided in exchange for a dollar. They know it as they add up the number of dollars that will be required to buy the coats and shoes for the family for the winter. The disturbing effects of the trend have already been felt. But, as disturbing as these effects have been thus far, they are inconsequential compared to what may follow unless some means can be found to put a stop to the spiral of prices now under way. That which may be disturbing today can very easily be diastrous in the immediate future. In fact, such will be the case, unless the brakes are applied, for the forces which have caused the present rise in prices will continue to influence our domestic economy in even greater measure in the future than they have up to this time.

As we continue to increase the output of dollars in the defense program, and as we continue to decrease the things which those dollars may buy, the inevitable re-

sult will be that more dollars will be required to purchase the decreasing number of things available. Dollars will have less value. Every automobile that must give way to a tank on the assembly lines of one of our manufacturers, every radio that is pulled out of production for an essential defense item, every yard of cloth that is kept off the looms for a yard of khaki, every one of the hundreds of commodities that are being diverted into the defense program from the customary channels of consumption means that the remaining number will command a higher price in every market place in the country. If there are only 7 automobiles in the showroom where under ordinary circumstances there would be 10, with no chance of getting the missing 3, and there are more people with dollars to buy those 7, common sense tells us that those 7 will command a better price. As the volume of dollars increases and the volume of goods decreases, the value of the former drops and the value of the latter jumps. It is this process which the administration seeks to check by the bill which it has urged for enactment and which is now before us. There is much doubt in my mind as to whether the legislation in its present form will accomplish the purposes sought. And, what is more important, the attempted cure will be worse than the disease. If the administration's proposal, the bill in its present form, is enacted, private enterprise as we have known it here in America would be brought under the iron heel of an arbitrary administrator.

I am persuaded, however, that the cause of inflation is not so much the shortages of available goods as the extraordinary expansion of money income which encourages competitive bidding for the available goods and services which are desired. In this field the administration could, if it would, remove a substantial part of the cause of the dangers which threaten.

Before discussing the merits and the demerits of the proposal before us we should ascertain whether other suggestions have been made with the same objectives in mind and what, if anything, has been done with these suggestions.

Almost a year ago a special report on the subject was submitted to the Congress by the Federal Reserve System. Certain definite recommendations were made to reduce the hazards of inflation. To these recommendations have been added the opinions of leaders in finance and industry. Together they form a formidable array of experience and common sense. To date I know of nothing which the administration has done to put these proposals to the acid test of a practical application.

The Federal Reserve report to the Congress made four specific recommendations. It advocated the termination of the President's power to devalue the dollar, the withdrawal of the power to issue $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks, the discontinuance of monetizing foreign silver, and the repeal of the power to issue silver certificates against the seigniorage on silver purchases. The importance which the Board attached to its recommendations can be estimated by the forcefulness of the closing words of the report:

> In the period that lies ahead a secure monetary system is essential to the success of the defense program and constitutes an indispensable bulwark of the Nation.

Thus far nothing has been done with these recommendations. The President may further devalue the dollar. He may issue the greenbacks. He may monetize foreign silver, and, on the basis of present silver stocks, he may issue more than a billion and a half dollars in silver certificates; that is, up to the full monetary value of such stock. He may exercise the inflationary powers delegated to him by the Congress in the early days of the depression, and thus further increase the potential dangers which have caused widespread concern in every part of the country. Subject only to his own discretion, the President may pour additional billions into the already swollen stream of funds which, because of its volume and current, is driving prices higher and higher day by day. I am at a loss to find any reason or excuse for the administration's failure to embrace these proposals. If the dangers of inflation are to be avoided, then recommendations, coming from the source these did, should be put into practice with all possible dispatch or a reason advanced for their rejection.

Can it be that the administration's real purpose in insisting on the enactment of the present measure is to bring to life the now long-buried N. R. A.? Is the "blue eagle," once securely caged by a Supreme Court opinion, to again flap its wings and screech its defiance of constitutional limitations? Is the emergency to be the excuse for another excursion by the Federal Government into the fields of private enterprise, so that the ambitions of those who sponsor this legislation may be realized by compelling the industrial life of the Nation to goose-step at their commands? Certainly there are foundations for these fears as we take a long-range view of the pronouncements and performances of the proponents of the bill.

I have already pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that these recommendations have been supplemented by the urgent suggestions of financial and industrial leaders. They have fared no better fate than the report of the Federal Reserve. These suggestions have taken on slightly different form depending on the individual or the group submitting them from time to time.

While the form may not have been exactly the same, the substance has been. There could be no mistake on that point. They all emphasized the necessity of a drastic curtailment in nondefense expenditures; the necessity of discontinuing the penalizing of farmers for planting as well as paying them a premium for not planting; the wisdom of selling the large accumulations of foodstuffs stored in Government warehouses or on the farms of the country; the necessity of putting a stop to waste and extravagance in every type of Federal activity; the need of calling a halt to many of the subsidies from the Federal Treasury whether these subsidies take on the form of gigantic public works or are based solely on some social objective; the necessity of more work and less play so that more things may be made to meet the demands of both the military and civilian needs; and the necessity of facing the tax problem resolutely and conscientiously. I do not claim, Mr. Chairman, that any of these proposals standing alone, or that all of them taken together, would perform the whole task of halting inflation. Something more might be needed. But I do insist, Mr. Chairman, that alone and collectively they could be a part of a contribution of common sense which would decrease materially the dangers, and which would make drastic legislation of the type now before us wholly unnecessary.

I have already referred to the admission made by Mr. Henderson that compulsory price controls are not possible unless controls are established over all the factors which enter into the price of goods. Efforts have been made to get around this admission. Instead of serving their intended purposes, these efforts have emphasized the weakness in the present proposal and have disclosed the glaring inconsistencies in the arguments which have been advanced in support of the measure.

But aside from this admitted weakness in the bill the most dangerous features are the delegations of power which it contains. No better description of the power sought by the Price Control Administrator under this measure can be found than the words of Justice Cardozo in his N. R. A. opinion, when he said:

> Here in effect is a roving commission to inquire into evils and upon discovery correct them.

This is what Mr. Henderson seeks to do—to have a "roving commission" to do as he sees fit with the domestic economy of the country. Again to quote Justice Cardozo:

> This is delegation running riot.

How any vestige of private enteprise could survive such complete and comprehensive control is impossible to imagine. Under the licensing power which is made a part of this bill and under the power to purchase commodities which would be vested in the Administrator, the entire business life of the Nation would be controlled by a far-flung Federal agency with an administrator in charge in Washington. Discretionary power, a plentitude of power, of this kind is dangerous. It is more than dangerous. It is destructive of our free institutions, for where there is no free economy there can be no hope for other freedoms.

Reasonable proposals have been made to modify the present measure so as to preserve the protection to private enterprise which is essential if it is to survive. They have been rejected by the proponents in a peremptory manner. Arbitrary power seems to be the major ambition of those who advocate the enactment of the bill. Against this danger I believe we must always be on guard if we are to vouchsafe to others our heritages as freemen.

The words of the Administrator recur to me, Mr. Chairman—"undemocratic"

and "un-American." This is the opinion of the Administrator, mark you—not my opinion—that the proposal which we are asked to approve is undemocratic and un-American. Have we come to this pass? Have we come to the point where undemocratic and un-American measures must be accepted and approved as the only means of safeguarding our economic security? Have democratic processes and American principles reached such a low level that they cannot any longer be depended upon as a way of life? Have we come to such a sorry state that dictatorship, in form if not in name, must be resorted to as our means of salvation? Must we fasten upon ourselves the yoke of serfdom in the illusory hope of defending freedom? Has the faith—the flickering flame of our faith in self-government—has our faith in ourselves and in our institutions given way to the desperate and dangerous doctrine that the end justifies the means? Are we to stand convicted before the world—this world in which dictatorship raises defiantly its ominous threat against freemen—are we to stand convicted as incapable of meeting the problems of today without forsaking the treasured heritages which have successfully defended freemen? Must constitutional limitations, constitutional safeguards—yes; and constitutional responsibilities—be recklessly abandoned in the hope that the fetters which would be forged for us will give us contentment, security, and the privilege of the pursuit of happiness? In a word, do we admit that democratic processes and American principles are a failure? I cannot reconcile myself to this admission.

I am persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that the landmarks can be preserved; that the basic law, the fundamental law, the Constitution, can be safeguarded and saved from the destructive forces of dictatorial methods; that within the framework of our system of government ways and means can be devised which will serve the purposes of preventing the peril of uncontrolled inflation; that the rich storehouse of resourcefulness of the American people will have a remedy available for the threatened ills if we but diligently search for it; that economic safety and security can be vouchsafed to us as a part of the American way of life and as the possessions of freemen.

Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding faith in freedom and in the capacity of freemen, and from that faith I shall not retreat.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that the logic of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] has seriously disturbed the Republican Party. That is evidenced by the fact that the most able advocate of the Republican Party in this House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], immediately rose, flushed to the extreme, showing that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] had penetrated his political skin.

Mr. DITTER. Will my distinguished friend from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. DITTER. Knowing my distinguished friend from Massachusetts as I do, I can only say I express regret that he feels that any such humble effort as mine would necessitate a reply from him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania deny my assertion and allegation that he is the ablest advocate on the Republican side?

Mr. DITTER. I categorically deny the charge.

Mr. McCORMACK. The modesty of the gentleman is the best evidence that my statement is correct, and emphasizes its truth.

Mr. DITTER. I should like the distinguished leader to yield now for one more correction.

Mr. McCORMACK. When I make one more statement the gentleman will probably want me to yield.

I am rather sorry to see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] whose eminent fairness is known to all, take a little poke below the belt, as we would say if we were agitating outside or speaking in the common parlance of the day, when in order to try to minimize the effective argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] he undertook to intimate, to say the least, that the gentleman from Massachusetts might be interested in a judicial appointment.

Mr. DITTER. I hope my friend will yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I would like to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. I know my distinguished friend wants to be fair.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why I made reference to it, so the gentleman could correct that impression.

Mr. DITTER. I certainly only wanted to be complimentary to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has a very peculiar way at times of being complimentary to a Democrat.

Mr. DITTER. May I remind the distinguished majority leader that I paid the compliment to my friend that I recognized him as an outstanding lawyer at the bar of Massachusetts and knowing that the President is always mindful of men such as he to elevate them to the Federal bench, I naturally felt he would be one who would be recognized by the favor of the administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the gentleman does admit that it was just a little below the belt?

Mr. DITTER. No; I make no such admission and I shall certainly apologize to my friend from Massachusetts now if any such inference were taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now the gentleman rises to that position that he logically should occupy, the position of a profound gentleman, and from which he temporarily strayed. I am glad to see him back home.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 7 words and I am not going to take all the time allotted me, but it seems to me something has been injected into the debate that should not be in it. I refer to the charge that the Republicans are playing politics with this bill. I want to talk to you about that because it reminds me a little of the pot calling the kettle black and I say this in all sincerity, because it is a matter that should be clarified before the country.

I am on the Rules Committee and when the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill came before the Rules Committee, the ranking minority member stood shoulder to shoulder with him to get a rule for the bill. The chairman said there that his committee had voted 17 to 5 to report this bill which obviously included the votes of numerous Republican members. It was said there that the minority members on that great committee had worked side by side with the Democrats to write the bill and that there was an absence of politics all the way through.

Then the rule was adopted and the consideration of the bill was begun and then I do not know what happened, but some votes that were taken in the committee when Republicans and Democrats, without regard to politics, were voting on the merits of the bill, some of those decisions were reversed and by a political vote. After voting in the committee on a nonpolitical basis to take them out, the majority members of the committee put back into the bill the revolving fund and the licensing provisions over the strenuous objections of the Republican members. They reversed the action of that great committee taken at a time when politics was out of the window and I predict that nonpartisan action by the House is going to reverse them. I charge and you cannot deny it, that if there is any politics in this present controversy you started it. I am getting sick and tired of sitting over here and hearing false charges that the Republicans are playing politics with defense and other critical matters before the country, when time after time the only politics and strictly political action is on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 8 words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the requestion of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us—the price-control bill—is a vivid manifestation of the tragic road our Nation is traveling.

This bill has been under consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee for nearly 4 months. The hearings on it began August 5. I listened attentively to nearly all the testimony given by the administration and other other witnesses. I attended practically all of the hearings.

As the printed hearings will show I also took an active part in the work of our committee on the bill. As the November 25 RECORD, on page 9108, will show, I have also made an attempt to study the fundamental causes of any

price inflation that may be threatening us now or in the future.

I have carefully gone over the price-control measures which were adopted by us during the World War. I have studied the present price-control measures of Great Britain and Germany.

Since first beginning consideration of this bill I have devoted my time almost exclusively, and have worked almost day and night, to inform myself of the true facts that are involved in it.

As a result of my efforts I am forced to come to certain conclusions:

First. This bill does not provide for the placing of ceilings over all prices.

Second. It specifically and directly provides for the fixing and control of farm prices. This may not appear to be so on its face; but I am convinced that once it is put into operation it will discriminate more and more against the agricultural group.

Third. It provides the greatest opportunity for favoritism.

Fourth. It sets up a virtual dictatorship over our entire economy, regardless of whether or not the licensing and certain other provisions are stricken from the bill.

I doubt if there is a man in this House who is more concerned about the dangers of inflation and finding a way to prevent inflation than myself. I think my past record in public office will substantiate this statement.

I am anxious to see legislation enacted that will protect this Nation against the hardships of inflation. But I want that legislation to be fair and equitable for all groups.

In our efforts to preserve our economy against the ravages of inflation, we must not lose sight of the dangers inherent in such legislation lest we destroy that which we would preserve. In other words, we must be very sure that what is left of our free economy will not be destroyed. The cure that we apply must not be worse than the disease.

The first steps in any effective price-control legislation must embody provisions for stopping the present dangerous inflationary policies of the Government itself.

This bill should be recommitted to the Banking and Currency Committee for further study and an effort made to write a fair, equitable, and safe bill, one that will go to the root of the matter instead of treating symptoms only.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, change or amend this bill as we may, still it will be an ineffectual measure for the purposes intended. At the same time it will create a new and high-powered Government agency, with thousands of employees, and at great expense, which will be in such control of business and agriculture that additional burdens will be placed upon both.

That it will not be sufficient to prevent inflation without much other and further legislation is declared by some of the most eminent of its sponsors. Mr. Baruch declares that it will not work out as intended. Mr. Eccles declares that money and credit control must first be obtained to avoid spiraling commodity prices which lead to inflation. Secretary Morgenthau advocates it as a mere step in a program, and would fix all profits at 6 percent. He also demands an additional income tax of 15 percent to sap the buying power of the people, and increased social-security taxes to further burden wage earners and employers.

The Reserve Bank Board now is limiting installment purchases so that those of lesser purchasing power may leave the markets for many commodities to those of larger means who have the cash resources with which to purchase.

The propaganda for price control is well organized and widespread. Added to the other fears which mark our course toward that eventful "freedom from fear" which is to come, is the added fear of increased cost of living, the fear of an inflationary spiral and the fear of the collapse which is to follow.

Peculiarly, a larger part of the propaganda is directed toward the increased cost of food products, for which the farmers are blamed and toward whom this legislation seems to be especially directed. Not mentioned in the alarms sounded as to food costs is the fact that the farmers' portion of the consumers' dollar still is below 40 percent, while more than 60 percent continues to go to processors and distributors.

There is nothing in this bill, even with its special provision for protection of farm products which would compel the Price Administrator to protect the farmers against increased costs of processing and distributing their products.

It is proposed to establish a new administrative bureau which would engage the services of thousands of additional Government employees to regiment and control every line of business. Licensing of all dealers would place in the hands of that bureau life or death control over not only the larger business concerns, but also over every little businessman in the country, including the 135,000 smaller industries, many of which now are facing elimination or extinction because of a dearth of materials which they must have to operate. Not even in World War days was such extensive and autocratic control over the lives and livelihood of millions of people ever proposed. It is the N. R. A. inverted, with greater powers of regimentation.

As a remedy for inflation the measure is a greater threat than the malady for which it is prescribed.

There is a fundamentally wrong principle in this bill, which is that it would set up one standard for price fixing upon industrial commodities and another for agriculture.

It would permit the Administrator to set a price for the products of industries based upon cost and reasonable profit. It would insure industry and business against loss, even though not limiting profits.

On the other hand, it would base the price of agricultural products upon the outmoded and unjust parity scheme, regardless of cost of production. Even the Brown amendment, while more just than 100 percent of parity, would not protect farmers against increased costs of distribution. They would have no protection against far lower than parity prices.

Any price-fixing bill which would provide a different standard of price fixing for agriculture than for industries, and leave farmers at the mercy of the monopolistic organizations which have fattened upon the farmers' depression and are becoming even more greedy with advanced prices, is neither just nor equitable. It would inflict upon agriculture wrongs as great as those which are alleged to come from spiraling prices and inflation and the consequent deflation. To give approval to such a plan is to sanction in advance another and even greater collapse of agriculture than that of the past decade.

This measure would make possible control of wages in industry and the income of farmers by fixing prices on the products which govern the wage scale and the farmers' income, but it would not affect the profits of the big industrial corporations nor those of monopolistic aggregations. Alone and without further legislation, it would permit increased costs of farm operation which so-called parity provisions would not govern. It would fix no level for the enormous fees and extravagant remunerations which are becoming common as the expenditures of billions are expended for national defense.

In 1940 the net cash returns of 6,000,000 farms were about $4,600,000,000, the largest since 1929. In that same year the dividends of corporations amounted to about $4,000,000,000. The Department of Commerce reports that corporation dividends for 1941 will be more than 40 percent above those of 1940. The income from dividends will exceed the national farm income this year. Still, the inflationary tendency of enlarged corporation profits will be disregarded if this bill is passed.

That the farmers are fully aware of the meaning of this legislation to agriculture is evident from the action of their meetings and conventions which have been considering it. As usual, all agriculture is asking is justice, and not special privilege. The farmers, after 15 years of depression, now are expanding production to a remarkable extent as their part in national defense. Certainly their patriotic endeavors should not be hampered or impeded by such legislation as this bill provides.

At the thirty-seventh annual convention of the National Farmers' Union, held last week at Topeka, Kans., and attended by delegates representing some 400,000 farm families who are members of that organization or of the many farmer cooperatives sponsored by it, the following point in its legislative platform for 1942 was adopted unanimously:

> Place no ceilings upon farm commodity prices, since farmers will produce an abundance of farm commodities, thus assuring reasonable prices but requiring now, instead of ceilings, floors under farm prices; if despite this assurance of abundant supplies, which other industries are not able or willing

to make to the Nation, such ceilings are forced upon our record-breaking yields of food and fiber, then we insist that farm prices be set at levels yielding living income and capital returns comparable to those returned from other products; and that all forms of income, whether dividends, interest, profits, salaries, rent, or wages be also accorded exactly the same treatment, so that no individual, no matter how highly placed, shall succeed in escaping sacrifices equal to that which farmers would then be making.

The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, in convention at Chicago, adopted the following in opposition to this bill:

We oppose rigid price fixing on agricultural commodities on any condition and particularly on the flimsy pretext that such action is essential to forestall inflation. With agriculture at complete disparity with industry and labor, we see no justification for a Federal policy of agricultural commodity price fixing.

In view of this position, we necessarily are opposed to the principles of legislation which have been introduced in Congress and are designed to authorize the fixing of price ceilings on agricultural products. Such legislation is predicated on the substitution of a philosophy of ceiling prices and get it if you can, for cushion prices. Further, such legislation obviously is inimical to the best interests of the Nation and agriculture, for it proposes to tie farmers to a depression parity formula and to fight a war on low commodity prices which, historically, cannot be achieved successfully.

We believe further that such legislation would throw into discard existing legislative programs and policies contained in such laws of Congress as the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, the triple A legislation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation authorizations, without an appraisal of either the merits, purposes, or accomplishments of such legislation.

If price fixing is forced upon us, we insist that the legislation contain (1) a formula which relates the prices of agricultural commodities to the rates of industrial wages, (2) adequate provision for periodic price adjustments, (3) a guaranty of minimum prices to producers, and (4) the preservation of the right to public hearings prior to the establishment of price ceilings as well as adequate court review.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEDURE

SEC. 203. (a) Within a period of 60 days after the issuance of any regulation or order under section 2 any person subject to any provision thereof may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to any such provision and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. At any time after the expiration of such 60 days any person subject to any provision of any such regulation or order may file such a protest based solely on grounds arising after the expiration of such 60 days. Statements in support of any such regulation or order may be received and incorporated in the transcript of the proceedings at such times and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this subsection, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing or 90 days after the issuance of the regulation or order in respect of which the protest is filed, whichever occurs later, the Administrator shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provide an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith.

(b) In the administration of this act the Administrator may take official notice of economic and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under section 202. Any proceedings under this section may be limited to the filing of affidavits, or other written evidence, and the filing of briefs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 13, line 7, strike out all of section 203.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite consideration of the matter I might say that section 203 and subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 204 are in conflict with the amendment recently adopted by the committee, and it is now no longer in order that they remain in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that section 204 be considered as read, and that three perfecting amendments may be offered and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

REVIEW

SEC. 204. (a) Any protestant who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest, may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to subsection (c), specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the Administrator, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of the proceedings in connection with the protest which shall include a statement indicating the economic and other facts of which the Administrator has taken official notice. Upon the filing of such complaint the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside such regulation or order, in whole or in part, or to remand the proceeding: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the Administrator at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the Administrator and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the Administrator or incorporated in the transcript, and the court determines that such evidence is material, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the Administrator. The Administrator shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof, and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof, except that on request by the Administrator, any such additional evidence may be presented directly to the court.

(b) No such regulation or order shall be set aside, in whole or in part, unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation or order is not in accordance with law, or is arbitrary or capricious. The effectiveness of a judgment of the court setting aside in whole or in part any such regulation or order shall be postponed until the expiration of 30 days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (d) within such 30 days, the effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the case by the Supreme Court.

(c) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act to affirm or set aside, in whole or in part, any regulation or order under section 2, or to remand the proceeding, except that it shall not have the jurisdiction to issue any order or decree staying the effectiveness of any regulation or order establishing a ceiling. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

(d) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Cod , as amended (U. S. C., 1943 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the authorizing such regulations or orders. Exclusi e jurisdiction to determine the validity of negotiations and orders under section 2, and the validity of the provisions of this act authorizing such regulations or orders. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider such validity, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any such provision of this act, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk two amendments in addition to the one already pending and I ask that the three may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 11, strike out subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 204.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, section 203 has to do with the procedure which has been included in the amendment which has been adopted. Section 204 has to do with review, which has

provided in the amendment which has been adopted, that there be a review of the ceilings placed by the Administrator, by the Administrative Board of Review, and it is my intention that a certiorari, or a review may be taken to the circuit court of appeals and from the circuit court of appeals to the Supreme Court, in the same manner as we now review the determinations, findings, orders, and regulations of such administrative agencies as the Security and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and others. It is my purpose to create exactly the same procedure for a judicial review of the determinations by the Board as is now provided for a review of decisions of other administrative boards.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Who will represent the Government agencies?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand the law to be that the Department of Justice can be called upon by any administrative agency of the Government, but lately we have authorized the attorneys named by the different administrative agencies to represent them.

Mr. WALTER. That was not the fact in the language of the original bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. But if there is no language, then the Department of Justice will represent the administrative agency, if I understand the procedure.

Mr. WALTER. Then it is your contention that the Department of Justice should represent the United States in case of appeal?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. If it is found desirable that a lawyer representing the administrative agency sit with the Department of Justice, he can be designated or named for that purpose by the Department of Justice, as I understand it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to strike out section 203, having to do with procedure and subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 204 having to do with the review, and rewrite subsection (d).

I believe there is an amendment on the Clerk's desk which should be read for the information of the House, in respect to language in lieu of that contained in subsection (d).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 17, strike out beginning in line 7 down to and including the period in line 22 and insert:

"(d) Within 30 days after the determination of the Board of Administrative Review any person aggrieved by such determination may file a petition to review such determination in the circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which the complainant resides, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; and thereupon such court shall have the same powers with respect to such determination as in the case of an order of the Federal Trade Commission, under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The order of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari, as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the amendments speak for themselves. They are perfecting amendments, and I ask for their adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 205. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 4 of this act, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 4 of this act, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under section 2 or section 202, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 2 years in the case of a violation of section 4 (c) and for not more than 1 year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Administrator has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

(c) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of section 4 of this act, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all civil proceedings under section 205 (a). Such civil proceedings and any criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Any such civil proceedings may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. No costs shall be assessed against the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

(d) No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, or under any regulation or order of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration or of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order, or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. The Administrator may intervene in any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Page 18, line 8, after the comma insert "or which constitute or will constitute the selling without a license of any commodity or commodities in any case in which a license is required as a condition of such sale," and in line 18, after the first comma, insert: "and any person who willfully sells, without a license, any commodity or commodities in any case in which a license is required as a condition of such sale," and after line 26 insert:

"(c) (1) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action is necessary or proper in order to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act, he may by regulation or order issue to or require of any person or persons subject to any regulation or order under section 2 establishing a ceiling on the price of any commodity, a license as a condition of selling such commodity. No such license shall contain any provision which could not be prescribed by regulation, order, or requirement under section 2 or section 202: *Provided*, That no such license may be required as a condition of selling or distributing newspapers, periodicals, books, or other printed or written material, or as a condition of selling radio time: *Provided further*, That no license may be required of any farmer as a condition of selling any agricultural commodity produced by him: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall not have power to deny to any person a license to sell any commodity or commodities in any case where such a license is required of such person, unless such person already has a license to sell such commodity or commodities, or unless an order of suspension or revocation of a previous license, to the extent that it authorized such persons to sell such commodity or commodities, is in effect under paragraph (2).

"(2) Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator a person has violated any of the provisions of a license issued under this subsection a warning notice shall be sent by registered mail to such person. If the Administrator finds, after opportunity for hearing upon at least 10 days' notice, that a warning notice has been sent and that a violation of any of the provisions of a license has occurred subsequent to the receipt of such warning notice, he may by order suspend or revoke such person's license insofar as it authorizes such person to sell the particular commodity or commodities—specified in the regulation or order in question under section 2—in connection with which the violation occurred. Such suspension or revocation shall not confer any immunity from the other provisions of this act. Within 30 days after issuance of such order of suspension or revocation the licensee may file a petition to review such action in the emergency court of appeals. Thereupon the Administrator shall certify and file with such court a transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was entered. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm or set aside, in whole or in part, the suspension or revocation of the license, or to remand the proceeding: *Provided*, That the Administrator may modify or rescind the requirement of the license or the suspension or revocation at any time notwithstanding the pendency of the petition to review. The court may, upon good cause shown, stay the effectiveness of the suspension or revocation. The revocation or suspension shall be affirmed if the finding of violation after receipt of warning notice is supported by substantial evidence in the record."

Page 19, line 2, strike out "for violations of section 4 of this act" and insert "under subsection (b) of this section."

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if we might not agree on time for discussion of this amendment. Members, of course, are exhausted and would like to conclude consideration of the bill. Let me suggest that the matter has been pretty fully discussed and views crystallized. May we not agree on a short time for the consideration of this amendment and all other amendments?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the gentleman would restrict it to this amendment I think we can agree to a time. I may say that I agree with the gentleman that the issue has been crystallized throughout the debates. There is no desire on our part to prolong debate any longer than is necessary for a full understanding of the amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let us say we will have 20 minutes' further time on amendments altogether.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think there may not be objection if the gentleman would restrict the time to 20 minutes on this particular amendment. I do not know of any other amendments which will take much time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Let us say 20 minutes on this amendment and 10 minutes on all other amendments, so that 30 minutes from now we can conclude consideration of the bill in committee.

I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that Members are tired and would like to conclude consideration of this proposal. I want to take only a very brief part of the time to discuss this amendment.

This is the licensing amendment. The original bill had a similar provision which was stricken from the bill by a vote in the committee. This proposed amendment is a sort of substitute for that provision. The principal objection that seemed to apply more than anything else to the proposal was that it authorized the licensing of a business as such. The amendment changes that provision of the bill so that it applies only to different commodities or articles on the market.

The provision now proposed would not permit an over-all ceiling on any business institution. This plan of price control was employed during the first World War and it worked with great satisfaction and considerable success and without any great annoyance or harassment to the public. Complaints were surprisingly few. So we propose to confine the plan to licensing of particular articles, and any measures of enforcement that would follow could only be employed to the particular article as to which a ceiling had been applied and as to which a license had been required.

I hold the view, which does not seem to be entertained by many members of the committee, that the licensing method of enforcing observance of regulations is much preferable and far less drastic than resort to criminal prosecutions would be.

Criminal prosecutions would not exercise the same restraining influence over large institutions or persons of immense financial means that it would over the small businessman, the small dealer, the citizen of unlimited resources and unequipped for defense in the courts of the country. The large institutions have their staffs of lawyers employed at all times. It is not easy to convict large institutions or individuals who have immense financial resources for conducting litigation in the courts of the country. The small dealer, the little businessman will obey either plan, but it is much less likely to result in hardship if enforced by licensing provisions than by criminal prosecutions.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, for just a moment in opposition to the amendment. I wanted merely to ask the Chairman a question and try to make it clear as to whether we find the margin provision still in his amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. There can be no licensing on that plan. Under this amendment it is limited to the particular article or commodity.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is, as I tried to make plain yesterday, that if a license is used unparegorically tne license is taken away until they make it paregorical. Is that it?

Mr. STEAGALL. I am sorry, I did not catch what the gentleman said.

Mr. GIFFORD. I used it very facetiously yesterday, but I will try to make it more specific: If the licensee of the various articles sells one in violation they do not take away his license except as to that one.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is absolutely so. That is the purpose of the amendment, to remove objections to the plan which we had hoped would remove all objections to this plan because it is so essential to the administration of this law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a fundamental question is involved in the amendment. I had expected that there might be some compromise worked out on this, but it was impossible as I see it for any amendment in respect to licensing to be agreed upon, because in order to have been satisfactory to Mr. Henderson in the administration of this law there had to be some teeth in it and teeth in the licensing provision was the revocation of that license without adequate hearing.

I have said, and I repeat, that this is the provision which gives the Administrator, the Board or any other Administrative agency which may eventually administer this law a strangle hold on American industry and business. The committee have made two or three changes in this provision. We started out with a licensing provision, and then on my motion, the licensing provisions in the original bill were stricken as being unnecessary.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the English bill, which is inserted on page 529 and following. They do not have any licensing provision in that bill except for second-hand dealers. They are required to register, but apparently are not licensed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The committee met later on and adopted a committee amendment which, if adopted, would reinstate the licensing provisions. Today they changed their mind once again and offer still another amendment.

The point I would like to make is this: The statement has been made over the air and in the press that there was no sanction to this law without licensing provisions, that there was no enforcement.

I call attention to the fact that they can go into any United States District Court and enjoin violations. They can have orders to show cause why injunctions should not be granted. If you violate the provisions of this law in any respect you are likely to go to the Federal penitentiary for 2 years, or pay a fine of $5,000. Mr. Chairman, there is an enforcement power which is greater even than the courts themselves, and that is public sentiment. If Mr. Henderson should put a price of $1.25 on silk hosiery and your wife or any of your womenfolks walked into a store downtown and found a price of $1.35 on silk hosiery, what would be their natural reaction? Why, that that store was not cooperating in national defense, and they would not pay this higher price. They would immediately report it. Public sentiment is one of the most effective sanctions of this law. Without favorable public sentiment and cooperation no price stabilization or price-control bill can be effectively enforced.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. In the event this amendment were adopted, could it be possible that the manufacturer of defense articles could have his operations interfered with because one of his vendors had his license suspended?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Absolutely; it might operate to interrupt the flow of raw materials to the defense industries.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been suggested that many prefer licenses as against criminal penalties. As I understand it, if this amendment is adopted as to licenses that would be in addition to criminal penalties, that criminal penalties still remain in the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is in addition to the penalties I have enumerated and in addition to the powers of the court to enjoin violations of the act.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Did not Herbert Hoover as food administrator have and used far wider licensing power than anything contained in this amendment? And did he not testify that such licensing power was necessary for proper enforcement?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is the gentleman going to vote against this bill because of something Herbert Hoover did?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. No. I am going to vote for this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Herbert Hoover is of a different generation than I. In this respect I have a different viewpoint. At any rate, I am not going to do things just because Herbert Hoover did them,

much as I respect his judgment and respect him as a man.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike imposing upon the Committee at this late hour and I am not going to use the full 5 minutes allotted me. I want to point out that the licensing provision now recommended as a committee amendment is not the licensing provision that was in the original draft of the bill which the Committee saw fit to strike from the bill.

The license provision in this committee amendment provides only that a license may be issued as to a particular commodity on which regulations and orders affecting ceilings have been issued under section 2 of the bill. The criminal provision of the license section applies only to the willful sale without a license of a commodity upon which a license is required. It does not make it a criminal offense for a person to sell a commodity on which a license applies when he does not have knowledge of the fact that a license must be in his hands.

Under the amendment no one can be refused a license. No license can be required of a farmer, of a newspaperman, or of a radio station. All the conditions of the license are subject to the protest and judicial review sections of the bill, so that the license can be tested judicially without risk of violation.

Let me call attention to something else. During the World War, when Mr. Hoover had charge of the Food Act, he made reports on numerous occasions to the effect that the licensing provision of that act and of that administration was the backbone of the control that he had over retail prices. At that time, as indicated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoover was operating under a much broader license plan than this, a license plan that enabled him to issue regulations and orders or licenses upon marginal write-ups and inventories. Mind you, this licensing provision applies only to a commodity on which the Administrator under section 2 has the authority now in the bill to issue regulations and orders and ceilings. It does not go beyond that and, in fact, does not go to the full extent of the power in section 2.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. The license only applies against a man who violates the ceiling prices?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Yes. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. A person may violate a license that has been issued to him once and receive a warning order by registered mail. He is not subjected to revocation of his license for having violated that provision on the first occasion. Should he subsequently violate the license provision he may have his license revoked as to the commodity on the sale of which he has violated the ceiling.

It seems to me that this provision the committee now offers is so considerably different from the one in the bill originally, and so much less offensive than the provision that Mr. Hoover operated under during the World War that we cannot afford to have an objection to it.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is it not a fact that if we fail to adopt this very mild system we actually penalize people who conform to the regulations in favor of those who are bootlegging?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. How can the gentleman say it is less powerful than Mr. Hoover had in the World War when in the World War they set only a very few commodities, while in this bill the Administrator has the right to set the prices on everything in the United States except farm products and wages?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I am sure the gentlewoman from Illinois will not have me anticipate the number of ceilings that will be issued under this legislation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Ginsberg says he considers it unfair to regulate a few people unless he regulates everybody. That is his way of interpreting the Constitution.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that in the operation of the law by Mr. Hoover during the last war the records indicate there were not many people who went to the penitentiary, not many who were subjected to fines and imprisonment because of violations of the license provision. Licenses were revoked in some few instances, it is true, but the percentage of revocations was so small that all of us who can remember that period cannot remember of a single instance where a license was revoked within our community or in our own locality.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Did I understand that a licensing provision was in the original bill and was stricken out by committee action?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Then subsequently after the bill was reported, was that same license provision voted back into the bill?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. The licensing provision that was voted back in the form of an amendment had three or four changes. I am sure the gentleman does not want me to point those out. The amendment now being offered is even different from the one that the committee voted as a committee amendment, and is much less offensive than the second amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Was the second one substantially the same as the one originally in the bill?

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. With three changes; yes. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this amendment will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to make an inquiry, in an effort to be fair. The Chair finds that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], a member of the committee, has an amendment on the Clerk's desk to the amendment; is that correct?

Mr. HULL. I have an amendment at the desk; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. To the pending amendment?

Mr. HULL. An amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion, in view of the limitation of time that has been placed, that the gentleman should offer his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HULL. Three minutes is all I want, so far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman seeks recognition in support of his amendment to the amendment, it probably should be offered at this time.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL to the amendment offered by Mr. STEAGALL: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. STEAGALL, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That persons, firms, or corporations doing an annual gross business of less than $100,000 shall be exempt from such licensing provisions."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the licensing provision in this amendment is peculiar, due to the fact that licenses will not be issued especially to any one individual or firm, but all people who are to be included in a particular price-control order which the Administrator shall specify are going to be blanketed in. In consequence, nearly everybody in business may be licensed. Many of them will be licensed, probably, for some time before they will know about it. Possibly the first notice they will get that they ever were licensed at all will be when a threat of prosecution or a threat of revocation comes to them.

There are about 600,000 small firms in the United States, independent grocers, meat markets, barber shops, beauty parlors, and many other lines of small business. They will be licensed by the Price Control Administrator, if deemed necessary.

The license order will, of course, be published in the Federal Register. The scope of such licenses will be too great for the newspapers to attempt to carry the information to everybody when a license is issued under a blanket order. In consequence, many of these firms without any acquaintance whatsoever with the law, or the system, will be subject to being hauled up and having their licenses revoked, without knowing what it is all about.

There are about 135,000 small firms in the United States, mainly in the industrial line, employing less than 20 people. They are having a hard time of it now, under the so-called priority rating

system, to obtain the materials in order to keep in operation. In consequence, it is estimated that thousands of them will be closed, 2,000,000 or more men will be out of employment, and many communities will be damaged greatly because of their closing.

These industries are going to be blanketed under the general licensing system whether they are in operation or not. The first they will know, probably, of any such license being in existence will be when they receive a notice that they have exceeded the limit on some particular line of goods.

It seems to me there ought to be some limit to this. There ought to be something done to enable the small businessman and the small industry to escape the persecution, possibly to escape the blackmail, which may be levied upon them by some competitor or some enemy. There ought to be something done to limit the number of people who will be included in the licensing system. That is the reason for this amendment. I have fixed the limit at $100,000 for the reason that with that exemption at least some of these small dealers will not be called upon to face a revocation of license proceeding before they even know that they have been licensed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 74, noes 91.

So the amendment to the committee admendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EFFECT OF PRICE REGULATIONS ON CONTRACT OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 206. Provisions in any contract or agreement for the sale of any commodity heretofore or hereafter entered into while a ceiling on such commodity was in effect, which require the payment, either unconditionally or on condition that such ceiling should be modified, rescinded, or declared invalid, of a price in excess of such ceiling are hereby declared to be invalid and unenforceable. Provisions in any contract or agreement for the sale of any commodity heretofore or hereafter entered into while a ceiling on such commodity was not in effect but under which deliveries were made while such a ceiling was in effect, which require the payment, either conditionally or unconditionally, of a price in excess of such ceiling, are hereby declared invalid and unenforceable with respect to such deliveries. As used in this section the term "ceiling" shall include any ceiling established by regulation or order of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration or the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 20, line 20, at the end of title II, insert a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE III

"SECTION 1. (A) Section 207 of title II of the Banking Act of 1935 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 207. The sixth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'"Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained against demand or time deposits, or both, by member banks; but the amount of the reserves required to be maintained by any such member bank as a result of any such change shall not be less than the amount of the reserves required by law to be maintained by such bank on the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935."'

"(B) All individuals, firms, associations, or corporations in the United States, or Territories and possessions thereof, receiving deposits of money or credit or any other substitute medium of exchange withdrawable or payable upon the check or equivalent order of the depositor upon demand or within 60 days and transferring such deposits or title thereto, to other banks or individuals, firms, associations, or corporations, in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or foreign countries, shall be deemed to be commercial banks engaged in interstate commerce, and as such are subject to Federal jurisdiction and to the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the carrying out of the purposes of this section.

"(c) In order to prevent inflation of bank credit and a consequent harmful rise in the price level, the board of governors shall, as soon as practicable without deflationary effects resulting, require all commercial banks to hold all deposits which are subject to check and/or payable on demand or within 60 days (hereinafter referred to as demand deposits) in trust for their demand depositors, in lawful money of the United States on hand or on deposit in a Federal Reserve bank: *Provided, however,* That commercial banks which have a portion of the funds of their demand depositors invested in interest-bearing bonds and/or notes issued or fully guaranteed by the United States Government on the date of passage of this act may hold such interest-bearing bonds and/or notes in trust for their demand depositors in lieu of lawful money or deposits in a Federal Reserve bank and such commercial banks may continue to receive the interest thereon and retain same for their own benefit: *Provided further,* That any such direct or fully guaranteed obligations of the United States shall be discountable at the par value thereof at any Federal Reserve bank: *Provided further,* That no commercial bank shall at any time use any part of the lawful money or deposits in a Federal Reserve bank held in trust for its demand depositors for the purchase of any bonds or notes of the United States: *Provided further,* That such funds as may be received by any commercial bank in redemption of bonds or notes of the United States held in trust for its demand depositors shall thereafter be held in trust for its demand depositors in lieu of such bonds or notes.

"(D) Within 1 year from the date of passage of this act, any solvent commercial bank which has on hand or on deposit in a Federal Reserve bank an insufficient total of cash and bonds or notes issued or fully guaranteed by the United States, to comply with regulations of the Board of Governors increasing reserve requirements, may hypothecate with the Federal Reserve bank of its district so much of its other sound bankable assets as may be necessary to bring its total holdings of cash and bonds or notes as herein specified to the total of the demand deposits of its depositors.

"(E) All demand deposits shall be held in trust for the benefit of the depositors and shall not be merged with or be regarded as assets of the bank nor shall they be liable for its obligations.

"(F) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish and enforce such uniform rules and regulations for the withdrawal of savings and time-deposit funds from banks subject to its jurisdiction as may be necessary to effect a complete separation of the demand-deposit departments from the time and savings-deposit departments of such banks. Such deposits shall not be withdrawable on demand but only after such due notice as the Board may require has been given by the depositor to the bank.

"SEC. 2. (A) The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is hereby authorized and directed forthwith to purchase the capital stock of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and branches, and agencies thereof, and to pay to the owners thereof the amount of their paid-in capital stock at the date of purchase.

"All member banks of the Federal Reserve System are hereby required and directed to deliver forthwith to the Treasurer of the United States, by the execution and delivery of such documents as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, all the stock of said Federal Reserve banks owned or controlled by them, together with all claims of any kind or nature in and to the capital assets of the said Federal Reserve banks, it being the intention of this act to vest in the Government of the United States the absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the said Federal Reserve banks.

"(B) The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall purchase from the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States from time to time non-interest-bearing obligations of the United States in sufficient amount to increase the total supply of money in the form of cash or demand bank deposits in the United States in the same ratio as the national income increases and thus to maintain a stable buying power in the dollar."

And on page 20, line 21, change "Title III" to "Title IV."

Mr. TABER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, the reading of the amendment has now progressed to the point where it is apparent it is subject to a point of order. I make the point of order that it is not germane.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from California on the point of order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with the fundamental problem of inflation and deflation. It has to do with the question of the control of the creation and destruction of what America now uses for its money, namely, demand bank deposits.

The amendment provides for 100 percent reserves behind these demand deposits, thus requiring that the money people think they have in the bank shall actually be there and making it impossible for 15,000 private banks to create money on the basis of fractional reserves in order to loan that money into circulation at interest. Yes, without 100-percent reserves the private banks of America are even permitted to use this privately created check-book money to buy interest-bearing Government bonds.

Those bonds then become security for the very credit that was created with which to buy them. And the bonds represent nothing on earth but the credit of the American people, their power to produce wealth, the taxing power of their Government.

This amendment provides further for the acquisition of the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks by the Government, and thereafter for the bringing into circulation by the permission of the Congress, according to definite provisions of law, of such amount of money each year as corresponds to the increase in the national income of the Nation, which is the right amount—the amount that will prevent deflation and also prevent inflation.

If you really want to control inflation and deflation, Mr. Chairman, these things have to be done. I submit that there is nothing as fundamental to this problem as the material contained in the amendment which I am attempting to offer, and that, therefore, it must be germane to a bill which has as its title—

A bill to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies.

I further submit that I have charts and materials here that show that between March of this year and August of this year there was created by the private banks of this country and put into circulation $6,500,000,000 of new money, that on the present basis the banks are in position to create an additional $20,000,000,000 of demand deposit money, and that at present there is no power in the Federal Reserve Board or anywhere else to prevent this. If we permit the irresponsible creation of this checkbook, demand-deposit money by private institutions, then it simply cannot be expected that inflation can be prevented now or deflation in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from California offers an amendment, and the gentleman from New York makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane. The Chair has rather hurriedly but, he feels, with sufficient care, examined the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The pending bill deals with price fixing or more specifically with a ceiling on prices of commodities, rents and so forth. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California deals with the Federal Reserve Board and its power of dealing with currency and credit matters. The Chair thinks this amendment is not closely enough allied with the pending bill to make it in order and, therefore, the point of order made by the gentleman from New York is sustained.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will it be in order when we go back into the House for me to ask unanimous consent to get time at some future time to make a speech on this subject?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can do that by unanimous consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 301. The Administrator from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 302. As used in this act—

(a) The term "sale" includes sales, dispositions, exchanges, leases, and other transfers, and contracts and offers to do any of the foregoing. The terms "sell," "selling," "seller," "buy," and "buyer," shall be construed accordingly.

(b) The term "price" means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the sale of a commodity.

(c) The term "commodity," in addition to commodities, articles, products, and materials, includes services rendered otherwise than as an employee in connection with the processing, distribution, storage, installation, repair, or negotiation of purchases or sales, of a commodity, or in connection with the operation of any service establishment: *Provided,* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the regulation of (1) compensation paid by an employer to any of his employees, or (2) rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility.

(d) The term "defense-rental area" means the District of Columbia and any area designated by the Administrator as an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations inconsistent with the purposes of this act.

(e) The term "defense-area housing accommodations" means housing accommodations within any defense-rental area.

(f) The term "housing accommodations" means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, hotels, rooming or boarding house accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

(g) The term "rent" means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the use or occupancy or the transfer of a lease of any housing accommodations.

(h) The term "person" includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided,* That no punishment provided by this act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

(i) The term "ceiling", as applied to prices of commodities, means the maximum lawful price for such commodities, and as applied to rents, means the maximum lawful rent for the use of defense-area housing accommodations. Ceilings may be formulated in terms of prices, rents, margins, commissions, fees, and other charges, and allowances.

(j) The term "documents" includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents, and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

(k) The term "district court" means any district court of the United States, and the United States court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: On page 21, line 17, after the word "commodity" strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the words "except services rendered."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to exclude from the provisions of the bill personal-service establishments.

There is excluded from the bill any price ceiling on labor or more correctly on wages, and it seems to me if we are going to be consistent then this amendment should be adopted. It has been said repeatedly on the floor of the House that labor is not a commodity, and I think that is correct, and if it is correct, then it also follows that if the labor of one laborer is not a commodity then the labor collectively of several of them is not a commodity. In other words, service establishments sell nothing but labor. They do not sell any commodity and there is no ingredient added that will make it any different from the labor of the individual. Another reason is that if we place a ceiling on service establishments, in effect, we are placing a ceiling on labor. The only alternative that the laborer will have in a service establishment is to stop work if the rates he seeks are not permitted under the ceiling on service establishments.

In addition, this will affect mostly such service establishments as laundries, dry cleaners, window cleaners, barbers, and so forth, where the services can be performed in the home, and this fact will prevent inflation, because the person seeking the service will perform many of them for themselves in case of inflation of prices. There will therefore be a natural control on any inflation in prices.

I think if we are going to be consistent this amendment should be adopted so as to exclude from the operations of the bill personal-service establishments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri will be recognized for 2 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an arrow pointed at the heart of democracy. If it is passed, it will set up an economic dictatorship and will give to one man—you call it a board, but it will be under the influence of that man, Mr. Leon Henderson. It will give to him complete control of life and death over private industry in this country. It is significant to note that hundreds of employees of the old N. R. A., that was declared by a unanimous and ringing decision of both the liberal and conservative Justices of the Supreme Court 6 years ago to be unconstitutional, have been retained at the enormous expense of thousands of dollars, and that the files of that N. R. A. have been cataloged and

preserved down in The Archives. I do not know how the Members are going to vote on this bill, but to me it is a hodgepodge, and much as I respect every member of the Banking and Currency Committee of this House—and it is a great committee, composed of men and women of high idealism and great intellect and of noble patriotism—I hesitate to oppose anything sponsored by my dear friend the gentleman from Alabama, HENRY STEAGALL, because I have for him the highest admiration and genuine affection, as I have for every single member of this committee. Much as I respect these members, I doubt if there is a single member on the committee who knows now what is in the bill. I am unalterably opposed to it and I hope that the motion to recommit the bill will carry overwhelmingly by Members on both sides of this aisle. The bill should be defeated. It will end in disaster.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 21, line 23, strike out all of subsection (d) and insert the following:

"(d) The term 'defense rental area' means any area designated by the Administrator as an area where defense activities have resulted in a substantial general increase in the rents for housing accommodations consistent with the purposes of this act and where a housing shortage has been evidenced by the area being designated for the grant of priorities or allocation for building materials which are upon the critical list of such materials."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for this bill. Out in the humble homes and firesides in my country, where people have been discussing the price of sugar and pork chops around the supper table, they are interested in a price-control bill. I want to get the best bill that I can and I am going to vote for this bill. I think this amendment to redefine the housing area so as not to thwart the free flow of public funds into private homes will make this a better bill and I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken on this price-control bill during this week of debate and amendment for the very good reason that I have been waiting to be convinced and awaiting its final form. Now that we have arrived at a final form, I am convinced that it should be sent back to the Committee on Banking and Currency, even though I do not envy that committee the task of rewriting the bill.

While I recognize the necessity for setting up certain temporary controls of a totalitarian nature in order that our country may become closely knit for any defensive action, I have no intention of casting my vote in this Congress for one small step beyond that which I consider absolutely necessary. As I see it, this bill, even with the amendments in it as proposed by the minority, contains many features that I believe dangerous. At the same time it fails to get at the roots of the underlying causes of inflation, such as currency devaluation, credit inflation, and the well-known unbalanced Budget. Of course, the latter is a general subject and not one that can be cured by a bill, but I want action.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see this bill go over to the other body. I am fearful that they will not improve it, but on the contrary. Therefore I shall vote to recommit. If that vote fails then I shall be compelled to vote against the bill.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, no bill of this composition, unless it be ruthlessly and well-nigh brutally administered, can be enforced. Our people are not likely to submit with resignation to such enforcement. The terms of the bill must be fair and must be recognized as such in order to obtain public cooperation and sanction. Otherwise its terms will be avoided and our people will perforce become lawbreakers. We had an unfortunate experience like that in the 1920's. Priorities and allocations bring about shortages in essential materials. Substitutes will be sought and the prices bid up until the price administrator will be forced, and I fear too late, to place ceilings on the substitutes. Then bootlegging develops in the essential and its substitutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that price control of only certain selected commodities is a mistake. In order to be fair, if rigid control be really necessary, then the only right solution seems to me to be the freezing of all prices at a given level, but in no single instance below the cost of production plus a fair return. The business of jimmying things around as this bill encourages seems to me to be crazy.

Prices on the same article are now, and always have been, different in different parts of the country. They are cheaper nearest the source of supply than they are at distant points of distribution. To sit down and even commence to compute a list of fair prices that should be charged in even four widely separated points in the United States is a monumental task that is not likely to be accomplished before the beginning of World War No. 3, let alone the end of World War No. 2.

Then there is another factor. In smaller communities or smaller stores the cost of doing business on merchandise is greater than in the larger places and stores. Are you setting the ceiling high enough so that the independent merchant can do business or are you going to set it so that he may be driven out of business?

The only fair price to set for merchandise to be sold at retail is the wholesale price, then limit the retailer to a fair margin of profit. If you do not do that then the large firms are going to eat up the remaining small firms and what becomes of not only small businessmen themselves but what becomes of the opportunity to start out in business.

No, Mr. Chairman; the approach is wrong, in my humble opinion. Perhaps I am wrong. I have not had the benefit of the long study given this great problem by the committee members. But listening to this debate I am inclined to believe that if price control must be had, then the approach to it offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is the better one. I say this even though I may not agree wholly with the proposal he submitted and which the House voted down on yesterday.

I have many other objections, many questions to raise, and fears to voice, but finally I want to say that I think Mr. Henderson, as Price Administrator, could do a lot more toward controlling prices by continuing the methods he has employed to date without being backed by laws of compulsion than he ever will by sending out a lot of snoopers and supersnoopers on a fattened Government pay roll to harass and bedevil merchants and traders. Do not forget for one moment that this bill enables the little agents of the big administrator to literally crucify any merchant they may choose to pick on.

In the final analysis the best regulators of prices are the housewives who do the buying and they are not feeding on the Federal pay roll meantime. Let our women know what the fair price is and the Administrator will need no other assistants.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 5990, and pursuant to House Resolution 348 he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read the third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make the necessary paragraph designations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miss SUMNER of Illinois moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Fifty-two Members have arisen; not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Miss SUMNER of Illinois) there were—ayes 134 and noes 173.

So, the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 191 and noes 120.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 161, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—224

Allen, La.	Ellis	Kerr
Angell	Engel	Kilburn
Barden	Englebright	Kirwan
Barnes	Fellows	Klein
Barry	Fenton	Knutson
Bates, Ky.	Fish	Kocialkowski
Bates, Mass.	Fitzgerald	Kopplemann
Beam	Fitzpatrick	Kramer
Beckworth	Flaherty	Kunkel
Belter	Flannagan	Leavy
Bender	Fogarty	Lesinski
Blackney	Folger	Lewis
Bland	Forand	Ludlow
Bloom	Ford, Thomas F.	Lynch
Boehne	Fulmer	McCormack
Boggs	Gamble	McGranery
Boland	Gavagan	McIntyre
Boykin	Gerlach	McKeough
Bradley, Pa.	Gifford	McLaughlin
Brooks	Gossett	McLean
Brown, Ga.	Hall,	Maciejewski
Bryson	Edwin Arthur	Maciora
Buckley, N. Y.	Hall,	Mahon
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Marcantonio
Burgin	Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Byron	Hancock	May
Camp	Hare	Merritt
Canfield	Harris, Ark.	Meyer, Md.
Cannon, Fla.	Harris, Va.	Michener
Capozzoli	Hart	Mills, Ark.
Carter	Harter	Mitchell
Casey, Mass.	Healey	Moser
Clason	Heffernan	Mott
Claypool	Hill, Wash.	Murdock
Cluett	Hobbs	Myers, Pa.
Cochran	Holbrook	Norrell
Coffee, Wash.	Holmes	O'Brien, Mich.
Cole, Md.	Hook	O'Brien, N. Y.
Colmer	Houston	Patman
Cooper	Hunter	Patrick
Courtney	Imhoff	Pfeifer,
Crosser	Izac	Joseph L.
Cullen	Jackson	Pheiffer,
D'Alesandro	Jacobsen	William T.
Davis, Ohio	Jarman	Pierce
Davis, Tenn.	Jenks, N. H.	Pittenger
Delaney	Johnson, Ind.	Priest
Dewey	Johnson,	Ramsay
Dickstein	Luther A.	Ramspeck
Dingell	Johnson,	Randolph
Dirksen	Lyndon B.	Richards
Domengeaux	Johnson, W. Va.	Robertson, Va.
Dondero	Kean	Robinson, Utah
Doughton	Kee	Rockefeller
Downs	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
Duncan	Kelley, Pa.	Rolph
Durham	Kennedy,	Sabath
Eaton	Martin J.	Sacks
Eberharter	Kennedy,	Sanders
Edmiston	Michael J.	Sasscer
Eliot, Mass.	Keogh	Scanlon
Schuetz	Sutphin	Ward
Schulte	Sweeney	Weaver
Scott	Tenerowicz	Weiss
Secrest	Terry	Welch
Shanley	Thill	Wene
Sheppard	Thom	Wigglesworth
Simpson	Thomas, Tex.	Williams
Smith, Maine	Thomason	Wolcott
Smith, Pa.	Tibbott	Wolverton, N. J.
Smith, Wash.	Tinkham	Woodrum, Va.
Somers, N. Y.	Traynor	Worley
Sparkman	Treadway	Wright
Spence	Van Zandt	Young
Steagall	Vinson, Ga.	Youngdahl
Stearns, N. H.	Voorhis, Calif.	Zimmerman
Sullivan	Vreeland	
Sumners, Tex.	Walter	

NAYS—161

Allen, Ill.	Gilchrist	Pace
Andersen,	Gillie	Paddock
H. Carl	Gore	Patton
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Pearson
Anderson,	Granger	Peterson, Fla.
N. Mex.	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.
Andresen,	Green	Plauché
August H.	Gregory	Ploeser
Arends	Guyer	Plumley
Baumhart	Gwynne	Poage
Bell	Haines	Rabaut
Bennett	Harness	Rankin, Miss.
Bishop	Harrington	Rankin, Mont.
Bolton	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Heidinger	Reed, Ill.
Boren	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Rich
Buckler, Minn.	Hope	Rizley
Burch	Howell	Robertson,
Burdick	Hull	N. Dak.
Butler	Jarrett	Robsion, Ky.
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.
Carlson	Jensen	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johns	Sauthoff
Chapman	Johnson, Calif.	Shafer, Mich.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Short
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Sikes
Clark	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Jonkman	Smith, Va.
Coffee, Nebr.	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Collins	Kilday	South
Cooley	Kinzer	Springer
Copeland	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Cox	Lambertson	Stefan
Cravens	Landis	Stevenson
Crawford	Lanham	Stratton
Creal	Lea	Sumner, Ill.
Crowther	LeCompte	Taber
Culkin	McGehee	Talle
Cunningham	McGregor	Tarver
Curtis	McMillan	Thomas, N. J.
Day	Manasco	Vincent, Ky.
Dies	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Disney	Mason	West
Ditter	Mills, La.	Wheat
Drewry	Monroney	Whelchel
Dworshak	Mundt	White
Elliott, Calif.	Murray	Whitten
Elston	Nelson	Whittington
Ford, Miss.	Nichols	Wickersham
Gathings	O'Connor	Wilson
Gearhart	O'Hara	Winter
Gehrmann	Oliver	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gibson	O'Neal	Woodruff, Mich.

NOT VOTING—44

Andrews	Hartley	Powers
Arnold	Hendricks	Rivers
Baldwin	Hill, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.
Buck	Jennings	Romjue
Byrne	Kelly, Ill.	Satterfield
Cartwright	Larrabee	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	McArdle	Scrugham
Cole, N. Y.	Maas	Shannon
Costello	Magnuson	Sheridan
Douglas	Mansfield	Smith, W. Va.
Faddis	Norton	Snyder
Flannery	O'Day	Tolan
Ford, Leland M.	O'Leary	Wadsworth
Gale	Osmers	Wasielewski
Grant, Ala.	O'Toole	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Larrabee for, with Mr. Scrugham against.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois for with Mr Hartley against.

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Leland M. Ford against.

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Hill of Colorado against.

Mr. Wadsworth for, with Mr. Cartwright against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Buck against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr Wasielewski against.

Mr. Mansfield for, with Mr. Jennings against.

General pairs:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Powers.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. McArdle with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Faddis.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Flannery with Mr. O'Leary.

Mr. Tolan with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions in opposition to the price-control bill by the National Farmers Union and the National Milk Growers Federation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF DECEMBER 1

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some uncertainty as to the program for next week. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, would tell us what the program is going to be?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very glad to answer the distinguished minority leader.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called and there will be two suspensions, one on the sugar bill recently reported out by the Committee on Agriculture, and a suspension on the defense-housing bill. There may be one or two consent requests. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], I understand has a bill which will not be controversial. Any bill that may be brought up by unanimous consent will not be controversial.

The labor legislation will be called up then, the rule on the Vinson bill. This

rule if adopted provides 2 days of general debate and for the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule. We expect to start reading the bill on Wednesday and it is hoped that the labor legislation will be disposed of by Wednesday.

Following the labor bill there will be an appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be called up on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention to call the appropriation bill up immediately after the labor legislation is disposed of. I think that is a bill which comes out of the deficiency subcommittee. I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] here. Am I correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. The bill will probably be ready to report on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then we can count on it for sure Thursday?

Mr. TABER. I am sure it can be reported out Wednesday if the gentleman wants it.

Mr. McCORMACK. We would like to have it follow the labor legislation, so I hope it will be out. I see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] here. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are ready to report the bill at any time required by the leaders.

Mr. McCORMACK. The appropriation bill will be in order after the labor legislation is disposed of.

We propose to sit on Saturday of next week if there is legislation to be considered, and there probably will be, for a bill extending the Soil Conservation Act must be passed before the end of December. We expect this bill to come up next week. It is a very important measure.

I do not know of any other legislation that ought to be disposed of by Friday, but I cannot make any promises.

It is the hope of the leadership on both sides, and I make this statement not for the Democratic side alone, but for both sides, that we can have some kind of recess or adjournment for an appreciable period prior to Christmas, so the Members can go home an appreciable period before the Christmas holidays.

Next week we intend to have rather an intensive week. That is the program we have in mind now.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the last legislative day I received permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a department. It now develops that this will require four pages and the cost of printing will be $180. I ask unanimous consent that permission may be given to extend the letter in the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS ON PRICE-CONTROL BILL

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in an extension of remarks as shown on page 8743 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 10, 1941, I referred to the Secretary of Labor as "Madam Frances (Wadski) Perkins." In doing so I thought that I was fully justified by reason of a copy of an affidavit in my possession made by Frank M. Grant, city clerk, Newton, Mass., on January 29, 1926.

Madam Perkins tells me that the affidavit is inaccurate so far as she is concerned; that she is not a native of Russia; that she was born in Boston; and that she is a daughter of Frederick W. and Susan E. Perkins, both of New England ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, I would not knowingly do injustice to any person, and have made this statement in fairness to the Secretary of Labor. I ask that in printing the permanent RECORD the word "Wadski," on page 8743, and the words "and the alien theories of her native Russia," as shown in the last paragraph of page 8744, be omitted.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article that appeared in the New York Evening Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permisison to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed in my district by the Townsend people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BUCKLER]?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST ON LOANS ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 6114) to reduce the interest on loans on United States Government life (converted) insurance be rereferred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I have talked to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and he has no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make two extensions in the RECORD and to include in one a letter from the Governor of Kansas and in the other a resolution adopted by the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHAFER of Michigan and Mr. HARRIS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution by a farm group on price fixing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by Oswald Villard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial from the Fort Worth Star Telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Shreveport Times on the farm situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a letter from the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and my reply thereto, and in the other to include a short editorial on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mrs. NORTON, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. LELAND M. FORD, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. WHELCHEL, for 20 days, beginning December 1, 1941, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'LEARY, for 1 week, on account of the death of his wife.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 466. An act for the relief of J. T. Colter;

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas;

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum;

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others;

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer; and

H. R. 5890. An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, December 1, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, December 2, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, December 2, 1941, on H. R. 6109, which supersedes H. R. 5879.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10 a. m., Tuesday, December 2, 1941, to consider S. 1623.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, December 3, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 6056, to regulate in the United States Court of Claims suits for payment for the use of inventions by or for the Government, on Wednesday, December 3, 1941, at 10 a. m., room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1104. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1105. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 26, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of, and review of reports on, Lumber River and tributaries, North Carolina and South Carolina, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939, and requested by resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted April 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5800. A bill authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 246. Joint resolution to authorize the Maritime Commission to sell two merchant vessels to the Government of the Republic of Eire; with amendment (Rept. No. 1454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 5925. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 6128. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Labor. H. R. 6137. A bill to provide for the voluntary mediation of labor disputes affecting the national defense, to require the maintenance by employers and employees of the status quo during mediation efforts, to provide for the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2304. A bill to further amend the naturalization laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5455) for the relief of Rebecca Goldbaugh, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6129. A bill to transfer the county of Meriwether from the Columbus division of the middle district of Georgia to the Newnan division of the northern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. R. 6130. A bill to provide for the acquisition for park and recreational purposes of certain privately owned land on the shores of Soap Lake, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6131. A bill to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 203 and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 6132. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territories; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6133. A bill authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 6134. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6135. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 6136. A bill to amend section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 6137. A bill to provide for the voluntary mediation of labor disputes affecting the national defense, to require the maintenance by employers and employees of the status quo during mediation efforts, to provide for the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 6138. A bill providing for the issuance of a certificate of citizenship to any person claiming to be a citizen of the United States at birth in whose case no official record of birth is available; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 6139. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6140. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, so as to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of floricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to create a committee on capital clearance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution granting permission to Thomas Parran, surgeon general of the United States Public Health Service; Bolivar J. Lloyd, medical director (retired), United States Public Health Service; Howard F. Smith, medical director, United States Public Health Service; Herbert A. Spencer, medical director, United States Public Health Service, and Gilbert L. Dunnahoo, surgeon, United States Public Health Service, to accept and wear certain decorations bestowed upon them by the Governments of France, Cuba, Chile, Finland, and Luang-Prabang; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Miss RANKIN of Montana:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution to order a national advisory election to ascertain the will of the people on war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to direct the Secretary of State to petition the Government of Great Britain to permit the organization of all-Jewish military units in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 349. Resolution requesting the appearance of Westbrook Pegler before the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 350. Resolution to appoint a fact-finding committee concerning the supply of metal useful to national defense; to the Committee on Rules

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. Res. 351. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Honduras to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 352. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial hospitality extended by the President of the Republic of Costa Rica and the congress of that nation to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 353. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the Government of the Republic of Panama to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 354. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Mexico and by the chamber of deputies of that nation to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 355. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Uruguay to a delegation of members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 356. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Cuba and the congress of that nation to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 357. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Haiti to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 358. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Venezuela and the congress of that nation to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 359. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Ecuador and the hospitality of the Congress of Ecuador on the occasion of a visit to Ecuador by a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 360. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Peru and the generous hospitality of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru on the occasion of a visit to Peru by a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 361. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President and by the Congress of the Republic of Colombia to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 362. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial hospitality extended by the Government of the Republic of Chile and the Chamber of Deputies of that nation to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 363. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President, by the acting President and by the Congress of Argentina to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 364. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of El Salvador to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 365. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial hospitality extended by the President of Nicaragua to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res 366. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of Guatemala and for the courtesies shown by other officials and by the people of Guatemala to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 367. Resolution expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended by the President of the United States of Brazil, by other high officials and by the people of Brazil to a delegation of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 368. Resolution requesting the President to call a conference of industry, labor, and government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 369. Resolution for the purpose of stopping strikes; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6141. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. M. W. Hull; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 6142. A bill for the relief of Ebbie Kirschke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr CLASON:

H. R. 6143. A bill for the relief of Ernest H. West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 6144. A bill for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6145. A bill for the relief of Mason C. Brunson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 6146. A bill to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Alfred Conrad Grzedzicki; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 6147. A bill granting a pension to Alva A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 6148. A bill for the relief of Allen C. Hover; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2092. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of the General Welfare Center of Newton, Kans., urging that the Social Security Act be amended in accordance with House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2093. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of C. Guy Steele, of Waterville, Kans., and 200 others, protesting against the standards of "oleo," signed by Paul V. McNutt, which give manufacturers of oleo liberty to sell oleo in imitation of butter, and hereby petitioning Congress to suspend these standards; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2094. Also, petition of Rev. H. F. Bennett and 16 others, of Robinson, Kans., and nearby communities, urging the support of Senate bill 860 to give to the young men of 1941 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2095. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the City Planning Commission of City and County of San Francisco, adopted and ordered, recommending that the construction and

management of federally controlled defense housing projects be under the jurisdiction of local housing authorities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2096. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Welfare Center of Newton, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2097. Also, petition of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2098. Also, petition of the Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of Hon. Lawrence J. Connery; to the Committee on Memorials.

2099. Also, petition of the Baptist Mission, First Baptist Church, Lincoln Park, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1941

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of the living and the dead, infinite yet tender Spirit, whose love and goodness we adore, in the solemn hush of this morning hour we lift our voice of sorrow unto Thee because one whom we have loved has passed into Thy nearer presence; yet we rejoice amid our sorrow that it was given to him to offer here his life in true and noble service on the altar of his country.

Enfold in Thine everlasting arms the loved ones for whom especially we pray, and grant that they may know that, in Thine own good time, lives that are sundered here shall be reunited in the country of their hopes, where Thou shalt make them glad in Thine abundant answer to every bygone prayer.

Love is and was my Lord and King,
And in his presence I attend
To hear the tidings of my friend,
Which every hour his couriers bring.

Love is and was my King and Lord,
And will be tho' as yet I keep
Within his court on earth, and sleep
Encompass'd by his faithful guard.

And hear at times a sentinel
Who moves about from place to place
And whispers to the worlds of space.
In the deep night, that all is well.

We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, who hath brought life and immortality to light. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, November 27, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 466. An act for the relief of J. T. Colter;

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas;

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum;

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others;

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.; and

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 27th ultimo,

On November 29, 1941, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 5890) to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand adjourned until Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORTS BY COMMITTEES AND SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session all committees may submit reports and amendments to bills may be submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEATH OF SENATOR ADAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it is with the deepest sorrow that I officially announce to the Senate the passing of my beloved colleague, Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS, the senior Senator from Colorado. Senator ADAMS was a kindly man, of profound judgment; he was widely informed, courageous, and industrious to a rare degree. He loved his country and his family, and he dedicated his life to their well being. My State of Colorado keenly feels his loss.

On some future day I hope that a time may be set for Members of this body to pay the tribute which swells in their hearts today to the memory of this good man.

Mr. President, I offer the resolution, which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of 19 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently, under the second resolving clause, appointed the following Senators to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator: Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. HERRING, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BUNKER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. O'DANIEL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, December 4, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 1, 1941:

JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Walter G. Riddick, of Arkansas, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. ARTHUR D. HEALEY, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hon. Elisha M. Brewster, retired.

Charles Edward Vyzanski, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hugh D. McLellan, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert Grant, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, vice Paul E. Ruppel, term expired

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frank A. Schuler, Jr., of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATOR

Carl Riggs, of West Virginia, to be Work Projects administrator for West Virginia, effective December 10, 1941.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

DENTAL CORPS

To be first lieutenant with rank from date of appointment

Capt. Walter Jacob Powers, Dental Corps Reserve.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be first lieutenants with rank from date of appointment

Capt. Russell Martin Madison, Veterinary Corps Reserve.

First Lt. James Clayton McIntyre, Veterinary Corps Reserve.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

(All officers listed below, with the exception of James Thomas Curry, Jr., Air Corps, and Earle J. Carpenter, Air Corps, now hold rank as temporary lieutenant colonel.)

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from December 4, 1941

Maj. Mortimer Francis Sullivan, Cavalry.

Maj. Eggleston Westley Peach, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Leslie Dillon Carter, Cavalry.

Maj. Don Riley, Infantry.

Maj. Pembroke Augustine Brawner, Infantry.

Maj. Isaac Leonard Kitts, Field Artillery.

×Maj. Fred Charles Thomas, Quartermaster Corps.

×Maj. Merrill Deitz Mann, Air Corps.

Maj. Albert Carl Foulk, Air Corps.

Maj. Edward Vincent Harbeck, Jr., Air Corps.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 8, 1941

Maj. Hubert Butler Bramlet, Chemical Warfare Service.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from December 18, 1941

Maj. Edward Ernest Hildreth, Air Corps.

Maj. Samuel Gordon Frierson, Air Corps.

Maj. Phillips Melville, Air Corps.

Maj. John Gordon Williams, Air Corps.

Maj. Albert Brown Pitts, Air Corps.

×Maj. Bernard Scott Thompson, Air Corps.

Maj. Willis Ratcliffe Taylor, Air Corps.

Maj. Robert Duane Knapp, Air Corps.

Maj. Louis Braswell Knight, Infantry.

×Maj. Lowell Allison Elliott, Chemical Warfare Service.

Maj. James Thomas Curry, Jr., Air Corps.

Maj. Harry Albert Fudge, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Burdette Mase Fitch, Adjutant General's Department.

Maj. William Bettencourt Souza, Air Corps.

Maj. Alfred Lindeburg, Air Corps.

Maj. Joseph Alexis Wilson, Air Corps.

Maj. Theodore Anton Baumeister, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Clements McMullen, Air Corps.

Maj. Ames Scribner Albro, Air Corps.

Maj. Milo McCune, Air Corps.

Maj. Benjamin Buckles Cassiday, Air Corps.

Maj. Charles Yawkey Banfill, Air Corps.

Maj. Myron Ray Wood, Air Corps.

Maj. Robert Theodore Cronau, Air Corps.

Maj. Rex Walter Minckler, Signal Corps.

Maj. Frank Charles Peters, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. William Joseph Gainey, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Lloyd Chartley Blackburn, Air Corps.

Maj. Edward Jenkins, Infantry.

Maj. William Campbell Goldsborough, Air Corps.

Maj. Roscoe Bonham, Philippine Scouts.

Maj. Walter Raymond Peck, Air Corps.

Maj. Leon Aurile White, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Ephraim Preston Jolls, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Walter Lee McCormick, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Arnold Dante Amoroso, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Clarence Omer Bell, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Fred Brenning Waters, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Arthur Girard Hamilton, Air Corps.

Maj. Charles Mellis Myers, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Frederick Rockwell Chamberlain, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Emil Charles Kiel, Air Corps.

Maj. Harold Lee George, Air Corps.

Maj. Lewis Allegeo Dayton, Air Corps.

Maj. Younger Arnold Pitts, Air Corps.

Maj. Howard Zabriskie Bogert, Air Corps.

Maj. Charles Roderick Mize, Finance Department.

Maj. Joseph Branson Canfield, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Emile Peter Antonovich, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Hans Christian Jespersen, Infantry.

Maj. Lyle Meredon Shields, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Harvey James Golightly, Infantry.

Maj. Charles Hale Dowman, Air Corps.

×Maj. Leonard Murphy, Infantry.

Maj. Edgar Baldwin Heylmun, Infantry.

Maj. Thomas Welch Blackburn, Air Corps.

Maj. Thomas Hayden Davies, Infantry.

Maj. Claude Weaver Feagin, Cavalry.

Maj. Harry Francis Hanson, Infantry.

Maj. Lee Vyvian Harris, Field Artillery.

Maj. Harry Anton Johnson, Air Corps.

Maj. Bob Edward Nowland, Air Corps.

Maj. Barney McKinney Giles, Air Corps.

Maj. Roy Travis McLamore, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Bernard Joseph Tooher, Air Corps.

Maj. Claude Edward Duncan, Air Corps.

Maj. Albert Francis Hegenberger, Air Corps.

Maj. Max Frank Schneider, Air Corps.

Maj. Donald Gardner Stitt, Air Corps.

Maj. Richard Pegram Boykin, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Eugene Walter Lewis, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. James Brian Edmunds, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Alexander Forest Dershimer, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Oscar William Koch, Cavalry.

Maj. Helmer Swenholt, Corps of Engineers.

Maj. John Joseph Gahan, Infantry.

Maj. James Franklin Greene, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Charles Maze Simpson, Jr., Signal Corps.

Maj. Albert Milton Pigg, Signal Corps.

Maj. Arnold Richard Christian Sander, Infantry.

Maj. Stanley Marshall Prouty, Infantry.

Maj. Glenn Charles Salisbury, Air Corps.

Maj. Harold Ralph Wells, Air Corps.

Maj. Samuel Nairn Karrick, Corps of Engineers.

Maj. Malcolm Stoney Lawton, Air Corps.

Maj. Jasper Kemper McDuffie, Air Corps.

Maj. Howard Knox Ramey, Air Corps.

Maj. Lionel H. Dunlap, Air Corps.

Maj. Harold Daniel Smith, Air Corps.

Maj. Michael Al Quinn, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Earle J. Carpenter, Air Corps.

Maj. James Pratt Hodges, Air Corps.

Maj. James Alvin Lewis, Infantry.

Maj. Herbert Edson Willis, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Frank Lauderdale Cook, Air Corps.

Maj. Bradford W. Kunz, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Adel Curry Harden, Finance Department.

Maj. Oakley George Kelly, Air Corps.

Maj. Bernard Tobias Castor, Air Corps.

Maj. James Alexander Mollison, Air Corps.

Maj. Harold Webster Beaton, Air Corps.

Maj. Lawrence Brownlee Savage, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Richard Clark Jacobs, Jr., Infantry.

Maj. Charles Stricklen Shadle, Chemical Warfare Service.

Maj. Edwin Thomas May, Infantry.

Maj. Stephen Bowen Elkins, Finance Department.

Maj. Edgar Eugene Glenn, Air Corps.

Maj. Joseph Jones Yeats, Infantry.

Maj. William Henry Buechner, Infantry.

Maj. John William Monahan, Air Corps.

Maj. Cortlandt Spencer Johnson, Air Corps.

Maj. Andrew Reid Duvall, Infantry.

Maj. Henry Walter Ulmo, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Charles Carl Chauncey, Air Corps.

Maj. Julian Meredith MacMillan, Infantry.

Maj. Raymond Dailey, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. Homer Barron Chandler, Air Corps.

Maj. Carl Weston Pyle, Air Corps.

Maj. Frederick Eugene Coyne, Jr., Finance Department.

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from December 27, 1941

Maj. John Myers McCulloch, Air Corps.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Frederick Cantwell Kelly, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 12, 1941.

Capt. William Henry Powell, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 12, 1941.

Capt. Junius Penny Smith, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 14, 1941, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Harry George Armstrong, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 15, 1941.

To be captains

First Lt. Robert William Lloyd, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Richard Reynolds, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Charles Raymond Sharp, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Gerald Arthur McCracken, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Jerome Joseph Hiniker, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Douglas Monroe Beebe, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Kenneth David Eye, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Virgil Gordon Walker, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 1, 1941.

First Lt. Jack Menefee Messner, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 9, 1941.

First Lt. Hal David Oakley, Jr., Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 12, 1941.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Julius Mark, rabbi of Vine Street Temple, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

In a time when the dark forces of tyranny and oppression compass us about, we pray, O God, that Thou mayest so fortify our spirits that we may find wisdom, courage, and decision in the heroic

utterance of St. Francis of Assisi, one of Thy most inspired sons:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace:

"Where there is hatred, let me sow love;

"Where there is injury, pardon;

"Where there is doubt, faith;

"Where there is despair, hope;

"Where there is darkness, light;

"Where there is sadness, joy.

"Grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled, as to console;

"To be understood, as to understand;

"To be loved, as to love;

"For it is in giving that we receive,

"It is in pardoning that we are pardoned,

"And it is in practicing good will toward others that Thy peace comes to us."

Remove from our hearts, O Father, every vestige of bitterness, ill will, and uncharitableness. Purge our souls of the dross that tarnishes and corrodes, but fill our spirits with the love that ennobles and the faith that exalts and inspires.

With Thy light leading us "amid the encircling gloom," victory of the spirit—so ardently and painfully sought by Thy children throughout the centuries—will become our blessed portion.

Fervently we invoke Thy benediction upon the President, the Vice President, Cabinet, legislators, judiciary, and people of the United States. Guard them, O God, from calamity and injury. Suffer not their adversaries to triumph over them, but let the glories of a just, righteous, and God-fearing people increase from age to age.

We invoke Thy blessing not because we are better than other men, but because we would be worthy of receiving it by living honorably, courageously, and usefully.

May the words of our lips, the meditations of our hearts, and the works of our hands be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 28, 1941, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that on today a motion will be made to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5988, a bill with reference to sugar; a bill, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I state without fear of contradiction, on which no hearings were held; a bill concerning which a great many statements have been made by its advocates and with reference to which its opponents have had no opportunity to say anything.

Mr. Speaker, I make this original statement in view of the fact that I am one who has no sugar whatsoever in his district, has no refineries whatsoever in his district, and as a representative of that remnant of the 130,000,000 people who do not produce sugar but who consume it and who have not been heard on this proposition, I oppose its present consideration.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes; I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman was cut off from a hearing before the Rules Committee, and a rule was granted upon the assumption that the gentleman would have full opportunity, under the rule, to present his views to the House.

Mr. KLEBERG. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th day of last April I made what I think was a statement somewhat of prophetic significance. It was in the nature of what I am about to read:

> Mr. Speaker, I have been the recipient within the last few days of hundreds of letters, and every letter strenuously objects to the way the present administration is handling the labor situation. These strikes are deplorable, especially when they tie up our national defense in such a manner that it becomes thoroughly disgusting to the people of this country, and particularly the constituents of my district. I am acutely conscious of the fact that the American workingman is loyal, sincere, and patriotic. He does not want to strike, but under the leadership of cheap, chiseling, unscrupulous racketeers—

and if I forgot anything I mean that, too—

> the American laboring man has been bludgeoned, browbeaten, and subjugated through intimidation and bodily harm.
>
> I am one who firmly believes that additional legislation is not necessary to stop these strikes.

At that time I did so believe, but inasmuch as the Department of Labor and the President have done nothing to stop them, I believe we ought to have some legislation to stop these strikes. Legislation can be enacted and at the same time help the American workingman. Exploitation on the part of un-American labor leaders must stop. Our national-defense program must go on—it cannot be impeded, and I for one will cooperate in this legislation if it protects the workingman from future abuses heaped on him by the labor racketeer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an editorial appearing in the Crowley Daily Signal, under date of November 7, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this statement is to give notice that beginning on Wednesday, December 3, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will investigate, first the matter of all moneys paid by any persons having defense contracts or otherwise with the Maritime Commission, or with any other agency under the jurisdiction of said committee, for any alleged services in connection therewith; second, all benefits received by any person in connection with said contracts; third, all activities by any person for a consideration, monetary or otherwise, in connection with the procurement of said contracts or efforts to procure defense contracts or otherwise, whether consummated or not; and fourth, all matters in the public interest related to or connected with the general inquiries above outlined or that may throw light on the subjects of said inquiry. All persons, Members of Congress or otherwise, having any information that may be helpful to the committee are requested to submit the same to the chairman.

This has been submitted to my committee and approved by a majority of them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter written to the Richmond News-Leader, signed by William C. Rivers, major general, United States Army, retired.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from two or three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Los Angeles Examiner, which shows the attitude of the people and the President of Cuba toward our national-defense program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by David Lawrence appearing in the Saturday, November 29, issue of the Evening Star newspaper of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TUNNEL UNDER POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much surprised to read in the press of Washington, yesterday and today, of the suggestion coming from a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia relative to a tunnel under the Potomac River. A committee has been appointed to see if we can reduce Government expenditures. Let me caution the Congress that we not only must reduce Government expenditures, but we must avoid extravagances in future expenditures, and certainly a tunnel under the Potomac River at this time at the expense of the Federal Government would be beyond any expectation of saving money for any purpose. I hope no such suggestion will be followed up by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a resolution passed by the Enid, Okla., Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNDERNOURISHED SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I heard two very excellent speeches by people who have been to England. They spoke of how in that nation at the present time every person is concerned about the welfare of every other person, recognizing the importance of every other person to the national efforts. We ought to feel the same way here. This morning I discovered, however, that the Bureau of the Budget has frozen $25,000,000 of funds of the Surplus Marketing Association, which funds were provided by Congress for the purpose of the purchase of so-called surplus farm commodities to be used for school lunches for undernourished school children, and for making it possible for certain groups of undernourished and low-income people to have a more adequate diet. It seems to me that this is precisely the wrong direction for us to go. The nourishment of our people, of all our people, of people who do the work of our country, of some of the very people who some day may be drafted into the Army, is of basic importance, and this is the wrong place to freeze funds, especially when provided by Congress for the purpose just stated. All of us know that the defense program is going to mean that we are going to have to go without some luxury items. No doubt we cannot have all the new automobiles we would like. But it seems to me that now of all times we should be trying especially hard to see that the necessities of food, clothing, and shelter are within the reach of all our people. Imagine, if you will, the effect on our own people and on the people of every dictator country in the world if it could be said, "America has ended undernourishment among her people."

But here we are going in the very opposite direction. I think this is wrong, wrong especially when we have just found evidences of undernourishment among young men drafted for our Army. And may I ask this, If the Budget can take away money provided by Congress for one purpose, can it also add to the amount provided for other purposes? For when that time comes, the ultimate power of government will certainly vest in the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address I delivered at the awarding of the Navy E to the employees of the Bethlehem Steel Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, today is the twenty-third anniversary of the founding of Yugoslavia and the union of the Yugoslav peoples. I have been requested to insert in the RECORD a broadcast that was sent from the United States to the people of Yugoslavia. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert this broadcast in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the cost of production by John R. Stewart, statistician of the Detroit Board of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks which I made on the price-control bill and which have not yet been printed a bill passed by the House in 1935 and my remarks on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JARMAN and Mr. BENDER were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by I. H. Nakdimen. The statement exceeds the quota, and I have an estimate from the Public Printer. That estimate is attached. I renew my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Must We Fight for Our Foreign Trade?" by Stuart Chase.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUGAR PRODUCTION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, our good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] just pointed out a few minutes ago that he was the friend of 130,000,000 consumers. I assume from his remarks that he feels he should protect those people on the question of their sugar supply.

The best thing this Congress could do in connection with sugar is to see that our people have a reasonable supply of that product during the next year or two. According to the best figures I can get, we will have a shortage of approximately a million tons during the next calendar year. That is something to which we should give consideration if the sugar bill is called up this afternoon.

We are these days dealing with price controls. You want to hold prices down and you wish to do this by increased production and by administrative procedure as voted just last week. In the case of sugar, if you do not increase production or very effectively set your control against price increases you are sure to witness an advance in the price of this product which the consumer will have to pay. Within another 12-month period you may be forced to introduce consumers' cards on this very product. Today we consider a new sugar bill and we should bear in mind that the very best guaranty we can give our people against very high prices on sugar is to let the sugarcane and sugar-beet producers of the continental United States have a free hand in producing all the sugar they care to produce while this war emergency and scarcity of food period is before us. I feel sure this House is in a frame of mind to let the bill before us today go through so that the producers of sugar in California and many other States may proceed with their 1942 crop and without further delay for we shall certainly need all the sugar the Western Hemisphere will produce this coming calendar year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short article by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short article from the Luther Companion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ULTIMATUM TO JAPAN

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the most imminent danger before the United States is war with Japan. President Roosevelt said that Japan can have peace or war. Nobody else in the United States seems to know anything about the ultimatum that the President and Mr. Hull gave to Japan. I doubt if the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], knows anything about what those ultimatums were that were given to Japan. Yet this is a great democracy. The President said Japan can have war or peace. I think it is time for us to begin to wake up as to our responsibility. If we are the arsenal of democracy, we should know what these proposals are. Woodrow Wilson, who led the first interventionist movement in this country and who is the eternal hero of our present President, clung fast to the policy of "open covenants arrived at openly" dealing with other nations.

Evidently the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee knows no more about these declared purposes of the President and the Secretary of State than any of the rest of us, for he is not making any move there on the front row to get the floor to contradict my statement.

A general said before a committee today he knew nothing about what they were. Hitler's dealing with other countries could not reveal any less of a democracy than is here exhibited by our President.

Again I repeat, he says Japan has the choice of peace or war on his proposals. And yet the American people or even the leaders on the Foreign Relations Committees of the House and Senate know nothing of what is contained in his proposals.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL PRESS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE LEND-LEASE PROGRAM

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this Congress during the past year has authorized and appropriated some $13,000,000,000 for lend-lease aid to Great Britain and other so-called democracies that are resisting aggression. The people of America have been led to believe that the term "lend-lease" does not mean that this $13,000,000,000 is an outright gift. They, in general, expect and have been led to believe that whatever aid we are now extending to Great Britain will at some future time be repaid, either in cash or in kind.

That the people of Great Britain and the British Government think otherwise is shown by the tenor of the debate in the House of Commons last Thursday, November 27. At that time the Honorable John McGovern, member of Parliament, charged that—

America is prepared to use British bodies to blast her way into the markets of the Continent.

He also charged that the Churchill-Roosevelt Atlantic charter was—

one of the grossest pieces of deceit of modern times, and that the United States, by pursuing its present policy, wants to reestablish the old financial system of Wall Street in Europe.

They—

He continued, meaning the United States—

are no more concerned with freedom and democracy than are a large number of reactionary Fascists in this country.

Mr. McGovern also charged that—

When this is all over the United States will hold us in financial bondage.

To this criticism the Honorable Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretary in the Churchill Cabinet, replied in the following words:

That is not true. Under the lend-lease arrangement, there is no accounting and no debt piling up.

Mr. Speaker, these are excerpts from remarks made in the British Parliament only last Thursday. I believe, sir, the mask of deceit should be torn from our transactions with the British Government. It is time the American people were being told the truth by their own Government.

POLITICS AND DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] spoke of the so-called Democratic Press. A copy of that pamphlet came to my desk about a week ago. I took it up with the Democratic National Committee. They told me they were in no way connected with the publication, and the Democratic National Committee sent a letter to every advertiser in that magazine pointing out to them that the National Democratic Committee had nothing whatever to do with the proposition. It is merely one of those cases where a clever operator is undertaking to pry money out of firms on the totally fraudulent assumption that he is representing the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. I take it this is just another attempt at chiseling.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And probably on the part of a good Republican.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution received from some of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR and to include therein some stanzas from a poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when the motion to suspend the rules comes up this afternoon on the sugar bill I hope the Members will vote against suspending the rules because it would mean the continuation of the quota system. The adoption of this particular bill would also mean an increase in benefits of 33⅓-percent increase at a period of time when we need to raise essential food products in this country. The consumer pays this item in an already increasing cost market.

This Congress should not put its stamp of approval upon a continuation of a quota system which might prevent us from raising this essential food product. Florida has presented its case before the Rules Committee and a rule was granted which would have given us sufficient time to explain our problems to the people. Under a suspension of the rules, however, we will be cut off in the debate which we ought to have. We hope you will vote down the motion this afternoon.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Florida [Mr. CANNON and Mr. PETERSON] in requesting that you not suspend the rules this afternoon for consideration of the bill providing for the extension of sugar quotas.

I never was so much in favor of quotas, for crop reduction, of crop restriction in sugarcane, and for a so-called economy of starvation for this industry in America. I do not now favor its continuance during a war period when our country needs sugar and when we are unable to import enough sugar at a reasonable price. To restrict sugar production within continental United States today would be unthinkable.

I ask that you vote down the motion which may be made to bring up this bill under suspension. Let it come from the Rules Committee and give us a chance to be heard and a chance to consider the bill in an orderly way. I understand that Dr. Jose Manuel Casanova is raising considerable static in the sugar bowl just now.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think there are some things going on in the sugar business that deserve the same type of investigation the Military Affairs Committee is engaged in. I shall be glad to aid the gentleman from Florida in any investigation which may be started.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate that, and I hope your committee will go into the activities of those who would restrict sugar production in Florida.

[Here the gavel fell.]

RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propound a question to the majority leader, if I may.

When does the majority leader expect to open up the ice box and bring forth that luscious piece of pork known as the rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman asking me a question as to when the rivers and harbors bill will come up?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am ignoring the descriptive statement of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will admit I understated it; but go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will not indulge in controversy, because personalities have no place on the floor either with reference to an individual or a bill.

I doubt if the rivers and harbors bill will come up until January.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it not be wise to hold it up until after the elections next year?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted at a State meeting of the Kansas Electric Cooperatives at Topeka, Kans., on November 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] in Indiana last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ROBINSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in answer to what the gentleman from Texas said in regard to the bill that is coming up that this will be an added expense to the American consumer. I call attention to the fact that when we were depending upon foreign sugar we were paying more for sugar than we are today under the quota system.

From 1921 to 1927 we paid 8 cents per pound for sugar before the quota system was inaugurated. From 1928 to 1934 we paid 5.94 cents per pound. From 1935 to 1940 we paid 5.47 cents per pound, showing that the quota system has been successful in reducing the price of sugar to the American consumer.

It has just been suggested by the gentleman from Florida that the benefit payments increase from 60 cents to 80 cents per hundredweight is unfair. As a matter of fact, the additional cost of raising beets, such as labor, supplies, taxes, and so forth, has been taken in account. With the increase of payments, the grower will not receive as much as he will under present law on account of such increase.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] at this time if he desires recognition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include three newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday there appeared in Washington papers and in newspapers throughout the country an article by Westbrook Pegler which made certain charges against every Member of the House. It made certain charges also against the House as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that some of the Members of the House do not care what they are called, nor how their actions are characterized, but there are some of us who would like to know what is being printed about us. There are some who would like to know how much truth there is in some of these charges.

Here are certain charges made in the public press and they were made throughout the country, which tend to discredit all of us. I have had 15 or 20 copies of this article sent to me from different sections of the country. That shows how widespread these charges have been aired. So I hope that as I call again to your attention some of these charges you will think it over, you will take it up with your conscience and just consider as I speak how much truth there may be in these statements.

Here is the first one, and listen to it, please: Pegler charges that this House is a "miserable, fumbling, timid aggregation of political trimmers and panhandlers."

Here is another charge: That this House as a whole is governed by fear and that the House itself is "afraid to pass any law that would place decent restraint on an organized mob of racketeers and dictators."

His article does not exempt anyone in the House. There is a charge that every single one of us, the chosen representatives of the people, are protecting these racketeers.

Now, listen to this one:

The article charges that we are afraid to protect citizens of the Republic because we refuse to exercise our constitutional duty to legislate for the protection of citizens of the Republic until the President has given his permission.

It charges that the Members of the House are "guilty of a crime against the American form of government" because we refuse to perform what the writer states is our duty.

It further charges that this House has "abdicated its powers."

It charges that this House is "now so far gone in whining yellow submission to the rule of the boss that the Members openly admit that all legislation must have the approval of the White House."

We are whiners and are yellow. How do you like it? How much whining do you do and how yellow are you?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For a question.

Mr. COX. Seriously, does not the gentleman believe he would render a very much better service to his colleagues, Members of this House, by entirely ignoring this charge rather than by joining issue and putting Mr. Pegler on proof?

Mr. HOFFMAN. There you are. A man walks up to you on the street and says, "You are a dirty crook and a liar," and you ignore him, do you? Does the gentleman from Georgia mean to tell me that he is the kind of man who will submit when a man walks up to him and charges him to his face with having committed a crime, or accuses him of everything that is dirty and mean and reprehensible?

Mr. COX. I am not the kind who objects to a newspaperman's saying what he thinks about the Congress or any other group of American citizens.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Neither am I. Let him say what he wants to say. But if he makes false statements about a public official and broadcasts them throughout the Nation, then let him submit proof of his statements. No one can successfully object to charges which are true and which reflect upon a public official in his official capacity.

Mr. COX. What has Mr. Pegler said to which the gentleman personally takes exception?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not take exception to anything that he said. Do you hear me, I say, do you hear me? I do not take exception to anything that he said; but I should like to have him appear before the Labor Committee, and I have a resolution there to that effect, to bring in the facts.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait until I get through. The gentleman asked me about what I objected to. I should like to have him come in before that Labor Committee, and I should like to have him produce the facts and circumstances, and then that would prove the truth or the falsity of his charges; and, believe me, I think he can prove some of them.

It is about time that we started to change our ways and got out from under the rule of a dictator. It is about time that we got some legislation in this House which will protect a man who wants to work in going to work, protect him on his way to his home, and protect him when he gets to his home—protect him at all times from goon squads.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. By using the Labor Committee as the forum before which Mr. Pegler should be heard, does not the gentleman realize he would be sending Mr. Pegler to what some might think is a packed court?

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is a charge against a committee of the House. Let me say something in answer to that. I understand there is going to be a motion here to refer this matter not to the Labor Committee, where I asked that it go, but to the Judiciary Committee. Talk about a packed court. I should like to ask the gentleman from Georgia how many labor bills have been taken away from the Labor Committee and what became of those bills? They are still reposing over there in the Judiciary Committee's files. That is where they are.

A year or more ago you took away from the Labor Committee the Smith amendments and put them through the House under special procedure. I voted for that procedure because the Labor Committee was not doing anything about it and would not act. Apparently the Labor Committee has had a change of heart. The Labor Committee has been receding, possibly under orders, because we sent out a bill here even though it does not amount to much, but we sent it out; it is something.

Now what do you want to do to the Labor Committee? Instead of letting this matter go to the Labor Committee, which should be responsible for labor legislation, you want to take it away, or the leadership wants to take it away from the Labor Committee.

I did not ask for the appointment of a special committee. That would entail extra expense. I just asked that it be sent over there and that Mr. Pegler be asked to come in and lay his facts before the committee so that the facts could be reported to the House and we could find out how many of these charges were based on rumor. There is nothing wrong in that.

Perhaps the gentleman from Georgia is not interested in a charge of this kind. Let me read you this one. It charges that the Members of the House are a "pathetic crowd of flabby political slobs who are selling out the American people today at the price of their contemptible patronage jobs and Treasury hand-outs with which to buy their own reelection."

There is something to put in your teeth. How do you like that? You are a "petty political slob." Yet we do not have the courage to call him in and tell him to produce the goods. We can lick Hitler all right enough, but he is 3,000 miles away. Pegler is right here at home where we can get at him if he is not telling the truth about it.

I suspect that there are some Members of the House, at least maybe one or two, who think there may be some truth in what Pegler says. We do not like the words, of course, they are too picturesque and too forceful. They attract too much attention. But that man certainly did a fine job on Bioff, Scalise, and Brown, did he not? The three of them are in the penitentiary. I do not mean to intimate that any of us would go there, but some of us might not come back to Congress.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I should like to know where these patronage jobs are. I think I have been overlooked.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe the gentleman has not always voted as he should.

Mr. HOUSTON. Have him come down and tell us where they are.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman would ask me, from the Republican side, that question. How would I know anything about a job?

Mr. HOUSTON. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does the gentleman not agree in principle with the charges laid down by the Pegler statements?

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is altogether too much of truth in them. The Pegler charges I have had fired at me in letter after letter from constituents, sometimes in the nature of a charge and sometimes by asking why we did not do thus and so. I agree with Pegler this far. I agree that we have been remiss in our duties ever since the sit-down strikes in 1937—4 or 5 years ago. American citizens have been denied the right to work by "goon" squads.

On Monday, in the Edwards against California case, the United States Supreme Court held that the State of California had no authority to keep people out of that State just because they were poor. Read that decision. That was just Monday.

They said the State had no such authority; and yet, by our inaction here and by inaction of the State law-enforcing officers, we permit a union to deny the right of an American citizen, not to cross a State line, although that is sometimes done, but we deny the right of an American citizen to cross a picket line by being beaten up or by being rendered physically incapable of going across the line, and we sit here and let them do it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am just wondering if the gentleman is not more interested in further airing the charge made by the Pegler article in his speech that he is now making than he is seriously interested in defending the House and the membership of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, bless your dear heart, I am not defending the House. Every Member of the House can defend himself. He ought to be capable of it if he draws his pay here. I am interested in airing these charges; that is right. I think every American citizen who has read or heard of these charges should have the facts available so that, when election time rolls around, if any Member of this House has betrayed his constituents, they will have opportunity to retire him from office.

Do you not believe that Pegler did a good job when he exposed Bioff and Brown? Of course, I do not mean that this case compares with the case of those men, but I do say that this man has charged us with much more than inaction.

Does the gentleman think this House has performed its duty when we have let the situation arise which now confronts us, where the whole national-defense program is held up? Does the gentleman believe the report of the Truman committee, which shows the collection without warrant of law, without excuse or justification, of hundreds of thousands of dollars from honest American working men for the privilege of working on national-defense jobs? Do you think we have done our duty when we let that go along? I say, do you? I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, have we performed our duty to the people when we sit silently here and let those things continue for a year? The gentleman does not answer.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman from Oklahoma is just a shade too smart to answer a 30-minute question with a "Yes" or "No" answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will ask it in 1 second. Do you think we have failed to do our duty when we have failed to protect our American workingmen?

Mr. NICHOLS. Certainly, I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly, only he says it in different language.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, Pegler goes further than that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; Pegler goes further than that; he surely does; and he calls us a lot of names and some of them cannot be justified. I do not like any of them. There is too much truth in his charges.

Mr. NICHOLS. Of course, I did not agree with any such action, and somebody in the House should defend it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will say to the gentleman that I know of no more capable gentleman to carry on that job than the Member from Oklahoma. Now, get up here tomorrow morning and justify our course of inaction, if you can.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. Has the gentleman a lurking suspicion even of what Pegler was attempting in those articles?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not going to pass my own opinion upon every article of that kind. I believe he was endeavoring to spur the Congress into action, effective action; action that we should have taken long ago; action that will protect the American workingman from exploitation, afford him an opportunity to earn a livelihood.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have a sort of suspicion he was partly right anyway, but I want to make this remark: Crows, if we are crows, are no whiter for washing themselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; and I am not asking for any whitewashing, but for an investigation that will lay bare the record, for sometimes, if a man has been doing something he should not, he can get right with God and start down another road, and that is what I am advocating this House do, and this is the time to do it. This week there is going to be labor legislation in this House. Here is our opportunity; here is the opportunity of the House to show that, whether Pegler's charges as to our past conduct have been true or false, we have at last awakened to the situation, and, awakening, pass legislation that will remedy the situation.

Now, are we going to be all of the things that Pegler says we are, or are we going to give to the people of the country, who are demanding it, and have been demanding it for months, some real labor legislation? Do not mistake me there. I do not mean antistrike legislation that would deprive labor of any fundamental right.

Pegler says that the House is so lacking in honor and manhood that it failed to enact laws which would prevent "robbery, extortion, physical brutality, and arrogant suppression of citizens' plain rights by groups of thugs, thieves, and anti-American conspirators in the service of the Kremlin."

How do you like that charge? He charges when there is undisputed evidence of the viciousness which is corrupting the whole Nation "they whimper like a kennel of curs, because the President will not give them his gracious permission to do their obvious duty."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but wait until I give you this, which you will have in mind. Pegler says here, and he does not exclude any of us, that some of us do not like it, but we have "not been able to make even a row." He said that we "whimper like a kennel of curs." How does the gentleman like that?

If that is true, that is, the gentleman's statement that he does not think that, in the entire history of the Republic, the Congress has occupied so low a level in the estimation of the American people as is the case at the present time, not because the people believe that Congress is an aggregation of ignoramuses, but because the people believe that Congress has not got the courage to meet and discharge its responsibility, it is a sad, sad fact.

If saying what I have said lowers the estimation of the people, lowers the opinion which the people have of Congress, it is regrettable that the Congress has gotten itself into that sort of a fix, and we should have the courage to remedy it, and maybe it is a good thing for the country that the people have discovered our fault. And since when has the truth been a bad thing for any people to know? Since when has it been a bad thing for the Congress to be told the truth? Since when?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I wonder if the gentleman thinks that the people of my district form their opinions of me because of what some columnist says about the Congress in general, or do my people form their opinions of me based upon my acts in this Congress?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, that answers itself. The gentleman's people had their opinion of the gentleman long before Pegler opened his mouth.

Mr. MASON. Then I do not need to worry about what Pegler says in a newspaper, do I?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not unless it is true and discreditable. I have had the C. I. O. after me for years. It does not bother me, because the boys back home know me, and they know that when these fellows say that I am a labor baiter, they are just common ordinary liars, and no Member of the House has any reason to fear any false charges, but God help those boys if the people suspect and finally get to believe, and finally know, that some of these charges are true.

Mr. GUYER. Has not the opinion of the people of this country in regard to Congress come from the fact that it does everything that the President lays down before it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For a long time—in fact, since the New Deal got in its real work—Congress has been known as a "rubber stamp" Congress. I do not know what the people form their judgment on, but I do know, from the letters that I receive, that the people are sick and tired of this inaction on the part of Congress and of being told that we have to wait for the White House to tell us something.

The author of the article, Westbrook Pegler, charges that the Members of the House having discovered "the viciousness which is corrupting the whole Nation, they whimper like a kennel of curs because the President will not give them his gracious permission to do their obvious duty."

The article charges that some Members of the House are—

traitors to the interest and rights of the very people whom they profess to serve best, and have sold them down the river to as vile and greedy a lot of slave drivers as ever laid the lash on the cringing Uncle Toms of antebellum days.

It is charged in this column that the Members of the House have known for years—

That the Committee for Industrial Organizations was a political organization which courted the Communists and raised them to positions of dangerous power over millions of decent American citizens.

It is further charged that the Members of the House have—

observed that the Committee for Industrial Organizations unions were knifing American soldiers and sailors and the American people in the back with fraudulent strikes and slowdowns up to the time of Hitler's attack on Russia.

The article concludes with the charge that, knowing all of the foregoing, this House lack "guts" and that—

When the flag of the new order is unfurled, it should contain a broad yellow streak in memory of the men who sold their country out for a few lousy jobs.

This is a charge that the Members of the House, the House as a whole and every Member of the House, lack patriotism and have betrayed their country.

Now, that is a jewel, is it not? If you Members of the House think for one moment that Pegler is alone in that opinion, all you need do is read what some other columnists have to say. If you are still in doubt and you want an opinion from some honest, God-fearing, patriotic citizens, come on over to my office. I will let you read my file, and it is possible you may find letters from your district. You may trace it back and see whether the man or woman who wrote that is a good, honest American who forms his or her judgment upon facts as they appear to him or to her.

One of these other articles which I will put in is from Mark Sullivan. He is no rabble rouser. There is one from David Lawrence, who edits the United States News. He is not a man who calls names without justification. But practically every one of these—and throughout the country there are dozens of editorials—tells us in no uncertain terms that we do not have courage to meet the situation; that we lack the manhood to represent our own people.

Calling your attention now to what is going to happen this week——

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. HOOK. Will you kindly tell me why some of these who are making these accusations do not run for Congress themselves?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have asked some of them to run. I have asked Walter Lippmann, and I have asked Dorothy Thompson. I said, "Dorothy, why don't you run for Congress and come down here?" I have written to the editor of the Post, and I think the Star. In the morning when I get up and get my paper and go back to bed and read the editorials, I can learn what I ought to do every day before I come over here. So I suggested to Eugene Meyer that he run for Congress; move out into a community where the air is pure and the folks earn their living honestly. I said, "Certainly, with your unquestioned honesty and integrity, you might even be elected Senator." Why do not some of these boys do it?

Like the unions—they are long on advice. The unions can tell every employer how to run his business and what he should do; the hours the men should work; but they have never, never established an industry of their own. These two unions have $42,000,000 in their treasury today. Why do they not operate an industry and operate it on the hour schedule, the wage schedule, and the production schedule that they say is right, and give all of us a demonstration, because certainly if they know so much and are so competent, I am sure that indus-

try will be glad to fall in behind and everybody would be happy and prosperous and satisfied.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Does the gentleman know of any industry that is run without labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, that is a wonderful question. I just have to stop and pause in admiration at that question, at its depth and its breadth. I want to thank the gentleman. I know several industries that would run, if the picket lines would permit men to go to work.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Michigan is not rising to a point of personal privilege and defending the House against attack, but is in fact agreeing in the opinion of the attacker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope the gentleman from Washington will observe that I have been in order and I am going to proceed in order, right along the same line I was following, if you get the point. If you need a defense, you certainly have the ability to make it far better than I, and you undoubtedly would have more heart in a defense than I would. I am not defending the House. I am calling the attention of the House to charges which reflect upon its honesty, its courage, its patriotism, and asking that the reason for those charges be spread on the record.

If there be truth in those charges, we should mend our ways and this week demonstrate that, for the present—and for the future, let us hope—there is no longer truth in them.

This week this labor legislation is coming up. Now, let us give the people some real legislation. I do not mean legislation that is going to wipe out any right of labor—not at all. The trouble with these union fellows is—there will be a lobby from the C. I. O. down here this week. If they did as they did before there will be 300 of them here. Then they will brag next week in their papers how they forced Congress to do this, that, or the other.

Now, they come down here, live in good hotels—they fare almost as well as the British purchasing agents do. Like the British purchasing agents, they are living on the fat of the land, on money which American taxpayers earn. Do not forget when these boys walk into your office they have an expense account. Do not forget that the money they are spending here comes from the men who do the work. Do not forget that they have to have some excuse in order to come here.

All we need in the way of labor legislation are a few simple amendments to the Wagner law, and law enforcement, and legislation making unions responsible, democratic in their organization and procedure, legislation protecting the worker from evilly disposed persons.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I wonder whether or not the gentleman objects to any delegation from any group which toils, whether it is C. I. O. or A. F. of L., or anybody else, coming to see him?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, no; I think they ought to come, and if I do not have stability of purpose enough to withstand their blandishments, it is too bad. I am glad to see them come down here. I certainly am not so conceited that I would not listen to what they had to say, and I hope I am not so bigoted as to refuse to adopt any sound suggestion on legislation.

When six C. I. O. fellows came to my office I asked them in and showed them that picture that I had hanging on the wall where these Communists in Briggs' local and three other fellows were beating up a defenseless man.

That picture shows an incident which occurred on April 3, 1941, at the Ford River Rouge plant in Dearborn, Wayne County, Mich. It shows how Melvin Bartling, a timekeeper, as he attempted to enter gate 4 on Miller Road, to aid in making out the pay roll for strikers, was beaten until he was unconscious by the four men shown in the picture.

About 15 members of the Michigan State police, who are not shown in the picture, stood within 50 feet of Bartling, but gave no assistance, this despite the fact that section 17 of Act No. 176 of the public acts of the State of Michigan for the year 1939 makes it a criminal offense for anyone to interfere with any employee on his way to work.

The men who are shown beating Bartling are: The man with the club, Roy Snowden; the man to the left of Bartling is Eugene Torrence; the man to the right rear, swinging his right, and the man in front, are the Ferraza brothers. None of these men was an employee of the Ford Motor Co. All were members of Briggs Local, U. A. W.-C. I. O. Snowden and Torrence are members of the Communist Party, and I have photostats of their membership cards in my office today.

I said to those C. I. O. delegates who came to my office, "You certainly represent a courageous lot; you sure do."

And then the fellow said to me, "Well, you did not tell the truth."

I said, "What is wrong?"

He said, "That is not a bunch from Briggs Local 208; it is 212."

I said, "I beg your pardon; I will correct that." I called my secretary in and made her correct it right away because I wanted to be right, and if Briggs Local 212 is proud of four of their members beating up this defenseless fellow, one using a club, I want them to get the credit.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Is that the picture the gentleman was distributing around here?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that was one of the many.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The gentleman does not know who posed for that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Posed! If I am not mistaken, those pictures were introduced as exhibits in the United States District Court at Detroit, Mich. They were published in the newspapers. Why, the boys up there recognized the men and said they were from local 212 instead of 208. I do not want to be wrong.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The gentleman is not sure whether he was a member of 208 or 212.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He said he was, and he was their representative.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. COX. Seriously——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have been serious all the time.

Mr. COX. Since the gentleman has had full opportunity to air his views and incidentally to give others opportunity to air theirs, will not the gentleman agree with me that it would be well, others having participated agreeing, to ask leave to strike from the RECORD all that has been said, withdraw his resolution, and get down to serious business?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Never, never. If the gentleman knows of any more serious business than the proposed labor legislation I would like to have him name it. Now, listen a minute.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has accomplished everything he started out to, has he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman does not like it why does he not make a motion to strike it?

Mr. COX. I will make a motion to lay it on the table as soon as the gentleman gets through.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman can do as he pleases but it will still be before the American people. You can never eradicate these charges from the minds of the American people until you get some action by this House dealing comprehensively with the trouble.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

The legislation we need is this: We need an amendment to the Wagner law which will permit men to join or refrain from joining a union. We need the legislation offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] an amendment which I understand will be reported out by the Labor Committee which would prohibit men with subversive views holding office in labor unions. We need the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] which provides that there shall be no violence in strikes. We need an amendment providing that there shall be no coercion from any source.

If the House and law-enforcing agencies of State and Nation will give protection to the men and women who have jobs, who want to go to work, we shall have gone a long, long way on our road toward a solution.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In addition to that we should have what so many have advocated—and what is the objection—a secret vote before men go on strike. I introduced a bill long ago providing that when there was a strike in a defense industry there should be a vote conducted by the Department of Justice and that the strike should end if 50 percent or

more of membership voted against the strike. What is wrong with that? I could not get the bill out; it is still in committee.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. After all, what we need is some real legislation which will protect the rank and file in labor organizations from their own bosses just as I would like to have, if it were possible——

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just as I would like to have if possible some legislation which would protect the political parties from boss control. Do you see what I am getting at?

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, of course; sure.

Mr. PATRICK. Does not the gentleman from Michigan believe it would have been a little more effective if he had let someone use this point of personal privilege who resents more the statements of Mr. Pegler?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will admit my incapacity, my lack of ability, as I am always willing to do when I am in the presence of the distinguished gentleman from Birmingham. I am willing to do that, but the gentleman can have a special order any time; he can get hours; he can get days; in fact, when we are in recess he can have a whole week to issue statements to the press, justifying, if he can, the inaction of the House.

The only reason I have spoken is to call the attention of the Members, who this week must pass upon this question of adequate labor legislation, to the fact that there is a feeling throughout the country that we have not been doing, and are not inclined to do, our full duty to protect the national-defense program and American citizens.

There is more than a suspicion that we are yielding, because we fear political reprisals, to the pressure of labor lobbies and to the demands of the administration.

Let us for once this week show to the people that we are not a rubber-stamp outfit; that we are unafraid; that we will adopt legislation which is in the interest of our country as a whole.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a subsequent article by Mr. Pegler, published on November 27:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

FLIMSY STRIKE LAW ANTICIPATED

GEORGE SPELVIN,
American, United States of America.

DEAR GEORGE: Well, you poor, dumb dope, I hope you have observed that those paltry fakers of the United States Congress are fixing to double-cross you and sell you out again. As sure as you are born, Spelvin, those political parasites who built up the Brown Shirt terror of the union goon system are going to slip that chive between your ribs again and give it a twist and break it off.

They are making a lot of noise about anti-strike legislation just now, George, but I am warning you, and I hope you will paste this in your hat and check me when it is done, they won't do anything about the rackets and the racketeers, the extortion, and the persecution of such as you.

They have received the President's order to pass some sort of arbitration and cooling-off scheme, but, whatever form this law takes, it will affect only war industries and it will be passed only because the President is more interested in fighting Hitler's dictatorship abroad than in saving Americans from the atrocities committed on his own subjects by the Brown Shirts of his own following at home.

You can paste that in your hat, George, and check me on it, because it will contain a back-stairs clause, probably in a cunning and treacherous negative language so common to the New Deal laws and the union constitution drawn by the Muscovite union lawyers, whereby the unioneers and their thriving, underworld thugs, or goons, won't have to obey, although American businessmen and the little American stockholder and the worker will.

George, this is about the nastiest treachery in the entire record of this assembly of boss-fearing two-timers who were elected to serve as an independent legislative arm of the National Government of a once great Republic but now are so utterly prideless that they don't even pretend to conduct their own duties on their own responsibility. Instead, they send over to the White House to ask the boss what he wants them to do and he tells them and they do it his way.

If you think they are going to pass any law which would compel the thieves who have been skimming $1,000,000,000 a year off your wages to give you an accounting of your money, you are just out of your mind or living back in the past when we had men in Congress.

If you think they are going to relieve you of the duty of buying ocean yachts and racing stables for a lot of low-lived union gangsters or protect your rights as a human being and an American citizen from the Hitleresque sluggers of the goon squads, you are kidding yourself. If you think they are going to do anything to stop the carpenters or the crooks of the hod carriers' racket from extorting good eating money from Americans who want to work on President Roosevelt's war jobs, you are nuts, because they aren't going to do anything that would interfere with the gains of the goons which you have heard described as labor gains.

But you are certainly too smart to think they would do any of these things or that they would require unioneers to be American citizens or not to be traitors in the service of Joseph Stalin, whom the President's messenger, Harry Hopkins, wrote about in tones of hero-worship last month.

You know they will talk and view with alarm and introduce bills harmlessly, but you certainly must know by now that when the President gives the orders they will roll over and sit up and yap like any kitchen mutt in return for a little sliver of patronage thrown to them from the people's own table.

No, George, they aren't fixing to do anything real. It just happens that the President needs some law now to help him put this country wholly into the fight against Hitler's dictatorship without impairing the dictatorship of his own faithful but sometimes erratic goons.

But this law will pertain only to the "emergency" and "defense" and while your kid is off in the North Atlantic being torpedoed or freezing in the Arctic or putting in his time in the Army at home at $21 a month, you still have to pay from $40 to $500 to some mob of racketeers, plus dues and assessments, too, for the right to work and you will have to quit work and go on relief if the union crook says so, because that is the new American way enacted for you by the members of the Ki-Yi Club in the doghouse on kennel hill in Washington, D. C.

Check me and tell me if I am wrong.

Yours truly,

WESTBROOK PEGLER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I may not agree with what Mr. Pegler says, but I will defend his right to say it.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will yield to me to ask unanimous consent that all of my remarks in the gentleman's speech be stricken?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Speaking personally, if I followed my own personal inclinations, I would make a motion to lay this on the table. However, I am going to offer a motion to refer it to the Committee on the Judiciary, and if it is defeated I will not be disappointed. If that motion is defeated, I will then make a motion to lay it on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert in connection therewith an address made by Conway P. Coe, Commissioner, United States Patents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KLEBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial by Lynn V. Stambaugh, national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES MUHLENBERG BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 209, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Muhlenberg Bicentennial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. MOSER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KINZER, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. GERLACH, of Pennsylvania.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include copy of an address delivered before the Ohio Bar Association recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 1544, to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING ACT TO AUTHORIZE AN APPROPRIATION FOR ROADS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4937, to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

FREE BRIDGE ACROSS ST. CROIX RIVER AT HUDSON, WIS.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4314, authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.

Messrs. SCHULTE, LESINSKI, O'CONNOR, and VAN ZANDT objected.

DIFFERENTIAL IN PAY FOR NIGHT WORK TO CUSTODIAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2232, to provide a differential in pay for night work to custodial service employees in the Postal Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide a differential in pay for night work in the Postal Service," enacted May 24, 1928 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., supplement V, title 39, sec. 828), is amended by striking out the words "motor-vehicle and pneumatic-tube services" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "motor-vehicle, pneumatic-tube, and custodial services."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT POSTMASTERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3192, to require the filling of all vacancies in the position of assistant postmaster in first- and second-class post offices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I believe I made a statement on this bill at one time. I reiterate that I perhaps would not be opposed to the bill if it were necessary, but the bill in its present form seems unnecessary, because the authority already exists for making these appointments. The Postmaster General in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads under date of March 5, 1941, states:

There is authority of law for the Department to make these appointments.

The purpose of legislation of this nature, as I understand, is to amend the authorization so that the Committee on Appropriations will with legal background consider the appropriations if they are recommended. It seems to me that inasmuch as the authority already exists in law this legislation is unnecessary. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BURCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that there is a law providing for the appointment of assistant postmasters in first- and second-class offices, but we have now between 2,000 and 2,100 vacancies in assistant postmasterships, principally in the second-class offices. These positions have not been filled. They are now being filled by clerks. This causes confusion in the offices. They do not get the service they would otherwise get. The personal service is not as good. There is confusion because this clerk or that clerk thinks that sooner or later he might be appointed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Could not the same thing be accomplished, if the Committee on Appropriations neglects to insert the appropriation in an annual appropriation bill, if the gentleman would offer an amendment on the floor when the Post Office appropriation bill comes on to appropriate enough money to fill these vacancies? That would accomplish the same purpose, would it not?

Mr. BURCH. If the Committee on Appropriations would make the appropriation, it would; and possibly that result would be accomplished if an amendment were offered on the floor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the House accepted the amendment on the floor, it would accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. BURCH. Why not settle this for good and all. If we are going to have a law on the statute books for assistant postmasters, then let us make some provision by which those vacancies in assistant postmasterships will be filled. If we are not, then we had better repeal the law relating to assistant postmasters.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is authority in the law at the present time with respect to the provision whereby these vacancies may be filled. I feel that this legislation is directing the Committee on Appropriations to do something contrary to the Budget estimates and recommendations and the recommendations of the Department. If the Department does not want this, and if the Budget Bureau will not recommend it, and if the Committee on Appropriations will not recommend the appropriation, then this legislation takes this form: It compels the Committee on Appropriations to do something they would not otherwise do, although the authority exists to do that thing.

I believe this is a dangerous precedent. It simply takes the form of a resolution by the Congress to compel the Committee on Appropriations to do something they would not otherwise do. We can accomplish the same thing by an amendment to the Post Office appropriations bill.

I may say to the gentleman that I should be inclined to go along with the amendment which he may offer next year to the Post Office appropriation bill to make this possible. All we have to do is to raise the money. The authority is already there. I do not want to establish a precedent whereby we instruct the the Committee on Appropriations to do something which they already have authority to do, if in their judgment it should not be done, because we reserve the right to offer amendments and to vote on amendments, if there is authority in law, right here on the floor, without telling ourselves by legislation to do something that we would not do in the ordinary course of appropriation matters.

Mr. BURCH. We have the law for appointing postmasters. They have not been appointed. Furthermore, our information, which I am sure is correct, is that it causes confusion in the post offices not to have a real assistant postmaster with the proper authority. The gentleman may recall that in the report the Post Office Department said that this bill has merit. They could not go any further than this on account of the Budget.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the Budget Bureau have the authority to control the policies of the executive establishments?

Mr. BURCH. I am afraid so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am afraid they assume to have. I do not think it was ever the intention of Congress that the Budget Bureau should control the legislative and executive policy. I have been thinking a lot about that lately, and sometime or other I am going to get out the Budget Act and read it over and see whether they have the authority to do it or whether they have assumed such authority.

Mr. BURCH. I may say to the gentleman that this measure comes from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads with a unanimous report. They have given it every consideration possible.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have great respect for that committee, and ordinarily I would go along with it, but I am afraid we are establishing a precedent here which will have a very unhealthy effect upon legislation in the future. That is the reason I have asked it to go over so that, perhaps, we will be able to accomplish the same purpose by orthodox processes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. BURCH. I object to the bill going over without prejudice, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. WINTER, and Mr. KEAN objected.

LOANS TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1433, to prohibit making or collecting loans to Government employees on Government property.

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. KEAN, Mr. WINTER, and Mr. KRAMER objected.

PUYALLUP TRIBE, WASHINGTON—CORRECTIONS IN TRIBAL ROLL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4578) to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that a moment and yield to me?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I may say to the gentleman that this bill is purely in the interest of correcting the tribal rolls of an Indian tribe in the State of Washington. An agreement has been reached by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by the Indian tribe itself. This merely provides for a better distribution of funds already appropriated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice at the last call to give the gentleman from Washington an opportunity to comply with the recommendations of the Interior Department, which this bill does not do. If this bill passes in its present form it does not satisfy the gentleman's tribe, and if he will read the letter from the Secretary of the Interior he will find that out. As far as I am concerned, if you comply with the report of the Secretary of the Interior, I have no objection to the passage of the bill. I may add I have no objection now if the gentleman wants to take the responsibility.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think we can work it out so it will be satisfactory if it is passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The Indian tribe has agreed upon the distribution provided in this bill. We worked on this for months, I may say to the gentleman from Missouri, and the gentleman knows how difficult it is to get these people to agree.

Mr. COCHRAN. But the Secretary points out that changes should be made. You only have to make a few minor changes, and if the gentleman will read the Secretary's letter he will find out what they are.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the gentleman, but in order that we may get action in the matter I will be glad to consult with the two gentlemen on the floor and see if we cannot work out something.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION IN SERVICE OF ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD OF THOSE SUFFERING FROM SERVICE-CONNECTED DISEASE OR INJURY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 165, to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment, those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter any enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States in the active service, whose term of enlistment shall expire while he is suffering disease or injury incident to service and not due to misconduct, and who is in need of medical care or hospitalization, may, with his consent, be retained in such service beyond the expiration of his term of enlistment, and any such enlisted man shall be entitled to receive at Government expense medical care or hospitalization and his pay and allowances (including expense money authorized by law and credit for longevity) until he shall have recovered to such extent as would enable him to meet the physical requirements for reenlistment, or until it shall have been ascertained by competent authority of the service concerned that the disease or injury is of a character that recovery to such an extent would be impossible, whichever is earlier: *Provided*, That any enlisted man whose enlistment is extended as provided therein shall be subject to forfeiture in the same manner and to the same extent as if his term of enlistment had not expired, and nothing contained in this act shall prevent any enlisted man of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, from being held in the service without his consent under, respectively, the provisions of the one hundred and seventh article of war, the act of August 29, 1916, as amended (40 Stat. 717), and section 1, subsection (a), of the act of May 26, 1906, as amended (50 Stat. 547).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIX MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1060) to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I want to have assurance, if I may, that an amendment will be offered to this bill to make the effective date go back far enough to cover Reserve and National Guard officers or members who have been killed or died in line of duty during the present emergency service. Of course, there have been many such.

My particular reason for making the request is that several very meritorious cases have come to my attention. A particular instance that comes to mind was that of a young Reserve officer from my district who was killed while flying with Regular officers transporting the secret bomb sight from McCord Field. This young man took exactly the same risks as they did, but his widowed mother did not get the same compensation that the other mothers did. I know that the intent of this bill is to correct such inequities. As the bill was introduced and passed the Senate, it was not retroactive. The young man I mention was killed before the bill would be effective, if the effective date be the date of the approval of the act. I was told that it was the intention of the committee to offer an amendment to make the effective date go back far enough to cover all officers and enlisted men who had died in line of duty since the guard and Reserve have been called to the present emergency service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the committee included that very provision in the bill and the date was fixed as of the 27th day of August 1940, more than a year ago, and, I think, as of the effective date of the resolution authorizing the President to call the guard into Federal service.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that an amendment to that effect will be offered?

Mr. MAY. That is the provision in the bill now. It was amended by the House Military Affairs Committee. We have amended the bill to that effect and made it effective as of the date of approval of the resolution of the Congress authorizing the call of the National Guard.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I ask the gentleman why that 30-day provision is put in the bill? A man can be killed and be just as dead 29 days after he goes into the service as he can in 30 days after he goes into the service, and his family will be hurt just as badly.

Mr. MAY. I do not raise a single question about the fact that a man can be killed as dead in 30 days or 30 minutes as in 30 years, but my recollection of that provision is that the statutes already provide for pay during these 15 days of training they have in the R. O. T. C., and that has been so for years, and we extended that to 30 days so as to cover the 30-day period.

Mr. BARDEN. Are they taken care of to the same extent?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. In the same full amount?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. In other words, let us get this clear for the RECORD, that from the first day that a man enters into the service, until the 30-day period, under another statute, he would get the same benefits as would be accorded those under this law after the 30-day period.

Mr. MAY. Yes; and that is the very argument that I made before the committee, and that was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

That the last proviso of section 1 of the act of August 30, 1935, as amended by section 5 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557), and by the act of July 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 1079), be, and same is hereby, further amended by changing the final period to a comma and adding the following: "including for their dependents the benefits of the act of December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. 367), as amended."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "that", insert "effective as of August 27, 1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks briefly at the point where I asked the question with respect to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5249) to amend section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, approved June 21, 1938, is hereby amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof and by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) No natural-gas company or person which will be a natural-gas company upon completion of any proposed construction or extension shall engage in the transportation or sale of natural gas, or undertake the construction or extension of any facilities therefor, or acquire or operate any such facilities or extensions thereof, unless there is in force with respect to such natural-gas company a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission authorizing such acts or operations: *Provided, however*, That if any such natural-gas company or predecessor in interest was bona fide engaged in transportation or sale of natural gas in interstate or foreign commerce, on the effective date of this amendatory act, over the route or routes or within the area for which application is made and has so operated since that time, the Commission shall issue such certificate without requiring further proof that public convenience and necessity will be served by such operation, and without further proceedings, if application for such certificate is made to the Commission within 90 days after the effective date of this amendatory act. Pending the determination of any such application, the continuance of such operation shall be lawful.

"In all other cases the Commission shall set the matter for hearing and shall give such reasonable notice of the hearing thereon to all interested persons as in its judgment may be necessary, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commission; and the application shall be decided in accordance with the procedure provided in subsection (e) of this section and such certificate shall be issued or denied accordingly: *Provided, however*, That the Commission may issue a temporary certificate in cases of emergency, without notice or hearing, pending the determination of an application for a certificate, and may by regulation exempt from the requirements of this section temporary acts or operations for which the issuance of a certificate will not be required in the public interest.

"(d) Application for certificates shall be made in writing to the Commission, be verified under oath, and shall be in such form, contain such information, and notice thereof shall be served upon such interested parties and in such manner as the Commission shall, by regulation, require.

"(e) Except in the cases governed by the provisos contained in subsection (c) of this section, a certificate shall be issued to any qualified applicant therefor, authorizing the whole or any part of the operation, sale, service, construction, extension, or acquisition covered by the application, if it is found that the applicant is able and willing properly to do the acts and to perform the service proposed and to conform to the provisions of the act and the requirements, rules, and regulations of the Commission thereunder, and that the proposed service, sale, operation, construction, extension, or acquisition, to the extent authorized by the certificate, is or will be required by the present or future public convenience and necessity; otherwise such application shall be denied. The Commission shall have the power to attach to the issuance of the certificate and to the exercise of the rights granted thereunder such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require.

"(f) The Commission, upon application or upon its own motion, may determine the service area to which each authorization under this section is to be limited. Within such service area as determined by the Commission a natural-gas company may enlarge or extend its facilities for the purpose of supplying increased market demands in such service area without further authorization.

"(g) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as a limitation upon the power of the Commission to grant certificates of public convenience and necessity for service of an area already being served by another natural-gas company.

"(h) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to affect the authority of a State within which natural gas is produced to authorize or require the construction or extension of facilities for the transportation and sale of such gas within such State: *Provided, however*, That the Commission, after a hearing upon complaint or upon its own motion, may by order forbid any intrastate construction or extension by any natural-gas company which it shall find will prevent such company from rendering adequate service to its customers in interstate or foreign commerce in territory already being served."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, beginning after the comma, insert the following: "subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission,".

On page 2, line 7, beginning after the word "gas", strike out the words "in interstate or foreign commerce" and insert after the comma the following: "subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission,".

On page 3, line 1, beginning after the comma, insert the following: "to assure maintenance of adequate service or to serve particular customers,".

On page 4, line 2, after the word "such" insert the word "reasonable" and strike out the words "in its judgment."

On page 4, strike out in lines 4 and 5 the words "upon application or upon its own motion" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "after a hearing had upon its own motion or upon application."

On page 4, strike out lines 16 to 26, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LANDS OF GOOSE LAKE, OREG. AND CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5490, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to quitclaim to the State of Oregon for the benefit of the State and/or of those claiming under the State at the date of such quitclaim deed, all the right, title, interest, and estate of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake held, or that might be asserted, by the United States under or in pursuance of section 2 of chapter 5 of the General Laws of Oregon, 1905, and to quitclaim to the State of California for the benefit of the State and/or of those claiming under the State at the date of such quitclaim deed, all the right, title, interest, and estate of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake held, or that might be asserted, by the United States under or in pursuance of the act of February 3, 1905, of the State of California (California Statutes, 1905, p. 4).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PANAMA CANAL GENERAL RETIREMENT LAW

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4871, to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, is amended by adding, after the fourth paragraph of said section, the following additional paragraph:

"Any employee retiring under the provisions of section 92 or 93 of this title may at the time of his retirement elect to receive in lieu of the life annuity described herein a reduced annuity payable to him during his life, and an annuity after his death payable to his beneficiary designated by him at the time of his retirement, which designation shall be in writing and filed with the Civil Service Commission. The amount of the annuity of the surviving beneficiary shall be either equal to or 50 percent of the employee's reduced annuity, as the employee shall elect in the writing hereinbefore provided for, and the said annuity shall be payable during the life of the beneficiary, and upon the death of the beneficiary all payments shall cease and no further annuity shall be due and payable. The amounts of the two annuities shall be such that their combined actuarial value on the date of retirement as determined by the Civil Service Commission shall be the same as the actuarial value of the single life increased annuity with forfeiture provided by this section: *Provided*, That no election in lieu of the life annuity provided herein shall become effective in case an employee dies within 30 days after the effective date of retirement and death within such period shall be considered as a death in active service."

SEC. 2. Section 99, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code is amended by adding, after the first

paragraph of said section, the following additional paragraph:

"At the option of any employee, to be exercised at any time prior to his retirement, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, additional sums in multiples of 1 percent, but not to exceed 20 percent, of his annual basic salary, pay, or compensation, for any period subsequent to June 30, 1931, may be deducted and withheld, or paid by the employee, and deposited as provided in the first paragraph of this section, which amount, together with interest thereon at 3 percent per annum compounded as of June 30 of each year, shall, at the date of his retirement, be available to purchase, in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, with the approval of the board of actuaries, in addition to the annuity provided by this article, an annuity according to the experience of the Canal Zone retirement and disability fund as may from time to time be set forth in the tables of annuity values by the board of actuaries based on an interest rate at 4 percent."

SEC. 3. Section 94, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, is further amended by striking out wherever they appear the words "90-day" and "90 days" and inserting in lieu thereof "1 year."

SEC. 4. Section 101, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of the said section an additional paragraph designated "(g)" and reading as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall be construed to apply to the additional deductions and deposits referred to in the second paragraph of section 99 of this title as added by section 4 of this act: *Provided, however,* That under paragraph (a) of this section there shall be no additional deduction of $1 per month or major fraction thereof, on account of said deductions and deposits: *Provided further,* That under paragraphs (b) and (d) of section 101, as amended, the interest payable upon return of the deductions and deposits referred to in this paragraph shall be computed at 3 percent per annum compounded on June 30 of each year: *And provided further,* That under paragraph (b) of this section no part of such deductions and deposits or interest thereon, returned to an employee upon his transfer or separation from the service as provided in this section, shall be required to be redeposited by him as a condition precedent to the receipt by him of benefits under this article."

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

One page 4, line 16, strike out "July 1, 1941", and insert "January 1, 1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN SERVICE IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3539, to provide for the deposit and expenditure of various revenues collected at schools and hospitals operated by the Indian Service in Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter miscellaneous revenues derived from schools, hospitals, and other facilities maintained and operated by the Indian Service for the benefit of Indians and natives of Alaska shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States under the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN SERVICE IN ALASKA, APPROPRIATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3542, to authorize the purchase from appropriations made for the Indian Service of supplies and materials for resale to natives, native cooperative associations, and Indian Service employees stationed in Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to purchase from appropriations made for the benefit of natives of Alaska, food, clothing, supplies, and materials for resale, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to employees of the Department of the Interior stationed in Alaska and to natives of Alaska and native cooperative associations under his supervision. The proceeds from such sales shall be credited to the appropriation or appropriations current at the date of the deposit thereof into the Treasury and shall be available for the same purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND FOR HIGHWAY AND ORNAMENTAL PARK PURPOSES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5168, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., certain lands of the United States in Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., for highway purposes and for ornamental park purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., upon the conditions and limitations hereinafter expressed, three parcels of land, hereinafter described, which are parts of the property encompassed by Eastern Regional Laboratory, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, United States Department of Agriculture, parcel one and parcel two to be held and used by the township for highway purposes, and parcel three to be held, used, and maintained as an ornamental park.

The three parcels of land are situated in Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., and bounded and described in accordance with a plan and survey thereof prepared for Springfield Township by David W. Bainbridge, registered professional engineer, January 18, 1940, and approved by the Board of Commissioners of Springfield Township, January 22, 1940, as follows, to wit:

Parcel one: Beginning at the point of intersection of the northeasterly line of East Lane (40 feet wide) as opened by the Court of Quarter Sessions of Montgomery County, Pa., in October 1922, with the southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue (33 feet wide) as opened by the said court of quarter sessions in October 1887; thence extending along the said southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue north thirty-seven degrees nine minutes thirty seconds east two hundred and four and thirty-five one-hundredths feet to an angle; thence continuing along the said southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue north twelve degrees forty-nine minutes east one hundred and sixty-five and fifteen one-hundredths feet to an angle, a point in the southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue as opened by the said court of quarter sessions in December 1899; thence north thirty-seven degrees thirty-six minutes east forty and fifty-six one-hundredths feet to the point of intersection with the southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue as it is proposed to be widened to fifty feet; thence south twelve degrees forty-nine minutes west one hundred and eighty-five and one one-hundredths feet to an angle; thence south thirty-seven degrees nine minutes thirty seconds west two hundred and thirteen and seventy one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence extending southwardly and southeastwardly on a curve to the left having a radius of eight feet the arc distance of twelve and sixty-two one-hundredths feet to a point; thence south thirty-six degrees forty-seven minutes thirty seconds west five feet to a point in the aforementioned northeasterly line of East Lane; thence north fifty-three degrees twelve minutes thirty seconds west sixteen and fifty-eight one-hundredths feet to the first-mentioned point and place of beginning.

Parcel two: Beginning at a point on the southwesterly line of Mermaid Avenue south fifty-two degrees twelve minutes thirty seconds east one hundred and thirty-three and seventy-one one-hundredths feet distant from the angle point of the southeasterly and southwesterly lines of Mermaid Avenue as opened by the Court of Quarter Sessions of Montgomery County, Pa., in December 1899, where the said highway is in juxtaposition to Flourtown Avenue (formerly known as Apple Street) northwest thereof; thence south fifty-two degrees twelve minutes thirty seconds east eighty and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to a point; thence south seventy-six degrees nine minutes thirty seconds west three hundred and eighteen and eighteen one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence continuing southwestwardly on a curve to the left having a radius of seventy-two feet the arc distance of forty-eight and forty-five one-hundredths feet to a point on the southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue; thence extending along the southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue north thirty-seven degrees thirty-six minutes east one hundred and twenty-eight and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence southwardly and southeastwardly on a converse curve to the right having a radius of eight feet the arc distance of nineteen and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to a point; thence extending along the northwesterly line of the proposed relocation of Mermaid Avenue north seventy-six degrees nine minutes thirty seconds east two hundred and one and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence continuing northwardly and northwestwardly on a curve to the left having a radius of eight feet the arc distance of seventeen and ninety-two one-hundredths feet to the first-mentioned point and place of beginning.

Parcel three: Beginning at the angle point of the southeasterly and southwesterly lines of Mermaid Avenue as opened by the Court of Quarter Sessions of Montgomery County, Pa., in December 1899, where the said highway is in juxtaposition to Flourtown Avenue (formerly known as Apple Street) northwest thereof; thence extending along the said southwesterly line of Mermaid Avenue south fifty-two degree twelve minutes thirty seconds east one hundred and thirty-three and seventy-one one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence extending southwardly and southwestwardly on a curve to the right having a radius of eight feet the arc distance of seventeen and ninety-two one-hundredths feet to a point; thence extending along the northwesterly line of the proposed relocation of Mermaid Avenue south seventy-six degrees

nine minutes thirty seconds west two hundred and one and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to a point of curve; thence extending westwardly and northwestwardly on a curve to the right having a radius of eight feet and the arc distance of nineteen and seventy-five one-hundredths feet to a point on the southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue; thence extending along the said southeasterly line of Mermaid Avenue north thirty-seven degrees thirty-six minutes east one hundred and sixty-six and fourteen one-hundredths feet to the first-mentioned point and place of beginning.

The land in parcel three is to be granted and conveyed subject to the conditions that Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., shall accept and use such land solely for ornamental-park purposes; that the area shall not be used as a building site; and that if such township shall at any time cease to use such land for ornamental-park purposes, or shall permit the use of such land for any other purposes, or shall alienate, or attempt to alienate the land, the land shall revert to the United States of America.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN MARCOS, TEX., FISHERY STATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5392, to convey certain property to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College.

There being no objection. the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, Tex., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tract of land, and all structures and improvements thereon, constituting that portion of the United States Fisheries Station at San Marcos, Tex., lying between the San Marcos River and State Highway No. 2, and extending from the highway bridge on the north to the Federal pump station on the south:

Beginning at the intersection of the west edge of the San Marcos River and the south boundary line of State Highway No. 2, at the west end of the highway bridge; this beginning point being the end of a substantial woven wire fence between the recreation park and the highway; thence along said wire fence in a curve in a southwesterly direction one hundred and fifty-six feet to end of curve; thence south thirty-eight degrees 10 minutes west along said fence, five hundred and nineteen feet to turn in fence; thence south twenty-nine degrees ten minutes west along said fence, two hundred and two feet to fence corner near the pump station; thence following said fence south sixty degrees east along the north side of the pump station, sixty feet to the edge of the San Marcos River; thence along the west edge of the San Marcos River with its meanders to the place of beginning.

Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the Southwest Texas Teachers College shall at any time cease to use the property, or any part thereof, as a college recreation park, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such property, or any part thereof, title to such property shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. The grantee shall bear any expense (other than for the preparation of the deed) necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, but shall not be required to pay any consideration for the right, title, and interest conveyed.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 2, line 17, strike out the balance of page 2 and all of line 1 on page 3 and insert:

"The conveyance authorized by section 1 hereof shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior upon payment to the Treasurer of the United States by the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, Tex., of the sum of $1,000, being the fair and reasonable value of the lands described in section 1 hereof without regard to the value of the improvements thereon."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY RESERVATIONS OF CARLSTROM AND DORR FIELDS, FLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5749, to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion, to sell upon such terms and conditions as he considers advisable, to the Embry-Riddle Co., of Miami, Fla., the Carlstrom and Dorr Fields Military Reservations situate in De Soto County, State of Florida, such reservations containing approximately 640 acres each, upon determination by him that said parcels are no longer needed for military purposes, and to execute and deliver to said company in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf any and all instruments, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effectuate such sale and conveyance: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall have said tracts of land appraised, and shall not sell said property for less consideration than the approved appraised value thereof: *And provided further*, That the proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR INDIAN USE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5359, to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interests in lands, together with the improvements thereon, which have been acquired by the United States for Indian use under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and of section 55 of title I of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), lying and situated within the States of Florida, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive order is hereby declared to be in the United States of America in trust for the use and benefit of those respective tribes, bands, or groups of Indians for whom the Secretary of the Interior may by proclamation hereafter declare such lands to be available and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to proclaim such lands as new Indian reservations or as additions to existing Indian reservations: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall deprive any Indian of any individual right, ownership, right of possession, or contract right that he may have in any land or improvements thereon.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "Oregon."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSSESSION OF CAMERAS AND PHOTOGRAPHING IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5876, to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, and so forth, in areas of the Canal Zone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of title 2, Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section numbered 15 and reading as follows:

"SEC. 15. Photographing, etc., and possession of cameras in areas of Canal Zone: Whenever, in the interests of the protection of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, the Governor of the Panama Canal shall determine that any part or feature of the Panama Canal, or any area, object, installation, or structure within the Canal Zone, requires protection against the general dissemination of information relative thereto, the Governor is hereby authorized to make, and from time to time alter and amend, regulations prohibiting or restricting:

"(a) The making of any photograph, sketch, drawing, map, or graphical representation of, within, or upon any such part or feature of the Panama Canal, or any such area, object, installation, or structure within the Canal Zone; and

"(b) The possession of any camera within any area or areas in the Canal Zone which the Governor may designate: *Provided, however*, That no regulation made pursuant to authority contained in this section shall apply to activities of the kind covered by this section which are conducted or performed by persons in the service or employ of the United States in the course of their official duties.

"Any person who shall violate any of the rules and regulations established in pursuance of the authority contained in this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 1 year, or by both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF HOMESTEAD PROJECTS IN VIRGIN ISLANDS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

USE OF CERTAIN SUGAR EXCISE-TAX FUNDS OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS FOR MILITARY AND NAVAL DEFENSE PURPOSES IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5825, to amend section 19 (a) of the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934, as amended by the act of August 7, 1939, and to amend the act approved June 19, 1934, so as to authorize certain sugar excise-tax funds and other funds to be used for military- and naval-defense purposes in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this, in my opinion, is too important a matter to be passed upon by unanimous consent. I believe it needs a great deal of consideration.

This bill involves the use to which about $52,000,000 will be put, and also involves another very important question in respect to $23,862,750.78, which represents the so-called Philippine currency reserve fund. This brings up the question as to whether they have any right to reimbursement for any deficiency in the value of the deposits which were made here because of our gold purchase and devaluation policy. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall object to the passage of this bill.

When we devalued gold in 1934 it appears that the Philippine government had about 44 bank accounts in various banks in the United States amounting to about fifty-six and one-quarter million dollars. The Philippine government therefore was a creditor of those banks. Those were mostly time deposits drawing interest. This bill proposes in substance to take the excise taxes which have ben accumlated in favor of the Philippine Commonwealth as a result of taxes on sugar, which funds have been built up to rehabilitate the Philippine Commonwealth when it reaches an independent status, and divert this fund away from the economic provisions of the Philippine Independence Act. It also proposes to take a so-called gold profit on the fifty-six and one-quarter million dollars of deposits in the banks in this country, which in rough figures amounts to around $39,000,000; and this figure is to be reduced by $15,000,000 interest calculated on these bank time-deposit accounts, reducing the figure down to roughly $23,800,000. In other words, it would establish the principle of paying the Filipinos a considerable premium on deposits which they had in American banks but denying premiums on deposits which American citizens had in similar banks. So it does two things: It is a direct move to destroy a large amount of the economic provisions of the Philippine Independence Act, and it would set up this precedent of allowing a gold profit on bank deposits. In view of the fact the bill is so important, so far-reaching, and so out of line with our established procedure, I shall have to object to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending question is upon the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FIFTEEN-ROUND CHAMPIONSHIP BOXING BOUTS IN THE TERRITORIES OF ALASKA AND HAWAII

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5007, to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 321 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of championship bouts the limitation on the number of rounds shall be 15 in lieu of 10."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5870, to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 893), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 109), be further amended to read as follows:

"Immigrant inspectors shall be divided into five classes, as follows: Grade 1, salary $2,100; grade 2, salary $2,300; grade 3, salary $2,500; grade 4, salary $2,700; grade 5, salary $3,000; and, hereafter, inspectors shall be promoted successively to grades 2 and 3 at the beginning of the next quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service (determined by a standard of efficiency which is to be defined by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General) in the next lower grade; and to grades 4 and 5 for meritorious service after no less than 1 year's service in grades 3 and 4, respectively: *Provided further*, That when officers, inspectors, or other employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are ordered to perform duty in a foreign country, or transferred from one station to another, in the United States or in a foreign country, they shall be allowed their traveling expenses in accordance with such regulations as the Attorney General may deem advisable, and they may also be allowed, within the discretion and under written orders of the Attorney General, the expenses incurred for the transfer of their wives and dependent minor children; their household effects and other personal property, including the expenses for packing, crating, freight, and drayage thereof in accordance with the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 73c–1). The expense of transporting the remains of such officers, inspectors, or other employees who die while in, or in transit to, a foreign country in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country for interment, and the ordinary and necessary expenses of such interment and preparation for shipment at their posts of duty or at home, are hereby authorized to be paid on the written order of the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That the appropriation of such sum as may be necessary for the enforcement of this act is hereby authorized."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

On May 28, 1928, the law known as the Jenkins-Reed Act was passed. That measure is the measure sought to be amended by this bill which is up for consideration at this time. The original bill, when first prepared by me contained the substance of this bill that we are considering today. It was decided at that time, however, that it would be well to stop the promotions at the $2,500 grade. In other words this bill does just what I had intended to do when I introduced the first bill which is the foundation of this automatic price structure.

It may be interesting for the membership to know that the principle of automatic promotions was first laid down when the Jenkins-Reed bill was passed. Mr. Coolidge was President at that time. The establishment of this new principle as provided in that bill rehabilitated the Immigration Service and the Border Patrol in a most wonderful manner. Of course, it involved what at that time was quite an increase in the expenditures. It involved some $600,000. Of course, that would be mere chicken feed in these days. The Bureau of the Budget refused to recommend the passage of my bill. Thereupon we took it up with Mr. Coolidge. When I first explained this principle to Mr. Coolidge he, in characteristic Coolidge language inquired, "What is it going to cost." When I explained it to him he realized immediately the justice of the principle involved and he assured me that he would sign the bill if and when the Congress had passed it.

This very fair and just principle has been accepted and now it is employed as the basis of practically all Government employment. It is only natural that I should support this measure, and I hope that it will be passed by the Senate and I hope the President will approve it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSINIBOINE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1035, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment, in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold my objection to permit the gentleman from Montana to make a statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this bill simply provides for the submission to the Court of Claims——

Mr. COCHRAN. Resubmission is right, is it not?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Very well, resubmission of certain claims to the Court of Claims. When the case was submitted before the Court of Claims, inadvertently by some mistake the court charged certain offsets against lands that were not involved; and this jurisdictional bill is introduced for the purpose of enabling the Court of Claims, if it sees fit, to correct that mistake. It does not cost the Government 1 cent for this bill to be passed, because it is finally up to the Court of Claims to say whether anything will be allowed. And may I further state to the gentleman from Missouri that if this bill has the same luck before the Court of Claims that all Indian bills heretofore have had, there would be less than 2 percent of the amount claimed allowed by the Court.

I also wish to remind the gentleman of the fact that due to certain parliamentary procedure, it is almost impossible to get a claim on behalf of the Indians submitted to the House for determination. If it gets through it has got to go through on the Consent Calendar or it has got to go through on Calendar Wednesday, which is the day allotted for the various committees. I have been a Member of Congress since the first of January 1937. The Committee on Indian Affairs has had the call on two Calendar Wednesdays during this period of time. Certain parliamentary dilatory delays are indulged which prevents us from really getting a vote on these controversial Indian bills. I realize the gentleman has the whip hand here; I realize he can object if he wants to, but I appeal to his fairness to permit this bill and these other jurisdictional bills on behalf of the Indians to go to the Court of Claims to the end that if they have anything to be determined the Court of Claims will have the right to determine it. I appeal to the gentleman to withhold his objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman there are about $15,000,000 involved in this bill. Further that when we have a minority report, and it has always been the policy of the House, where there is a minority report, not to permit the bill to pass by unanimous consent. This bill is worded in such a way that it takes away from the Government the right to defend itself properly.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. In explaining the gentleman's consistent opposition to most of these Indian bills may I make the suggestion that perhaps this is due to an ancestor of his having been tomahawked some time back?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman has carried the tomahawk right on down from his ancient ancestors.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says he has been here since January 1937. While I was sick, this House passed two jurisdictional bills, one for the Klamath Indians and one for the Shoshone Indians, which took away from the Government its right to properly defend the suit. The court was required under that act to render a decision in each case. The total amount involved was $11,000,000, and this House appropriated that amount in a deficiency bill, and the claims were paid. Now the gentleman wants the same kind of a bill, and $15,000,000 is involved.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope the gentleman will not accuse me of participating in the passage of a bill when the gentleman was sick. I had nothing to do with it. These were not my bills. There is no $15,000,000 involved in this bill. Nothing will be allowed unless the Court says so. No judgment at all may be rendered.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman helped get it out of the committee.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present considertaion of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS (MONTANA)

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another resolution of the gentleman from Montana. I hold in my hand a letter from the Attorney General saying that if this resolution passes in its present form there might be a judgment rendered against the United States in the sum of $100,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that those same kind of letters have been written by the Attorney General for the past 25 years to the Members of this House. I want to further call attention to the fact that there has only been recovered before the Court of Claims of this country less than 2 percent of the amount that these Indians have claimed, even though the United States Government has stolen nearly all of their property. May I say also that the mere fact that $15,000,000 might be recovered in one of these cases means nothing? It is a safe bet that not to exceed $50,000 will be recovered on any bill before that same Court of Claims, if we judge the future by the past.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the letter of the Attorney General, which I hold in my hand, I object.

ARAPAHOE AND CHEYENNE JURISDICTIONAL BILL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1065, authorizing the Arapaho and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is another raid on the United States Treasury, and I object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. I withhold my objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the same observations, and I want the RECORD to show the same observations to the gentleman's objection to this bill as I made to his objections to the other Indian bills. I imagine he will make the same sort of objection to every bill that comes to this House where an Indian is asking that his claim be submitted to the Court of Claims for determination.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman that the Indian Committee has the next call on the calendar, and I understand the gentleman is going to call up these bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am sure going to try it. I hope the gentleman will be here and help give us a vote on the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be here all right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not want the gentleman to get sick. I want him to be here.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be here, and I will have the tomahawk, I will tell you that. I will base my argument on the views of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INVESTIGATION BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5142, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the extent of damages suffered by landowners and water users on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Department of the Interior has not the authority now to cause this investigation to be made. I understand the purposes of this bill, of course. I understand also that no attempt is to be made in this bill to fix the responsibility for the break or the damages which the Government might have to pay. But if a claim is filed in the Court of Claims or otherwise by the aggrieved persons, would not the Government have the authority under existing law to cause an investigation to be made incident to the defense of such suit?

Mr. PIERCE. If the gentleman will yield, I will explain. That is possibly

true, but this was a serious break in the Owyhee ditch, and many claims were filed, aggregating $350,000. The Senators from Oregon and myself thought it would be desirable to have the Secretary of the Interior make an investigation to see what was the real loss. Therefore this bill was drawn and sent to the Interior Department, where some amendments were suggested, which we were glad to accept. The bill simply gives the Secretary of the Interior the right to appoint a commission to ascertain individual losses. The expense to be borne by the local irrigation district at no cost to the Government.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Right in that particular, the intent of this bill is not to authorize a new appropriation then?

Mr. PIERCE. No; not at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The expense of the investigation will be paid out of the reclamation fund?

Mr. PIERCE. Out of the reclamation fund of that district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to investigate and determine the amount of damage suffered in 1940 by any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress the results of his investigation and determination as soon as possible during the present or next succeeding Congress.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 4, 5, and 6, and insert "to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "and determination."

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"The cost of said investigation and report shall be accounted for as part of the cost of operating and maintaining said project, and such expenditures as are deemed necessary therefor by said Secretary shall be made from moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated to the Department of the Interior for operation and maintenance, Owyhee project, Oregon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project."

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5945, granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the provisions of section 2 hereof, the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, which compact reads as follows:

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska hereinafter designated as Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, respectively, desiring to remove any and all causes, present or future, which might lead to controversies with respect to use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, and being actuated by considerations of interstate comity, and by a desire to effectuate an equitable division of the waters of the Republican River Basin and the efficient beneficial consumptive uses thereof, and in consideration of the mutual advantages resulting therefrom within their respective boundaries, and pursuant to acts of their respective legislatures, have resolved to conclude a compact for the attainment of these purposes, and to that end, through their respective governors, have named as their respective commissioners for the negotiating of such a compact:

M. C. Hinderlider, for the State of Colorado;

George S. Knapp, for the State of Kansas; and

Wardner G. Scott, for the State of Nebraska; who have agreed upon the following articles, to wit:

ARTICLE I

The Republican River Basin, hereinafter referred to as the "Basin," is herein designated to mean all the area in the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which is naturally drained by the Republican River and all of its tributaries to its junction with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas, a map of which signed by the commissioners hereinabove named, is attached hereto and by reference made a part thereof.

The Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Basin, as hereinabove defined, are not navigable, and all uses of water of a consumptive nature, as hereinafter defined, wherever such uses may occur within the basin, shall constitute paramount uses.

ARTICLE II

The term "virgin water supply," as herein used, is defined to be the water supply within the basin undepleted by the activities of man.

The term "beneficial consumptive use" is herein defined to be that use by which the natural water supply of a drainage basin is consumed by the activities of man, and shall include water consumed by evaporation from reservoirs, canals, ditches, and irrigated areas.

Beneficial consumptive use shall be the basis and measure of the right to divert and use the natural waters of the basin by the citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations of the signatory States, and upon this principle the following allocations of water herein made are predicated.

ARTICLE III

There is hereby allocated to Colorado for use annually a total of 54,100 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described, and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 10,000 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 15,400 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 25,400 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

In addition thereto there is hereby allocated to Colorado for use annually the entire water supply of the Frenchman and Red Willow Creek drainage basins in Colorado.

There is hereby allocated to Kansas for use annually a total of 190,300 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

Arikaree River drainage basin, 1,000 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 23,000 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 500 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,400 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 12,600 acre-feet;

The main stem of the Republican River at the Nebraska-Kansas State line, 138,000 acre-feet: *Provided*, That Kansas shall have the right to divert all or any portion thereof at or near the town of Guide Rock, Nebr.;

And in addition thereto there is hereby allocated to Kansas for use annually the entire water supply originating in the basin below the Nebraska-Kansas State line.

There is hereby allocated to Nebraska for use annually a total of 234,500 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 11,000 acre-feet;

Frenchman River drainage basin in Nebraska, 52,800 acre-feet;

Rock Creek drainage basin, 4,400 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 2,600 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 800 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 1,200 acre-feet;

Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 4,200 acre-feet;

Medicine Creek drainage basin, 4,600 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,700 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 2,100 acre-feet;

The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the Colorado-Nebraska State line and the Nebraska-Kansas State line, and from the small tributaries thereof, 132,000 acre-feet.

The use of the waters hereinabove allocated shall be subject to the laws of the State to which the allocations are made. No State shall have the right to dictate the method of distribution or place of use of the waters herein allocated to another State.

ARTICLE IV

The specific allocations in acre-feet made to each signatory State by article III are derived from the computed average annual virgin water supply originating in the following designated drainage basins in the amounts shown:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 44,700 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 19,610 acre-feet;

Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 7,890 acre-feet;

Rock Creek drainage basin, 11,000 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 57,200 acre-feet;

Frenchman River drainage basin, 98,500 acre-feet;

Blackwood Creek drainage basin, 6,800 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 7,300 acre-feet;

Red Willow Creek drainage basin, 21,900 acre-feet;

Medicine Creek drainage basin, 50,800 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 16,500 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 21,400 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 27,600 acre-feet;

The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the Colorado-Nebraska State line and the Nebraska-Kansas State line and the small tributaries thereof 87,700 acre-feet.

Should the future computed virgin water supply of any source vary more than 10 percent from the virgin water supply as hereinabove set forth, the allocations herein made from such source shall be increased or decreased in the relative proportions that the future computed virgin water supply of such source bears to the computed virgin water supply used herein.

ARTICLE V

The judgment and all provisions thereof in the case of *Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer of the State of Colorado et al.*, v. *The Pioneer Irrigation Co.* (decided June 5, 1922, and reported in 259 U. S. 498), affecting the Pioneer irrigation ditch or canal, are hereby recognized as binding upon the signatory States hereto and the people of each said States, and Colorado, through its duly authorized officials, shall have the perpetual and exclusive right to control and regulate diversions of water at all times by said canal in conformity with said judgment.

The water decrees heretofore adjudicated to said Pioneer Canal by the district court of Colorado in the amount of 50 cubic feet per second of time is included in and is a part of the total amounts of water hereinbefore allocated to the States of Colorado and Nebraska.

ARTICLE VI

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to construct or participate in the future construction and use of any storage reservoir or diversion works in an upper State for the purpose of regulating water herein allocated to such lower State, provided that such right is subject to the rights of the upper State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, to control, regulate, and use the waters herein allocated to it.

ARTICLE VII

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to acquire in an upper State, by purchase or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such easements and rights-of-way, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs, and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits, required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article VI: *Provided, however*, The grantees of such rights shall pay to the governmental agencies in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights of way are occupied for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements so occupied, based upon the 10 years preceding the use of such lands, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said governmental agencies.

ARTICLE VIII

Should any facilities be constructed in an upper State under the provisions of article VI, such construction and the operation of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of such upper State.

Any repairs to or replacements of such facilities shall also be made in accordance with the laws of such upper State.

ARTICLE IX

It shall be the duty of the three signatory States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact.

ARTICLE X

The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Republican River Basin constitute the basis for this compact, and none of the signatory States hereby concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

ARTICLE XI

This compact shall become operative when ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress of the United States. Notice of ratification by the Legislature of a State shall be given by the Governor of such State to the Governors of the other States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the Governors of the signatory States of consent by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

Done in the city of Denver, in the State of Colorado, on the 19th day of March in the year of our Lord 1941.

M. C. HINDERLIDER,
Commissioner for Colorado.
GEORGE S. KNAPP,
Commissioner for Kansas.
WARDNER G. SCOTT,
Commissioner for Nebraska.

SEC. 2. (a) The foregoing compact shall not be construed (i) to impair or affect in any sense any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin or the capacity of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to acquire rights in and to the use of waters of said basin; (ii) to subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by any State, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes, nor to subject such property to the laws of any State if such laws do not otherwise apply.

(b) The Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio, with the officials of the signatory States referred to in article IX of the compact in the execution of the duty of these officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of water facts necessary for the proper administration of the compact, and may perform such other services related to the compact as may be mutually agreed on with the said officials of the signatory States.

SEC. 3. The consent of the Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact amending the Republican River Compact: *Provided*, That a suitable person shall be appointed by the President of the United States to participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and to make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: *Provided further*, That such amendatory compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or affect any right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce or the jurisdiction of the United States in and over the waters of the Republican River Basin as defined in said compact, as navigable waters or otherwise; and the consent of Congress hereby given is with the express reservation that it does not constitute an admission or declaration by Congress that the Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Republican River Basin as so defined are not navigable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCRETIONARY PENALTY OF PUNISHMENT BY DEATH FOR SABOTAGE IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2, to provide for discretionary penalty of punishment by death on conviction of willful sabotage against the national defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to start passing around the death penalty in time of peace for noncapital offenses, at the discretion of judges, it seems to me we are starting to approach pretty close to the Hitler technique. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the gentleman's statement, and with all respect to his right to take the action he has taken, I should like to state for the RECORD that this bill, introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], came before the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration and that a hearing was had on the bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary took the position that the imposition of the death penalty unqualifiedly or the enactment of a law which would have authorized the imposition of the death penalty without qualification in cases such as those covered by this bill would be improper. However, the bill has been amended, as the gentleman will note. The Committee on the Judiciary took the position that, as amended, the bill contains sufficient qualifications to remove the objections which have been made by the gentleman.

In 1918 a law was passed to punish willful injury or destruction of war materials or war premises when this country is at war, and the penalty provided was a fine of $10,000 and not more than 30 years imprisonment.

In November 1940 that law was amended. The amendments took care of a situation such as that in which we now find ourselves, when we are engaged in a national-defense effort. It was so amended as to include national defense. National-defense material, national-defense premises, and national-defense utilities were included in the act. There was no provision in the 1940 amendment that the country need necessarily be at war in order that the penalties might be imposed.

When this bill came before the Committee on the Judiciary, as I have stated, the committee felt that the provision in the original bill with respect to the imposition of the death penalty was too stringent. The bill was sent to the Attorney General for his consideration, and he returned it with a statement of his attitude. This statement appears in the committee report on the bill. The gentleman will note that the following statement is contained in the report of the Attorney General:

> To permit a death sentence to be imposed during peacetime would provide a more stringent punishment for sabotage than that prescribed for espionage. The crime of espionage carries a death penalty only if the offense is committed in time of war (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 32). Moreover, the severity of the proposed penalty becomes more apparent when consideration is given to the fact that the maximum term of imprisonment for violation of the seditious conspiracy statute (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 6) is 6 years and that for inciting rebellion or insurrection is 10 years (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 4).

Then the Attorney General goes on to say in his communication to the Committee on the Judiciary on this bill:

> If the proposed legislation restricted the imposition of the death penalty, upon recommendation of the jury, to cases in which persons were killed, maimed, or placed in grave jeopardy of life or limb as a result of the acts of sabotage committed, it is believed that it would be more meritorious and its enactment would be worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. KEAN. Might not that be considered as damning it with faint praise?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say that the committee took the same position as that taken by the Attorney General, and the views of the Attorney General corroborated the views of the committee which considered the bill.

The bill now contains a proviso, as follows:

> If such offense resulted in death or serious injury to any other person or placed any other person in grave danger of death or serious injury.

The death penalty is made subject to this qualification. There is yet the other qualification which appeared in the bill in its original form. That qualification makes the death penalty subject to the recommendation of the jury. So there are two processes which must be followed before the death penalty may be ordered. It does not rest with the court, as the gentleman seemed to intimate by his remarks.

Mr. KEAN. I stand corrected on that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It rests with the jury, and rests with the jury only when the circumstances are found to be as provided in the qualifying amendment of the law, namely, that the offense resulted in death or serious injury to any other person or placed any other person in danger of death or serious injury. Under those circumstances the Judiciary Committee, by unanimous vote, felt that the provision making possible the imposition of the death penalty was not too drastic.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Does this apply in peacetime or in wartime?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It applies in wartime under the 1918 enactment and applies in peacetime under the 1940 enactment, both of which enactments would be affected by the terms of the bill and by the amendment which we have been discussing.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. It seems to me it is very drastic for peacetime legislation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I appreciate the concern of the gentlewoman and have attempted to explain the circumstances under which the penalty authorized may possibly be imposed.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISTRIBUTION AND PROMOTION OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5837, to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the total number of commissioned officers on the active list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be distributed in rank relative with officers of the Navy in the proportion of 5 in the grade of captain to 8 in the grade of commander, to 87 in the grades of lieutenant commander, lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, inclusive: *Provided*, That the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant commander shall not exceed 35 percent of the total authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list.

PROMOTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 2. (a) Promotions to the grades of captain and commander shall be made as vacancies occur and shall be by selection from the next lower respective grades upon recommendation of the Personnel Board hereinafter authorized.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this act, lieutenants, lieutenants (junior grade), and ensigns shall be promoted to the respective grades of lieutenant commander, lieutenant, and lieutenant (junior grade) in the order in which the names appear on the current lineal list hereinafter authorized as the officers become credited with 17 years', 10 years', and 3 years' commissioned service, respectively: *Provided*, That lieutenants with not less than 14 years' accredited service and lieutenants (junior grade) with not less than 7 years' accredited service may be promoted to the grades of lieutenant commander and lieutenant, respectively, at any time in such numbers as will not cause the resulting number of officers in each of the grades of lieutenant commander and lieutenant to exceed 28 percent of the total authorized force of commissioned officers on the active list.

(c) All promotions, when made, shall be effective from the date of the respective vacancies, and promotions to all grades shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(d) Each officer shall be assumed to have, for promotion purposes, at least the same length of service as any officer junior to him on the lineal list hereinafter authorized, except that an officer who has lost numbers on the lineal list shall be assumed to have for promotion purposes no greater service than the officer next above him in his new position on the lineal list.

(e) Whenever a final fraction occurs in computing the authorized number of officers of any grade, the nearest whole number shall be regarded as the authorized number: *Provided*, That the total number of officers as authorized by law shall not be increased as a result of the computations prescribed herein, and if necessary the number of officers in the lowest grade shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That no officer shall be reduced in grade or pay or separated from the active list as the result of any computations made to determine the authorized number of officers in the various grades.

PERSONNEL BOARD

SEC. 3. At least once a year and at such other times as may be necessary, the Secretary of Commerce shall appoint and convene a Personnel Board consisting of not less than five officers not below the rank of commander on the active list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to make the computations prescribed herein, to prepare and maintain a lineal list on which the names of all officers on the active list shall be arranged in such order as the board may determine, and to make selections and recommendations for the promotion and retirement of officers as herein prescribed.

SEC. 4. Each report of the Personnel Board shall be submitted to the President for approval or disapproval: *Provided*, That in case any recommendation by the board is not acceptable to the President, the board shall be so informed and shall make such further recommendations as shall be acceptable to the President and, if necessary, the board shall be reconvened for this purpose: *Provided further*, That when the report of the board shall have been approved, the recommendations therein shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of this act.

RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS

SEC. 5. The President may transfer to the retired list from the grades of captain, commander, lieutenant commander, and lieutenant, such officers as have been recommended for retirement by the Personnel Board: *Provided*, That the total number of officers so retired in any fiscal year shall not exceed the whole number nearest 1 percent of the total authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list, and, except as otherwise required by law, the number of officers so retired plus the number of officers retired for age in any fiscal year shall not exceed 3 percent of the total authorized number of commissioned officers on the active list: *Provided further*, That all transfers to the retired list pursuant to this act shall become effective on the next ensuing July 1 and the resulting vacancies may be filled as of that date.

SEC. 6. Officers retired pursuant to section 5 of this act shall receive pay at the rate of 2½ percent of their active-duty pay at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years' service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied.

SEC. 7. Should an officer fail in his physical examination for promotion and be found incapacitated for service by reason of physical disability contracted in line of duty, he shall be retired with the rank to which he would otherwise be entitled to be promoted, with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay of that grade.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of

the Senate, an officer on the active list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander to serve as Assistant Director; his appointment shall not create a vacancy and while holding said office he shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of rear admiral (lower half): *Provided*, That any officer who may be retired while serving as Director or Assistant Director, or who has or shall have served 4 years as Director or Assistant Director and is retired after completion of such service while serving in a lower rank or grade, shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade or rank held by him as Director or Assistant Director.

SEC. 9. The provisions of sections 1 to 5, inclusive, of the act of April 20, 1940 (54 Stat. 144), relating to the burial expenses of Navy personnel, and the provisions of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824), as amended by the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 710), relating to the payment of a death gratuity to dependents of commissioned officers and other personnel of the Navy or Marine Corps, shall apply to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, except that the duties and obligations imposed in said acts upon the Secretary of the Navy are hereby imposed for the purposes of this act upon the Secretary of Commerce who shall cause the necessary payments to be made from funds appropriated for the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

SEC. 10. Commissioned officers, ships' officers, and members of the crews of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be permitted to purchase commissary and quartermaster supplies as far as available from the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps at the prices charged officers and enlisted men of those services.

SEC. 11. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 24, change the period to a colon and add:

"*Provided further*, That for purposes of pay, longevity pay, allowances, promotion, or retirement, which are now or may hereafter be authorized for officers appointed after June 30, 1922, there shall be counted in addition to active commissioned service, service as deck officer and junior engineer in excess of 1 year."

Page 2, line 15, delete the word "commissioned."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2035, to amend sections 345 and 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-marketing quotas.

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who is unavoidably absent, I move that the bill be stricken from the calendar, as it will be too late to put into effect in the event the House took favorable action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman ask that the bill be passed over in view of the fact that the usual procedure with reference to the Consent Calendar is that in such circumstances the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3487) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have any objection to the bill, but this is a bill of 10 pages, and I am wondering whether or not the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] would give the membership an explanation of it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, this bill undertakes to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in three or four particulars. It extends the coverage of the act to quite a number of people who are not now under the Civil Service Retirement Act, or the Social Security Act. It extends the age limit at which people must be retired for two groups; one from 62 to 70 years, and one from 65 to 70 years, and permits all employees that come under the act to retire at 60 years if they have had 30 years in the Government. It increases the rate of contribution for retirement from 3½ percent to 5 percent. In brief, that is what the bill does.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out the whole thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 1. (a) All officers and employees to whom this act applies who shall have attained or shall hereafter attain the age of 70 years and have rendered at least 15 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act shall be eligible for retirement on an annuity as provided in section 4 hereof.

"(b) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have attained, or shall hereafter attain the age of 60 years and have rendered at least 30 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, or who shall have attained or shall hereafter attain the age of 62 years and have rendered at least 15 years of such service may, upon his own option, retire and shall be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"(c) The head of a department or independent Government agency concerned may request the retirement of any such officer or employee described in subsection (b) of this section who, by reason of a disqualification, is unable to perform satisfactorily and efficiently the duties of his position or some other position of the same grade or class as that occupied by the employee and to which he could be assigned. No such request shall be submitted to the Civil Service Commission unless and until the said officer or employee has been notified in writing of the proposed retirement. Each such officer or employee shall, upon request by him, have opportunity for a hearing before the Civil Service Commission, at which hearing the officer or employee may appear in person or he may be represented by a person of his choice. No such officer or employee shall be so retired unless the Civil Service Commission after examination finds that he is so disqualified. The determination of the Civil Service Commission as to whether the officer or employee shall be retired under this subsection shall be final and conclusive. Any person so retired shall be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof.

"(d) Any officer or employee who has completed 30 years of service computed in accordance with the provisions of section 5 hereof and who has reached or may hereafter reach the age of 55 years may voluntarily retire and shall be paid an immediate life annuity beginning on the first day of the month following the date of separation from the service having a value equal to the present worth of a deferred annuity at the age of 60 years computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"If none of the options provided in this section is exercised prior to the date upon which the officer or employee would otherwise be eligible for retirement from the service, the provisions of this act with respect to automatic separation from the service shall apply."

SEC. 2. Strike out all of section 2 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as provided in section 204 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 404), and (50 Stat. 512) section 3 of the act of July 13, 1937, all officers or employees to whom this act applies shall, on the last day of the month in which they attain retirement age as defined in the preceding section, and having rendered at least 15 years of service, be automatically separated from the service, and all salary, pay, or compensation shall cease from that date, and it shall be the duty of the head of each department, branch, or independent office of the Government concerned to notify each such employee under his direction of the date of his separation from the service at least 60 days in advance thereof: *Provided, however*, That no provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall have any application whatever to any elective officer.

"(b) No person separated from the service who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of section 1 of this act shall be eligible again to appointment to any appointive office, position, or employment under the United States or of the government of the District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 3 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out all thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) This act shall apply to all officers or employees in or under the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government, all elective or appointive officers in or under the said branches, and to all officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not apply to any such officer or employee of the United States or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia subject to another retirement system for such officers and employees of the said governments, nor to any elective officer until such officer gives notice in writing to the Civil Service Commission of his or her desire to come within the purview of this act. Said notice must be given in the case of any such person in the legislative branch of the Government on the effective date of this act, within 6 months from such effective date, and in the case of any such person elected and serving after the effective date of this act, within 6 months from the taking of the oath of office.

"(b) The President shall have power, in his discretion, to exclude from the operation of this act any officer or employee or group of officers or employees in the service whose

tenure of office or employment is intermittent or of uncertain duration."

SEC. 4. Section 7 of the said act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby repealed, and in lieu thereof the following is substituted:

"(a) Should any officer or employee to whom this act applies, after having served for a total period of not less than 5 years and before becoming eligible for retirement become separated from the service, such officer or employee shall be paid a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years, computed as provided in clauses (1) and (2) of section 4 (a) of this act: *Provided*, That any such person involuntarily separated from the service not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency may elect to receive an immediate annuity beginning at the age of 55 or at the date of separation from the service if subsequent to that age having a value equal to the present worth of a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years, or at age of separation if subsequent to age 62, computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"(b) Should an annuitant under the provisions of this section be reemployed in a position included in the provisions of this act, the annuity and any right to an immediate or deferred annuity as provided herein shall cease as of the date of such employment. If such annuitant is reemployed in any position in the service of the United States or the District of Columbia, not within the provisions of this act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during the period of such employment, and resumed in the same amount upon termination of such employment.

"(c) Interest shall be allowed on the amount credited to such separated officer's or employee's individual account in the retirement fund at 3 percent compounded on June 30 of each year until the beginning date of annuity."

SEC. 5. That in section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, after the words "and also 3½ percent of the basic salary, pay, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1926" insert the following: "and prior to June 30, 1941, and also 5 percent of such basic pay, salary, or compensation for services rendered on and after July 1, 1941."

SEC. 6. Add to the first sentence of section 10 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the following: *"Provided*, That after June 30, 1941, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of any officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 5 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation."

SEC. 7. Strike out paragraph (b) of section 12 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"In the case of any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall be transferred to a position not within the purview of this act, or who shall become absolutely separated from the service before he shall have completed an aggregate of 5 years of service computed in accordance with section 5 of this act, the amount of deductions from his basic salary, pay, or compensation credited to his individual account, together with interest at 4 percent compounded on June 30 of each year shall be returned to such officer or employee: *Provided*, That when an officer or employee becomes involuntarily separated from the service, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency before completing 5 years of creditable service the total amount of deductions from his basic salary, pay, or compensation with interest at 4 percent compounded on June 30 of each year shall be returned to such officer or employee: *Provided further*, That all deductions from basic salary, pay, or compensation so returned to an officer or employee must, upon reinstatement, retransfer, or reappointment to a position coming within the purview of this act be redeposited with interest at 4 percent compounded on June 30 of each year before such officer or employee may derive any benefits under this act, except as provided in this section, but interest shall not be required covering any period of separation from the service."

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to affect any rights of persons separated prior to the effective date of this act, but all such rights shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as though this act had not been made.

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect July 1, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 23, strike out "(50 Stat. 512)."

On page 3, line 24, after "July 13, 1937", insert "(50 Stat. 512)."

On page 4, line 12, strike out "(b) No" and in lieu thereof insert "(b) Except as may now or hereafter be provided by law no."

On page 4, line 20, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof "and."

On page 4, line 22, strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof "and."

On page 5, between lines 17 and 18, add the following as section 4:

"SEC. 4. Section 4 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the act of August 4, 1939, is amended by striking out the period at the end of section 4 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding the following sentence after the semicolon: 'Nor shall such total annuity paid be less than an amount equal to the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the employee during any 5 consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the employee, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 35 years, and divided by 70.' "

On page 5, line 18, renumber section as "5" instead of "4."

On page 6, line 10, after the word "act", strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following after the colon: *"Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prohibit the refund of deductions, deposits, or redeposits made prior to the effective date of this act with interest thereon, or of any voluntary contributions made under the provisions of section 10 of this act, with interest: *And provided further*, That all moneys, except voluntary contributions, so refunded an officer or employee must be redeposited with interest before such officer or employee may derive any annuity benefits based on the service covered by the refund."

On page 6, line 25, renumber section as "6" instead of "5."

On page 7, line 4, strike out "June 30, 1941" and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1942."

On page 7, line 6, strike out "July 1, 1941" and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1942."

On page 7, line 7, renumber section as "7" instead of "6."

On page 7, line 9, strike out "June 30" and insert in lieu thereof "December 31."

On page 7, line 14, renumber section as "8" instead of "7."

On page 8, between lines 16 and 17, add the following as section 9:

"SEC. 9. Section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby amended, effective from January 1, 1940, by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

" 'The term "annuitant" as used in this act shall include any employee who has met all requirements of the act for title and has filed claim therefor, notwithstanding final administrative action was not taken by the Civil Service Commission prior to his death. Nothing in this section shall be so construed as to reduce any benefit otherwise payable.' "

On page 8, line 17, renumber section as "10" instead of "8."

On page 8, line 22, renumber section as "11" instead of "9."

On page 8, line 22, strike out "July 1, 1941" and add "upon approval except as otherwise provided herein."

The committee amendments were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ABOLISHING CERTAIN FEES OF DISTRICT COURT CLERKS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5880) to abolish certain fees charged by clerks of the district courts; and to exempt defendants in condemnation proceedings from the payment of filing fees in certain instances.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857, as amended; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 550), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: *"And provided further*, That in any proceeding instituted under any law of the United States to acquire property or any interest therein by eminent domain, defendants and other parties adverse to the condemnor shall not be required to pay the fees prescribed by this section."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 8 of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 555), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to the bill just passed, and to include a brief statement I made before the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert at this point the statement which I made before the Committee on the Judiciary and the accompanying remarks of my colleague from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] relating to the bill, H. R. 4807, introduced by our colleague from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], for which the bill H. R. 5880 was substituted, in which public-utility districts of our State, and in my district, are particularly interested.

The statements referred to are as follows:

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1941

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 o'clock a. m., Hon. CHARLES F. MCLAUGHLIN (chairman) presiding.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary is convened for the purpose of hearing witnesses on H. R. 4807, introduced on May 20, 1941, by Mr. COFFEE of Washington.

H. R. 4807 is as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That paragraph 8 of section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States,' approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857; U. S. C., title 28, sec. 555), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(8) For receiving, keeping, and paying out money in pursuance of any statute or order of court, including cash bail or bonds or securities authorized by law to be deposited in lieu of other security, 1 percent of the amount so received, kept and paid out, or of the face value of such bonds or securities: *Provided, however*, That no charge or collection shall be made on the basis of any amount of money, bonds, or securities which have been received from a State, political subdivision thereof, or from an agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision.'"

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This hearing has been called at the request of the author of the bill, Mr. COFFEE, who has indicated that there are a number of witnesses who desire to be heard, and we shall proceed to hear them now.

I call attention to a fact with which we are all familiar, that the House convenes today at 11 o'clock. It is now 10 o'clock, so I suggest we expedite this matter as much as possible.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, if you wish me to do so, I shall take charge of the calling of the witnesses so that we may hurry this matter along.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That will be agreeable to the committee.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, Mr. SMITH of Washington, one of our colleagues, must attend an executive committee meeting of the Rivers and Harbors Committee at 10:30. If agreeable to the others, I think it would be well that he be heard first. So if there is no objection, we will hear Mr. SMITH.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We shall be glad to hear Mr. SMITH.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my colleague, Mr. COFFEE, has correctly stated the situation. We have an executive session this morning of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I am a member. It is probably the most important committee meeting we are going to hold this year. We are preparing now to report out our omnibus rivers and harbors bill. Our committee meets at 10:30, and therefore I appreciate the courtesy of Mr. COFFEE and your committee in being permitted to precede him in testifying at this hearing this morning. Mr. COFFEE, as the author of the bill, would naturally make the opening statement in the usual course. So I appreciate this consideration very much.

I am appearing in support of Mr. COFFEE'S bill, H. R. 4807, which is a bill to exempt States and agencies thereof from the payment of certain district court fees.

This is a bill that is of great importance, particularly to the public-utility districts in our State and in my district, and, of course, throughout the Nation as well.

We have had considerable litigation in our State in acquiring the properties of private power companies in connection with our great public-power program, in regard to which we have been making very satisfactory progress and which is related, of course, to our Bonneville public-power development.

I believe that I could better state the purposes of this legislation and the arguments in favor of it by reading a letter from Hon. E. K. Murray, attorney at law at Tacoma, Wash., than by attempting to make a general statement myself. Mr. Murray is one of the leading members of the Washington State bar and has appeared for many years in court in litigation involving the questions pertaining to this legislation and is very familiar with the entire subject. With the committee's permission, I would like to read his letter bearing the date of April 18, 1941. It is addressed to me and reads as follows:

"In July of last year I wrote to Congressman COFFEE, calling his attention to the provisions of United States Code Annotated, title 28, section 555, subparagraph 8, pursuant to which the clerk of the United States district court is entitled to a fee of 1 percent of all amounts received, kept, and paid out by him. This particular provision takes on importance because of the fact that a number of public-utility districts in Washington have instituted condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of various public-utility properties throughout the State. These cases have all been instituted in the first instance in the State courts and thereafter removed to the Federal courts by reason of diversity of citizenship; that is, because the private-utility companies happen to be incorporated under the laws of some State other than the State of Washington. Under the State law there is no requirement for the payment of any fee to the clerk of the superior court similar to that provided in subparagraph 8 aforesaid.

"The working of the above rule and the hardship which it imposes upon the public-utility districts is illustrated by what happened with reference to public-utility district No. 1 of Cowlitz County."

That, gentlemen of the committee, is a county in my district. I continue reading Mr. Murray's letter:

"It instituted a suit to acquire the properties of the Washington Gas & Electric Co. in Longview and vicinity. This case was removed from the superior court of Cowlitz County to the United States district court at Tacoma and, after trial, resulted in an award by the jury of approximately $6,000,000 as the value of the property to be acquired. In November of last year the district proceeded to take over the property, and in connection therewith was required to pay the above sum with accumulated interest thereon into the office of the clerk of the United States district court and, in addition to the judgment and interest, to pay a 1-percent clerk's fee, which amounted to $62,299.38. This fee is, of course, entirely out of proportion to any services which the clerk renders. In fact, the service which he does render consists largely of receiving a check, depositing the same, and thereafter writing and drawing a check, and the situation remains that except for the removal of the cause to the Federal courts no such fee would be incurred."

That is the evil which Mr. COFFEE'S bill seeks to correct; and it seems to me, gentlemen of the committee, that that certainly should be done, because there can be no justification for exacting such a fee and imposing that additional cost on the citizens and taxpayers who are affected, for the performance by the clerk of a purely ministerial act. I read further from Mr. Murray's letter:

"In my letter to Congressman COFFEE I suggested that subparagraph 8, aforesaid, be amended at least to make the same inapplicable to public bodies. I further suggested to him that he discuss with you the matter of presenting a private bill for the relief of Cowlitz County so as to procure the return to it of the above amount. It seems to me that such action would be simply a carrying out of the policy of the Federal Government, which is to encourage the widest possible use of electricity at the lowest possible cost. Certainly the above fee or charge is entirely unjust and unnecessary to impose upon the acquisition of the properties.

"Public Utility District No. 1 of Whatcom County, in August, likewise obtained a judgment fixing an award of $5,000,000 to be paid it for the properties of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. in Whatcom County."

That is in the district of my colleague, Mr. JACKSON, who is here this morning. Mr. Murray's letter continues:

"The company appealed this case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco, and the case will be argued there during the week of May 19, 1941. In the ordinary course the decision should be obtained within about 60 days, and if the judgment is affirmed the district should be in a position to take over the properties about September or October of this year. Unless the above subparagraph 8 is amended and the amendment becomes effective before that date the district will likewise be called upon to pay the clerk a fee of approximately $52,000, covering 1 percent on the above judgment and accumulated interest thereon.

"I have been authorized by W. A. Cardwell, James A. Doyle, and John H. Slade, the commissioners of Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, to request you to introduce a private relief bill on behalf of the district for the above amount. I would appreciate anything you can do in the matter. Should you desire further information in reference to the claim or any supporting documents or data, I will be glad to furnish same upon request.

"Very truly yours,

"E. M. MURRAY."

I have not as yet introduced such a private bill for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, because I thought it would be advisable to wait the outcome of this legislation introduced by my colleague, Mr. COFFEE. But I certainly do intend to introduce such a private bill because I consider that it would be most meritorious.

There is very little that I can add, gentlemen of the committee, to this very logical and, it seems to me, cogent letter of Mr. Murray. I think he has analyzed the situation very well, and I hope that your committee will give this legislation very serious and, I trust, favorable consideration.

I want to thank you very much.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Thank you, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH. May I be excused now in order to go to the committee meeting which I referred to earlier?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE. Gentlemen, there are two other Members of the House here. I know their time is valuable. If there is no objection, we will call on them before we call on any of the other witnesses. May I ask Mr. LEAVY if he desires to speak now?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We shall be glad to hear Mr. LEAVY.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES H. LEAVY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LEAVY. Members of the committee, I want to say that I do not know that I could add very much to what has already been stated by my colleague, Mr. SMITH, except this thought. While it appears that the problem is one peculiar now to the State of Washington, I understand there are numerous other States that have exactly such problems in the making. And then I would like to leave this further thought with the committee, that this situation might arise, and perhaps has arisen, in a minor way, in numerous places in the United States where a State or a subdivision of a State might see fit to acquire a bridge that is privately owned and privately operated, and the corporation that owns and operates it is foreign to the State, thus resulting in Federal litigation. So that when payment is finally made, this same fee would be charged.

I do not doubt that instances of that type could be multiplied, and, as stated by my colleague, Mr. SMITH, I am sure that it was never the intent of Congress when it enacted this fee provision of the code, to place such a burden, or any burden, upon a State or its subdivisions.

I want to join with Mr. SMITH in his attitude on the question. I am sure he has made clear to the committee how tremendously

onerous and even unreasonable this burden becomes to these municipal creatures that have been set up under our State.

When a P. U. D.—that is, a public-utility district—is required, in addition to paying whatever the court decrees is a reasonable award for the property being taken by condemnation, an additional sum of sixty or seventy thousand dollars for a service that is merely a nominal service, at once the situation points out those evils and needs no argument further. I trust the committee will be able to go along with us and report this bill out in its present form or in some form that will grant us the relief that is so sorely needed.

I thank the committee for giving me this opportunity to be heard.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. COFFEE. Thank you, Mr. LEAVY.

FREE ENTRY OF ARTICLES BY RETURNING RESIDENTS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1632) permitting free entry of articles imported by returning residents from certain countries on the basis of the frequency of use of the exemption rather than the length of visit abroad, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD] intends to interpose an objection to this bill. I merely want the House to understand that the bill comes with the unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means and that there was no partisan consideration of it at all. The bill deals only with a Treasury regulation that was made in connection with customs district No. 25, involving the lower part of California, San Diego, down to Calexico. The bill has the endorsement of all the other members of the California delegation except the gentleman who will object. I cannot prevent him from objecting. This bill was thoroughly and carefully considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee entrusted the reporting of it to me. I have been instructed to use every parliamentary procedure to secure its adoption. If, therefore, it is necessary for me to come back to the House under a suspension of the rules, or with a rule from the Committee on Rules, I want the membership of the House to understand very distinctly that I am not acceding to any objection at this time.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. Merely to say that I think the gentleman has made a statement of fact regarding the action of the committee, and the opinion of the committee as to the justness of this measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SEEING-EYE DOGS IN GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1826) to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds if this legislation takes care of those people having newsstands and such things and permitting them to have seeing-eye dogs in the post offices and to keep them there?

Mr. LANHAM. It is my understanding that it does; and the Post Office Department, without any legislation, has very recently prescribed regulations for the use of these dogs.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I know that. They did it at my request. At least, I was one who requested it.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. I would say that this legislation provides not only for the seeing-eye dogs but for other dogs that are trained for the same purpose, so that all dogs that may require regulations may enter these buildings in accordance with the regulations established by those in charge. We have similar legislation now with reference to their use on trains.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That seeing-eye dogs or other guide dogs, specially trained and educated for that purpose, accompanied by their blind masters, shall be admitted to any building or other property owned or controlled by the United States, upon the same terms and conditions, and subject to the same regulations as generally govern the admission of the public to such property: *Provided*, That such dogs shall not be permitted to run free or roam in or on such property, and shall be in guiding harness or on leash and under the control of their blind masters at all times while in or on such property. The head of each department or other agency of the United States may make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary in the public interest to carry out the provisions of this act in its application to any such building or other property subject to his jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS AT WARTIME RATES FOR OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN DISABLED IN LINE OF DUTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6009, to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extrahazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I received a letter from the Regular Veterans' Association complaining about this bill, and it seems to me their position is well taken in the fact that if a man is dead or injured in camp he is just as dead or injured as if he was on a maneuver. It seems to me that section 2, page 2, line 5, ought to be omitted. If that is omitted, I would not have any objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I will make an explanation so that the House will understand the bill.

Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago we passed legislation for the regular veteran and raised them from 45 percent of the World War rate to 75 percent, which is today effective. This year we passed H. R. 1030, which raised dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment from 45 percent to 75 percent. This bill, H. R. 6009, has the approval of the Budget Bureau, has the green light from the White House, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion. There has been one objection raised by a gentleman representing the Regular Establishment consisting of approximately 12,000 veterans.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that that was the only single objection raised to the bill by any organization?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct. This bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Was it not a fact that we felt this was one bil' that would have a great effect upon the morale of our Nation at this time?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it not a fact that the individual who represents the organization which has made objection to this bill is the only individual of any organization that represents the peacetime soldier?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. So therefore his objection is on behalf of the entire Military Establishment at the present time?

Mr. LESINSKI. The only objection from that establishment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will recall that during the Seventy-sixth Congress the benefits of the peacetime veterans were increased to 75 percent of what the World War veteran received.

Mr. LESINSKI. Correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And the Senate passed a bill, S. 415, several weeks ago that would increase those benefits to 90 percent?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If this bill is amended to include the peacetime veterans, will it not cause this bill to be defeated eventually?

Mr. LESINSKI. I do not think so.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that if we include

peacetime veterans in the bill now before the House it will be accepted?

Mr. LESINSKI. A certain amount of them. It includes about 9,000 who are on the pension rolls today. It takes in the submarine *Squalus;* it takes in the *Panay.* It even takes in the expedition into Mexico and it takes in the expedition in the Moro Island in the Philippines. Those men are paid a lower rate. This bill covers all of those who were in expeditionary forces.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the amendment that is suggested by the Regular Veterans' Association is adopted by this House, then it will include all peacetime veterans?

Mr. LESINSKI. It would take in everybody; yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And you inject a new issue and a new problem, do you not?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And this problem may eventually defeat H. R. 6009?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 6009, is based upon careful study by your committee. It was drafted by the Veterans' Administration after collaboration with the War and Navy Departments, and the Coast Guard, and took into consideration discussions had with your committee. Bills have been considered both in hearings and executive sessions having for their purpose a general increase of peacetime pension rates to 90 percent or 100 percent of the wartime rates under veterans' regulations. Under existing law, such pension rates are generally 75 percent of the wartime rates. Those bills have received adverse reports from the Veterans' Administration and advice had been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President.

With reference to the pension rates for the Regular Establishment, it should be stated that the general pension law, before the enactment of the Economy Act, provided from $6 to $30 per month, the latter being for total disability. These rates were dependent upon rank except that as between $8 and $18 per month partial disabilities could be rated and paid regardless of rank. There were other permanent statutory rates for certain specific disabilities such as amputations and those specific rates ranged to $125 per month. However, the rate for total disability from organic disease, in the absence of helplessness, was pensionable to $30 per month. However, the Economy Act, and Presidential regulations eliminated these inequalities and increased the rate for total disability from $30 to $45 with specific rates up to $125, but the rates established were considered to be more in accordance with the payment of pension for degree of disability from the standpoint of reduction or earning capacity. As a result of this change, the differentiation on account of rank was eliminated and the disabilities were graduated in 10 steps which resulted in pronounced increases of rates for partial disabilities. In order that no injustice would result as to some of the peacetime veterans who were receiving some of the high specific rates under the general pension law, Public, No. 788, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 24, 1936, was enacted by the Congress and approved by the President which protected such rates to 75 percent of the wartime rates under the Presidential regulations. Public, No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress, increased the disability rates to 75 percent of the wartime rates. H. R. 1030, Seventy-seventh Congress, was reported favorably by your committee, passed the House of Representatives and is now on the Senate Calendar. This bill would further increase present dependents' rates to make the rates more uniform.

The suggestion has been offered that the Regular Establishment rates should be established on, or approximately on, a wartime basis because of limited emergency and the expansion of the armed forces. Your committee has carefully considered the facts pertaining to a parity of peacetime rates with wartime rates and has concluded that the differentiation between such rates must be considered as justified and it is not believed that at the present time the differentiation established by law is unreasonable.

However, your committee in its deliberations recognizes the present necessity of providing wartime rates for service-connected disabilities and deaths under conditions where the payment of any lesser rate would obviously appear to be unjustified. Bills have repeatedly been considered prior to the present emergency to grant wartime rates in cases where the injury or death was incurred in an area of armed conflict such as the conditions under which disabilities and deaths were incurred in connection with the *Panay* and *Augusta* on duty in Chinese waters. These eventualities exist to a great extent today and will probably increase in frequency. You will note that one of the first groups to be taken in under H. R. 6009 is that where injury or death is incurred as a result of armed conflict.

Bills have also been previously considered pertaining to cases where the disability or death was incurred as a result of extra-hazardous service. As you will recall, for some years there was a general law providing a double pension for aviation and submarine accidents. Because of the inequalities and injustices resulting from that legislation in its particular form its provisions were not restored following repeal thereof by the Economy Act. Such injustices and inequalities are believed to be removed by H. R. 6009 and, as evidence of this, not only is extra-hazardous service involving aviation and submarine activities covered, but the second group to be covered in the bill includes injuries and deaths resulting from extra-hazardous service, regardless of whether the injury or death is incurred in connection with submarine, aviation, operation of mechanized equipment, testing, or other activities of the armed forces of the United States.

It is recognized that a statute of this nature must leave for regulation the classification of the various types of service to be deemed extrahazardous so as to permit of necessary flexibility of administration depending primarily upon experience under the act and changed conditions surrounding military and naval operations. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has informed the committee that the regulations to be promulgated under this legislation will be drafted on a basis of liberal interpretation, and it is the opinion of your committee that this can well be left to the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs within the standards established by the bill.

There also have been bills pending in the Congress to provide benefits in the event the United States engages in war. Legislation would be required in order to apply the wartime rates in the eventuality of war. This bill, H. R. 6009, provides the necessary legislative authority to apply such wartime rates in time of war. Therefore, if the bill is enacted and should the United States become engaged in war, it will not be necessary for the Congress to be concerned with a prompt drafting, consideration, and enactment of adequate legislation to give wartime rates to the disabled and dependents of those who might die as the result of injuries or diseases incurred or aggravated in line of duty.

Relating back to the bills heretofore considered by the Congress and by your committee pertaining to injuries and deaths incurred in line of duty prior to the date this bill may be enacted into law I want to emphasize that H. R. 6009 contains specific provisions that cases wherein the requirements of H. R. 6009 are met, even though the disability or death is due to injury or disease incurred prior to the date of enactment of this act, the wartime rates will be paid although the award will not be effective prior to the date of enactment of the law.

I wish to impress the Members with the fact that this legislation is not restricted to selectees or National Guard men nor is it restricted to volunteers who enlist in the Army or Navy but it covers also those persons in the Regular Establishment and with the retrospective provision in the bill will cover in addition to all of these groups in the active service and those who may come into the active service, the Regulars, Volunteers, National Guard men, and selectees, and any others in the active military or naval service who suffered injury or disease or where death resulted from injury or disease incurred at any time during the past years in the active military or naval service in line of duty under the circumstances described in the bill.

I want also to emphasize the statement which is contained in the conclusions of the committee report No. 1449, that this bill not only was reported by unanimous vote of your committee but has the unanimous endorsement of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the Bureau of the Budget. Enactment of the proposed legislation is also recommended by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American

Veterans of the World War and the Fleet Reserve Association.

With our steadily increasing armed forces, concentration and enhancement of intensive training, together with possible involvement which may increase to a pronounced degree the frequency of incurrence of injury or disease or death in line of duty under conditions described in the bill, it is considered a very important defense obligation of this Congress to act promptly so as to assure those persons in the active military or naval service that their Government is not unmindful of the extra hazard assumed and is making immediate and appropriate provision for them and their dependents.

Mr. GORE (interrupting the statement). Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan is making a very excellent explanation. If, however, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] intends to persist in his request that this bill go over without prejudice, it seems to me this explanation might be deferred until such time as the bill is actually considered.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey persist in his request?

Mr. KEAN. I do.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the balance of my statement in the RECORD at the point where I was interrupted by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This is the last bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTHORIZING THE MARITIME COMMISSION TO SELL TWO MERCHANT VESSELS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRELAND

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 246) to authorize the Maritime Commission to sell two merchant vessels to the Government of the Republic of Eire.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Maritime Commission is authorized, with the approval of the President, to sell the merchant vessels *West Neris* and *West Hematite* to the Government of the Republic of Eire, upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable for the protection of the public interest.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "the Republic of Eire" and insert "Ireland."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the Maritime Commission to sell two merchant vessels to the Government of Ireland."

TRANSFER OF COAST GUARD STATION BUILDING AT TWO RIVERS, WIS.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1916) to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, two Rivers, Wis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer and convey to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Two Rivers, Wis., without cost to such post, the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., upon condition that such building shall be removed from the station premises without cost to the United States within such reasonable time as may be prescribed by the Commandant of the Coast Guard: *Provided*, That upon failure by said post for any cause to remove the building within the time specified by the Commandant of the Coast Guard, such building shall be disposed of as provided by existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "Treasury" and insert the word "Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH DECEMBER 2

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar on tomorrow be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH DECEMBER 3

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have written to a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief article by Lynn Landrum of the Dallas News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to the sugar legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to make a statement. The Chair intends at each day's session always to recognize every Member to extend his remarks or to proceed for a minute. If we proceed to the consideration of business before all Members have been recognized for such purpose they will be recognized afterward.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables compiled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That (a) so much of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, as precedes subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In order to provide housing for persons engaged in national-defense activities, and their families, and living quarters for single persons so engaged, in those areas or localities in which the President shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends which would impede national-defense activities and that such housing would not be provided by private capital when needed, the Federal Works Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') is authorized:".

(b) Section 1 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the next to last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the cost per permanent family-dwelling unit shall not exceed an average of $3,750 for all type of construction for those units located within the continental United States nor an average of $4,250 for those located elsewhere (exclusive of Alaska), and the cost of no family-dwelling unit shall exceed $4,500 within the continental United States or $4,750 elsewhere, except in the Territory of Alaska, where the

cost shall not exceed $7,500, exclusive of expenses of administration, land acquisition, public utilities, and community facilities, and the aggregate cost of community facilities shall not exceed 3 per centum of the total cost of all projects: *Provided further*, That where the Administrator shall consider that there is no reasonable prospect of disposing of such housing to meet a need extending beyond the emergency he shall construct temporary units:".

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (a) the following: ": *Provided*, That any proceedings for the recovery of possession of any property or project developed or constructed under this title shall be brought by the Administrator in the courts of the States having jurisdiction of such causes and the laws of the States shall be applicable thereto".

SEC. 3. So much of section 3 of such act, as amended, as precedes the proviso therein is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purpose of this title, in accordance with the authority therein contained and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (Public, Numbered 839), and regulations promulgated thereunder, not to exceed the sum of $600,000,000, to remain available until expended in such amounts as the Congress from time to time shall make appropriations therefor:".

SEC. 4. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 3 the following new section:

"SEC. 4. It is hereby declared to be the policy of this title to further the national defense by providing housing in those areas where it cannot otherwise be provided by private enterprise when needed, and that such housing shall be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposing of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may, in his discretion, upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments such housing constructed under the provisions of this act as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy."

SEC. 5. Clause (b) of section 301 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(b) property acquired or constructed under this act (including schools and hospitals), which has not been previously sold or disposed of, shall be disposed of as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest.".

SEC. 6. The second proviso of section 304 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the Administrator shall fix fair rentals, on projects developed pursuant to this act, which shall be based on the value thereof as determined by him, and that rentals to be charged for Army and Navy enlisted personnel shall be fixed by the War and Navy Departments:".

SEC. 7. Section 305 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 305. In the construction of defense housing under this act the Administrator shall act through the Public Buildings Administration, or, in his discretion, the War Department and Navy Department: *Provided*, That any other agency lawfully designated by the Administrator to construct projects for which funds were available at the time of designation may continue such projects to completion: *And provided further*, That the Public Buildings Administration may utilize the services of local housing authorities in such construction herein authorized; and in carrying out the other provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to utilize and act through the Federal Works Agency and other Federal agencies and any local public agency, with the consent of such agency. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this act for defense housing or for defense public works and equipment therefor shall be available for transfer to any agency authorized in this section to construct the same. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the employment or utilization of the professional services of private persons, firms, or corporations. Consultation shall be had with local public officials and local housing authorities to the end that projects constructed under the provisions of this act shall, so far as may be practicable, conform in location and design to local planning and tradition."

SEC. 8. Section 306 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall pay from rentals annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State and/or political subdivision thereof, with respect to any real property acquired and held by him under this act, including improvements thereon. The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall approximate the taxes which would be paid to the State and/or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation, with such allowance as may be considered by him to be appropriate for expenditure by the Government for streets, utilities, or other public services to serve such property."

SEC. 9. Section 309 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Preference in such employment shall be given to qualified local residents."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOLMES. I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Ohio opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am a member of the committee, and I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all realize that these times of turmoil demand many expenditures which in normal times would not be required. The measure we are now to consider is a case in point. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has brought in this bill with reference to defense housing in congested areas after several months of very serious investigation and deliberation. A message of recommendation was sent to the House of Representatives by the President in June of this year requesting that such an appropriation be authorized.

I am sure every Member regrets the necessity of asking for large sums of money under any circumstances, and certainly no such request would now be made except for the fact that the urgent need has been definitely determined after painstaking study and research. Personally, I have been a supporter of economy in government and, had all my votes prevailed, we should owe several billions of dollars less than the amount now indicated in the national debt. But our preparation for defense is of imperative importance, and we all realize the large and pressing expenditures it involves.

Mr. Speaker, I wish first to pay tribute to the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. They have labored assiduously in the study of this housing problem. They have visited practically every section of the United States and inspected the housing which has been done under previous authorizations and appropriations. As a result of unflagging effort and investigation, the amendments to the defense-housing law now being offered in this measure are designed to make it sure that mistakes which have heretofore been made will be obviated in future construction. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] has demanded a second and has indicated his opposition to this bill, yet I think you will find that his opposition is not to the amendments which the committee has recommended to the law but to the procedure of taking this matter up under suspension of the rules.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, this would not be taken up under suspension of the rules if it were a bill involving a policy being considered de novo for enactment into law. We have the law at the present time. The amendments are to correct whatever abuses may have arisen under that law. It would not be taken up under suspension of the rules if the need for speed in providing the necessary housing had not been very deliberately and definitely determined by the committee. It would not be taken up under the suspension of the rules except for the proposed amendment requiring the need to be established before the Committee on Appropriations before the appropriations from time to time to meet that need could be made under this act. It would not be taken up under the suspension of the rules if we had not in this measure so amended the law that the mistakes and the architectural abortions which have existed in some parts of our country could be entirely eliminated from future construction. These and other considerations which the limitation of time will not permit to be mentioned prompt the presentation of the measure in this manner.

The necessity for speedy enactment is obvious to those who have given serious thought and study to the present situation. For instance, as typical of the many urgent requests submitted to our committee, I call your attention to this letter from the Under Secretary of War, dated November 21, 1941:

I am informed that H. R. 5211, which provides an authorization of $300,000,000 for additional defense housing, has not yet been reported to the Congress by your committee.

As you are aware, the primary purpose of this authorization is to insure adequate housing for industrial workers at many munitions

plants which have already commenced production or which will go into production in the near future. The acute need for defense housing at many of these plants already exists. As additional plants go into operation, this need for housing will steadily grow more and more acute.

In view of the immense investment of Federal funds in these plants and the urgent need for the munitions, a lack of adequate housing for the workers engaged in these industries will be detrimental to efficient operation.

Certainly the news items which we have seen paraded in the press in the last few days increase the tension and enhance the necessity for our preparation for the defense of our country. Workers at the many plants referred to in the letter from the Under Secretary of War must have housing provided in cases where that housing is not already available or cannot be supplied by private capital. A survey of the present status of world conditions accentuates the necessity for speed if munitions and equipment are to be furnished as may be required.

Before yielding for questions I want to bring to the attention of the House the amendments suggested in this bill to the present law.

The first amendment is readily understood inasmuch as it provides authorization for such housing for single workers as may be necessary. There may be sufficient authority in the act for that purpose, but this makes clear the intent in that regard.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LANHAM. I will if the gentleman insists, but he will have 20 minutes for his discussion of the measure.

These units will be so constructed that after their occupancy by single persons they can be easily converted into family dwelling units and disposed of as such.

The second section provides for an increase in cost in certain houses to be constructed under this act, and this is made necessary not only because of increased costs of material and labor but also by reason of the fact that we are providing that in location and design these houses shall conform to the kind of building in the respective communities where they are to be constructed. In this way they will be more readily salable to permanent occupants. Furthermore, there are sections of our country where by reason of the rigorous climate cellars and other things will be needed and can be properly installed. And may I say and emphasize the statement here that the purpose of this act is to sell these houses to those who will be permanent residents, in all cases where such disposition can be made of them, and thus recoup for the Treasury as much as possible of the money expended.

Of course, with reference to Alaska, where very few units are to be built, but which are vitally essential, we must establish a higher ceiling because materials have to be transported long distances and the climatic conditions require very substantial construction.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman state whether there is any method by which the committee is preparing to add the facilities required?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. A bill was introduced on Friday for that purpose and we hope to bring it to the House as soon as possible.

Mrs. BOLTON. But it is not in this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. There is nothing in this bill to that effect?

Mr. LANHAM. No. We are trying to get this matter disposed of in order that we may take up the problem of providing necessary facilities.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing in this bill for the community facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. No. I repeat, I introduced on last Friday a bill for community facilities, which will be given consideration by the committee promptly.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is there anything in the bill to prevent pursuing the building policies initiated by Mr. Hillman in regard to the Currier Co.?

Mr. LANHAM. I did not understand you.

Mr. COX. Is there anything in the act to prevent a looting of the public, as was done in that instance and in many others?

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say that I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question when my time comes?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass on labor legislation this week. If you put this construction under the administration of the Public Buildings Administration, I think you may rest assured that it is going to be looked after in a most expedient manner by the permanent constructing agency of this Government that has had little trouble in that regard. Let me explain the bill further, and then I will be glad to yield.

Then we provide that, with reference to the people who live in these houses, the tenants of these houses, any actions in the courts with reference to the recovery of possession of any property or project developed under this act shall be tried in the States where the houses are located. We feel these tenants should not be taken all over the country to the Federal courts.

We also provide, with reference to the authorized appropriation, that that is not to be handed over to any of these agencies to be disposed of as they please. They must come to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress from time to time will make the appropriations under this authorization as the agencies show the definite need. I believe that to be a very important provision.

Then we provide this policy:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of this title to further the national defense by providing housing in those areas where it cannot otherwise be provided by private enterprise when needed, and that such housing shall be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposing of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may, in his discretion, upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments such housing constructed under the provisions of this act as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy.

In other words, this is not to be subsidized housing. This is housing that we want to sell so that we may recoup for the Treasury as much of this expenditure as possible, and at the same time provide these homes for permanent occupation by their purchasers.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I inquire of the gentleman before I decide how to vote on this measure whether the properties that are to be built by the Public Buildings Administration will be subject to a local tax for the support of the local government.

Mr. LANHAM. They will, and this bill so provides. With reference to rental, the bill provides:

Provided further, That the Administrator shall fix fair rentals, on projects developed pursuant to this act, which shall be based on the value thereof as determined by him, and that rentals to be charged for Army and Navy enlisted personnel shall be fixed by the War and Navy Departments.

In other words, the rental that will be charged on these buildings will be in accordance with the value of the buildings. These are not people of low income. These workers are getting good wages. Further, they have come before us and said that they do not want any subsidies; that they want to pay rentals just as everybody else pays rentals, except that insofar as the enlisted men of the Army and Navy are concerned, on that part which the War Department and the Navy Department may use they shall fix the rental with reference to the commutation of quarters they give to the men.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman did not mean to tell us that they were exempt from taxation?

Mr. LANHAM. No; they are going to pay taxes on the same basis that any other citizen of the community has to pay. The report clearly shows that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Read the last paragraph of the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. The last paragraph does not refer to taxes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but the gentleman talked about taxes.

Mr. LANHAM. That provision is in the bill, as I stated.

Mr. GIFFORD. In the last section.

Mr. LANHAM. No. I am coming to that.

Mr. GIFFORD. These are exempt from taxation?

Mr. LANHAM. They are not exempt from taxation, in accordance with the terms and purposes of this bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. Read the last section.

Mr. LANHAM. The last section is the amendment of section 309, which states:

Preference in such employment shall be given to qualified local residents.

Mr. GIFFORD. Section 306 is the one to which I am referring, in which it is provided that you will pay a certain sum which will approximate what you might otherwise have to pay in taxes.

Mr. LANHAM. The reason it may only approximate it is explained by the remainder of the paragraph, that is, that such allowance may be considered as is appropriate for the expenditure the Government has made for streets or utilities or other public services to serve such property.

Mr. HINSHAW. That does not mean for the current local expenses of the city government.

Mr. LANHAM. It does mean for the current local expenses. These taxes shall be paid, taking into consideration the feature I have mentioned, just as other residents of the community pay their taxes. That is just as clear, I believe, as we can possibly write it into the law.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I apologize for taking the gentleman's time, but I am more or less interested. I wonder if we are still putting electric refrigerators, electric ranges, and articles of that sort in the houses that are being built for rental to defense employees, as was originally done.

Mr. LANHAM. There was an amendment about that in the former amendment of the law. That matter has been discussed and we passed upon an amendment in the law about that heretofore.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does not that affect this bill? Under this bill the same type of houses will be built, will they not?

Mr. LANHAM. No; the same type of houses will not be built altogether, and we do not want some types built. The committee has seen some of those houses that we do not want to see duplicated. That is the reason we provide in section 305 that the Public Buildings Administration, which is the permanent construction agency of the United States Government, shall have charge of this construction along with the War and Navy Departments in such work as may be assigned to them for their purposes.

Now, we are going to have to use the Public Buildings Administration for Federal construction when this emergency is over, as we have done for a century, and, furthermore, the best housing this committee has seen built under this act on its trip of inspection has been that which has been constructed by the Public Buildings Administration. It is absolutely foolish to be laying off their force of skilled workers while some of these emergency housing organizations, and heaven knows we have too many of them, are increasing their forces to the detriment of our permanent construction agency of the Government. But we do provide for local housing authorities and local public authorities to be consulted, and we also provide that they can be used in the construction that is to be carried on.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman and his committee are doing a good job, and I just wondered if the gentleman would advise the House as to the average cost of a family unit under this defense program.

Mr. LANHAM. It is different in different places and the law provides what the average shall be.

Mr. JENSEN. I know that, but I would like to know what is the average.

Mr. LANHAM. It is $3,500 under present law, and this makes an increase.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman if they are staying within the $4,000 with a completed job?

Mr. LANHAM. With the exception of Alaska, I assume they are. The law so provides.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I understand the bill represents a recommendation by the committee over which the gentleman presides, and I also understand that a subcommittee has been traveling throughout the country, a highly efficient subcommittee, and this is the result of their studies.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, absolutely; after many months of study. We have labored very diligently and very laboriously, and in our judgment, if you will pass this bill, you will not have any more of this criticism of public housing, and we will get houses that we can sell.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. And still the gentleman is asking this House to adopt a $300,000,000 bill under suspension of the rules.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; but the law is already enacted.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman think that ought to be done?

Mr. LANHAM. I would not do it except for reasons I stated in the beginning of my remarks, and for the fact that from the President, from the Department of the Navy, from the Department of War, and from the industrial establishments and plants engaged in our preparation for defense, it is urged that they must have this housing or very much of it ready by March, and consequently, we have got to have speedy action.

Mr. COX. Who is responsible for the passage of the act?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield the gentleman 1 additional minute if he will state whether or not he has the word of the leaders in the Senate that this bill will be given any consideration or will be acted upon over there.

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly have none, and I do not think it is my function to tell the Senate what it should do. I think it is the function of this House to pass upon these measures and then when such a measure gets over to the Senate it is the responsibility of the Senate to act upon it over there.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Does the gentleman from Ohio yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McGREGOR. I will be glad to yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NICHOLS. My parliamentary inquiry is this: I just got into the Chamber a minute ago and I would like to know what time has been allotted for debate on this amendment and who controls the time and whether or not one in opposition to the passage of the amendment to the law may have an opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is before the House under suspension of the rules, and the gentleman from Texas controls 20 minutes of the time and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] the remaining 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio is now recognized for 19 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to give a brief history of the bill H. R. 6128. The bill we now have before us for consideration was drafted out of possibly a portion of the report of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, which had hearings on the bill H. R. 5211. I want to submit to you that H. R. 5211 is a bill that simply changes the law in one respect—changing the amount from $300,000,000 to $600,000,000. The bill we now have before us, H. R. 6128, contains 6 pages and makes a complete change in the program of housing. We are changing the entire system of administration of housing and this is being done under suspension of the rules.

I do not want to be considered an obstructionist because in certain ways I do favor this bill. If I had wanted to be an obstructionist, I would have raised objections a few days ago. This bill H. R. 6128, was introduced on Friday, and without a formal notice by our committee we were called to the Ways and Means Committee of this House and there voted out a new bill, which is H. R. 6128. If I had wanted to obstruct the procedure, I would have raised a point of order that there was no quorum at that meeting, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring it out on the floor and let it fall or be passed on its merits.

But I contend to you that I think there should be a complete investigation of the procedure being followed by the present administration in housing construction. Some time ago we appropriated $300,000,000. Today we are asking for $300,000,000 more, and doing it under a suspension of the rules, where no one has the right to amend the bill. We are spending $300,000,000 in 40 minutes, at the rate of $7,500,000 a minute, and yet my distinguished chairman, the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], would ask you to waive any debate upon it and grant the right of consideration. I want now to call attention to specific items in this H. R. 6128. We have all heard of and fully realize the District of Columbia situation relative to housing units.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am wondering whether the gentleman can save 3 minutes to yield to me before he gets through.

Mr. McGREGOR. If I can possibly do it I shall be glad to do it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I would like to know if they have definite locations for these houses, because of the fact that the other day they made a mistake and built 176 houses several miles from where they ought to be.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. With regard to my statement relative to defense housing conditions in the District of Columbia, I have called the office of Mr. Alan Johnstone, General Counsel of the Federal Works Agency, and they informed me that it will not be possible to erect a building in the District of Columbia to take care of the housing situation under this particular bill.

There are some things that I would like to bring up that my distinguished chairman has spoken of, and that is whether or not we should have this type of legislation. I submit to you that the thing we are doing when we pass this bill under a gag rule is to spend $300,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in the period of 40 minutes. If this bill is meritorious, why not let it come out in the regular procedure? Why the rush about this bill? I asked the chairman this morning whether he was assured the Senate would pass this legislation or give it consideration if we passed it today. I took it upon myself this morning to call up the Senate leaders. I found Mr. BARKLEY out, and his secretary referred me to Mr. Biffle, clerk of the majority, and I talked to Mr. Biffle. He told me this: "Mr. Congressman, it is not incorporated in our program in the Senate. We expect to take up the price-control bill and labor legislation, and, in my humble opinion, this bill will not be brought up until sometime in January." So why the hurry on this $300,000,000 bill? Why not let it come out on the floor in the regular way with the right to amend it? There are some things now that I would like particularly to call to the attention of you Members of Congress.

First. Do you want to know that there are 10 Federal Government agencies building houses, more or less in competition with each other?

Second. Do you want to know how key members of the Federal Government agency staffs were coaxed away from one housing agency to another and given higher wages?

Third. Do you want to know that when local housing authorities protested loud and vigorously that they were threatened with complete banishment from the defense housing program unless they kept quiet?

Fourth. Do you want the report of findings of one of your standing committees that spent several thousand dollars of the people's money investigating defense housing construction?

Fifth. Do you want to know about one project, which, when completed, they could find no one to turn the keys over to and waited 2 or 3 days before the man was found?

Sixth. Do you want to know about the local agencies being completely ignored and how houses were constructed in local communities over the protest of local citizens? Then,

Seventh. Do you want to know about the local agencies, the mayors and others, wiring Washington in protest of housing construction, involving 800 houses? Yet the Federal authorities put them there regardless, even after one of your standing committees, after investigation, vigorously protested?

Eighth. Do you want to know how W. P. A. workers paid from W. P. A. funds are being used to find places to construct defense houses that cost W. P. A. $1,688,000?

Ninth. Do you want to know how Federal housing agencies failed to answer letters from private agencies who offered plans and desired to construct defense houses privately and with private capital?

Tenth. Do you want to know why in the awarding of a contract on one project the award was given to a bidder approximately $300,000 higher than another bidder, whose financial statement and record of construction was entirely acceptable?

Eleventh. Do you want to know the number of houses that are constructed by each agency of the Federal Government authorized to construct houses?

Twelfth. Do you, as Members of Congress, want to know the number of houses constructed by all Federal agencies, covering the amount appropriated by you as Members of Congress, to the extent of $300,000,000?

Thirteenth. Do you, as Members of Congress, want to know the number of houses built by Federal agencies and the number which are still vacant?

Fourteenth. Do you, as Members of Congress, want to know the total amount of houses yet under construction by Federal housing agencies?

Fifteenth. Do you want to know what the ranking majority members of the House Investigating Committee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds said relative to the procedure and activities of the various housing programs, as well as the members of both parties of this committee?

Sixteenth. Do you want to know about the construction of 750 single units in 30 days, and after the construction was completed the survey showed that there were 1,000 available rooms in that same community for rent?

In summing up, ladies and gentlemen of this House, do you want to know where your money has gone for defense housing before you appropriate and spend another $300,000,000?

Do you want to say to the people back home, "I will not be a 'rubber stamp.' I will investigate and listen to the arguments both pro and con before I will spend an additional $300,000,000 for housing that does not include facilities for schools and hospitals?" I want the democratic way and a chance to discuss and amend any bill.

If you want to learn the facts and be able to give the people back home a real reason for voting for or against H. R. 6128, vote "no" on this proposal, and then let the bill come onto the floor of the House under an open rule and you will have both the right to amend and vote for or against it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As one Member of Congress, I do want to know about some of the things mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio. It seems strange, indeed, that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in whom we have such faith and confidence, should bring a $300,000,000 bill in here and ask for its passage under the most stringent gag rule in the House, with only 40 minutes' talk, and without reading the bill for amendment. The gentleman from Ohio is entitled to the thanks of the House for the splendid presentation he has made of this most unusual situation. It distresses me to vote against my good friend from Texas, but I see no other course open.

Mr. LANHAM. In view of the fact I was referred to, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sorry, but my distinguished chairman has time in his own right.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. Is there anything to prevent the Housing Authority from ramming these houses down the throats of communities that do not want them?

Mr. McGREGOR. In reply to the gentleman, I call attention to page 6 of this bill, H. R. 6128, where it says:

> That consultation shall be had with local public officials and local housing authorities to the end that projects constructed under the provisions of this act shall, so far as practicable, conform in location and design to local planning.

Those words "so far as practicable" takes the determining factor away from your local authorities, because they will say, "It is not practicable" for us, as the Federal Housing Authority to take that into consideration."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I yield at this time 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I will be against this bill or not, but I do know that when similar legislation was being considered the last time before the Committee on Rules, that legislation was held up before that committee for several days and amendments were agreed to that would be offered by the committee when the legislation was presented to the floor of the House, or before the legislation came to the floor for consideration.

Some of those reasons were these: I got the specifications for the construction of some national-defense houses. They had copper water pipes running throughout the house. They had copper screens in the specifications. Electric refrigerators and electric stoves were provided. I was told by a builder that the construction in the flue is the construction that would be put into a house to last 50 years. Only the best brass hardware was used throughout the building. At that time they told us that these houses were only being built for temporary occupancy, and it was then the plan to dismantle them and get as much as they could for them after the purpose for which they were constructed had been served.

I do not know what this bill provides. I submit to you there are not 20 men in the House of Representatives this minute who do know the provisions of this bill. You do not know and you never have had an opportunity to inquire, may I say, whether or not it was proper that it be taken from one agency and put in another. I am not arguing about that. Perhaps it is good. Nobody has explained it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is a great man. He is fearless. He is a good chairman, but even he, in 20 minutes, could not give his colleagues in the House the benefit of the contents of this bill.

I submit to you that when we are spending this money we should take a little more time. Perhaps we should question a lot of the other money we are appropriating here. But we are about to spend $300,000,000 to build defense houses. When you build them you build them in competition with private contractors and many other things. It is not the type of legislation that should be considered with 40 minutes of debate on the floor of this House. You will not harm the bill if you vote it down and let it go through the regular channels so that we can hear the story.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any difference of opinion among the Members of this House with respect to the Federal Government's responsibility in connection with defense housing, nor do I believe there is any difference of opinion with respect to the almost complete break-down and confusion of the housing program. As a member of the Tolan committee that has been investigating national-defense migration, I can state that this committee found evidence in all parts of the country that there was no coordination of defense housing activities in the United States, and in our recommendation submitted to the Congress in October we stated that the reorganization of the Office of Defense Housing Coordination was absolutely imperative. This recommendation was based on evidence given to the committee that there is a striking lack of coordination of Federal housing activities in defense communities; and, further, we believe that the basic policy of this Office in relying upon private builders to meet the present shortages has been a mistake. It is for these reasons and from a personal study of conditions that I oppose the consideration of this bill under a suspension of the rules. I had a simple amendment I wanted to offer to this bill which would have changed the method for determining the need for defense housing and placing it with the Public Works Administrator rather than with the President. The President secures his advice from Mr. Palmer, the present Housing Coordinator, and I believe there is ample evidence that Mr. Palmer's office has failed to adequately appraise the need for defense housing in the United States. I believe we need not delay an unusual length of time putting this measure through in the regular course of business of the House. Nearly every Member has defense housing near or in his district, and many have important contributions to make to the writing of this bill. I feel very much as did the gentleman from Ohio, who read the list of questions that Congress wants answered. I believe we should get the answers to those questions before acting.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSMERS. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from New Jersey knows that in connection with defense-housing administration some Federal officers have been exceedingly harsh in their relationships toward local governmental agencies; and furthermore, promises, when made by Uncle Sam's agents, have not been kept. The record shows this. One of the abortions was committed in my district not far from the gentleman's district. It will never be done again.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OSMERS. I know of the situation spoken of by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the courtesy that was given me, and I appreciate the splendid contributions that were made by the Members.

I would like to have the Members vote "no" on this motion to suspend the rules. This will bring the bill up not under a suspension of the rules but in the regular course of business when it can be fully considered. Probably a rule will be granted by the Rules Committee. The bill should not be passed until it has received full consideration.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. COX. A rule has already been granted for the consideration of this bill. I believe I am in error about that, it was on another bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if we vote "no" on this motion, then the committee can go to the Rules Committee and ask for a rule. They have not yet asked for a rule. I am sure they can get a rule if they ask for one. The thing to do then is to vote "no" on the motion to suspend so the legislation can be brought up under such circumstances as will give us time to discuss it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield for a question only. I have but 2 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Reference was made by one of the Members with regard to improper coordination. I want to state from my observation as a member of the committee that I for one feel that Mr. Palmer has done a wonderful job in the hurried time he has had to deal with the housing problem.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is no new legislation. The Congress has already passed two bills on the subject; the original bill authorizing $150,000,000, and a second bill appropriating an additional $150,000,000. We are today asked to appropriate $300,000,000 more. As a member of the committee which has given weeks and months of study to this legislation I believe—and there is no one here who can deny it—that this housing is necessary and must be constructed.

In this bill we have tried to clear up questions of doubt that were found in the original legislation; in other words, we want more cooperation by the Federal Government with municipal authorities. We want private people to build as many homes as possible. We do not want the Government to build unless private capital fails.

We have placed the responsibility in this legislation for the construction of defense housing in the hands of the Public Buildings Administrator, or in his discretion the War Department and the Navy Department. We have tried here to protect the municipalities by providing for taxation of the properties built by the United States Government. We have fixed the question of rentals so that rentals will not be a subsidy but will be computed according to the value of the property rented.

I hope this legislation passes today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired; all time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 70.

So two-thirds having failed to vote in the affirmative, the bill was not passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

AMENDMENT OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5988) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to establishment and revision of quotas), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. Whenever a determination is made, pursuant to section 201, of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers, the Secretary shall establish quotas, or revise existing quotas—

"(a) For domestic sugar-producing areas by prorating among such areas 56.77 percent of such amount of sugar (but not less than 3,793,802 short tons) on the following basis:

"Area:	*Percent*
Domestic beet sugar	42.49
Mainland cane sugar	11.52
Hawaii	24.72
Puerto Rico	21.03
Virgin Islands	.24

"(b) For foreign countries, and the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, by prorating 43.23 percent of such amount of sugar (except, if such amount of sugar is less than 6,682,670 short tons, the excess of such amount over 3,793,802 short tons) on the following basis:

"Area:	*Percent*
Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands	34.70
Cuba	64.41
Foreign countries other than Cuba	.89

In no case shall the quota for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands be less than the duty-free quota now established by the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act, as amended.

"The quota for foreign countries other than Cuba shall be prorated among such countries on the basis of the division of the quota for such countries made in General Sugar Quota Regulations, series 4, No. 1, issued December 12, 1936, pursuant to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended."

SEC. 2. That section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to redistribution of deficits in area quotas), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall, as he deems necessary during the calendar year, determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugar beets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or Cuba, will be unable to market the quota for such area. If the Secretary finds that any domestic area or Cuba will be unable to market the quota for such area for the calendar year then current, he shall revise the quotas for the domestic areas and Cuba by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined to the other areas, on the basis of the quotas, then in effect. Any portion of such sugar which the Secretary determines cannot be supplied by domestic areas and Cuba shall be prorated to foreign countries other than Cuba on the basis of the prorations of the quota then in effect for such foreign countries. If the Secretary finds that the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands will be unable to market the quota for such area for the calendar year then current, he shall revise the quotas for domestic sugar-producing areas, for Cuba, and for foreign countries other than Cuba, by prorating an amount of sugar equal to the deficit so determined, as follows:

"(1) To the domestic beet-sugar area and to the mainland cane-sugar area, on the basis of the respective quotas for such areas then in effect, an amount equivalent to such part, if any, of such deficit as the Secretary determines is due to inability to market in continental United States the amount of refined sugar permitted to be brought into continental United States, duty free, under the provisions of the Philippine Independence Act, as amended;

"(2) To foreign countries other than Cuba, on the basis of the proration of the quotas for such foreign countries then in effect, an amount not in excess of 100,000 short tons of the remainder of such deficit, after giving effect to the foregoing subsection (a) (1);

"(3) To Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Cuba, on the basis of the respective quotas for such areas then in effect, the remainder, if any, of the amount of such deficit in excess of 100,000 short tons, after giving effect to the foregoing subsection (a) (1): *Provided, however*, That no part of any such Philippine deficit so prorated may be filled by direct-consumption sugar except that part, if any, prorated pursuant to the foregoing subsection (a) (1).

"(b) If, on the 1st day of September in any calendar year, any part or all of the proration to any foreign country of the quota in effect on the 1st day of July in the same calendar year for foreign countries other than Cuba, has not been filled, the Secretary may revise the proration of such quota among such foreign countries, by prorating an amount of sugar equal to such unfilled proration to all other such foreign countries which have filled their prorations of such quota by such date, on the basis of the prorations then in effect.

"(c) If the Secretary finds that any foreign country other than Cuba will be unable to market any part or all of the proration to such foreign country for the calendar year then current, the Secretary may increase the quotas for other foreign countries, for the domestic sugar-producing areas and for Cuba, by prorating an amount of sugar, equal to the deficit so determined, as follows:

"(1) To such foreign countries other than Cuba, on the basis of the proration of the quotas for such foreign countries then in effect, such portion of such deficit as the Secretary finds they will be able to market in the calendar year then current;

"(2) To the domestic sugar-producing areas and Cuba, on the basis of the respective quotas for such areas then in effect, the remainder, if any, of such deficit.

"(d) The quota for any domestic area, the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, or Cuba, or other foreign countries, shall not be reduced by reason of any determination made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section 204."

SEC. 3. Section 207 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to direct-consumption sugar from Cuba), is amended by striking out "three hundred and seventy-five thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "three hundred thousand."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. (a) The amount of the base rate of payment shall be 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar or liquid sugar, raw value."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The total payment with respect to a farm shall be the product of the base rate specified in subsection (a) of this section multiplied by the amount of sugar and liquid sugar, raw value, with respect to which payment is to be made, except that reduction shall be made from such total payment in accordance with the following scale of reductions:

"That portion of the quantity of sugar and liquid sugar which is included within the following intervals of short tons, raw value:

	Reduction in the base rate of payment per hundredweight of such portion
350 to 700	$0.05
700 to 1,000	.10
1,000 to 1,500	.20
1,500 to 3,000	.25
3,000 to 6,000	.275
6,000 to 12,000	.30
12,000 to 30,000	.325
More than 30,000	.350"

SEC. 5 (a) Section 101 (f) of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to the definition of liquid sugar), is amended by striking out "6 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 percent."

(b) Section 401 (b) of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to the definition of "manufactured sugar"), is amended by striking out "6 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 percent."

SEC. 6. Section 513 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to termination of powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 513. The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1944, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1944 and previous crop years."

SEC. 7. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3508. TERMINATION OF TAXES

"No tax shall be imposed under this chapter on the manufacture, use, or importation of sugar after June 30, 1945."

SEC. 8. Section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to payments to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1942" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CANNON of Florida and Mr. RIZLEY rose.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture was absolutely right when he asked that committee to pass this bill without hearings. The original sugar bill was considered by the Committee on Agriculture in 1934 after long and extensive hearings. It was renewed in 1937, after long and extensive hearings. When it expired 1 year ago, we passed a continuing resolution, without hearings, that it would be continued for 1 year, and that is the law we are now operating under.

The only question now before the House is whether operation under the act shall be continued for 1 year or for 3 years. Even the gentleman from Texas, who is against this bill, offered in the committee a continuing resolution for 1 year. This is a continuation for 3 years, with slight changes only.

I know of no act that has come before the House since I have been a Member of it that has been as beneficial as the Sugar Act. When the law was passed, the sugar growers as well as the processors were practically bankrupt throughout the Nation. Under this law, stabilizing the industry, it has been possible for the beet growers, the cane growers, and the processors to thrive, and it has given the American people the cheapest sugar they have had for a long time.

It has collected from the sugar users and processors over $87,000,000 more than has been paid out in benefits. Under the law, the benefits paid to the cane growers and the sugar-beet growers are 60 cents per hundredweight of sugar.

I am in favor of the pending bill—H. R. 5988—introduced by our colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. I repeat, this bill is practically an extension of the present Sugar Act under which we are now operating. It expires December 31, 1941, hence some action is immediately necessary. The original Sugar Act was passed in 1934—the Jones-Costigan Act. It was amended and renewed in 1937. The pending bill is virtually an extension of the present act for 3 years, until January 1, 1945.

CONDITION OF SUGAR INDUSTRY PRIOR TO PRESENT LAW

Prior to the inauguration of this administration in 1933 the sugar industry was in a chaotic condition. After the first World War, there was a big development in Cuba and other South Sea islands for the production of cane sugar. Help was cheap, living conditions were low, and money for heavy investments was found available in New York. During the first World War sugar went from low to high prices very rapidly. There was no market stability. For many months the price was pegged at $27.50 per hundredweight retail.

After the first World War the sugar-beet growers of the United States enjoyed a few years of semi-prosperity and then they suffered great financial losses. The sugar-beet interests, producers and refiners, in the United States were practically bankrupt in 1933. This situation called for immediate legislative action.

THE SUGAR ACT OF 1934

In 1934 the Congress passed the Jones-Costigan law, which stabilized the industry. It provided quotas of sugar to be shipped into the United States from the Philippines, Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other islands. It provided quotas for cane growers in Louisiana and Florida and for the sugar-beet growers of the West. Under this act a $10-per-ton processing tax was levied on refined sugar. This tax on the refiners was collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and paid into the general fund of the Treasury. The benefit payments were graduated, smaller amounts being paid to growers of more than 350 tons of sugar. Those producing less than 350 tons received 60 cents per hundred pounds.

The amounts provided by law were spread among sugar-beet and cane producers of the continental United States through appropriations made by Congress. It thus becomes of interest to Members of the Congress to know just how much has been collected under the act, how much distributed to the growers, and what amount of profit has remained in the Federal Treasury. These figures were given to me by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture on November 28, 1941.

Collections and disbursements under the Sugar Act

	Revenue tax	Payments	Profits to Government
1938 [1]	$33,508,820	$22,160,073	$11,348,547
1939	69,194,645	52,810,365	16,384,280
1940	73,601,560	47,386,824	26,214,736
1941	80,146,351	46,118,986	24,027,365

Total receipts in excess of disbursements, $87,974,928.
[1] 1938 covered a partial year of operation. Figures cover fiscal years ending June 30.

Under this law, there has been collected a total of $87,974,928 of excess over payments made to producers. In other words, that amount of money has been the contribution of the sugar processors, growers, and consumers, to the Treasury of the United States. This is no small matter when the emergency is causing a search for sources of revenue.

EFFECT OF THE PROCESSING LAW

The processing tax stabilized the sugar industry. It made it possible for the growers of sugar beets and the processors to figure on a stable business. The growers of sugar beets and of cane in the continental United States knew when they harvested their crops what they were going to get. Payments depended upon the amount of sugar content and the amount that the processors realized for the sugar. Under this law, the sugar-beet growers in the Pacific Northwest have averaged about $7 per ton for beets. The growers of cane in Louisiana and Florida have likewise benefited by reason of the existing law.

BENEFIT PAYMENTS INCREASED

This bill increases the benefit payments to the producers of raw beets and of cane from 60 to 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar. It raises their benefit payments one-third. This is necessary to pay the excess costs of increased wages, taxes, and machinery prices, as well as general increased costs of farm operations.

INCREASED ACREAGE

This bill provides an increased acreage of 4 percent for the present cane and beet growers in the continental United States. This is an extremely small increase, in the face of the extra demand that the Government is making for increasing foodstuffs.

REDUCTION IN IMPORTS OF OFFSHORE SUGAR

The bill provides for a reduction in refined-sugar imports from Cuba of 75,000 tons. The pending bill also provides for a decrease in the quota from the Philippines of 27,363 tons, and from other foreign countries 702 tons. Reduction in the quota of the Philippine Islands affects only the dutiable portion of that quota, and does not involve the duty-free quota which is provided for in the Philippine Independence Act. The Philippines have never used any portion of this quota, so they have never paid duty. This bill works no hardship on the Philippines, as they are not able to fill their duty-free quota.

DECREASE IN IMPORTATION OF OFFSHORE SUGAR

There is a slight decrease in import allowance of offshore refined sugar, but in no way does it affect offshore raw sugar. Therefore, the bill has no effect upon the sugar refineries in either the Atlantic or Pacific States.

CHEAP SUGAR

The cheapest sugar the consumer has ever bought in the United States has been bought during the period of operation under this law. The average cost of sugar to the housewife has been about 5 cents per pound; at the present time 5½ cents. It is safe to predict that, during the exigencies of the present emergency, it will not advance much, if any, above its present price.

SECRETARY ASKS INCREASED PRODUCTION

The Secretary of Agriculture, speaking for the administration, asks all agricultural producers to increase their production. All farmers of America are preparing to do this and are cooperating fully with the administration. The extension of this law at this time by the passage of H. R. 5988 is necessary to give the sugar growers, both cane and beet, in the United States, an opportunity to fulfill to the fullest degree the request of the Government as made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SUGAR ESSENTIAL FOR CIVILIZED MAN

Sugar has, in the last century, become recognized as an essential energy food, beneficially used by civilized men everywhere. It was only a little more than a century ago when it was found that sugar could be commercially extracted from the sugar beet. The process has been improved from time to time, until today it is scientifically possible to grow profitably sugar beets of a high percentage of sugar, with a very small subsidy, supplied by the processors. This processing tax is necessary to maintain the American standard of living for those engaged in the industry which must compete with the low living standards of the tropics.

PROCESSING FEE IS NO TAX ON CONSUMER

Many wild statements have been made about the sugar-beet business being a business that can exist only with a subsidy, and that it is costly to the consumer. The experience of the last 7 years, under the present law, proves the fallacy of this statement. Sugar has never been so cheap. Prices have never been as stable. Products have been 100 percent perfect. Both growers and processors have prospered. There has been no wild speculation, and an essential article of food has been furnished for the consuming public at a comparatively low price.

CONTINUING RESULTS

Those opposing the passage of this bill today asked, in the Committee on Agriculture, that a continuing resolution, only, be passed, keeping the present law in force for 1 year, without modification. We passed such a resolution last year, and are working under it now. There is no good reason why we should ask the sugar-beet growers, the processors, and the cane growers to conduct their business on a year-to-year basis. This Congress has all the facts necessary and can safely enact the pending bill giving the growers and processors of sugar a stable business for 3 years. It is our duty as a Congress to avail ourselves of this opportunity, so that the men who are producing this necessary food commodity may make their plans accordingly.

OFF-SHORE SUGAR

It is often stated that we can buy our sugar in the islands of the Pacific and the Caribbean cheaper than we can produce it in the United States. We are told that we ought to allow these tropical countries to grow the cane and be satisfied here to sell them our manufactured goods and other products of the Temperate Zone. The difficulty surrounding this proposition is that we have no assurance that they will buy our products in exchange should we buy their off-shore raw sugar, and the further fact that they produce that raw sugar under extremely low standards of living and pay their help a wage far below the standard wages paid in the continental United States. American workmen, either in sugar refineries or on farms, cannot exist on the prices paid the cheap, servile help of Cuba and other islands where there are no laws governing wages and hours. Neither should we depend entirely on offshore sugar, incurring the risks of monopolization and price control by the great bankers.

SHOULD SUGAR-BEET ACREAGE BE INCREASED?

I have ever contended that we should grow our own sugar in the United States. The sugar beet could be grown in competition with offshore sugar without any benefit payment to sugar-beet growers, provided the offshore grower produced it under the same working conditions which we expect in the United States. It is my judgment that, following this act, there should be a general sugar act passed further decreasing the future importation of offshore refined sugar and granting the increased quotas to the beet and cane producers in the continental United States.

Sugar beets are a profitable crop when produced under conditions made possible by the present law. The pending bill will increase the benefit payments to sugar-beet growers in high-producing areas so that they will get about $8 per ton. On more than a million acres that will be planted to sugar beets there will be produced something like twelve or thirteen million tons of beets. This will produce nearly 2,000,000 tons of sugar. In something like 100 beet-sugar factories located in the United States this will afford a large amount of well-paid labor for American citizens. The beet pulp, after the sugar has been extracted, has been found a most excellent feed with which to fatten cattle, and it is said to be worth at least a hundred million dollars yearly. There is also an industry of producing sugar-beet seed which will yield nearly $2,000,000 to enterprising American farmers.

It is acknowledged by the Department of Agriculture that the production of sugar beets can be alternated with clover, alfalfa, and other crops, making it a very profitable crop to grow in rotation. Farmers producing sugar beets find their farms increasing in fertility from year to year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from the President.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I arise to object to the bill under consideration, as it affects, and is inimical to, the American territories of Puerto Rico and Hawaii. The bill is unfair to Puerto Rico and Hawaii. It contains unjust discriminations which are not necessary nor are justified by the present situation of the sugar industry. In discriminating against the domestic areas of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, it tends to create a sore feeling among the American citizens of Puerto Rico and Hawaii as if we were second-class or inferior citizens of this great country, something that we certainly resent.

Under the present control program and legislation, after long and extensive hearings, after people from all the sugar and beet areas were fully heard, and also after administration officers were heard, a quota was originally allocated to Puerto Rico, which at that time was also really unfair. Puerto Rico had to cut its production and shipments in more than 300,000 tons of its normal output. This was done by the original Jones-Costigan Act in 1934. This unfair quota was again allocated by the present Sugar Act of 1937, against our reasoned opposition. Now, by this bill, this quota is again cut and reduced, when it is really unnecessary under the present conditions of the sugar industry in the mainland.

The quota of Puerto Rico has been less in proportion to the island's ability to produce than has been true in any other area. Puerto Rico is the only area that has filled its quota every year under the control program. The island's quota is at least 35 percent below the island's ability to produce, while that of most of other major producing areas is equal to or in excess of their ability to produce, as shown by the record under the quota system.

In the matter of Government payments, due to the fact that production of sugarcane in Puerto Rico as well as in all areas is in large-scale units, the processing tax in the case of Puerto Rico is greater than the Government payments. Nevertheless, certain continental areas are seeking to increase the Government payment for their own areas without a similar increase for Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

If there are to be changes in the raw-sugar quota and in Government payments, the changes should be made on some uniform basis and not on the basis of clear discrimination against Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

In the matter of refined sugar, the present Sugar Act permits the continental sugarcane and sugar-beet producers to refine any or all of their sugar while establishing refined quotas for Puerto Rico and Hawaii in an amount about equal to that which had been shipped in previous years. This type of legislation clearly discriminates against Puerto Rico and Hawaii.

The refined issue narrows itself down to whether or not the eastern seaboard refiners have the right to say who shall and who shall not refine raw sugar. In other words, it raises the question not only of discrimination and injustice to Puerto Rico and Hawaii but it raises the question as to whether or not it is for the best interest of the consuming public to turn over to the 17 refiners on the continent a practical monopoly of the sugar-refining business. In this connection, in a letter dated August 7, 1937, addressed to Hon. Pat Harrison, United States Senate, Secretary of State Cordell Hull said:

It is believed to be against the public interests for the Government to grant any further measure of protection to a group whose record repeatedly indicated it would resort to monopolistic practices and conspire to restrain trade in violation of the antitrust laws. Only a little over a year ago the United States Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling and found the Sugar Institute guilty on 40 separate counts of engaging in a combination and conspiracy to restrain trade in sugar.

It is not a matter of business or economic gain but a matter of equal opportunity and justice in the democratic process on which Puerto Rico bases its insistence against discrimination.

Such discrimination, the President, in his letter of April 11, 1940, to the chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, Hon. MARVIN JONES, points out as being entirely unjustified and un-American. He said:

The people of the Territory of Hawaii and the possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are American citizens who compose some of these minority groups in our population with local governments that lack the protection of statehood. If this circumstance were not given adequate consideration, it would be possible to destroy by legislation the livelihood of our citizens in the insular parts of the United States through the enactment of discriminatory prohibitions against their products; and they would possess no legal power to take counter measure in self-defense. Such a course of action, as I have pointed out on a previous occasion, would be tantamount to an imperialistic classification of citizens and a tyrannical abuse of minority rights that is utterly contrary to the American concept of fairness and democracy. Among the cases in point is the proposal to reinstate the former discrimina-

tion against the refining of sugar in the insular parts of the United States.

I ask that the quotas of the present law be reinstated, to avoid increased discriminations and injustices to Puerto Rico. That would be fair. May I read a letter from the President about this question of sugar.

The letter which President Roosevelt addressed to me today, concerning sugar legislation, reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 1, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. PAGÁN: I wish to acknowledge your letter of November 5, and the memorandum accompanying it, in both of which you gave your views on sugar legislation. You have expressed the fear that certain bills about to be introduced in the Congress would discriminate against Puerto Rico and other offshore sugar-producing areas.

I recommended sugar-quota legislation in 1934, which took form in the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934 and subsequent legislation, primarily because the sugar-tariff rates of the 1920–30 decade, contrary to the expectations of their advocates, had resulted in an accumulation of surpluses of sugar, price depression, and general demoralization of the sugar industry. Domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane producers then complained of poor returns, wage rates were low, and Cuba suffered financial and economic chaos. To meet the economic and social problems, resulting from low incomes and large surplus supplies a sugar program was recommended.

The administration has not recommended sugar legislation at this session of Congress, for today we are no longer confronted with the price-depressing surpluses which in prior years were so burdensome and difficult to manage. On the contrary, a balance between supply and demand has been created as the result of stimulation of consumption of sugar growing out of a wider distribution of a larger national income, some building up of stocks, and the diversion of large quantities of sugarcane in Cuba to the production of high-test molasses for making industrial alcohol. In fact it was found necessary in August to establish a ceiling price on sugar to prevent excessive speculation. I am advised that it is not expected that any available price-depressing surpluses will reappear, at least as long as the war continues. As you know, the Department of Agriculture has already announced that it will not be necessary to limit the 1942 Puerto Rican crop.

It must also be recognized that a quota and allotment structure may, under the conditions now current, conflict with the national welfare and defense requirements to the extent that such provisions have a limiting effect upon the free flow of goods and the efficient use of the land and water transportation facilities of the Nation.

The principal purpose to be served by the continuation of the sugar-quota system is to be found in the protection it will provide the industry after the termination of the war. For it is reasonable to suppose that when the usage of sugarcane for industrial alcohol returns to normal levels, the large stocks of sugar in certain distant areas again move freely, and holders of accumulated stocks in the United States begin to reduce their inventories to the level of prior years, the price of sugar in the domestic market may again become disastrously low within a quota system. Consequently, if the various parts of the domestic sugar industry can agree on sugar legislation which does not conflict with the public interest, conforms to defense requirements, and is noncontroversial in character, it may be advisable to continue the sugar-quota system and its necessary complementary features to serve as a protection to the industry in the post-war period, even if it be found necessary to suspend the quota provisions of the act during the emergency.

Please be assured that I am glad to have your views on sugar legislation. As you know, this administration has repeatedly stated its objections to any provisions in sugar legislation which discriminate against Puerto Rico and the Territory of Hawaii. I am advised that you have already brought your views to the attention of the various Federal departments which are primarily concerned with sugar legislation.

Very sincely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Hon. BOLIVAR PAGÁN,
Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN. The Florida delegation is very much opposed to this bill.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GREEN. I want to know about dividing this time. We have very little time.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, what is the rule for dividing the time?

The SPEAKER. The time in favor of the resolution is in the hands of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] and the time for those opposed to the resolution is in the hands of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. GREEN. Is there not a rule that the opposition shall have half of the time?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules there are 20 minutes in favor of the resolution and 20 minutes in opposition.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will suspend the rules and pass H. R. 5988, which is commonly referred to as the sugar bill. I believe that the best interests of our entire country will be served by the passing of this legislation. This bill does give some expansion to the continental growers of beet and cane sugar. It does not go nearly as far as it should and as far as I would like to have it go, but I feel that it is imperative that we pass this bill rather than have no bill at all passed this year.

The housewives of the country well remember what they had to pay for sugar during the last World War. I do not have before me the exact figures on the price of sugar in 1917 and 1918, but I do know that it exceeded 30 cents a pound. It was entirely out of line with all other food prices and most prices of all kinds. When it is realized that it was not American producers of sugar that forced that price up during the last World War, the American housewives are going to expect that this Congress increase the domestic quotas of sugar at this time, when there appears a likelihood that the supply of foreign sugar and raw sugar reaching our shores may be curtailed. During the last World War it was the foreign producers of sugar that extracted unreasonable and enormous prices for sugar from the American housewives. All that the domestic producers are asking at this time is that they be allowed to raise the sugar needed and raise it at a reasonable price.

This bill proposes to increase the basic quotas of continental sugar produced by about 4 percent. This increase amounts to approximately 62,000 tons for sugar beets and almost 17,000 tons for Louisiana and Florida cane sugar. It does this without materially lessening the allotment for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands. In fact, if we figure these insular possessions on the same basis that we do continental growers—that is, by charging them with their own sugar consumption—they are not reduced at all.

In a sense this bill is a stopgap and is something that should be passed now to take care of the immediate situation. I have stated before that it does not go as far in increasing the domestic allotment for sugar as it ought to. But I think it does establish a precedent and that it embodies a good principle. In this bill we are increasing continental quotas by about 4 percent. In doing this we are recognizing, in a measure at least, the fact that the American market belongs to the American farmer, and we are proposing to give to him a portion of that market without apologies or concessions to anyone.

I hope that Congress will pass this bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House will vote down this motion. The bill was before the Committee on Rules and that committee agreed to allow 3 hours of debate, and the rule would allow such amendments as would be necessary to perfect the bill. All we are asking is a chance to give our cause to the House so the Members may act upon it. We have to beg to get just 1 minute to discuss a matter that involves our State and a number of other States of the Union. It also involves the consumers of every State in the Union. It involves millions of dollars from consumers.

I call attention to the fact that you represent consumer districts. The benefit payments in this bill are raised 33⅓ percent. You check the bill and you will find that the benefit payments are raised and at the same time the quota is extended 3 years, not from year to year as under the continuing resolution but for 3 years, fixing a quota system in this country when we are begging people to raise essential food products.

The Agriculture Department several years ago estimated that this sugar system was costing the consumers of the United States $350,000,000 per year above the world market.

This bill increases benefit payments from 60 to 80 cents. On that basis, the cost to the consumers is still further increased.

Sugarcane is situated differently from beets. Beet areas can plant from year to

year. The cane areas must plant and then depend on several years' harvest from the one planting. It does not settle the problem when we say, "All right, on account of emergency, we will suspend quotas right now." Sugar is a very essential food element. Just as I predicted several years ago, today ships are not available to haul the sugar from the Philippines. It is necessary that we produce more in this country, and the quota system is not conducive to encouragement in sugar-producing areas. Any system which limits the production of necessary food products in the United States, when we do not produce sufficient for our own needs, is economically unsound.

I urge the defeat of the motion.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate for us, I believe, that we have just experienced a vote on another bill under this particular procedure. Contrary to the bill that was just considered, the bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] this bill has not had one moment's hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member. This bill has not been referred to the subcommittee on sugar, of which I am a member. This bill has received no consideration by any Member of the House, regardless of from what committee he may come. If, therefore, we can bring ourselves now to vote for this bill, which has received no consideration whatever, then I do not understand the temper of this House and never have understood it.

I believe that any bill, however insignificant, should receive the consideration of at least two or three Members of this House, but such is not the case here.

The proponents of the bill would have you believe, indeed, that this bill is innocuous. Let me talk to you in this regard. In the first place, under the operation of the bill the consumption estimate has been increased, which is tantamount to saying that all quotas have been dispensed with. They would have you believe that this bill must be passed now or the whole endeavor will destroy itself by nonaction. Let me say that since the quotas have been virtually suspended, it does not make one iota of difference if this bill is never passed. Under the present law benefit payments can be made until June 30 next. Is it not odd, is it not peculiar, that the benefit payments under the operation of this bill—this innocuous bill, this bill on which surely everybody is in agreement—are raised from 60 cents a hundred to 80 cents a hundred? This is a raise in benefit payments alone of 33⅓ percent.

Where are you gentlemen and where are you ladies who have been trying for all these months to save money and help the farmer? Really, where are you now? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] made a beautiful presentment the other day against a much less vicious and nefarious bill than this. I wonder where the gentleman from Michigan is now on this bill?

I repeat, the legislative necessity for this bill does not exist. If there are no more quotas, if there is a rise in the consumption estimate in the sugar operation itself, and by reason of that the quotas are suspended, if—and it is true—we can sell our 1941 crop now, and if, indeed, we can sell our 1942 crop, and we can, then all that could possibly expire of the 1937 Sugar Act on the 31st of this month would be the quota system, which does not exist, anyway. Therefore, why the necessity for this bill?

If the Committee on Rules has given us 3 hours of debate on this matter and has granted us that rule, why do we not use it? Is it that some of the gentlemen in this House fear the debate? Is it that you do not want to hear the truth about this bill? Is it that you want everybody to believe that all sugar interests are satisfied, even though you know in your own minds that we are not? Is that your game? If it is, then pass this bill, and if it is not your game, let us debate it and see what is in the bill itself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I strongly urge you to vote down a motion to waive the rules and pass H. R. 5988, which would continue the quota control of the sugar industry in our country. This House Committee on Agriculture, which reported the bill, has already applied to the Rules Committee for a special rule for consideration of this bill. It is expected that a special rule will be granted by the Rules Committee and that this rule will give reasonable time for debate and consideration of the bill.

It is impossible to give the membership of the House full information on this important bill in the 40 minutes which is all that is possible under our procedure here today. This bill should never have been taken up under suspension. It is of tremendous importance and is fully entitled to several hours of debate and deliberation by this body. A large number of us oppose the bill and desire to have an opportunity to debate the bill at length and to give you our reasons for opposing same. If you will join with us and vote down the motion to suspend the rules, then the bill will remain on the calendar and will come up in an orderly way before the House after the rule is granted. We who oppose this bill are at least entitled to our day in court to present the fundamental reasons why this bill will do absolutely more harm than good to our country.

We have had sugar-control legislation since 1934. The present control act, which this bill before us would extend, was passed in 1937. My State has suffered grave injustice and injury through each of these control bills. I, indeed, have no fight to pick with the beet-control representatives of our State and desire to do no injury to the sugar-beet growers of our country. It is not at all necessary or wise to put the beet and sugarcane growth in our country on a parity. Sugar-beet growers have been hard pressed in their efforts to make the price of production with any profits from the growth of sugar beets. They are entitled to relief and there is some probability that a control program would help in their case. I am perfectly willing for them to have relief, but I know this relief can be accorded them without penalizing the infant sugarcane industry in the State of Florida. The Committee on Agriculture should draw a comprehensive bill which will provide subsidy benefits to the beet growers, if such is the will of the Congress—and it appears it is—and at the same time in the same bill provide for expansion of the sugarcane industry in the State of Florida and in any other State in the Union which desires to expand this production.

Under the provisions of this iniquitous bill and also the act which it would continue, the State of Florida and other sugarcane-producing areas in the United States are penalized and forbidden to grow sugarcane upon the limited quota given them, and at the same time the United States is importing about 50 percent of America's consumption of sugar from foreign countries. Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and continental United States produce only about one-half of the sugar consumed in the United States. I appeal to you as representatives of free American people not to penalize our Florida sugarcane growers in favor of foreign-grown sugar.

And may I at this time sound a warning to the absentee sugar financiers in the United States. I have reference to those who live in the United States and have their sugar-producing investments in foreign countries. I predict that the American people will eventually awaken to the fact that your investments in foreign countries are giving employment to labor in foreign countries and bringing this foreign sugar to America when at the same time, a greater portion of American sugar need can be produced at home. You may not long expect the Government of the United States to lend itself to you to carry on any such unfair deal to American sugarcane producers and to American labor. Far better would your investments be ultimately if they were in the Florida Everglades where sugar production is now in its infancy.

The Florida Everglades area offers probably the best opportunity in the world for sugarcane growth. I am convinced that this soil is the richest in the world, exceeding in fertility and productiveness the ancient Valley of the Nile, the Euphrates delta, the lowlands of the Philippine Islands, and the volcanic terrain soil formation in Hawaii. Florida is capable of producing a large percentage of American demand for sugar but owing to the short-sighted policy of the Government in controlling production of sugar in Florida, we are by the Federal law not permitted to grow enough sugar

there to supply the demand for this product even within the State of Florida.

Gentlemen, this is wrong. It is a false philosophy of numbers and force winning over justice and economy. I cannot subscribe to an economic policy so false and a legislative theory so unnecessary as to restrict, throttle, and prevent, by law, the production of a food product which is so sorely needed in the United States, and a product which the United States is now importing from foreign countries. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently admonished food producers in the United States to exercise every effort to produce and preserve everything of food value. In Florida we yearn to respond to this admonition by producing greater amounts of the sugar requirements of our Nation. We are not asking that Florida be paid a bounty and subsidy for sugar production; we are not asking for a price any greater than any other sugar producers. We are simply asking to be permitted to produce sugar.

Many of you can recall the scarcity of this food commodity during the last World War and it will not require much stretch of your imagination to envision a repetition of this, probably during the next year or two. All of this tends to convince me that the bill before the House should not be enacted, but that the Committee on Agriculture should give further study to the bill and make provision therein whereby unlimited sugarcane production can be had in continental United States. Under the rules covering our discussion of the bill this afternoon, it is not possible to offer any amendment to the bill. All amendments are shut off. Debate will be shut off at the end of 40 minutes and the bill will be voted up or down without the possibility of presenting to you a true picture of our Florida situation; therefore, I urge you to vote against the motion to suspend the rules.

Some of my colleagues possibly have in mind the bearing of this legislation on reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries. I think it would be safe to assure you that we have no reciprocal trade obligation which is of greater importance or of equal merit to permitting our own American people to produce needed things of value, with American labor, within the United States. We owe far more to the producers and employees of the sugarcane industry in Florida and other States of the Union than we do to the inhabitants of foreign countries, particularly those in the Indian Ocean. It is said, and I think quite truthfully, that the highest wages and salaries paid in the sugarcane industry in the world are paid in Florida. These employees spend the money in America and add their full strength to the economic chain and security of our Nation. In many of the foreign countries tragically low wages are paid. In fact, cane labor in some nations is practically peon labor. Frankly, do we owe more obligation to our American sugar, produced with good wages and high standard of living, or to foreign sugar produced with starvation wages? I say our first duty is to America and American laborers and our American economic system and standard of living.

There is quite a difference in financial investment in foreign countries and the merit of the lives and occupation of American citizens within the United States. Far more important to our national defense is the American citizen earning his living within the United States than an American dollar invested for profit in some foreign nation which may not even be friendly to our Government and our people. I believe it is time for the Congress to look toward the security of America and American industry within America, rather than to uphold the policy of protecting American dollars invested in foreign countries.

If our Nation produced a surplus of sugar, then it would be time to give consideration to restriction of sugarcane production in Florida. There would possibly then be merit to the contention that we had to find a foreign market. The opposite is true, my colleagues, and it is the height of false economy to, particularly during a war period, restrict the production of an essential food commodity within the United States, especially when foreign importation has to run the ocean lanes of torpedo destruction.

If you will vote against suspension of the rules and let the legislation come up in an orderly way, we may have an opportunity to amend the bill in a manner to permit the sugar-beet industry to have its rights and at the same time permit the sugarcane industry expansion to unlimited production in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS].

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 5988, now before this House, extends the Sugar Act for 3 years. From the point of view of the people of Philadelphia, this bill should be enacted, because it at least maintains the present volume of work which is made available under the quotas to the thousands of organized workmen now employed in the Philadelphia refineries. I also note that the bill does not change the present position of sugar consumers.

Each time that Congress has considered sugar legislation, spokesmen from the Hawaiian and Puerto Rican sugar industries have appeared before the committees of Congress to testify that certain features of the quotas are what they call discriminatory against the islands. Specifically, it has been claimed that the quota limitations upon the shipment of refined sugar from Hawaii and Puerto Rico to the United States are unfair. Congress has never found this to be the case. It approved these refining quotas in 1937 by a vote of 198 to 23, and in 1940 by a vote of 134 to 20.

It is extremely difficult to understand how Hawaii and Puerto Rico have been discriminated against under quota legislation. Hawaii has been getting a total production quota large enough to permit her to operate at about 100 percent of capacity. She has not had to restrict her production to any appreciable extent. The corporations in Hawaii which control the sugar industry have received $44,000,000 in cash subsidies from the Federal Treasury since 1934, including payments on the coming crop. On the same basis, the sugar producers of Puerto Rico have received $53,000,000. On top of these subsidies, the planters in the two American islands have received handsome incomes from the protected prices which they have received in the American market. American consumers have paid the bill.

I do not want to take your time to repeat the arguments, pro and con, which have been made regarding the fairness of the quotas on Hawaii and Puerto Rico refining. The decisive vote of the House on this subject in the past has settled that issue. As a friend of organized labor in Philadelphia, however, I wish to emphasize one point, and that is that the agencies of the United States Government have officially reported that there is no collective bargaining in the sugar industry in Hawaii. Collective bargaining has been fiercely opposed by the sugar corporations. I now quote from a Department of Labor publication entitled "Labor Conditions in Hawaii," by James H. Shoemaker, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, page 198:

The history of management in Hawaii is one of antagonism to labor organization.

Secondly, I should like to point out that the Wagner Act, the basic law of American labor, does not apply to Puerto Rico. If Congress should continue to pay enormous subsidies to the sugar industries in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, without maintaining the quota limitation upon their refining, it will have discriminated against organized labor in this country.

Although this bill does not go as far as I desire, yet it is at least sufficient to protect the consumers and American industry. This bill should be passed.

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK ENTITLED "LABOR CONDITIONS IN HAWAII," BY JAMES H. SHOEMAKER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Thus the Territory of Hawaii possesses a strongly centralized industrial structure, highly integrated in its broader aspects as well as its minor details, not only in the economic but even in the social and political aspects of island life (p. 196).

Although many of the large enterprises maintain effective employee-welfare policies, their attitude may best be described as benevolently paternalistic rather than liberal. The history of management in Hawaii is one of antagonism to labor organization (p. 198).

The high degree of intercorporate control makes it possible to mobilize the resources of all large enterprises to restrict the growth of labor unions and to combat strikes in whatever fields of industry they may occur * * * although management has done much for labor in Hawaii, it has also used every influence at its command to restrict labor organization (p. 198).

The workers of Hawaii are economically isolated. They find it equally difficult to return to the countries of their origin or to migrate to the American mainland, and are thus completely dependent upon a relatively restricted group of local island enterprises throughout the whole of their lives. In this respect they are in a very different position

from that of the typical mainland wage earner. There is, therefore, a very strong incentive not to do anything which would jeopardize their future employment possibilities (p. 198).

The position of the individual plantation worker is especially vulnerable. The house in which he lives, the store from which he buys, the fields in which he finds his recreation, the hospital in which he is treated, are all owned by plantation management, which, in turn, has its policies controlled from the offices of the factors in Honolulu (p. 198).

Whether it is justified or not, there is a prevalent feeling among the majority of Hawaiian workers that a bad record with any important concern in the Territory makes it difficult to obtain employment in any other concern, and that to be associated with labor-union activities is certain to weaken their employment opportunities, if not destroy their economic future (p. 198).

In comparison with the highly integrated character of industrial management, the organization of labor in the Territory is meager (p. 199).

To understand the development of labor organization in Hawaii, it is necessary to remember that in less than 70 years the population has increased from 56,000 (in 1872) to well over 400,000. Practically all of this increase is non-Hawaiian and represents the organized importation of labor for plantation purposes (p. 199).

The original idea of plantation management was to bring out workers under contract and ship them back after the contract was finished; that is, they were interested in obtaining young unmarried males at the best of their productive period and avoiding the problem of maintenance of families or of pension for superannuated workers (p. 199).

The laborers brought into the islands were, for the most part, docile and ignorant. They had come from countries in which conditions of labor were extremely harsh, hours were long, and pay was low. They were thrown into strange surroundings far distant from their accustomed homes. Moreover, they found themselves in immediate competition with other races with which they had previously had no contact. Thus, they were easily exploited. The record of the early days of plantation life under the contract system is a severe indictment of the methods and attitudes of plantation owners of those days. This system was not abolished until annexation in 1898. Partly by virtue of a gradually growing sympathy and unity on the part of the various elements among the plantation laborers, partly because of the gradual increase in the number of second- and third-generation citizen laborers on the plantations, and partly because of a marked change toward a social-minded attitude on the part of plantation management, conditions have greatly improved in respect to wages, hours, working conditions, and the whole of the life of plantation communities since those early days (p. 199).

Nevertheless, the plantation system continues to be paternalistic. Employee organizations do exist on the plantations, but they take the form of recreational and social clubs, or of religious groups, usually along racial lines. Labor organizations, as such, have gained little footing. Since all of the property—the land, the housing, the community center itself, even many of the governmental functions of the plantation towns—are controlled by plantation management, anyone in the plantation community who is disapproved by management is legally a trespasser, and, as such, can be put off the plantation (p. 200).

The total membership of all unions in the Territory has been increasing. Accurate figures are not available. Estimates of total membership by union officials range from 3,500 to 6,000. Even if the larger figure is accepted as accurate, it would indicate that less than one twenty-fifth of the gainfully employed are unionized (p. 202).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture how this bill compares with the O'Mahoney bill, S. 937, which was introduced in the Senate.

Mr. FULMER. This is an identical bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How about House bill 3582? As I understand, there is a great deal of opposition to both of those bills.

Mr. FULMER. There is nothing being done about the bill H. R. 3582. There is quite a lot of opposition to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a slight decrease in the quota from outside the United States.

Mr. FULMER. Very slight, and all of that goes to the South American countries and comes to the refineries in this country.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I do not believe the bill goes as far as it should in behalf of the sugar-beet people, whose throats have been getting cut on allotments for many, many years. This bill is giving these people some recognition and legislative relief, to which they are entitled.

It is imperative that this bill be acted upon without delay. It is timely that we consider our domestic producers of sugar and their needs; and this legislation is not harsh or particularly unfair to foreign producers. In recognition of long-needed legislation—a step at least in the right direction—I urge you to support this much-needed legislation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret to find myself at variance with my distinguished chairman and my colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture. I think it proper, however, in the very brief time we have to consider this bill, to call your attention and the attention of the membership of the House to certain facts.

From the Department of Agriculture this morning, in a hurried call down there, I found there were 54,541 beet producers in 21 States which produce beet sugar and cane sugar. In the cane-sugar-producing State of Louisiana there are 9,227, and in the refining industries there are 14,133 individuals engaged, there are a grand total of some 78,000 citizens in the United States with a total citizenship of approximately 130,000,000. In South and Central America and in the Philippines and in Hawaii there are another 130,000,000, or a total of 260,000,000 people. There will be $16,000,000 added to the pay roll of the 78,000 people, at which price, in all probability, we will antagonize and lose the friendship of a great number of the 130,000,000 people who are outside the United States and thereby injure all but a small remnant of the 130,000,000 people who eat and buy but do not raise sugar.

There is a rule pending for this bill and the rule permits 3 hours of debate. This bill affects friendships of this country in peace in its most vital aspects with respect to the Western Hemisphere.

I hold three letters signed by the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, and by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Claude Wickard. You have just heard the Puerto Rican Commissioner read, this morning, a letter from the President of the United States.

I attempted to present my case before the Rules Committee and there are doubtless members of that committee here present who were present at the time when I attempted to present many succinct reasons why this bill should not be considered in this period of emergency.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I recall that the gentleman was before the Rules Committee wanting to be heard and the gentleman will recall that there were others there favorable to the rule.

Mr. KLEBERG. I do.

Mr. COX. And we heard them in detail.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is true.

Mr. COX. And we adjourned at 12 o'clock with an implied understanding that we would hear the gentleman.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is correct.

Mr. COX. But later the committee did report the bill, but upon the assumption that it would come up under the rule and that the gentleman and others thinking as he does would have full opportunity to present their views to the membership of the House.

Mr. KLEBERG. I thank the gentleman; and, in conclusion, may I call your attention to this peculiar fact? There is no opportunity here for me as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and chairman of the subcommittee that is called upon to consider sugar legislation or as an individual who has had to do with every sugar bill since 1934, including the act of 1937, to present my views.

Mr. Speaker, with the statement that there is no reason for this bill, as evidenced by the suspension of the quotas, and with the definite assertion that a continuing resolution is the only kind of legislation which should be entertained in this tragic hour, I yield back the balance of my time, in the firm hope that the Congress of the United States will not forget 130,000,000 citizens of the United States and their Latin-American friends in South and Central America, who are our friends at this moment.

The chief ways in which H. R. 5988 would, if enacted, adversely affect the interests of certain of the other American

republics and of American exporters dependent on them for markets may be summarized as follows:

First. The bill would seriously affect Cuba. It would decrease the percentage share of Cuba in the basic sugar quotas; it would reduce from 375,000 short tons to 300,000 short tons, raw value, the quantity of direct consumption sugar permitted entry into the United States from Cuba, and would subject to quota restrictions and to taxation imports of edible molasses from Cuba now imported without regard to the quotas. Although the bill provides an opportunity for Cuba to share in the Philippine deficit—an opportunity that would be realized only in the very unusual circumstances when the deficit exceeds 159,920 short tons—this provision would not offset the above-mentioned disadvantages to Cuba.

Second. It would be less favorable than the Sugar Act of 1937 to foreign countries other than Cuba in respect of allocation of the Philippine deficit and would therefore have an adverse effect on such countries, particularly Peru, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti.

Third. It would, by redefining liquid sugar, place an absolute embargo on trade in certain edible molasses from the Barbados, contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of our trade agreement with the United Kingdom.

The above-mentioned important changes in sugar legislation which enactment of the bill would place in force are essentially similar to proposed changes which have been opposed repeatedly in the past by the various interested departments of the Government and by the President.

A further comment of a general nature is the fact that at the present time, when every effort of the Department of State is being bent to secure the closest possible cooperation between the nations of this hemisphere, a bill such as the one under consideration cannot fail to promote disharmony.

And last, but not least, it furnishes ammunition to spreaders of Nazi propaganda in Latin America, whereby they will claim a lack of interest by the United States toward its Latin American neighbors.

Here are the letters referred to earlier:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, December 1, 1941.

Hon. RICHARD M. KLEBERG,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. KLEBERG: Reference is made to our telephone conversation of this morning with respect to H. R. 5988.

We have been advised that the House Committee on Agriculture has reported favorably on the bill which would extend for a 3-year period certain of the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, and in addition, contains certain important amendments affecting Cuban-American relations and the interests of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands. Prior to its action, the House committee neither held public hearings on the proposed legislation nor requested the Department of Agriculture for a report thereon through the Bureau of the Budget in the usual course.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 28, 1941.

The Honorable RICHARD M. KLEBERG,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KLEBERG: In response to your request I am herewith quoting to you extracts from a letter of November 27, 1941, I have addressed to the chairman of the Rules Committee of the House:

"My attention has been called to H. R. 5988, introduced on November 7, 1941, by the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER and referred to the Committee on Agriculture. This bill was reported favorably by that committee on November 19, 1941, and has been placed on the Union Calendar.

"No public hearings were held on the bill and, so far as I know, none of the various departments concerned was asked to comment on it in accordance with customary procedure. I am therefore taking the liberty of expressing to you the Department's views on the bill from the point of view of our foreign relations so that you may be advised thereof in the event the Rules Committee is asked for a rule.

"Certain important changes in sugar legislation which enactment of the bill would place in force are essentially similar to proposed changes which have been opposed in the past by the various interested departments and by the President. For example, the bill would decrease the percentage share of Cuba in the basic sugar quotas, and only in very unusual circumstances would this loss be offset, even in part, by a share in the Philippine deficit; it would reduce substantially the quantity of direct consumption sugar permitted to enter the United States from Cuba; and it would be less favorable that the Sugar Act of 1937 to foreign countries other than Cuba in respect of their share in the basic sugar quotas and much less favorable in respect of allocation of the Philippine deficit. Furthermore, by redefining liquid sugar, the bill would further restrict Cuba's participation in the United States market for certain sirups and would place a virtual embargo on such sirups from the British West Indies.

"To these specific objections may be added two general comments. First, sugar legislation now in effect in the United States was enacted only after the most careful consideration had been given to the question of equitable distribution of the burden demanded of all parties concerned in the interest of stabilizing the sugar industry. This Department is strongly of the opinion that any proposed legislation which would worsen the position of sugar producers in the offshore areas should be subject to the same careful scrutiny to which legislation now in effect was subjected prior to its enactment. Second, legislation such as that proposed would be particularly inappropriate at the present time when the need for the closest possible cooperation between the nations of this hemisphere is of such crucial importance.

"For the foregoing reasons, it is hoped that H. R. 5988 will not come before the House until the various departments interested in the question of sugar legislation have had an opportunity to have their views considered.

"In view of the possible urgency of the matter, this letter has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget."

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and in the revision thereof include letters that I referred to from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill. As far as I know, all of my constituents, and they are engaged to a great extent in growing beet sugar, and there are five large refineries in my district, also favor this bill. I cannot conceive of any opposition to it that should be based on statements such as those made by my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] who just preceded me. I ask at the conclusion of my remarks the right to insert a short analysis of the bill which I have prepared myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the cane-sugar producer is injured in any way, shape, or manner by this bill, and I do not believe that the cane-sugar producer in Hawaii or in the Virgin Islands or anywhere else can be injured. The quota of the Virgin Islands will be increased in this bill by 129 tons. The net production of all will be increased 260 tons, or about .015 percent of the basic quota of 1,744,000 tons, which are allowed.

STATEMENT OF MR. BUCK IN EXPLANATION OF THE SUGAR BILL INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN FULMER (H. R. 5988)

The measure which was introduced today is designed to extend the life of the Sugar Act for 3 years and to make some, but not all, of the adjustments which the sugar industry, as a whole, have desired for many years.

The bill is a recognition, in the first place, of the fact that under present abnormal conditions it is highly desirable to produce in continental United States as much as possible of the sugar consumed by the people of continental United States. Shipping shortages make this essential. This bill is also intended, without increasing the conditional payments made to the larger growers of sugar beets and sugarcane, to recognize the increased costs of labor and materials involved in the production by small farmers and planters. Finally, it is recognized that with the termination of the emergency the quota system is necessary to prevent disastrous reaction upon the American sugar industry. The terms of the law and the amendments are such that the retail price of sugar cannot get out of hand regardless of any other legislation affecting prices.

Section 1 of the bill increases the basic quota for the mainland cane-sugar area by 4 percent, or 16,880 tons, and for the domestic beet-sugar area 4 percent, or 62,088 tons. The minimum quota for all domestic sugar-producing areas is thus raised from 3,715,000 to 3,793,802 tons. The quantity of sugar now allotted to Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands is not materially changed.

Slight reductions are made in the quotas of Cuba, the Philippines, and foreign countries other than Cuba. These are, however, only slight changes.

Section 2 of the bill deals with the reallotment of any deficit in the Philippine quota and an attempt has been made to reallot this deficit in a way that will be fair to all areas.

Section 3 reduces the amount of white sugar that may be imported from Cuba from 375,000 tons, as provided in the present law, to 300,000 tons. This provision does not reduce Cuba's total quota, but merely means that 75,000 tons, which now may be imported from Cuba in white form, would be shipped as raw sugar.

Section 4 deals with the conditional payments which, under the present law provide 60 cents per hundredweight to growers producing up to 500 tons. The new basic rate is fixed at 80 cents, but the scale-down begins at 350 tons instead of at 500 tons, as under the present law and the rate of payment to the larger producers remains as it now is.

Section 5 deals with imported sugar sirups. It amends the present definition which has been found to be deficient in that it permits the importation in the form of liquids, sugar which escapes both the quota and tax provisions of the present law.

Section 6 extends the act to December 31, 1944.

Section 7 continues the present processing tax from the proceeds of which paid by processors and growers, the entire cost of the Sugar Act has been paid.

COMPARISON RECENT PRODUCTION OF HAWAII, DOMESTIC BEET-SUGAR AREA AND DOMESTIC CANE-SUGAR AREA WITH QUOTA UNDER FULMER-O'MAHONEY SUGAR ACT

All references herein to sugar production are from the June 1941 issue of World Sugar Situation, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture.

All figures are in short tons, raw value.

Hawaii

The production of Hawaii for 1938 was 994,000 tons; 1939, 977,000 tons; 1940, 1,000,000 tons; or an average for the 3 years of 990,000 tons. On a consumption estimate of 7,000,000 tons, Hawaii would receive, under the Fulmer-O'Mahoney Sugar Act, a quota of 982,348 tons. This quota is within 8,000 tons of Hawaii's average production for the last 3 years and is actually greater than its average production over the lest 3 years after deduction from production of the sugar locally consumed in Hawaii.

Domestic beet-sugar area

The production of the domestic beet-sugar area for the last 3 years was as follows: 1938, 1,803,000 tons; 1939, 1,758,000 tons; 1940, 1,884,000 tons. Average production for 3 years, 1,815,000 tons. Under the Fulmer-O'Mahoney Sugar Act, on a consumption estimate of 7,000,000 tons, the domestic beet-sugar area would receive a quota of 1,688,510 tons. This quota is 126,490 tons less than the average production of the domestic beet-sugar area for the last 3 years.

Domestic cane-sugar area

It is to be remembered that the 1940 crop in the domestic cane-sugar area was drastically reduced by a severe early frost which materially reduced sugar production of that area for that year. The domestic cane-sugar area in 1938 produced 583,000 tons; 1939, 504,000 tons; 1940, 336,000 tons; an average for the 3 years of 474,000 tons. The quota for the domestic cane-sugar area under the Fulmer-O'Mahoney sugar bill on a consumption estimate of 7,000,000 tons, would be 457,793 tons. This quota is 16,207 tons less than the average production of the domestic cane-sugar area for the last 3 years in spite of the reduction in the 1940 production because of the freeze mentioned.

These comparisons show:

1. The need for additional quota for the domestic beet-sugar area and the domestic cane-sugar area.

2. That Hawaii's quota under the Fulmer-O'Mahoney Sugar Act is entirely adequate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years, the entire sugar industry, as it related to the American market, has been carefully regulated by a quota system. Under any quota system that fairly distributes a market for a commodity as widely used as sugar, there will never be complete satisfaction on the part of any individual or group.

H. R. 5988, while not a perfect bill and not completely satisfactory to the workers in the cane-sugar refinery in my district, is a reasonable effort to regulate the sugar market for the next 3 years.

In my judgment, it is absolutely essential that the future of so basic an industry as sugar be assured, during the difficult days ahead, of a stable act under which to operate. The charges of discrimination again made by Hawaiian interests are not valid. The Congress clearly established this in the McCormack amendment adopted last year to the Sugar Act of 1940. The Hawaiian sugar interests, both with respect to refining and growing, have always been considered a separate entity by any group dealing with sugar. Conditions in Hawaii governing the production and refining of sugar are entirely different than conditions in the continental United States. It is possible to import Philippine labor into the Hawaiian Islands, under certain conditions, and it is impossible to bring them into the United States. This is but one example of the many that could be mentioned which show that the Hawaiian Islands receive special, separate, and specific consideration from Congress.

The conditions of labor in the Hawaiian Islands are entirely different than those obtaining in the continental United States. So far as can be determined, and there has never been a demand from Hawaii, asking that their workers be paid the same and be granted the same privileges that our domestic sugar workers have.

Taking all circumstances into consideration, this bill is a fair approach to the sugar problem for the next 3 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes no material change in the Sugar Act of 1937, which is fostering the domestic sugar industry, and which benefits the consumers of our country. This year it is unfortunate that there was a reduction of about 165,000 acres in the sugar-beet allotments in our country, and today in this emergency we find that the consumers of the United States are facing a real shortage in this commodity. The sugar-beet industry and the cane-sugar industry in this country produce today only about 30 percent of our domestic sugar requirements. It seems to me that, in considering the interest of off-shore producers, we should not overlook the fact that the sugar-beet industry is of vital importance to the agricultural sections of the West.

The Fulmer bill now under consideration represents a compromise which does not fulfill maximum desires of any sugar-producing area. However, it does make a serious attempt to overcome some of the injustices which have arisen under the act, and to make certain adjustments which are essential because of rapidly changing conditions here and abroad. More than 50,000 sugar-beet growers are interested in the passage of this measure, which will give added stability to the industry, and increase their basic quota about 62,000 tons.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in connection with any legislation regarding sugar, I am interested in the matter from the standpoint of the consumer and from the standpoint of the industry in my district, because of employment in the refineries. While this bill is not everything we desire, I wish to advise the House both the management and the workers in the refineries in my district, and in the eastern part of the country generally, I am told, are in favor of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to incorporate some tables that I have prepared and copies of telegrams sent to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, it is obviously impossible in 3 minutes to present the issues that this bill involves.

The Committee on Agriculture presented this bill to the Rules Committee and asked for a rule. The Rules Committee granted the bill a liberal rule. It could be brought before the House under that rule, amendments could be proposed to the bill, and the whole matter debated in full for the information of the membership of this House and of the American public.

The assumption is made that this bill does not differ from the Sugar Act of 1937. That is quite erroneous. It is a drastic change from that bill in several particulars. I, as the representative of the Territory of Hawaii, having battled for the last 7 years for equal treatment of my people, must protest against this bill, which has juggled percentages so as to preserve to the mainland producers their quotas, in part at Hawaii's expense.

I want to repeat that the percentages have been so juggled that the proposed

increase of the domestic quota is reserved exclusively to the mainland producers. We have again inserted in legislation that distinction between continental and noncontinental Americans which I thought the Sugar Act of 1937 had stopped once and for all. It also distributes the deficit in the Philippine quota by granting preferential rights to that deficit to mainland producers. First, the mainland producers are to receive 50,000 tons, then other foreign countries 100,000 tons, and then finally Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Cuba are to get what is left.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill does make drastic changes from the Sugar Act of 1937.

I proposed in committee two amendments; and one amendment, which would have extended to Hawaii and Puerto Rico the privilege of sharing in any increase granted to domestic producers, was lost by a tie vote only. If we had this bill up under a rule I could propose that amendment in the House and present my arguments for the consideration of the House. But under a suspension of the rules no such procedure is possible.

This bill goes further in other features, with which I have no concern and regarding the unwisdom of which at this particular time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] has called attention.

I cannot imagine a more iniquitous bill brought in here under an absolute gag rule that the House is asked to pass upon with only 40 minutes of debate, that does great injury to two powerless groups of this Nation, one the people of the Territory of Hawaii and the other the people of Puerto Rico. No argument can justify such a surrender of principle. The reason advanced is that because nothing is taken away from Hawaii and Puerto Rico, their people should acquiesce in this legislation, even if they are refused the right of their citizenship under the American flag, to share in any quota allotted to the domestic sugar industry.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the membership of the House will vote down this motion, and allow the sponsors and proponents of this bill to bring it before the House in an orderly way, defend it in debate, and in the discussion of amendments which those of us who oppose it want to offer. We in opposition represent 50 percent of the total domestic sugar industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere conviction that the pending bill is neither necessary nor good legislation. Insofar as Hawaii is concerned, it offends against the principles of equity and justice that should govern all legislation in at least two particulars. This bill gives mainland sugar producers certain advantages denied to those of Hawaii and Puerto Rico. It arbitrarily juggles the percentages of the total domestic quota apportioned to each domestic producing unit so as to exclude Hawaii and Puerto Rico from sharing in the increase provided for the domestic producers.

These percentages were incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1937 after exhaustive hearings, and were proclaimed as establishing as equitable an apportionment of the domestic quota between all domestic producers as could be devised. Hawaii and Puerto Rico are now asked to acquiesce in the new apportionment on the ground that our quotas are not to be reduced.

The domestic quota is to be substantially increased, but all of the increase, in direct contravention of the principles laid down in the present Sugar Act, is reserved for a special group of sugar producers—those who have the good fortune to live on the mainland. Can anyone justify such a proposal? If it is thought necessary to increase the domestic quota, then the only square thing to do is to let all domestic producers share proportionately in such increase.

Another feature of this bill repeats the difference in treatment as between continental and noncontinental Americans. Any deficit in the Philippine quota is reserved first for mainland producers; then for "foreign countries other than Cuba"; and last, if there happens to be a large deficit, what remains is divided between Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Cuba.

On the assumption that the Philippines will have a very large deficit, Hawaii and Puerto Rico are urged to go along with this legislation, accept being classed with Cuba, and sell our birthright for a will-o'-the-wisp, the uncertainties of the Philippine deficit.

It is because of these provisions that I say the bill before us is not good legislation. I had two amendments to offer if the parliamentary situation had permitted. The first would restore to the bill the percentages in existing law, in order that all domestic producers might share proportionately any increase in the domestic quota.

I offered this amendment in committee, and it was defeated only by a tie vote. My second amendment would strike out the special preferences granted in the distribution of the Philippine deficit, and in lieu thereof incorporate the provisions of the Coffee bill, H. R. 3582. This measure, favorably reported out of committee and pending on the Union Calendar, provides a fair distribution of the Philippine deficit, which the bill before us, for some occult reason, has completely scuttled. Time does not permit me to dwell on other important features of this bill, particularly those which have cemented anew the unholy alliance between the divergent interests of the seaboard refiners and the mainland producers, but the House and the public should have the opportunity to delve into those provisions.

The proponents of this proposed legislation have not been content to bring the bill up under the liberal rule granted only last Friday. Under that rule, ample time for debate would have been possible, amendments could have been offered, and the House and the American public informed as to the true character of the proposed changes in existing law. The bill is said to have the support of "the greater part of the sugar industry" when in fact practically 50 percent of the domestic sugar industry is opposed to it.

Bringing it up under suspension is defended on the specious ground that the domestic sugar industry must have this legislation enacted before the end of the year because the present Sugar Act expires on December 31, 1941. No such urgency can excuse adopting these drastic changes in existing law when a simple continuing resolution, for which there are many precedents, would better suit the requirements of the domestic sugar industry and fit our present national policy.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture has estimated the consumptive requirements so high—9,000,000 tons—that every sugar-producing unit has been granted all the quota it can produce. There is no necessity to increase domestic quotas, already at capacity production, by hastily considered legislation on which no hearings have been held and no reports obtained from the executive departments concerned. The House should not be rushed into approving a measure when there is no warrant for such action.

Between now and adjournment, or early next year, the House can pass a continuing resolution, or consider in a manner more befitting the importance of the subject, a sugar bill reconciled to the elements of fair play and not one which violates the principle of equal treatment and benefits special groups of citizens at the expense of others. The membership of the House will recall that I have consistently fought for equal treatment for Hawaii during the 7 years I have been a Member of this House. No arguments of necessity can justify deviating from that basic principle of our American democracy.

I submit, therefore, that the pending measure is as unnecessary as it is iniquitous, and urge the House, as the only alternative left to it under the circumstances, to vote the bill down.

The following tables illustrate the purpose of the proposed legislation to secure to mainland producers by legislation, to the exclusion of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the entire benefits of the proposed increase in the domestic quota. Table No. 1 compares the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937 with those of H. R. 5988. Table No. 2 shows what the distribution of the increased quota would be if the percentages were unchanged. Table No. 3 analyzes the distribution of any deficits in the different areas. Table No. 4 tabulates the increased conditional compliance payments this legislation would inaugurate.

Table No. 5 shows clearly that Hawaii has contributed a greater share in making the quota system work than any other domestic sugar-producing unit. From the inauguration of this method of stabilizing the sugar industry, Hawaii's quota has been substantially reduced in order to extend larger quotas to other units. The pending bill would simply perpetuate and increase this inequity for the benefit primarily of mainland producers.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of Sugar Act of 1937 with H. R. 5988 and S. 2401*

QUOTAS

Area	Basic quotas						Increase	Decrease
	Sugar act of 1937			H. R. 5988 and S. 2401				
	Percent of total	Percent of group	Tons	Percent of total	Percent of group	Tons		
Domestic beet sugar		41.72	1,549,898		42.49	1,611,986	62,088	
Mainland cane		11.31	420,167		11.52	437,046	16,879	
Hawaii		25.25	938,037		24.72	937,827		210
Puerto Rico		21.48	797,982		21.03	797,837		145
Virgin Islands		.24	8,916		.24	9,106	190	
Total domestic	55.59	100.00	[1] 3,715,000	56.77	100.00	[1] 3,793,802	79,157	355
Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands		34.70	[2] 1,029,782		34.70	[2] 1,002,437		27,345
Cuba		64.41	1,911,476		64.41	1,860,720		50,756
Foreign countries other than Cuba		.89	26,412		.89	25,711		701
Total Philippine Islands and foreign countries	44.41		2,967,670	43.23	100.00	2,888,868		78,802
Grand total	100.00		6,682,670	100.00		6,682,670	79,157	79,157

[1] Minimum quota for domestic areas.
[2] In no event less than the duty-free quotas (approximately 982,663 tons).

PORTION OF TOTAL QUOTA WHICH MAY BE DIRECT CONSUMPTION SUGAR

	Tons raw value equivalent			Tons raw value equivalent	
	Sugar Act of 1937	H. R. 5988 and S. 2401		Sugar Act of 1937	H. R. 5988 and S. 2401
Beet	All	All	Virgin Islands	None	None
Mainland cane	All	All	Philippine Islands	80,214	80,214
Hawaii	29,616	29,616	Cuba	375,000	300,000
Puerto Rico	126,033	126,033	Other foreign	All	All

TABLE II—*Comparison of Sugar Act of 1937 with H. R. 5988, if amended to domestic percentages of quota in 1937 act*

Area	Sugar Act of 1937		Basic quotas		
			H. R. 5988 and S. 2401 if amended to percentages division as in 1937 act		Increase
	Percent of total	Tons	Percent of total	Tons	
Beet sugar	41.72	1,549,898	41.72	1,582,774	32,876
Mainland cane	11.31	420,167	11.31	429,079	8,912
Hawaii	25.25	938,037	25.25	957,935	19,898
Puerto Rico	21.48	797,982	21.48	814,909	16,927
Virgin Islands	.24	8,916	.24	9,105	189
Total domestic	100.00	3,715,000	100.00	3,793,802	78,802

TABLE III—*Comparison of Sugar Act of 1937 with H. R. 5988 and S. 2401*

Dec. 204 (a) REDISTRIBUTION OF DEFICITS IN AREA QUOTAS

SUGAR ACT OF 1937	H. R. 5988 AND S. 2401
DEFICIENCY IN ANY DOMESTIC AREA OR CUBA	
Prorated to other domestic areas and Cuba, and any portion such areas cannot supply is to be prorated to "Other foreign."	Prorated to other domestic areas and Cuba, and any portion such areas cannot supply is to be prorated to "Other foreign."
DEFICIENCY IN PHILIPPINE ISLANDS	
Prorated to "Other foreign."	Prorated as follows: (1) To beet area and mainland cane area an amount equivalent to the deficiency in duty-free refined sugar as per Philippine Islands Independence Act (50,000 long tons refined); (2) To "Other foreign" not in excess of 100,000 tons of the remainder of such deficit after effect of (1) hereof; (3) To Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Cuba, prorata, the remainder, if any, of such deficit in excess of 100,000 tons, after effect of (1) hereof; Provided, except for (1) hereof, no such proration of deficiency may be filled by direct consumption sugar.
DEFICIENCY IN "OTHER FOREIGN" FOR CALENDAR YEAR	
To remaining "Other foreign."	Prorated as follows: (1) To "Other foreign" to extent of ability to fill; (2) Remainder, if any, after (1) hereof, prorata to domestic areas and Cuba.

TABLE IV.—*Comparison of Sugar Act of 1937 with H. R. 5988 and S. 2401*

CONDITIONAL COMPLIANCE PAYMENTS

Sugar Act of 1937				H. R. 5988 and S. 2401			
	Rate per hundredweight in cents	Payment			Rate per hundredweight in cents	Payment	
		This tonnage increment	Total to this tonnage			This tonnage increment	Total to this tonnage
0–500 tons	60	$6,000	$6,000	0–350 tons	80	$5,600	$5,600
500–1,500 tons	55	11,000	17,000	350–700 tons	75	5,250	10,850
1,500–6,000 tons	52.5	47,250	64,250	700–1,000 tons	70	4,200	15,050
6,000–12,000 tons	50	60,000	124,250	1,000–1,500 tons	60	6,000	21,050
12,000–30,000 tons	47.5	171,000	295,250	1,500–3,000 tons	55	16,500	37,550
Above 30,000 tons	30			3,000–6,000 tons	52.5	31,500	69,050
Example, 50,000 tons	30	120,000	415,250	6,000–12,000 tons	50	60,000	129,050
				12,000–30,000 tons	47.5	171,000	300,050
				Above 30,000 tons	30		
				Example, 50,000 tons	30	120,000	420,050

AMOUNTS OF PAYMENTS AT VARIOUS TONNATES PRODUCED

	1937 act	H. R. 5988 and S. 2401		1937 act	H. R. 5988 and S. 2401		1937 act	H. R. 5988 and S. 2401
350 tons	$4,200	$5,600	1,500 tons	$17,000	$21,050	12,000 tons	$124,250	$129,050
700 tons	8,200	10,850	3,000 tons	32,750	37,550	30,000 tons	295,250	300,050
1,000 tons	11,500	15,050	6,000 tons	64,250	69,050	50,000 tons	415,250	420,050

TABLE V—*Comparison of domestic sugar production in years 1931–33 with domestic quotas under sugar acts*

Area	Average production, years 1931–33	Final quota, 1 year 1934, Jones-Costigan Act	Final quota compared with average production		Initial quota for year 1937, Jones-Costigan Act	Basic quota, Sugar Act of 1937	Basic quota, H. R. 5988 and S. 2401	Basic quota, H. R. 5988 and S. 2401, compared with average production years 1931–33	
			Increase	Decrease				Increase	Decrease
Beet	1,481,950	1,556,166	74,216		1,613,576	1,549,898	1,611,986	130,036	
Mainland cane	234,144	261,034	26,890		270,664	420,167	437,046	203,902	
Hawaii	1,046,318	948,264		[1] 69,554	976,685	938,037	937,827		[3] 71,426
Puerto Rico	878,308	807,312		[2] 4,870	831,508	797,982	797,837	[4] 5,744	
Virgin Islands	5,300	5,304	4		5,462	8,916	9,106	3,806	
Total, domestic	3,646,020	3,578,080			3,697,895	3,715,000	3,793,802		

[1] After including local consumption, 28,500 tons, raw value.
[2] After including local consumption, 66,126 tons, raw value.
[3] After including local consumption, 37,065 tons, raw value.
[4] After including local consumption, 86,315 tons, raw value.

Compiled from official sources (all in short tons raw value).

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING], who is my very good friend, should stand up for his people at all times. That is his duty, and he performs it exceedingly well. However, I regret that he has found it necessary to oppose the bill now before the House, which actually does the Hawaiian people no harm, but does offer advantages to the Hawaiian sugar industry. The same can be said of those others who represent the State of Florida and have spoken against the bill. Of course, it does not do as much for the Hawaiian industry as the gentleman from Hawaii would have it do, but that is exactly the situation the beet-sugar growers and refiners, and the mainland cane growers and refiners find themselves in. As a matter of fact, the bill is a compromise between the respective views of each segment of the American sugar activities. It is not the bill any one of them would have written had that segment been permitted to write a bill solely in its own interest. But, in view of the lateness of the session and the fact that the Sugar Act expires in just 1 month, it seems clear that all domestic activities should support the Fulmer bill. It provides modest benefits for all and regardless of what may have been said to the contrary in this debate, it does not do violence to the good-neighbor policy.

The opposition of the gentleman from Hawaii forces me to remind the House of the preferred position which Hawaii enjoys in the sugar program. In the first place, the statistics show that over 78 percent of the land under cultivation in Hawaii is devoted to the production of sugarcane. Pineapples are produced on 17 percent, and all other crops are produced on the remaining 5 percent.

With our Government devoted to soil conservation as an agricultural policy, and with crop rotation and diversification recognized as good farming practice, Hawaii could very well consider increasing the acreage of general food crops necessary to supply her own population and the large and increasing Army and Navy personnel stationed in the Hawaiian Islands. The requirements of fresh green vegetables alone would very probably take up much of the available acreage and at the same time release much needed space in Pacific shipping which is now at a premium, every ton of which may in the immediate future be vitally necessary for the success of activities of much graver importance than the growing of agricultural products on a very limited acreage, such as is available in Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, the Hawaiian sugar industry is made up of a group of large plantations with interlocking corporate ownership. Government reports show that 38 plantations operate 94 percent of the sugar lands and average 6.114 acres per plantation. This brings me to a comparison with the 75,000 sugar-beet growers in the United States who last year received an acreage allotment of 830,000 acres, or an average of about 11 acres each. Only 6 percent of the sugar lands in Hawaii are operated by comparable small producers. The fundamental purpose of the Sugar act is supposedly to benefit the family-sized farm; and it must be conceded that the large planters of Hawaii are most fortunate indeed to enjoy the protection and stabilization inherent in a sugar-quota system, created for the benefit of the so-called small growers of sugar.

In these days of national stress, we cannot overlook the fact that labor reports show that one-third of the employees on the sugar plantations of Hawaii are aliens, and one-third of these aliens are Japanese. Of the 101,000 employees on plantations, only 6 percent are Anglo-Saxon or native Hawaiian, while one-half of the citizen employees are Japanese. This reminds me of the very pertinent fact that in matters of immigration legislation, there have been special provisions made to facilitate the immigration of foreign laborers into the Hawaiian Islands, and these special provisions did not apply to the States of the Union; therefore, the plea that Hawaii is entitled to 100 percent the same treatment as the 48 States is not a consistent argument when we consider that the Hawaiian planters have asked for and been accorded special treatment in our immigration laws.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Sugar Act gives Hawaii privileges and advantages which are not collectively given to the States of the United States. Hawaii has a most generous quota of sugar which she markets in continental United States and, in addition, she has a quota amounting to 37,000 tons for the local home consumption. Puerto Rico receives similar advantages.

No States are allowed to market sugar in Hawaii, and the Hawaiian producers enjoy a monopoly in that market. My State of Michigan produces less than three-fifths of the sugar consumed by the citizens of that State. If Michigan had the same privilege the Sugar Act accords Hawaii, we then could nearly double our sugar production for the Michigan market alone. In addition, we would receive our pro rata share of the quota allocated to the entire United States beet-sugar industry. I have no doubt that the other beet-growing States would be mighty glad to have the arrangement which Hawaii has, whereby they furnish their entire home market and still participate most generously in supplying the sugar needs in other sections of continental United States.

The Fulmer bill proposes to increase the continental beet-sugar quota by some 62,000 tons. This 62,000 tons will make a total basis quota of 1,612,000 tons, which is considerably less than the average beet-sugar production of the last 3 years. In 1941 the Department of Agriculture arbitrarily reduced the acreage in the beet-sugar areas by 17 percent. Even with the 4 percent increase in basic quota provided in this bill, the United States beet-sugar industry will still be restricted in its production of sugar. This falls far short of giving the beet industry the basic quota needed to make full use of processing facilities which have long been available in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has many other benefits under the Sugar Act which the States do not have:

First. As far as I have been able to learn, the Department of Agriculture has never imposed acreage allotments on Hawaii, but has recognized the growing crop as proportionate share production, in compliance with the requirements of the Sugar Act and to qualify for benefit payments.

Second. The quota given to Hawaii is distinctly for Hawaiian producers alone. No other State or Territory shares that quota with her. In my own State of Michigan we do not have a Michigan quota, but we are forced to take our pro rata share of the quota for the beet-sugar industry as a whole. If other States increase production, and a reduction in acreage of the existing plants is required to conform to quota restrictions, then Michigan producers must accept

acreage curtailment, as do all the other beet-growing States, even though Michigan's record of production has been constant over a period of years.

Hawaii asks for equal treatment with the States, but I question very seriously whether she would advocate a general domestic cane quota, which would include the mainland cane area, Hawaii and Puerto Rico in one group, so that when Florida increases her production the Hawaiians would have to take an acreage curtailment the following year. That is exactly the situation which faces the sugar-beet industry.

The beet area is composed of 19 States, which have to share proportionately the area quota, and the mainland cane area is composed of 2 States, whose shares are proportionate. In the case of all of these States, the individual share of any State is subject to adjustments each year. The gentleman from Hawaii will certainly concede that in regard to this individual area quota Hawaii has a distinct advantage over the States, which she would not willingly abandon. "Equal treatment," which the gentleman demands? She has much better than that now.

Newspapers carry the report that the Maritime Commission has issued orders that ships from the Philippines shall bring to this market no more sugar for probably 2 years at least, because of the developing situation in the Far East. When we consider that we depend upon the Philippines for 1,000,000 tons of sugar each year, it is very significant that the shipping shortage has become so acute as to shut out one-seventh of our normal source of supply. I mention this regrettable situation because it accentuates the importance and necessity for encouraging the production of sugar in continental United States. Sugar produced on the continent does not depend upon ships to reach consumers. Sugar produced in the islands is of no use to the American consumer unless ships are available to deliver that sugar to the mainland.

I regret that Hawaii is 3,000 miles away; but with the Japanese threat in the Pacific and the need of shipping space for strategic war materials there is a physical distinction which forces us to a realistic consideration of whether consumer requirements in sugar should not be more largely filled in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we can bring ourselves to think of this whole sugar problem in a national sense, then no one can question that the first consideration must be that the consumer will have a sufficient supply of sugar, and that he is assured of buying his sugar requirements at a fair price. Every other consideration is secondary, and the best insurance policy which the United States Government can write for consumers with regard to supplies and price lies in legislation which will permit the healthy and progressive expansion of the production of sugar in continental United States.

Unfortunately, this bill does not provide for such expansion. It does, however, bring to each of our domestic sugar activities certain very limited benefits, and through these a legislative recognition of our rights to these benefits. I earnestly urge every Member of the House to vote for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not be beguiled by this argument about getting a rule. We who are interested in sugar legislation and whose life blood depends on it know that this is our offered opportunity and our only opportunity to get this bill passed. You must know that the bill that is in operation now expires December 31. There will be no sugar legislation unless this bill is passed between now and that date. You also know the vast amount of legislation that is now before the House. Therefore, in order to get this bill passed in this House and in the Senate, it is absolutely necessary that it be done now.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. How will this be affected, then, if there is no bill passed? As a matter of fact, there are not any quotas now.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. If there is no bill passed, we have no sugar legislation at all, and the sugar industry and the consumers of sugar are absolutely in a mix-up.

If this bill does not pass, the price of sugar will immediately rise. Considerable has been said about the price of sugar. The price of sugar during the past 4 years has been lower than it has been at any comparable time during the last quarter of a century. At the present time we are in an emergency, and if we do not have legislation that will control the price of sugar and prevent its rising, sugar will go about like it did during the last World War, when it went to $27 a hundred instead of $5, the present price. So we need this legislation.

I am interested in the argument of the Delegate from Hawaii. Hawaii is affected in just one way in this bill. Under its terms it will lose 209 tons of sugar—get that figure—209 tons of sugar in a year.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I cannot yield. Hawaii has nearly 1,000,000 tons allotted to it. Think of the loss of 209 tons out of a million. Not only that, it is thought by the framers of this legislation that the Territory will not lose anything, because it will have a portion of the quota that will come from the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I cannot yield.

The Philippines cannot ship its quota that it has now. Hawaii, therefore, will come in for its share of the Philippine quota, and unquestionably it will, under this bill, be able to ship more sugar than it has been shipping up to this time.

This bill comes before you as the work of every sugar interest in the United States. They are united on it. We ask you now in the interest of those people, in the interest of the 22 States where sugar is an agricultural product, and in the interest of the refiners to vote for this bill at the present time and give us a chance to get legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House will agree to suspend the rules and pass this bill. As stated by the distinguished gentleman from Utah, sugar legislation expires on the last day of this year, just a few weeks off. With the crowded conditions of the House Calendar that confronts us, it is very possible that we shall not have any sugar legislation unless we pass this bill under suspension.

I noticed the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, who spoke in opposition to this bill. He was entirely in error as to the number of people concerned in the State of Louisiana. The sugar growers in Louisiana are for this bill. It is not all that we want, but, as stated by others, it is a compromise between conflicting interests. There are 17,255 sugar farmers in the State of Louisiana who hope this measure passes today, and this is not counting the laborers in the transportation agencies at the port of New Orleans or in the railroads.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table showing the revenue received under the Sugar Act and the disbursements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made a few moments ago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the complaint has been voiced this afternoon that the Committee on Agriculture did not give proper consideration and hearing to this legislation. The Committee on Agriculture has been considering the sugar question for the last 7 years. Congress passed the Sugar Act in 1934. There are absolutely no new issues involved at this time or any reason why the committee should have conducted a hearing on this particular bill. As for there being any issues at any time on sugar legislation they can all be boiled down into one, and that is to make a proper and fair distribution of sugar among the various producing areas. That is all there is to it. We have more sugar from the areas which are accustomed to supplying this country than we can consume. That is all that has ever been done in the course of any sugar legislation, the effort to make a fair alloca-

tion of sugar between the various producing areas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this time?

Mr. HOPE. I prefer not to at this time. If I have time later, I will.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a member of the committee?

Mr. HOPE. I am sorry; not at this time. I will later, if I have time.

What does this bill do, Mr. Speaker? It really affects only four of the major sugar-producing areas. It takes away from Cuba about 50,000 tons of sugar. It takes away from the Philippines 27,000 tons of sugar and gives them to the beet- and cane-producing areas in continental United States. That is about all this bill does. That is the major thing done by this bill.

The Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are not affected so far as their present quota is concerned; that is, they are not substantially affected.

The Florida area, whose representatives are protesting against this bill, will receive a slight increase in the amount they can produce. So there is today no reason why any area should object to what is done in this bill unless it would be Cuba and the Philippine Islands; and so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned, the amount that is being taken from them is from their dutiable quota which they have never been able to fill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HOPE. Not at this time. If I have time later I will gladly yield.

I can, of course, understand why Hawaii and Puerto Rico should like to have a part of this quota which is being given to the beet and cane producers in continental United States. I should like to see those areas have the right to produce more sugar, but the situation is that the beet and cane areas in the United States have been overproducing their quota for the last 3 years. They have not been able to get a quota which was sufficient to take care of their normal production during the last 3 years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the pending bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation known as H. R. 5988, if passed, will, in my opinion, be very agreeable to the sugar-beet growers of my State, Nebraska, and also the cane growers of our own continent. We all know that there is no mystery about this legislation, which is merely an amendment to the Sugar Act of 1937 and will really hurt no one in particular but will give the American beet-sugar grower a chance to increase his acreage if he so desires. I call your attention to the fact that our American sugar-beet acreage has been reduced to such an extent that some have thought eventually the sugar-beet grower will be eliminated and the sugar-producing business may be surrendered to Cuba, Hawaiia, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

The American sugarcane grower and the American beet-sugar grower produces only about 30 percent of the sugar consumed domestically. The rest is produced outside the continental United States, and I feel, through our sugar legislation, we have been paying a very substantial sum to the growers outside the continental United States. I am the follower of the philosophy that the American sugar-beet farmer is here to stay and that he should be encouraged to grow more sugar beets in order that we of this continent be not entirely dependent upon the sugar growers of other lands.

All this amendment does is to ration some of the dutiable quota of sugar raised in the Philippines to our domestic sugar producers. This dutiable sugar from the Philippines is not being sent to us anyway and the Philippines cannot send it now.

There is a great lack of shipping bottoms for some of this outside sugar now and there should be no opposition on the part of Members here today to deny the right of the American cane-sugar growers and the American beet-sugar farmers to supply us with this deficiency of sugar. They should be encouraged to raise more sugar beets and more sugarcane in the continental United States, and I believe this bill should be passed in order to give them this encouragement.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I want to use these few minutes of my time to generally outline my opinion on the Fulmer bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1937, which is now being considered.

I do not feel that this bill fully justifies the importance of the continental sugar industry. At its best, it is merely a compromise. Although it does not fulfill the maximum desires of our domestic sugar-producing areas, I feel that it is an effort in the right direction to relieve a few of the hardships that have arisen under the original act.

The Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, has clearly demonstrated the value of regulation to the sugar planter, and its continuance should receive the full support of this House. The provisions of the act have materially helped to stabilize the farmer through crop control, benefit payments, deficiency payments, and abandonment payments. It has provisions totally unlike that of legislative control to other agricultural pursuits in that it is totally financially self-sustaining and has in fact netted the Government a neat profit.

In view of the example these provisions have set, I am naturally disappointed that the quota provisions allow only about 4 percent more production in domestic areas. It would seem to me that in view of the present international crisis, where it is known that the Philippines and other foreign producing areas will be unable to make deliveries throughout this crisis, which will probably be of long duration, and that after this situation clears the demand for sugar will probably triple itself, legislation should be enacted that will encourage our farmers to materially increase their production instead of merely teasing the industry with the negligible increase of 4 percent. The industry will naturally be glad to get any increase; however, under conditions as they are, I feel sure that this pitiful increase will in no way cause any gleeful anticipation among the industry.

I feel, further, that a provision should be placed in this bill to protect the peculiar problems of the sugarcane planter. Under present regulations, the Secretary of Agriculture issues individual quota allotments in the early part of the year. Sugarcane in Louisiana and Florida is planted in the fall of the year and naturally the amount a farmer should plant is guess work, as he does not definitely know what his quota will be until the following spring, in which case he either did not plant enough or he has to plow under some of his cane or let it grow up without the benefits of the act.

It is gratifying to see that the Committee on Agriculture has seen fit to allow more latitude to the Secretary of Agriculture in realloting deficits from off-shore areas. These provisions will, under certain conditions, greatly improve domestic marketing.

Recognition of the smaller farmer is also to be commended in allowing benefit payments of 80 cents as against the past 60 cents per 100 pounds.

In order that you may have a clearer picture of the benefits received by the sugar farmer as against the benefits received by other agricultural interests, I cite the following figures. In the first instance we produce only about 29 percent of the sugar that we consume, yet our farmers are restricted as to production. In comparison to this we produce a surplus of other major commodities, such as cotton, corn, wheat, and rice.

The total parity and soil conservation benefit payments paid to these other four agricultural industries were as follows during the fiscal year 1940: Cotton, $198,316,000; corn, $129,782,000; wheat, $103,638,000, and rice, $2,215,000. These amounts were paid by the Government to these farmers with no cost whatsoever to the farmers themselves. In the same year the sugar industry, through the processing tax, paid to the Government approximately $80,000,000. Out of this $80,000,000, the sugar farmers were reluctantly given $46,000,000 in the form of benefit payments, deficiency payments, and abandonment payments. Out of this same fund, there is reserved approximately $10,000,000 for the Philippines, who want their independence and at the same time want the generous patronage of our country. The remaining twenty-four million is in the United States Treasury to be used in assisting farmers of other products and other general governmental expenses, from building battleships to chasing insects. For the fiscal years 1938–41, inclusive, this Treasury take has risen from eleven million to thirty-four million annually, and the total profit to the Treasury for the same years is approximately $60,000,000.

This clearly shows that the sugar industry is not receiving anything from the Government, but is, instead, generously donating millions to other governmental activities. The relation between the Government and the sugar industry may be compared to the relation between a gold-digger and her sugar daddy. She takes him for all she can, gives him only what she is forced to, and distributes the remainder upon herself and her more attractive paramours.

But this is only the beginning. The sugar industry is not only made to pay someone else's bills, but also forced to sing the song of the siren in luring the good will of our sister republics. In spite of being the only basic crop in which we do not produce a surplus and instead of encouraging domestic-sugar production so that our Nation may become independent of foreign-price control on this commodity, it seems that the Government insists upon using sugar as its political football. Instead of using our surplus crops in trading with our good neighbors, which would greatly assist producers of other commodities, our Government still persists in the use of a juicy political sugar teat in its good neighborly dealings. I could never understand the logic or reasoning of this and do hope that some day the majority of Congress will be able to see otherwise.

Proof that the sugar industry is one of the most substantial is the fact that it has outlived these adversities and discouragements and in view of the benefits that have arisen under the Sugar Act of 1937, I am in favor of the Fulmer bill for its extension. I honestly believe that the basis of this regulation is sound and that it may some day be applied to other agricultural production so that regulation will later evolve into something that will be much fairer to those who have spent their lives in bringing agricultural pursuits to their present status.

The present bill amends section 202 of the 1937 act as amended by increasing the allotment from domestic sugar-producing areas from 55.59 percent to 56.77 percent, and from the domestic allotment mainland cane sugar is increased from 11.31 percent to 11.52 percent.

The Fulmer bill further amends the original act in that it proposes to change the method by which the deficits in the Philippine quota and in the quotas for foreign countries other than Cuba should be reallocated. The present act restricts these deficits to full-duty countries and in the event of a general deficit in these quotas, the Secretary is unable to allot them to areas which have available supplies.

The bill further proposes to reduce the quota of Cuban refined sugar from 375,000 tons to 300,000 tons; however, the 75,000-ton decrease is added to the raw quota for Cuba.

The conditional benefit payment provisions are amended to increase the base rate of payments from 60 cents to 80 cents per 100 pounds and lowers the basic tonnage from 500 tons to 350 tons.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the present Sugar Act expires December 31, 1941. Thus it is imperative that if we are to have the benefits and protection of the present law, H. R. 5988, which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, will have to be passed and approved by the President before that time. If, for instance, the present law were not extended, beet growers may grow all of the beets for which processors or factories will contract; they would, however, be taking the risk of receiving no benefit payments heretofore and now received under the Sugar Act.

The basic quotas of sugar produced in the continental area is increased 4 percent by the bill under consideration. In tons, such increase will amount to 62,088 tons for the sugar-beet industry and crowding 17,000 tons for the cane industry. This increase is taken from Cuba and other foreign countries and that portion of the Philippine quota which is dutiable. In the neighborhood of 700 tons is taken from other foreign countries. In the event that there is a deficit in the Philippine quota due to the war conditions or other conditions, the deficit will be reallocated to continental producers up to the extent of 100,000 tons of any raw deficit and to other areas such as Cuba any excess of 100,000 tons.

The bill under consideration also amends the benefit or conditional payment provisions of the present law by increasing the rate of payment from 60 to 80 cents per hundred pounds, which would bring the benefit payments to the ordinary Montana ton of beets up around $2.50 per ton. Also the present bill extends the law for a period of 3 years, to wit, from December 31, 1941, to December 31, 1944.

If our quotas are maintained and the sugar supplied in relation to demand, the tax on sugar and the benefit payments are to no appreciable degree handed to the consumer. We have the word of the Agriculture Department on this question, given many times.

I want to emphasize another important feature of the bill, particularly to the family-sized farm or small producer, and that is, the 80 cents per hundred pounds is graduated down as production increases over more than 350 tons of sugar per year. I might also add that the increase in the rate of payment is imperative because of the increasing costs of production.

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have been on an unofficial committee composed of western Congressmen and Senators, and our purpose has been to bring about an increased acreage production and an increased price for sugar beets; also we have had the assistance of able representatives of the various groups of growers which have been of invaluable help. I am dissatisfied with this bill. It is the best, however, that we can get. It is not what we want and need, but we are making some progress. I have always contended and do so now that the American market should belong as much as possible to the American farmer, for we must not forget that it is the American people who will be called upon to pay the tremendous tax burden that the Congress is voting upon them to establish the "four freedoms" everywhere and to make this country the arsenal of democracies.

I fully realize that we cannot take from foreign countries in the Western Hemisphere too much at a time of their production as it might upset our needed friendly relations with these countries but today when we realize we only produce about 30 percent of the sugar we consume in this country, it is high time that we commence to take some quota from those countries so as to eventually produce a more substantial percent of sugar which we consume. A 4-percent increase of production is small but it is at least a beginning and is an opening wedge by which eventually the door will be open for greater expansion of a splendid industry for our western country, as sugar beets is about our best cash crop. If we are to assume the position of the world's bread basket then we are just as likely to become the world's sugar bowl, as sugar is an essential food and may be stored indefinitely without loss. I think it is obvious that this is the time we should urge that our agricultural resources of all kinds, particularly essential foodstuffs, should be built up to the maximum. No one can say, in the light of what we are now doing, namely, shipping to foreign so-called democracies our essential foodstuffs, what our domestic needs are going to be. It is going to take a mighty lot of food to keep a nation of 130,000,000 people in full strength. Everybody, of course, knows that war brings higher prices for everything. We have a tremendous area of undeveloped land and also huge supplies of water with which to irrigate those lands. Therefore, it should be our aim and purpose to bring into production every acre of those lands that is possible to the end that we will make Montana a better and more profitable State in which to live. Sugar beets is a mighty big factor in the development of our State. In connection with expanding our production, let me quote from the Democratic platform of 1940:

> To safeguard the farmer's foreign markets and expand his domestic market for all domestic crops.

It has been a great source of pleasure for me to work in season and out to help in the development of this much needed industry in Montana. As long as I am in Congress, I will use every effort to increase our domestic production of sugar beets as well as all other crops and utilize our tremendous resources in both land and water to the utmost.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in Congress for about 21 years. During all of this time, except during my first term, I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Agricultural Committee of the House.

Throughout all of these years, the most controversial legislation has been sugar legislation.

In every instance we have had to hold hearings for days and days, with many

of the groups interested in sugar complaining to the last ditch.

It is my belief, however, that the Agriculture Committee will make for itself an all-time record in the passage of H. R. 5988, the sugar bill now under consideration.

This bill was introduced by me on November 7, and reported to the House on November 19.

We appeared before the Rules Committee on Friday morning, November 28, at which time a rule was granted for the consideration of the bill.

Today, December 1, we are actually considering this bill, and I am sure that within the next few minutes it will be passed by the House by an overwhelming vote.

This bill perhaps does not completely satisfy any group that is interested in sugar legislation. However, it is the most satisfactory bill to all groups except in one or two instances that has ever been presented to the House.

The bill in question extends the Sugar Act of 1937 as amended, and which will expire on December 31, for 3 years.

This bill contains certain adjustments, which, because of the emergency at this time, are very advisable.

The bill does not depart from the principles underlying the basic legislation dealing with sugar.

During the 7 years this legislation has been in effect the sugar industry has been stabilized, and farmers, workers on the farm, and workers in the sugar industry have received real benefits.

The retail price of sugar to consumers, under present legislation, has been lower than in any period of the history of our Nation.

Certainly, this would indicate that we have been able to be helpful to the consumers of sugar.

It is to continue these gains that we propose to re-enact the 1937 act with certain helpful modifications.

The bill grants two major concessions to the beet and sugarcane growers:

First. It provides for an increase in the minimum quota allotted to the domestic sugar growers.

All of this increase, as stated, will go to the beet producers and the mainland sugarcane growers, each of these groups obtaining a 4-percent rise in its minimum quota.

Second. There is an increase in the benefit payments from 60 to 80 cents per hundred. Producers producing up to 350 tons of sugar would receive the full base payment. Thus the problem of the small farmers will receive much needed consideration.

I understand about 94 percent of all beet sugar is grown by farmers who produce less than 350 tons per farm, 61 percent of mainland cane sugar, 39 percent of Puerto Rico cane sugar, and 7 percent of Hawaiian cane sugar.

These conditional payments, however, will not be a public gratuity to producers. These payments are really a substitute for tariff protection which has steadily declined since 1934 from a rate of $2 to a present rate of 90 cents on Cuban imports.

In the meantime, the Treasury has been receiving an annual revenue from the sugar-excise tax of 50 cents, amounting to about $68,000,000, and with increased consumption, this may exceed $80,000,000.

Conditional payments have amounted to about $45,500,000 per year, leaving a Treasury balance more than ample to cover this proposed advance of around $10,500,000 to producers.

In other words, there is no necessity for an increase in the price of sugar, and certainly no loss to the Treasury or the taxpayers of the country.

The sugar refiners of the country are well pleased with this bill for two reasons:

First. The import quota for refined Cuban sugar is reduced from 375,000 to 300,000 tons. This will give to the refiners in this country 75,000 additional tons of raw sugar.

Second. The bill provides that any part of the quota not used by the Philippines, because of the lack of shipping space, brought about by the war, will be allocated to the South American countries, all of which will be refined by the refiners in the United States.

The only opposition to this bill is coming from three sources:

First. Our congenial friend and colleague, Mr. KING, who represents Hawaii. However, on account of the increased benefits, and the very slight decline in Hawaii's quota, realizing that this bill will extend all of the good things under the original act, all of which has meant much to Hawaii, certainly these good people should not complain.

Second. That outstanding and lovable character, the congenial gentleman from Florida, a prominent member of the Agriculture Committee, PAT CANNON, complains on behalf of the sugar interests in Florida.

I am sure that deep down in the heart of our colleague there is no real complaint. Naturally, he has to represent his constituents.

The sugar industry in Florida disapproves of this bill; in fact, they disapprove all sugar legislation. In other words, if they had their way about it, there would not be any sugar legislation at all. In that this group, composed largely of one large producing and manufacturing concern, is blessed with a fine climate and abundant rich land, it is their belief that if they could be turned loose they would be able to produce enough sugar to satisfy the whole country and so cheaply that it would put all of the other domestic groups out of the farming business.

To me this is pure selfishness, in that if these people had their way about it, they would force thousands of good American citizens who are now engaged in growing sugar beets and sugarcane out of business and on the W. P. A.

Third. It appears that our good friend and colleague, Mr. KLEBERG, who is an outstanding members of the Agriculture Committee, is opposing this bill based on the grounds that its passage may interfere with a love affair that this country, through the State Department, has with the South American countries.

With all that we have been doing, and that which we are doing at this time, for these countries in doling out millions of dollars, much of which will never be returned, and in permitting them to ship into this country millions of dollars' worth of imports, practically all of which compete with our farm products in this country, as far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to have a little disturbance in our love affairs.

I fully realize the deep interest on the part of the State Department concerning this matter, but the months will not be many before we are going to have to do something about these trade-treaty arrangements in the interest of our own farmers or we are going to have considerable unemployment and tenant farming in this country.

These arrangements would not be so bad if the Secretary would see to it that an agricultural quota was written into these treaties; that is, out of the tremendous purchasing power that we give to these people they would have to spend a certain portion thereof for agricultural products.

However, up to this date nothing has been done about it, and I believe the great interest in this love affair is on the part of many of the representatives of the selfish groups of this country, in that they are the recipients of the benefits accruing to this country.

I make this statement for the reason that the facts will show, as stated, that this purchasing power given to these countries does not benefit farmers but is used in buying manufactured goods.

Mr. friend, Mr. KLEBERG, visited Cuba some time ago, and upon his return, in speaking about his trip, he made this statement:

> I was talking with one of the Cubans, and he said to me: "Do you see all of these automobiles all over the streets? We bought these automobiles in the United States with our sugar."

In the meantime I want to challenge Mr. KLEBERG or anyone else opposing this bill on the grounds that it will harm the South American countries, because we all know that for the next year or two, during this emergency, practically all of the quota allotted to the Philippines will go to these countries.

Let us, for one time, give some serious thought to the welfare of thousands of farmers in this country.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman vill state it.

Mr. BOREN. If we vote down the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, will it then come up in the regular procedure?

The SPEAKER. It takes its place on the calendar.

All time has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5988).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PETERSON of Florida and Mr. CANNON of Florida) there were—ayes 134, noes 32.

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEETING AT 11 O'CLOCK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday of next week to call the bills on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM and Mr. PATTON asked and were given permission to extend and revise their own remarks in the RECORD.

LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4139) to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any matter which relates to labor disputes and conditions in national defense. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous questions shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, as the Members understand, this is a rule to make in order the consideration of some kind of antistrike legislation. I take it that everybody is agreed that the rule should be passed and that these proposals should have full consideration. I have not consulted with the gentleman from Virginia, and I beg his pardon for breaking in in this manner, but I wonder if it will not be agreeable to the gentleman from Virginia and the ranking minority member that the gentleman from Virginia move the previous question on the resolution in order that we may proceed with the debate instanter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I may be able to do that a little later, but I have promised some time, and I think this rule is of such a nature that it requires some explanation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for the consideration of the so-called Vinson antistrike bill. I want to explain to you the parliamentary situation, in view of the fact that this is a very unusual rule.

You know we have had discussions on and off the floor on the question of strikes in defense industries every since the defense program began. There has been a great demand for legislation, so the Committee on Rules, in granting a rule on the Vinson bill, made it just as broad as possible so that every phase of this subject could be considered and would be in order when the matter came to the floor.

There will be at least three proposals for legislation. There will be the Vinson bill, the so-called Ramspeck bill, and the so-called Smith bill. In view of the latitude given in the rule, I have consulted with the Parliamentarian and have a statement from him which is agreeable to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and to me. So that the House may know before we start just how this matter is to be considered, I shall read the statement, which is somewhat brief:

When the bill H. R. 4139 is taken up for reading under the 5-minute rule, it will be in order for Mr. RAMSPECK, after the first section of that bill has been read, to move to strike out the section and insert the provisions of H. R. 6137, as a substitute for the bill—that proposition will then be pending as the original amendment. Under rule 19 of the House it would then be in order for any Member to offer an amendment to the Ramspeck proposal and it would be in order for Mr. SMITH to offer the provisions of his bill as a substitute for the Ramspeck proposal. The Smith proposal would then be open to an amendment. Thus it will be seen that the four amendments allowed by rule 19 could conceivably be pending at one and the same time. If they were all pending at the same time the order of voting on them would be as outlined on page 6 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, to wit: The question would first be put on agreeing to the amendment offered to the Ramspeck bill; then the vote would come on the amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. SMITH. Following that, the vote would come on the Smith substitute for the Ramspeck amendment, and, finally, the vote would come on the Ramspeck amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. It must be understood, however, that any number of amendments may be proposed to the Ramspeck amendment or the Smith substitute, but not more than one may be pending to each of those at the same time. As one is disposed of by vote, however, another amendment may be proposed. After the Committee of the Whole has perfected both the Ramspeck proposal and the Smith substitute, the vote would first come on the Smith substitute.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Briefly.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I correctly understand that if the gentleman's bill is offered as a substitute and is voted down, it would then be in order for any other Member having a bill to offer it as a substitute?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is correct. The door is wide open for any substitute or amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is one point I want to clear up. There is what is known as the committee print.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the Vinson bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the first section of the so-called committee print is read, then it will be in order to offer H. R. 6137?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; H. R. 4139 is the bill that is under consideration by the terms of the rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is this that bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; H. R. 4139 is the original Vinson bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understood the statement just read by the gentleman from Virginia, prepared by the Parliamentarian, all questions relating to the Smith bill and to the Ramspeck bill will be disposed of before we come to a vote on the Vinson bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, let me say a brief word about some of the bills you are going to have to consider.

Mr. HEALEY. Before the gentleman gets to that, will he yield for one question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Just one question, then I shall have to proceed.

Mr. HEALEY. As I understand, under the rule the Smith bill and the Ramspeck bill both may be offered as substitutes and may be perfected before a vote is had on either one?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. HEALEY. Then, is it possible to introduce any other measure or any other amendment which has no relationship to either the Smith or Ramspeck bills?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. After they are disposed of, I think so.

Mr. HEALEY. They must be disposed of first, under the rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield further, I have been to the document room personally and have been to the desk three times, and have been told that there is no such bill as H. R. 4139 available. I am trying to locate that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry, I cannot help the gentleman. I did not introduce the bill and do not know what became of it. Probably there is so much interest in the legislation that Members have asked for copies of the bill. I would not be surprised if a great many of their constituents have wanted to see copies of strike bills.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry, I will not be able to yield any more, because I have to make a brief statement.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I just wanted to know about a comparison of the bills.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am going into that. I am going now briefly to compare the proposal I have offered and the Ramspeck proposal.

As I understand the Ramspeck proposal, and he will doubtless go into detail about it tomorrow, all that does is to legalize those things which up to now have been going on; that is, the Mediation Board and the seizure of property. In addition to that, it also legalizes something that has happened in all of these cases by mutual agreement and that is stay periods while the negotiations went on. This is all that the Ramspeck bill does. This procedure for a year has proved a failure, as you gentlemen know.

What I propose to offer is a bill to do three specific things, to start back at the core of the trouble instead of starting after the disease has become in its acute stage. I propose to do the thing that many of us have been wanting to do for some time, and that is to freeze the closed-shop status so that your program of defense may not be used for organizational purposes by labor unions. In other words, those shops which are now closed shops will remain closed shops, and those which are now open shops shall remain open shops, as was done in the World War.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the gentleman's bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is my bill.

I think the House would be interested in knowing, on the subject of closed shops, that in a recent Gallup poll, taken purely on the question of whether we should have a closed shop or an open shop, the Gallup poll showed that 77 percent of the people of this Nation favored the open shop.

We then have what are known as jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and boycotts. I seek in my bill to outlaw those three things so far as defense industries are concerned.

In my bill is contained also the provision of the ill-fated May bill, which will prohibit violence during the process of these strikes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

In my bill is also the provision for a fair, democratic strike election by secret ballot, supervised by the Federal Government before these strikes may be called.

In my bill will also be a provision that will require the registration and accounting of funds by all of the labor unions. I believe almost everybody, including the labor unions, say they favor this.

I think the House would be interested in knowing that the Gallup poll took a poll on the question of registration and accounting of the people who handle their funds and they took that poll amongst organized labor and 84 percent of organized labor itself voted in that poll for an accounting of the funds by their leaders.

I think that the House would also be interested in another Gallup poll recently taken. This Gallup poll went so far as to ask the question of whether the voters thought that strikes in defense industries should be absolutely prohibited. I was astounded to find that 64 percent of the workingmen themselves voted for an absolute prohibition of strikes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one more minute.

Seventy-eight percent of all the voters in that poll voted against strikes in defense industries.

There is nothing in any bill that will be pending before you, so far as we at present know, that will prohibit any man from exercising his right to strike.

There are two classes of strikes. There is the usual, ordinary, legitimate strike about wages and working conditions. There are certain types of strikes, like the jurisdictional strike and the sympathy strike, which are not lawful causes of dispute and cessation of work, and I have undertaken in my bill to distinguish between the lawful strike and the unlawful strike, and the unlawful strike is outlawed by this bill, but there will be no criminal punishment. The only punishment that will occur will be that we will say to these unions, "You may exercise all of the rights to strike you want to exercise; you can strike for legal objectives and you can strike for illegal objectives, but if you strike for illegal objectives, we propose to take away from you those special privileges which Congress has heretofore given you in the way of the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] can well say that this is the day he long has sought. When I look at the rule I note that it was reported on May 14, 1941, and has been ripe for action ever since that day. I want to compliment the majority leadership of the House on, finally, being able to get the consent of the White House to bring up for consideration these bills. If persistency and patience are virtues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is indeed well endowed.

The distinguished Member from Virginia has explained what this rule does. I agree with his explanation, but as a practical matter, you can do more under this rule than was outlined by the gentleman from Virginia. This is the ordinary rule, bringing this bill up for consideration under the 5-minute rule. There is one exception, and that exception is this: It shall be in order to consider, and so forth, "without the intervention of any point of order any matter which relates to labor disputes." Any matter which relates to labor disputes will be in order as an amendment to the Vincent bill. Second, "and conditions in national defense." Any matter pertaining to conditions in national defense will be in order as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman interpret that as broad enough to bring up at all, in connection with this question, the matter of profiteering? That is certainly related to national defense.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan will not be the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, but if the gentleman from Michigan were presiding at the time, he would be compelled to hold that conditions which relate to national defense are germane, and that anything that relates to national defense is germane. There will be a question of fact in each case. That was the intent of the Rules Committee at the time the rule was drafted. So this is a very unusual rule.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would it not be possible, from a reading of the rule, that amendments could be offered so that the bill could go on under the discussion of amendments under the 5-minute ad infinitum?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. There is no question but that the bill contemplates extensive and sufficient consideration under the 5-minute rule. However, I do not contemplate that anybody in this House will attempt to continue the consideration of the bill for an unusual length of time. If there is merit in the type of legislation which this rule makes in order, then the legislation should be placed upon the statute books at the earliest opportunity, so that the country might benefit by the legislation.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. As the gentleman has pointed out, any matter that can be considered as coming within the broad language involving national defense is in order to be considered under this rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The rule, of course, was reported out last May. It is now brought up in December, and under the broad language of the rule I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will agree that any matter such as the Smith bill, so-called, the recently revived Vinson bill, or any other restrictive legislation can be offered somewhere along in the reading of the bill as a germane amendment to the language of the Ramspeck or Labor Committee bill. I ask the gentleman this question: With a matter of such great importance—important to the country and to the world—does the gentleman from Michigan subscribe to the thought that this is good conduct on the part of the Congress to so hurriedly consider the matter that violates the very God-given, fundamental rights of labor, as established not in the last few years but over the period in which man has toiled from the beginning of time? I merely point out to the gentleman—and thank him for his kindness in permitting me to intervene—that this is so sacred an institution that it involves the human family and I think it is only becoming to the Congress of the country that we give more time to it. I merely point out,

in conclusion, that the rule provides for 2 days of general debate. It is now 4:20 o'clock, so that there is very little time in the first day, and I again point out that there seems to be a great demand to hurry. I ask the gentleman to comment, if he will, about that particular requirement, and ask that we give Tuesday and Wednesday to general debate.

Mr. MICHENER. I am glad to respond to the remarks of one of the distinguished leaders on the majority side.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I accept the compliment, although it is unearned.

Mr. MICHENER. It is a well-deserved compliment and is not unearned. I accept the gentleman's apology for the delay in bringing this matter up. I wondered why the delay from May 14 until December 1, before the rule is brought up. I am glad to have the gentleman's explanation, that because of the importance of this matter it has been carefully considered for all of these months.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I want to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I do not know that it has been considered from May to December, that is I do not know that any standing committee of the House has considered it.

Mr. MICHENER. The Committee on Naval Affairs gave long study to the Vinson bill, the Judiciary Committee considered the Smith bill and the Labor Committee advises that it has carefully considered the Norton-Ramspeck bill. Yes; there has been ample committee consideration of the whole national defense labor and strike difficulties.

It seems to me that 2 days' general debate is sufficient on a subject with which every Member of the House is familiar and which has been one of the live questions of the country and before the Congress for at least a year. There is little merit in insisting that we should have more than 2 days' debate. I feel sure that the leadership of the House will see to it that there is adequate time for consideration under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Is not this rule broad enough so that amendments even as to firing squads and concentration camps could be considered? Is it not broad enough that even under this rule a declaration of war could be considered if it was in the interest of national defense?

Mr. MICHENER. Well, I do not think it was quite that broad. I know of no Member who contemplates anything like that unless my good friend from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] has in mind firing squads, concentration camps, and things of that kind. We should not approach the consideration of this subject in that frame of mind. We should approach consideration of this whole matter as nonpartisan, patriotic Americans, interested in one thing, and that is national defense and the best interests of our country and all the component parts of our society—labor, capital, and all the rest.

I am not going to take any more time. When section 1 of the Vinson bill is read, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] will undoubtedly be recognized by the Presiding Officer to offer his bill as an amendment. Then the Ramspeck bill will be perfected as an amendment. That means that any amendment germane to the Ramspeck bill will be in order. After the Ramspeck bill is perfected as an amendment, then the Smith bill, as I understand it, will be offered as a substitute for the amended Ramspeck amendment. The Smith amendment can be perfected exactly the same as the Ramspeck amendment. Then the vote will be between the Smith bill as amended and the Ramspeck bill as amended. If one of those bills is adopted by the House, then, as the various sections of the Vinson bill are read for amendment, they will be stricken out.

I think as a practical situation, that is what is going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I notice that some comment was made on the 2 days' general debate accorded under the rule. Would the gentleman consider that meant Tuesday and Wednesday or just Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. MICHENER. I think under the rule—speaking strictly from a parliamentary standpoint—the day upon which a bill is called up is a day, under the rules. So I think if this bill is called up today, when the House adjourns tonight, 1 day, under the rules, will have been exhausted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4139, to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4139, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it was Victor Hugo who said, "There is one thing which is stronger than armies and navies and that is an idea when its hour has come."

The hour has come and the American people are determined that Congress enact legislation dealing with strikes.

The uppermost thought in the minds of the people, the most discussed issue by the men and women of this country in every walk of life today is the strikes that have occurred and the strikes which are taking place in national-defense industries.

I measure my words when I say, something has got to be done about these strikes, and if this Congress does not deal with this issue in a sane and constructive manner, as sure as the night follows the day, the American people will put a Congress here that will have the courage and judgment to meet this issue which is challenging the very life of the Nation.

The temper of the American people is clear. They are not going to tolerate any further appeasement. It has crystallized on this subject. The issue is clear cut and the hour has come to meet it. It is simply national safety against the selfish interests of labor organizations. No group, whether it be labor or capital, can be allowed to imperil this country. No group can put its own selfish interest ahead of the national safety.

It is unquestionably true that the bulk of organized labor in this country is as loyal and patriotic as any other group of citizens.

The rank and file want to work and they know that today wages are at a record high level; yet, nevertheless, there is a small minority of troublemakers who bring on strikes.

This minority is digging unionism graves.

The President said:

> That small minority is a menace to the true cause of labor itself, as well as to the Nation as a whole.

No longer can the responsible heads of organized labor control these minority groups, therefore, the sovereignty of government must be used to preserve the Government.

The country is not going to permit labor or capital to take advantage of the national needs and the national danger. The time has come when "Strikes shall cease," must be the American slogan.

Anything less spells "France." Anything less spells death to England. Anything less means that the sailors now engaging the enemy on the high seas will not have equipment necessary to fight with. Anything less means that we will not become the arsenal of democracy.

This problem with which the House is now being asked to deal did not arise suddenly.

It is not something which has forced itself upon public attention overnight.

The Committee on Naval Affairs has been profoundly disturbed by this problem and the failure of Congress to meet it for almost a year.

That committee is charged with the responsibility of providing the United States with the most powerful navy in the world—a navy that will be supreme in both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans; a navy that will be America's first line of defense—and of getting that navy quickly. The committee in the last 2 years has authorized appropriations in excess of $10,000,000,000 and it is now conducting an investigation into the manner in which these appropriations are being expended.

The committee could meet tomorrow and report a bill authorizing the appropriation of another $10,000,000,000. But all the money in the United States will not drive one rivet into the side of a battleship, will not bring into being one shell casing, will not produce one ounce of armor plate if the great Government of the United States by inaction permits itself to be brought to its knees by the concerted action of powerful and irresponsible bodies of men.

With the success of the naval expansion program seriously threatened by action of this sort, I introduced a bill in the House last January to deal with this problem. But at that time we were importuned—wait—wait—wait—give labor an oportunity to work this thing out for itself voluntarily. The man-days of labor lost in defense industries as a result of strikes in January was appalling. In February it was still wait—wait—wait—wait—labor has not yet had sufficient time to work out this problem. In February the man-days lost was greater than in January. In March the American people became alarmed when a wave of new strikes broke out all over the United States.

At the height of this alarm the President by Executive order created the National Defense Mediation Board.

In April the Committee on Naval Affairs determined that legislation was essential, that labor had been granted more than sufficient opportunity to voluntarily make the sacrifices that most other elements in our country had already been compelled to make by legislation, and reported to the House the bill which we are now considering.

Again we heard wait—wait—wait; labor was making progress; already several large organizations had entered into no-strike agreements with the Government. Then followed the North American strike, the Kearny strike, the Bethlehem strike. Over wages? No. Over hours of employment, over safety conditions? No.

This great defense effort of the American people was being torpedoed by those who saw in it the opportunity to feather their own nests—the opportunity to compel every workingman in the United States to pay tribute to some labor organization for the privilege of working for his country in the hour of its peril.

Then we had the big coal strike in the Appalachian field, and we thought that had been settled. But we were only kidding ourselves. By our inaction and temporizing we were encouraging the very thing that we all hoped we would not be compelled by legislation to prevent.

And finally in the last few weeks we have had the threat of a great railroad strike, the effect of which on our defense program would be a catastrophe.

We have witnessed the spectacle of the Chief Executive of the greatest and most powerful Nation on the face of the earth being compelled to make abject and humiliating pleas to a man lost to all sense of responsibility who alone had it in his power to close down every steel furnace in the United States and took it upon himself to do so.

Truly the great Government of the United States has been brought to its knees—not by enemies from abroad—but by the selfish and irresponsible action of a few of its own people.

The hour has come for this Government to reassert its sovereignty.

This Congress has already too long delayed the consideration of legislation of the character now before us.

Others have been compelled to make sacrifice. We did not ask our boys to voluntarily go into the armed forces of the Nation at $21 per month, nor to voluntarily extend their period of service an additional 18 months.

At the next session of Congress, if I have anything to say about it, legislation is going to be enacted limiting the profits which can be made on defense contracts. There are going to be no war millionaires if I can prevent it.

And there are going to be no more of these unwarranted interruptions in defense production if I can prohibit them.

If preventing such interruptions means sacrifices on the part of labor it is a sacrifice which labor is going to have to make—and make by law—in the same manner as sacrifices by others have been and will be required.

The enactment of legislation of the character under consideration is essential if the United States is to be preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia yields back 3 minutes, having consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, on the 17th day of February, just about 10 months ago, the Committee on the Judiciary commenced hearings on the question of delays in the national defense preparations. Many hearings were conducted. Much testimony was adduced. Out of those inquiries came a bill, H. R. 5218, which I introduced some months ago.

I say to you members of the Committee if it had not been for one man, and one man alone, John L. Lewis, seeking to make an issue over something that is as dead as any issue possibly could be, we would not be in this Committee this afternoon considering this type of legislation. The closed-shop issue is a dead one. Let me point out to you why.

The union shop and the closed shop only serve two purposes: One, to prevent a man from losing his job because of union activity; and, second, to insure collection of the dues of the members of the union, thereby preserving the union.

As to the first reason, for the closed shop, the National Labor Relations Act took care of that. As to the collection of dues, with the check-off in universal use, that is no longer necessary.

So I repeat what I said, that John Lewis was willing, with our national defense at its hour of greatest peril, to make an issue of something that was purely academic. But for that we would not be here today.

This bill which I introduced, H. R. 5218, and which I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, reads as follows:

Whereas it has always been and is the policy of Congress to protect competition and the free flow of goods, to foster invention and enterprise, to protect the consumer from artificial restraints, and to secure freedom and equality of economic opportunity for the purpose of maintaining a free economy; and

Whereas the Congress finds that such purpose and policy are imperiled and jeopardized, that the productivity of the country necessary for the health, comfort, and safety of its citizens is diminished, that the right of the employee to choose representatives is weakened, that the compensation and employment of labor are curtailed, and the attainment of legitimate labor objectives made more difficult, and that consumers are exploited and the functioning of a free and competitive system is impaired and the military defense of this country is dangerously retarded by strike and boycotts of labor organizations and by agreements between such organizations and their employers which are not designed to further the lawful objectives of labor organizations; and

Whereas the Congress specifically finds that—

(1) stoppage of work on Government orders pending mediation proceedings seriously impedes the military defense of the Nation;

(2) jurisdictional strikes between labor organizations burden and obstruct free flow of interstate commerce;

(3) strikes and boycotts imposed by labor organizations in order to place unreasonable restrictions upon the use in many States and localities of materials and goods produced or manufactured in other States and localities, create interstate trade barriers, and burden and obstruct interstate commerce;

(4) strikes and boycotts imposed by labor organizations in order to retard or prohibit the reasonable introduction of equipment or machinery designed to increase productivity and to further the progress of science and the useful arts, burden and obstruct interstate commerce;

(5) strikes and boycotts imposed by labor organizations in order to compel employers not to bargain collectively with the labor representatives certified as exclusive bargaining representatives pursuant to the National Labor Relations Act defeat the policy, intent, and purpose of Congress expressed in the National Labor Relations Act;

(6) agreements, contracts, and combinations between employers and employees which unreasonably restrain trade by fixing prices, allocating customers, restricting production, and otherwise stifling competition burden and obstruct interstate commerce;

(7) strikes, boycotts, and agreements imposed by labor organizations in order to require employers to pay for unnecessary labor, when such requirements are unreasonable and are not designed to prevent a speed-up system nor to mitigate the transition to new methods of production or distribution, burden and obstruct interstate commerce;

(8) agreements, contracts, and combinations which are intended to eliminate competing employers, burden and obstruct interstate commerce.

Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any labor organization or for the officers, representatives, or members thereof to enter into any contract, combination, in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations if one of the purposes of such contract, combination, or conspiracy is—

(a) to induce or require any employer to deal with, to recognize, or to employ members of, one labor organization instead of those of another labor organization, provided such latter labor organization is authorized

by its members to represent them for purposes of collective bargaining with the employer, and the latter labor organization is free from domination or interference in its formation or administration by the employer, and the employer does not contribute financial or other support to the latter labor organization; or

(b) to induce or require any employer to pay or to give to any officer, agent, member, or representative of a labor organization any money or other thing of value unless the payment is pursuant to publicly announced terms of an existing collective-bargaining agreement and no part thereof is for the personal benefit of such officer, agent, or representative; or

(c) to induce or require any employer to impose or adopt unreasonable restrictions or conditions upon the use of any material, machines, or equipment: *Provided*, That no such restrictions or conditions shall be regarded as unreasonable if they are directly and appropriately related to the wages, hours, health, safety, or working conditions of the employees, or if they are required in good faith as part of a temporary program to retard technological unemployment by providing an orderly change in the methods of production or distribution or to forestall the imposition by the employer of a speed-up system; or

(d) to join or combine with any employer to fix prices, allocate customers, restrict production, eliminate competing employers, monopolize or attempt to monopolize any part of trade or commerce, or to restrain competition or otherwise to restrain trade or commerce.

SEC. 2. Every district court of the United States is hereby authorized to issue restraining orders or injunctions pendente lite or permanent in any case even though it involve a labor dispute where such a dispute is not in pursuit of a lawful labor objective: *Provided, however*, That such labor dispute restrains or threatens to restrain interstate commerce.

SEC. 3. Lawful labor objectives shall include the securing of better wages, hours, health, working conditions, or the protection or advancement of collective bargaining within the limits herein defined, but shall not include—

(1) stoppage in any defense work pending a hearing before the National Defense Mediation Board;

(2) the protection of inefficient methods of production or distribution other than measures designed to insure to labor an adequate and fair return during a transition period when labor-saving devices are being adopted;

(3) a compulsory or coerced employment of additional employees whose employment is required by the union as a method of preventing the adoption of more efficient methods, or for the purpose of eliminating or penalizing competing employers, or for the purpose of preventing the employment of members of a union not dominated or interfered with in its formation or administration by the employer and not supported financially or otherwise by the employer;

(4) the requirement that any employer refrain from bargaining or dealing with or employing members of a union not dominated or interfered with in its formation or administration by the employer and not supported financially or otherwise by the employer;

(5) the requirement that the employer pay bribes, secret payments, or other exactions to any union or any officer, agent, or representative of any union;

(6) the joining or combining with any nonlabor persons or groups to fix prices, control production, or otherwise to restrain trade or commerce;

(7) the fixing of price or the imposition of other restraints upon any commercial as well as noncommercial competition.

SEC. 4. The United States or any person who is affected, injured, or threatened with injury by any such stoppage, strike, boycott, or coercive measure, or by any combination, plan, or conspiracy to effectuate such stoppage, boycott, strike, or other coercive measure, may institute proceedings under this statute in any district court of the United States in any district where acts in connection therewith have been taken or are planned to be taken. Thereupon, the court shall in a summary proceeding, during which proceeding there shall be no stoppage of work, determine whether such stoppage, strike, boycott, or coercive measure or combination, plan, or conspiracy to effectuate such stoppage, boycott, strike, or other coercive measure directly or indirectly burdens, obstructs, or retards trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, or within the district; and if the court shall so determine it shall refer the case to a master, unless it involve a defense activity, in which case it shall be referred to the National Defense Mediation Board, who, after giving reasonable notice, shall grant a hearing to all interested parties, and, within thirty days following the institution of the proceedings, determine and report to the court whether the stoppage, strike, boycott, or other coercive measure, or the combination, plan, or conspiracy to effectuate such stoppage, strike, boycott, or coercive measure, has or is intended to have as one of its purposes a lawful labor objective as defined herein.

SEC. 5. Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the remaining provisions of the chapter and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. All acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this statute are hereby repealed.

I respectfully urge that you examine this bill between now and the time when I offer it as an amendment.

This bill deals with the abuses that we discovered were in existence during the hearings conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary. This bill has nothing to do with lawful labor objectives, and the bill defines what they are: The securing of better wages, hours, health, working conditions, or the protection or advancement of collective bargaining within the meaning of the law. As to those lawful objectives this bill does not apply, but when we get around to those things that everybody admits are wrong, these jurisdictional disputes—and I say although I am sorry to have to admit it, that some of them are caused by some of the representatives of this administration—then any person aggrieved has the right and power to appear before a United States court and make application for a restraining order. This method is as old as our system of government. It places the issue squarely in the hands of the umpire that our form of government selected for all disputes.

I think it is time for this body to direct its attention to the current attempts by a few strategically located labor unions to secure and maintain a monopoly in defense construction. I shall not recite to you all of the facts in connection with the Currier case. You are all very well acquainted with them. Certainly that is the type of work stoppage that it is our duty to do something about.

Mr. Chairman, legislation probably would not be necessary but for the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hutcheson case—and a most tortuous decision it was. It is the law of the land, however, and because of it the Department of Justice is now powerless to act. In this connection I want to pay my respects to the Assistant Attorney General, who has so courageously endeavored to prevent further abuses in the labor movement, Thurman Arnold. He tried, and I think that if the Supreme Court had decided the Hutcheson case as every—well, shall I say ordinary run-of-the-mine—lawyer thought it should have been decided, then perhaps the Department of Justice would have had authority to proceed against work stoppages. Let me read a portion of the decision in the Hutcheson case:

> So long as a union acts in its self-interest, the licit and the illicit under section 20 (of the Clayton Act) are not to be distinguished by any judgment regarding the wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or unselfishness of the end of which the particular union activities are the means. There is nothing remotely within the terms of section 20 that differentiates between trade-union conduct directed against an employer because of a controversy arising in the relations between employer and employee, as such, and conduct similarly directed but ultimately due to an internecine struggle between two unions seeking the favor of the same employer. These conflicts have intensified industrial tension, but there is not the slightest warrant for saying that Congress has made section 20 inapplicable to trade-union conduct resulting from them.

That decision very effectively bound the hands of a branch of our Government that up to that point was making great progress toward eliminating labor abuses. In this bill, H. R. 5218, I think we have very effectively dealt with all of the abuses that have been called to the attention of the people of this country. This bill was drafted by a group consisting of the attorney for the American Business Congress, a small businessmen's organization, the American Farm Bureau, members of the judiciary, and representatives of the Department of Justice; and, significantly enough, many organized labor groups are for this bill. The United Brotherhood of Welders, Cutters, and Helpers is one. A representative of this organization came here from California to call the attention of myself and some of the people interested in this legislation to a situation which exists there of work stoppage directly affecting national defense only because of a dispute not between two labor unions but between members of the same labor union. This bill is intended to put certain labor practices back under the antitrust laws. As a result of this Hutcheson decision this is necessary. Specific union power can be and is being used for the following purposes: First, to force an employer to violate the orders of the National Labor Relations Board. Two of the cases in which the Supreme Court sustained demurrers were based on boycotts having this purpose. Second, to

force an employer to discontinue dealing with one bona fide union in order to give help to another.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. In just a moment.

The significance of this matter for national defense appears in the American Zinc Co. incident in which the C. I. O. threatened to tie up an existing plant if it was not allowed to build the addition to the plant while an A. F. of L. union threatened to stop construction of the new plant for the same company if the work upon the additions were not given to it. As a result the program of plant extension was suspended for 30 days.

Third. To contribute to the private income of union leaders in cases where the means are not flagrant enough to be covered by the Antiracketeering Act. This matter has not yet been taken to the Supreme Court, but the dictum in the Hutcheson decision to the effect that the purpose of a union's action is irrelevant unless it conspires with nonunion groups appears to grant legal exemption.

Fourth. To require employers to refrain from adopting improved methods, particularly in the building industry. One of the cases in which the Court has sustained a demurrer involved a charge that the Hod Carriers Union in Chicago forbade the use of ready-mixed concrete in construction in that city. Cases not yet disposed of, but beclouded by the Hutcheson decision include charges that the electrical union in New York requires that equipment made outside the State be disassembled and reassembled on the job.

Fifth. To fix prices and otherwise restrain commercial competition. Lower court decisions indicate that even where the union has conspired with other groups, there is question whether the law now covers the conspiracy. In Belleville, Ill., the court sustained a demurrer to a charge that local dealers, contractors, and unions used boycott enforced by violence to prevent the erection of prefabricated housing. I am informed that various groups are endeavoring to disguise price-fixing conspiracies as unilateral efforts by unions in the hope of obtaining legal clearance, and specifically that this endeavor was made in the case of the bread conspiracy which is now under indictment in the District of Columbia.

Other parts of the bill which deal with the use of injunctions against stoppages in defense work prior to hearing before the National Mediation Board and against strikes having no legitimate labor objectives are not central to the bill's objectives, but are included and are effectively dealt with.

In our current defense program we have also witnessed with a good deal of admiration the attempts of labor to point out to management and to Government ways of industrial organization which they feel would greatly increase our productive effort. The Reuther plan for the automobile industry, the Murray plan for the over-all organization of the defense program, whatever their limitations in practice, nevertheless represent the emergence of the workingman into full responsible cooperation in making industrial decisions.

However, there is another side of the story. In the growth of the labor movement, as is to be expected when no curbs are placed on the coercive power granted to individuals and groups, many unfortunate practices have developed. In some unions racketeers have seized control and have used the strength of labor organizations to enforce schemes of bribery and extortion. Moreover, short-sighted labor organizers, seeing a chance at easy organization of all the workers in one town, have sold out to employer groups, agreeing to enforce price-fixing schemes in return for recognition by the employers of labor's right to organize. Rival business agents, in an attempt to maximize the amount of work to be done by each individual union, have further made all sorts of ridiculous claims of jurisdiction and have attempted to enforce those claims through strikes, boycotts, and violence. Under the stress of serious unemployment, labor unions in the construction and transportation industries have set up a series of private W. P. A.'s, burdening the productive process with disastrously high cost superfluous labor requirements. And finally, unscrupulous labor officials have exploited their own membership, denying competent workmen the right to work, extorting unreasonable fees, dues, and kick-backs from the members who are privileged to work and denying the right of the membership to democratically choose and control their leadership and their policies.

I am not using my imagination when I make the statement that these activities which are characteristic of a few unions strategically situated as middlemen in the productive and distributive systems are a serious burden to the consuming public and thwart our efforts to achieve all-out production in peace and war. Economists of the Department of Justice have estimated that such practices on the part of building trades and transportation unions cost the economy in excess of $1,000,000,000 annually.

But let me get specific. Let me give you a few examples of each kind of restraint which I have heretofore mentioned.

Probably the most dramatic of all of these restraints is the strike of one union against another—struggles between the officials of two great unions to obtain as many dues-paying members as possible. I have already cited two examples of the effect of this kind of dispute. But there are many more. In the middle of August the Detroit transit system was brought to a standstill because of a struggle between two unions, one in the A. F. of L. and the other in the C. I. O.

It seems incredible that defense production should be held up by dispute between rival labor organizations involving only a few hundreds of dollars' worth of work. But, gentlemen, this is the habit into which shortsighted labor leaders fell prior to the war and it is only natural for them to carry on their prewar prejudices however idiotic.

Let me give you a few more examples of the jurisdictional dispute. In St. Louis in 1939, the Anheuser-Busch Co. contemplated a $750,000 expansion in its plant capacity. This company had for years been a 100-percent union plant. It had negotiated an agreement with the International Association of Machinists which granted to the machinists the right to install all machinery. This was in line with a decision by the A. F. of L. which put this kind of work within the jurisdiction of the machinists. Anheuser-Busch also had an agreement of many years' standing with the carpenters which provided among other things, that any dispute between them and the carpenters would be settled by arbitration. In the spring of 1939, the carpenters decided that they wanted the work of installing the machinery to be put into the new plant. The company was in an impossible position. If they acceded to the demands of the carpenters they would be violating their agreement with the machinists. If they did not accede to the demands of the carpenters they would be faced with a very strong and bitter strike. After endless negotiations during which time the Anheuser-Busch Co. exhausted every means they could to settle the controversy, the carpenters finally went out on strike in June 1939, because the company refused to guarantee them preference in jurisdiction over the machinists. Negotiations continued through the summer, but in September, unwilling to launch the expansion program without the use of union carpenters, the company abandoned its plan to expand its plant. Nobody gained, everybody lost. If the carpenters had permitted the expansion to go through on the basis of previously negotiated contracts, the St. Louis carpenters would have had a great deal more work than that involved in the rather small job of installing machinery.

In the fall of 1939 the facts in this instance were presented to a Federal grand jury who returned an indictment charging the leaders of the carpenters' union with violation of the Sherman Act. But in February of this year in the decision heretofore quoted, the Supreme Court threw out the indictment, saying in effect that the power of economic coercion which a labor union is able to obtain is subject to none of the curbs which the antitrust laws place on other groups.

Here is another example. In Hoquian, Wash., both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. carried on long and expensive campaigns to organize the workers in the plywood industry. Finally an N. L. R. B. election resulted and the majority of the Harbor Plywood Corporation chose the C. I. O. union to represent them in their relations with the company. The officials of the Harbor Plywood Corporation thereupon bargained and signed contracts with the C. I. O. union in keeping with the National Labor Relations Act. You would think that an N. L. R. B. election would settle a dispute of this kind but the carpenters in various cities immediately instituted a boycott against the Harbor Plywood Corporation and refused to work on plywood manufactured by this company. Again there was nothing for the company to do. It had to comply with the order of the N. L. R. B. but in so

complying it was deprived of its market in many large cities.

In this case, too, the facts were presented to a Federal grand jury, who returned an indictment which charged the carpenters' union with misuse of the power of economic coercion. In April of this year, however, the indictment was thrown out by the Supreme Court.

Here is another instance. Certain transport companies in New Orleans were ordered by the N. L. R. B. to bargain collectively with members of the C. I. O. Transport Union, but the Building and Construction Trades Council of New Orleans set itself up above the United States Government and refused to accept deliveries by any of the transport firms who employed C. I. O. labor. Again the employer was helpless, faced with the threat of either contempt proceedings in court or loss of market.

In this case, likewise, a Federal grand jury returned an indictment charging violation of the Sherman Act. Again the Supreme Court refused to permit the complained-of activities of the offending union to be curbed.

These examples could be multiplied many times, but I think they are sufficient to convince you that somebody should do something about jurisdictional strikes. The leader of the great American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green, has protested his inability to do anything about it. Gentlemen, we can do something about it. We can declare such strikes of one union against another an illegal use of trade-union power, and the Department of Justice can thereupon proceed against them in exactly the same way as they proceed against other unreasonable restraints of trade.

Another case which was recently called to my attention is particularly ludicrous. In Brooklyn, N. Y., a plasterers' union struck on a construction project because metal arches had been used rather than wooden arches. The wooden arches would require more plaster and more time spent in working around the corners.

This kind of activity was one which the Department of Justice considered not to be exempt from prosecution under the Sherman Act. Accordingly, a Federal grand jury returned in June 1940 an indictment against certain officers of Chicago building-trades unions, charging them with preventing the introduction of the use of ready-mixed concrete in the Chicago area. In every other city in the country the process of premixing concrete has been substituted for the outmoded process of mixing on the job, with savings in time and money, but the Chicago unions have insisted on their right to take all the time in the world mixing concrete by an outmoded process. Among other things, the grand jury charged that the unions in Chicago instructed their members not to work upon any paving or building project in Chicago where truck mixers were used in the production of concrete, that the union officials warned manufacturers of truck mixers that they were not permitted to sell truck mixers in Chicago, and they warned prospective purchasers of truck mixers that the use of truck mixers in Chicago was prohibited.

However, in April of this year the Supreme Court, without hearing arguments, threw out this indictment, presumably on the ground that such activities do not constitute a violation of the antitrust laws.

And finally, the great revolution of our generation in the construction industry, a revolution which potentially can bring the benefits of mass production to home owners and laboring men, namely the development of prefabricated housing, has been sabotaged in one community after another by local building trades who refuse to permit union men to work on such developments.

This situation is most dramatically presented in a grand jury indictment brought by a Federal grand jury in East St. Louis, Ill., against local millwork firms and union officials. This case was brought to a head by the attempt of a prefabricated housing manufacturer to introduce his development in East St. Louis. He found upon attempting to get labor that the local millwork firms and the building trades had agreed that the only millwork to be used in the East St. Louis area would be that manufactured by local union labor. For months this builder attempted to get A. F. of L. building tradesmen to work on his project. Finally despairing, he turned to the newly organized C. I. O. construction workers and asked them to do the work. Whereupon, so the grand jury charged, the A. F. of L. unions violently assaulted and beat the workers who were not affiliated with them, threatened violence and bodily harm to members of their families, threatened to destroy materials brought to the job.

Despite these facts, the district court in the eastern district of Illinois, following the edict laid down in the Hutcheson case, ruled the activities charged against the unions did not violate the antitrust laws. Although clothed in judicial restraint, Judge Lindley's decision is an urgent plea for clarification of the law. Gentlemen, the Hutcheson decision is a new force let loose on the judicial world. At this point we do not know what, if any, activities of labor unions are subject to Federal prosecution. Congress is the proper body to clarify this situation.

Another type of restraint imposed by labor unions on efficient processes is one of particular importance to low-income consumers and the farmers. In the trucking of foodstuffs, a whole raft of unnecessary charges are imposed by labor unions which cut down on the farmers' income and increase the cost of food to the consumers. In a nation where a substantial proportion of the population suffers from inadequate diet, such hijacking of the cost of food is criminal.

In New York City the over-all cost of delivering fruits and vegetables from freight car to retail store is $112 more per carload when delivery is taken through the lower Manhattan Market where such practices are prevalent than when delivery is taken through other markets where such practices are less prevalent. These exorbitant costs are merely a product of an attempt to pile onto the cost of raising and delivering foodstuffs the cost of maintaining a work relief program for all of the truckers in New York City.

A trucker entering New York City who is not a member of the New York local, regardless of whether he maintains membership in another union or not, must hire a New York local union driver upon reaching the outskirts of the city. This driver does not work at all but merely goes along for the ride. Upon reaching his destination, the out-of-town trucker is neither permitted to do the unloading himself nor to get the local union driver to do the unloading. On the contrary, he must hire at least one additional union workman for that specific purpose. The charge for this is $9, regardless of the time it takes.

These facts were charged by a Federal grand jury in 1938. In a subsequent trial leaders of New York Teamsters' Local 807 were convicted and fined in a district court. Some were sentenced to prison. Nevertheless, this conviction was reversed in the Circuit Court of Appeals in April of this year, following the line laid down in the Hutcheson and other decisions. Let me quote from the decision of the circuit judges sitting in the Second Circuit:

> The evidence was such that the jury might have found the following facts. * * * Large quantities of merchandise enter the city of New York from other States in motortrucks owned and operated by individuals and corporations engaged in the trucking business who employ their own truck drivers to bring the trucks into the city—generally to warehouses on the west side—and to unload them. The accused objected to this and insisted that they should either drive and unload, or should at least unload, all trucks entering the city from outside the territorial jurisdiction of the union. For this service they demanded $9.42 for each large truck, and $8.41 for each small one, these being union wages for a full day's work. The operators resisted these demands, but the accused forced their claims upon them in some instances by actual violence to their drivers and trucks; in some by threats of such violence; in others by persuading receiving clerks not to receive the loads. At times the operators refused to allow the accused to have any part in the handling of their loads; more often they let them do some of the unloading; but in almost all cases they were forced to pay the full day's wage.

Despite these findings of fact the judges ruled:

> The convictions under the Sherman Act cannot stand after the decision of the Supreme Court in *Apex Hosiery* v. *Leader*.

Gentlemen, I say to you in all sincerity that these practices are too expensive for the farmer, the small businessman, the consumer to bear. The inevitable result must be a monopoly in the business of hauling foodstuffs, a criminally low return to the farmer for his labor, a criminally high cost to the consumer for his food.

The power granted to labor unions by public opinion and legislative enactment has been further misused by union leaders and business groups to fix prices, control production, freeze channels of distribution, to set up interlocality trade

barriers, to limit the number of firms which are permitted to engage in business, to eliminate small competitors, and to prevent new firms from entering the field.

Here is a clause in a union contract signed by building-trade contractors and building-trade unions in a midwestern city:

> Any contractor not a member of the party of the first part may receive benefits and assume the obligations of this agreement by becoming a member of the party of the first part or by signing this agreement and paying to joint arbitrary board a membership fee of $100 and to the party of the first part for term of this agreement his customary fees and dues.

This is a common clause in union agreements in the building trades. It forces independent contractors either to become members of the contractors' association or to pay $100 for the privilege of signing the contract plus the fees and dues ordinarily charged by the contractors' association. It is an obvious arbitrary restriction on the right to do business.

Let me give you an example of the way a union acting independently can prevent a new firm from being organized or an out-of-town firm from doing business. On the west coast a former union lather thought up a new way of manufacturing lath which would save labor and considerable expense. He set up a manufacturing establishment in one city using A. F. of L. union labor exclusively, but lathers of another city excluded his material because it was not manufactured by members of their local and because it required less labor to install.

Finally, we come to the blackest of all the types of misuse of power by labor officials, namely, the use of labor's strength to enforce systems of graft, extortion, and racketeering; the milking of union membership through the charging of outrageous fees, dues, and special assessments; and the denial to union rank and file of their right to choose and control the officials who shall lead them.

Some initiation fees are notoriously high. The glazier's union in Chicago charges $1,500. The motion-picture union in Cleveland charges $1,000. The truckers in Seattle charge $500. Sometimes when a local union cannot fill the demand for jobs, instead of admitting new members they charge nonunion men for the right to work, levying a daily fee of $1 or $2 for a working permit, like the electricians at Fort Meade. The New York Times has estimated "take" of one union at Fort Meade from admission charges was over $400,000.

In a southern town, union members have charged that the business agent uses the power of organized labor to increase the business of companies in which he has a financial interest; that he imposes arbitrary charges upon the membership and will permit them no accounting as to his use of it. These rank and filers charged that the business agent brought in a number of out of towners immediately prior to an election, gave them membership cards to insure his election, coerced and intimidated rank-and-file members into voting for him, and after the election was over he drove out of town those members who had voted against him by denying them right to union membership and black listing them on every job they were able to get. Physical violence was also resorted to.

Last month the Plasterers International Union held its first election since 1911.

I have been told by a man from Pittsburgh, Pa., that he attempted to get a job as a painter at the Edgewood, Md., arsenal. The Baltimore business agent for the Painters Union required a cash prepayment of $100 before admittance to the union. This man was perfectly willing to join the union, but naturally, being out of work, he could not afford to pay $100 for joining. Most unions, even where initiation fees are large, permit payment of the fee to be spread out over a period of time. This man was denied that privilege. Not being a union member, and being financially unable to become a member, he was denied the right to work at the Edgewood, Md., arsenal.

A hair-raising story of arbitrary action by union officials has been told by Thurman Arnold, writing for Reader's Digest in June 1941. I quote from this article:

> When individuals do protest, unscrupulous leaders have ways of punishing them. Here's one example. Two men—let's call them Smith and Black—dropped into the Department of Justice the other day. They had been members of a union in Chicago. Dissatisfied with the management, they had made a protest. The management took away their union cards. This was a catastrophe because the union's old-age benefit fund made a membership worth about $5,000. Smith and Black went into court and got an injunction. The union fought the injunction, and during the ensuing litigation Smith and Black went broke. So they gave up their retirement funds and moved to Washington, where, being good workmen, they soon got jobs. As soon as they were established the Chicago union found out about it and told the Washington employer to fire them. He had to comply.
>
> Smith and Black are about 50 years old. They are skilled in their trade. But they can't work at that trade any longer. They are stunned and beaten men. It doesn't take many such examples to prove to the workman that he had better not protest too much against the actions of the union management.

Gentlemen, a rising tide of public opinion is demanding that Congress act to curb the arbitrary use of unlimited power granted labor unions and various racketeers masquerading under the protection of labor unions. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America issued a statement on September 6 to this effect:

> For many years churches and synagogues in America have been giving moral support to organized labor. This has been true also of many secular liberal groups and agencies. It was recognized that labor suffered very gross inequality of bargaining power and to rectify this inequity seemed to be a first requirement. Many persons, however, who entertained only sentiments of good will toward the labor movement, are questioning whether this moral support should not have been accompanied by more candid criticism. No more than any other group of human beings is a labor union immune to the corrupting influence of monopoly power. Many of the practices discussed above are of long standing. They inspire increased resentment, however, in the light of the enormous advantages accorded labor in recent legislation. The bearing of all this on current theological discussion is obvious. One does not have to adopt a pessimistic view of human nature in order to recognize the corrupting influence of power in the affairs of men. The mere redistribution of power will not usher in social righteousness.

Mr. Chairman, to defend the practices of labor unions which I have outlined is a gross misinterpretation of the intent of Congress and of the purpose of labor unionism. To attack them is no more an attack on labor than the traffic laws are an attack on the motorists, the Sherman Act an attack on business, or the due process of law provision in the Constitution an attack on government.

Does this body intend that the transportation system of this country should be controlled by a tight monopoly, that the farmers of this country should have their incomes drastically reduced, that the low-income consumers of this country should be forced to pay exorbitant prices for the necessities of life? Does this body intend that workers in a manufacturing plant shall be denied the right to choose their own representatives merely because their choice does not please the officials of another union located strategically in a position to cut off the market for their products? That small businessmen shall be forced by the irresponsible dictates of labor bosses to disobey the edicts of the N. L. R. B.? Does this body intend that labor's strength shall be used to enforce systems of graft and extortion; that labor's membership shall be denied the right to choose and control its own leaders; that labor's membership shall be milked by unscrupulous leaders who refuse to face the danger of a free democratic election? Does this body intend that the benefits of mass production shall be denied the home builders of this country; that new processes of technology shall be forever kept out of the construction industry? Does this body intend that monopolists masquerading as labor leaders shall be permitted to fix prices, control production, prevent the introduction of new methods of distribution, enforce interstate trade barriers, eliminate small competitors, and deny the right to new firms to enter the market? Mr. Speaker, to intend this would be to deny that the term "restraint of trade" has any meaning.

Many responsible men in trade-unions and public life, while recognizing the evils which I have recited, have insisted that the reform of the labor movement should be left up to the labor movement itself and that Congress should take no action. Gentlemen, I hold the declaration of these activities as contrary to sound public policy to be a function of Congress and not of the trade-union movement itself. The power of one union official to brand another union official a racketeer and thereby expel him from his job would be too good a bet for the racketeers themselves to miss. You may rest assured

that such power in the hands of private groups or private individuals would be misused in the same way that unlimited power in the trade-union movement has been misused in the past. Gentlemen, the men who lead labor are neither unpatriotic nor vicious. Those who control the unions located at strategic points in the productive and distributive processes are merely human beings behaving in the way that any human being will who is granted the right to use coercive power without legal restraints.

Our refusal to act in this crisis would be tantamount to a ghastly vote of "Ja" to the demands for ruthless and irresponsible dictatorship. By taking action now, by plugging up the loophole which has been found in the Sherman Act, our great charter of economic freedom, we can free the labor movement from its greatest weaknesses and once more look upon the Sherman Act as our mighty, traditional bulwark in our war for industrial democracy, in our continuous battle against the private seizure of unrestrained coercive power.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I must yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. I just wanted to express the observation that I believe the paramount issue before the American people today is to try to get unity in our country. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion of what this bill if enacted into law would do so far as the unity of our people is concerned.

Mr. WALTER. I may say to my distinguished friend that he could not look into the faces of 22,000 workers in the greatest steel plant in the Nation turning out munitions and big guns without appreciating and realizing that these men above all others are sufficiently patriotic to go about their jobs no matter what Congress writes on the statute books. Nowhere in the land are there workers who do not place the welfare of America above any legislation. These workers are just as anxious as we are to see that our armed forces are adequately supplied.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. We have four bills now with the presentation of the Walter bill before us. Do the Ramspeck, the Vinson, the Smith bills cover the features that are involved in the Hutchinson case, or is the Walter bill the only bill that covers that particular feature?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think the Smith bill covers it. I am sure the Ramspeck bill does not meet that situation.

I wanted to say something more to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. I think this chaotic condition that exists today is due to the fact that we have no labor policy, for one thing; and, second, labor has no place in the Cabinet at a time when certainly the views of labor should be given every consideration and should not be taken into consideration as they are now through the representations of Sidney Hillman, in whom I have no confidence, and I am just wondering how many workers of this country have any confidence in him.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion, particularly his legal opinion, having served with the gentleman for a number of years on the Judiciary Committee. May I ask the gentleman what he thinks of the constitutionality of antistrike legislation?

Mr. WALTER. Under the thirteenth amendment I do not think we can prevent men from striking for better wages or better working conditions or shorter hours whether the national-defense effort is affected or not. I do not think it is constitutional.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think we can prevent anyone from calling a strike under the provisions of the Constitution the gentleman spoke of?

Mr. WALTER. Of course not. If it is unconstitutional to prevent workers from striking, then it must necessarily follow that legislation prohibiting the calling of a strike is violative of the Constitution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the middle of a cat-and-dog scrap here between the conflicting opinions about one of the most controversial subjects that human nature knows anything about. On the one hand, some of my good friends are convinced, and I am not questioning their sincerity about it, that there should be no legislation whatever on this subject; and, on the other hand, just-as-sincere friends are convinced that they ought to perform a major operation upon the workers of this country and upon organized labor.

I am one of those who up until a short time ago frankly and sincerely thought that labor might work this situation out without legislation. Several times during this session of Congress I have come down into the well of this House and have done what little I could to prevent adoption by the House of amendments tending to restrict the rights of the workers of this country. I did that because I knew what had happened in France and because I knew how hard labor had struggled over many, many years to acquire its present status and the present privileges which Congress has seen fit to give it. I held to the conclusion that we would probably be better off to let them work it out, until quite recently. But after the President of the United States, with all of the patience in the world and with tact and diplomacy, had three times called upon the president of the United Mine Workers to call off a strike in the coal industry of this country and had been defied by that gentleman, I came to the conclusion that the time had come in the United States to find out whether the Government and the country was being run by the duly elected representatives of the people or by John L. Lewis. As far as I am concerned, whenever it comes to a question of deciding between my country and some labor leader or some owner in industry, then I am going to line up with my country.

The Labor Committee week before last began to hold meetings to consider the question what, if any, legislation it should initiate. It has been charged, of course, in some of the newspapers of the country that we did nothing about this matter until we were given permission to do so by the President of the United States. That statement is not correct. The Labor Committee was meeting on this subject before the White House called the conference about which you have read. It so happens that on the day after the White House conference the chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, was confined to her home by influenza and has not since been able to participate in the committee's discussions. On that Tuesday morning the committee, on motion of one of its members, unanimously directed me as acting chairman to draft a bill dealing with this subject.

That bill has been reported and is before the House, known as H. R. 6137. It is what I have described as a middle-of-the-road bill. The criticism has been made of it that it does not do anything that we have not already done except to provide a 60-day period in which a mediation board can issue an order stopping individuals from assisting in a strike. I think that is true. It does not do anything else. I ask the critics of it, however, what else can you do that has any relation to keeping the wheels of industry turning? We can adopt, if the House sees fit to do so, the things that are in the bill of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] or the things that are in the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. But if you will study this question as I have studied it, there are only four steps that I see you can take in an effort to keep industry moving.

First, you can have collective bargaining between the management and the representatives of its employees. If that fails, you can call on the conciliation service of the Department of Labor or some of the States, and if that fails you can have an effort to mediate through the Mediation Board set up in this bill and in some others that will be offered. If all those fail, under the Constitution of the United States there is no power by which we can prevent men from quitting their work. All we can do under those circumstances is take over the plant in the name of the United States and operate it. That is what this bill provides for.

You can provide for accountability regarding the finances of labor unions, you can prohibit the open shop or the closed shop or vice versa, or you can go into the question of combinations in restraint

of trade, monopolies, and so forth, but if the object of this Congress is to keep the wheels of industry turning, the four steps I have outlined, which are the four steps included in this Labor Committee bill, are the only things you can do.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As I understood, the gentleman had a provision in his bill originally that would have required compulsory arbitration. Would the gentleman say that that could not be done?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I did not say that could not be done. The provision we had in the bill did require them to arbitrate, but if they rejected the result of the arbitration the penalty on the manufacturer or the owner of the plant was that the Government would take over his plant, and the penalty to be imposed upon labor was that they would lose certain privileges we had given them by other acts of Congress, including the rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

The difference between that and compulsory arbitration is that under compulsory arbitration you can enforce the award of the arbitrators in the courts. We did not propose that, and I do not believe Congress has any authority under our Constitution to impose compulsory arbitration.

Mr. COLMER. I do not want to impose too much on the gentleman's time, but it seems to me that if you could have some such provision, even the one that the gentleman said would be constitutional, it would give more force and effect to your legislation than the bill now has.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We had it in the bill. The committee left it out because no witness supported it before the committee. The National Association of Manufacturers, represented by Mr. Hook, was just as much opposed to it and just as vigorously opposed to it as were the labor unions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is it not natural for the secretary of the National Manufacturers' Association to be against all regulatory legislation, because he knows his bridge is the next one Congress is going to cross?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He was not against all regulatory legislation. He gave us seven or eight points that he wanted us to put in the bill, but they were directed toward controlling the internal affairs of the labor unions. What we were interested in was to keep the wheels of industry turning so as to produce the implements for national defense.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Certainly, I have no desire to embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is all right.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman care to say to the House very frankly whether or not he would favor such a provision in the bill? Maybe the House would write it in even though the committee did not see fit to do so.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am not in favor of putting it in the bill now. I am going to defend the bill my committee has reported out. Personally, I was in favor of it up until that time.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure that the gentleman still, where the question of his country is involved as against any group, would apply that rule even as against his own committee, would he not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I would not, because we have a committee bill here just as effective as the proposal you have discussed which it is my duty to defend and try to have enacted into law, and I am going to stick by my committee. We have put in this bill in lieu of that a provision which I believe to be just as effective for the purposes for which we are legislating in that we give the Government the right if the dispute is not settled by mediation and otherwise to take over the plant and operate that plant in the interest of national defense.

Mr. COLMER. That applies only to one side of the controversy.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it does not apply to only one side, because the President of the United States has publicly stated that the Government of the United States will not order a closed shop, if that is what the gentleman is getting at.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman has just stated that he is convinced that compulsory arbitration is unconstitutional.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I do not believe we can require labor and management to arbitrate, and enforce that arbitration in any way except by taking away from them something we gave them.

Mr. HEALEY. That would be a sufficient reason for the gentleman not to advocate compulsory arbitration?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have never advocated compulsory arbitration, although it was called that. We did advocate that we require them to arbitrate and, if they rejected the arbitration, then we would take away from them certain privileges or take away from the owner his plant.

Mr. HEALEY. But the gentleman would oppose compulsory arbitration if he were convinced that it was unconstitutional?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I certainly would.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I just wanted to point out that the industrial-court law on compulsory arbitration was tried in Kansas about 1920 or 1922, and it was found unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who preceded him, say that in his opinion it would be unconstitutional to seek to prevent anyone from calling a strike. Does the gentleman think that it would be unconstitutional, or does he not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I hesitate to put my legal judgment up against that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman's bill does state that a strike cannot be called.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; my bill does not state that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. On page 6 of what I believe is the gentleman's bill there appears language to the effect that the Mediation Board can issue an order requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such disputes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right, but you will find we have written in there a saving clause by which we recognize the right of any individual to quit his work.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand that. I am speaking about calling a strike.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I believe we can by an order of the Mediation Board, as provided in here, stop the officers of a union from calling a strike. If in that opinion I differ from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], then we shall just have to differ, because I believe we have that right, and we can enforce it by court order if it becomes necessary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is my understanding that your committee had turned down the various proposals for compulsory arbitration, but I am wondering if the bill your committee has reported does not accomplish the same thing. As I read it, if mediation fails and employer and employees do not agree, it is provided that the Government, acting under the direction of the President, can take the plant over. Then it is also provided in your bill that a defense wage board be set up and that that board then determines the wage that shall be paid and that wage has to be paid. Now, I think that means that the persons running the plant will have to pay the wage and the employees will have to accept that wage if they elect to continue to work in the plant, and what I am wondering about is whether that is not, after all, compulsory arbitration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I do not think it is compulsory arbitration. We are simply providing that instead of letting the Army or the Navy, which so far have taken over the plants the Government is operating, fix the wages in the plant, that we set up a public board appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, whose duty it shall be to fix the wage. We fix the wages in the navy yards by a wage board, and we are providing very much the same machinery here if the Government has to take over a plant. Of course, nobody has to work there if they do not want to, so they are not

compelled to accept that wage, but I think it is much fairer to the workers and better for the country to have this wage board appointed in this manner, owing allegiance to the whole country, fix the wages than to turn it over to the Army and the Navy.

Mr. HALLECK. Do the employees become the employees of the Government when they take it over?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. And will they be paid by the Government?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Rather than by the employer who has theretofore operated the plant?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it will be operated by the Government.

Mr. HALLECK. I was interested in what the gentleman had to say about the different things that might be done to avoid stoppages in defense industries. The gentleman is familiar, of course, with a bill I introduced to relieve an employer of the necessity of taking back an employee who had resorted to willful violation or unlawful destruction and seizure of property in connection with a labor dispute. Does not the gentleman believe that some such action as that by Congress would tend to do away with minority strikes that would not be effective except as violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property is resorted to to make a strike effective?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot see, to be perfectly frank with the gentleman, what connection that has with defense strikes. It might be that in some particular case something of that sort had something to do with the strike.

Mr. HALLECK. Just one further suggestion along that line. We all recall, I think, the North American Aircraft strike in California, when the President, for the first time, called in the troops to clear away a picket line that, apparently, was preventing a majority of the workers from going into the plant and working, as they wanted to do. Now, does not the gentleman believe, in that circumstance, the operation of some such provision as I have indicated might have done much to deter those who were calling the strike from going ahead and making it effective by reason of the means to which they resorted?

Mr. RAMSPECK. As I said to the gentleman, in some particular case, perhaps so, but we are trying to carry on a vast program of national defense, and what we all want to do, I am quite sure, is to keep those wheels moving, keep them from being stopped by labor disputes, and I think if we are to do that we must have the simplest type of legislation we can enact, the one that will create the least friction within the ranks of labor itself, and I am not condoning what has been done by labor in a lot of the strikes in national defense, and never have. In the talks I have made here against the amendments of the gentleman from Virginia, I have condemned them every time because I do not think it is good sense on the part of labor to permit a strike to happen. They are destroying the very public sentiment that gave them these beneficial laws.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. On page 4, under the head of jurisdiction, your Mediation Board gets no jurisdiction until a dispute arises and the Board itself takes jurisdiction. Am I right about that?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then on page 6 comes your stop order and, of course, that stop order cannot become effective until after the Board gets jurisdiction.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now, what happens if a strike is called before the Mediation Board finds out anything about it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. A labor dispute often develops before it has reached the stage of a strike.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Suppose it has reached the stage of a strike.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If it has reached that stage, they can stop it under section 8.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does not this section freeze the status quo of that labor dispute?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Would the gentleman care to explain that?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I will be glad to discuss it.

Under section 8 of the bill, the Board, which is the Mediation Board, when it has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 4, in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, shall have power to issue an order first requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling or assisting in any manner a strike arising out of such dispute.

All right. The gentleman says that freezes the situation if they have a strike and the strike goes on. This Board can issue an order against picketing, and against the payment of strike benefits, or against anything else that is being done to assist in the strike.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman favor that?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Certainly I do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is the gentleman against picketing?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. I am against it where they are trying to mediate. For the purposes of this bill I favor giving the Board authority to say to them, "You must stop interfering with this plant while we are mediating."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope the gentleman will make the language clearer, because I do not so construe it. Of course, if the gentleman will make the language clear, he has a stronger bill than I think he has at the present time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not know how much stronger you can make it than saying "assisting the strike in any manner." Certainly a man picketing is assisting, and by paying a strike benefit, that is assisting in maintaining the strike.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. In a work stoppage, where a vast amount of the employees want to work, but are interfered with by pickets, is it necessary that legislation be enacted to permit the Government to take over that plant?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it is not necessary, but the gentleman knows you cannot stop picketing under the Constitution of the United States. You may regulate it. The Supreme Court has held that it is a right they get under freedom of speech.

Mr. WALTER. I understand that perfectly, but I have in mind the case in California, where the Army took over a plant, and there the work stoppage was caused by picketing.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Does the gentleman think legislation is necessary to meet that situation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not necessarily, of course, but no two labor disputes are exactly alike, and you will not find any ironclad rules that will settle that difficulty. That is the reason I favor people sitting down around the table to settle these disputes. There never has been a labor dispute yet that could not be settled if both parties really wanted to settle it, and if they would sit down in the proper spirit and try to settle it. A strike is just as foolish as a war. There is no sense in it; it does not benefit either side. You are not going to settle a strike by simply curbing the right of labor unions to picket, if that is what the gentleman is getting at.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. I am interested in the question just propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. As I understand it, the committee bill is being discussed by the gentleman, and that provides for a seizure of the plant whenever there is a stoppage of production in the plant, regardless of whether the stoppage is due to labor disorder or other cause.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is not exactly correct. It is whenever the President finds that there has been a failure to settle a dispute, under processes set out in this bill, or by conciliation or collective bargaining, and that it imperils the national defense. Then he can take it over.

Mr. HARNESS. What that means is stoppage of production. The Government has a right to take over the plant if the management fails to cooperate.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. HARNESS. Why is it necessary to give this additional power to take over a plant when the stoppage is not due to the failure of the management to cooperate?

Mr. RAMSPECK. In order to keep the plant working.

Mr. HARNESS. Does the gentleman think it is necessary for the Government to seize a plant, when it is not the fault of the management because production is stopped, in dealing with all these questions of labor, when it could be solved without the seizure of the plant?

Mr. RAMSPECK. How would the gentleman keep it operating?

Mr. HARNESS. They did it out in the North American plant.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Government took over the plant there.

Mr. HARNESS. Yes; the Government took over the plant, but they did not have any statutory authority to seize the plant. What they did was to send the Army in there and police the plant, so that men could go back to work.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The War Department operated it. It is true they used the people working for the company, but it was operated in the name of the United States by the War Department.

Mr. HARNESS. The Government did not assume the control of the plant and did not pay the labor any wages.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman may know more about the details of that than I do.

However, I know that it was taken over in the name of the United States by the United States Army. Lawyers disagree as to whether the Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has that authority. The only statutory authority that the Government has to take over a plant is where the owner of a plant refuses to operate it for national defense purposes.

Mr. HARNESS. The thing I cannot understand about the proposal of the gentleman, if you want simple legislation and you want to solve this one problem, why is it necessary to penalize the management of industry and take it over in the name of the Government, when they are cooperating fully with the program?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, it is not necessary, of course. If you want to let it stand idle you could do it.

Mr. HARNESS. The plant would not stand idle, if the men wanted to work and the Government provided them the protection to go to work.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I see what the gentleman is getting at. He wants to call out the Army in every labor dispute and put them out to break the strike. I am not in favor of that.

Mr. HARNESS. I did not suggest that at all.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, that is the only alternative to the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. HARNESS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Federal Government has no law-enforcing agencies except the Army?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Certainly not; but it is not the duty of the Federal Government to enforce the law in a community. It is the duty of the State.

Mr. HARNESS. But your program would entail that, in addition to seizing the industry and taking it over within itself.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, I think it is the remedy, myself.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The object of this bill, of course, is to keep the wheels of industry turning, as you say, and likewise to do so with the least amount of friction. I am wondering whether the committee had considered machinery similar to that which was used under the N. R. A., which permitted the effective elements within a given industry to formulate a code of fair trade practice, and in that sense, under certain restrictions and limitations, to formulate a fair code of operation. In this instance, it seems to me it would be possible, seeking to get at it along the line of the least amount of friction, to try to get a committee consisting of labor and management and the public who understand the problems in a given industry, and then to arrive at some sane, sensible, and voluntary plan under which they could work.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think I can answer the gentleman. I do not believe that under present conditions, involving the division in the ranks of labor, you could get the two factions to agree on the hour of the day or the day of the week. Ninety percent of all the trouble we are having with labor today is due to the fact that some of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. leaders are more interested in fighting each other than they are in anything else.

Mr. DINGELL. I cannot agree to that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. All right. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. DINGELL. But the gentleman has not answered my question. Has that plan ever been given any consideration?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not in the Committee on Labor.

Mr. DINGELL. I think it should have been.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. These four bills have me somewhat confused. Do I understand the gentleman to say—and I have high regard for the gentleman's legal talent and ability, especially in constitutional matters—that it is unconstitutional for any legislation to forbid a man striking?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. I do not think under our Constitution you can require a man to work.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I further understand the gentleman to say he regarded it as constitutional that we might prohibit the calling of strikes?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. I think we can issue an order, pending mediation, to require a man—we cannot keep an individual from striking. We cannot keep John Jones from striking, but we can prevent anybody from assisting in a strike or maintaining a strike by paying strike benefits, or things of that sort.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman then feel that his bill protects the worker's constitutional rights in that respect and yet adequately and properly bridles the leaders?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The bill, as I see it, goes just as far as we legally can, during the 60-day period in which the Mediation Board has authority to issue a stop order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It goes just as far as we legally can during that period. As I said, we cannot say to worker A, "You have to work." He can quit if he wants to. All of them can quit if they want to. In that way they would have a strike. But we can stop the people who are assisting in maintaining that strike—not the individual himself.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the committee thoroughly understands the position of the chairman, the interpretation of section 8, and I want to say I think he is absolutely correct. That section says—

> after the board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 4, the board in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, shall have power to issue an order requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute.

There is no doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that the board has the authority to prohibit benefit dues, has authority to issue an order to stop picketing, has authority to do anything to prohibit the strike from taking place during the status quo period. Is that correct?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think so, just like a court has the right to issue a temporary injunction to stop people from exercising their rights during a certain limited time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think we ought to be clear on that because the gentleman from Virginia said there was not very much in the bill. I think there is a great deal in the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman. I must now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. The four points raised are the right of collective bargaining and the National Labor Relations Board, these two being provided by statutory enactment, and if I understood the gentleman correctly, his bill goes a step further and sets up a statutory law for the creation of a mediation board and the taking over of plants.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Defense Wage Board function at any time under the gentleman's bill other than when the Government has taken over a plant?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it does not. It is limited to the plant which the Government is operating, which they take over as a result of this legislation, if it passes, or plants taken over under section 9, I believe it is, of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, may I ask this additional question: The gentleman raised one exceedingly important point to me in which he said that the Government would proceed to pay the wages of employees in a plant which is taken over by the Government. Does the Government step in, for instance, like a receiver in bankruptcy and take over all assets and liabilities of that company, working capital and all, and proceed to make disbursements out of the company's working capital and meet the obligations, accounts payable, notes payable, sinking funds, amortization payments, wages, and all? Or just how is that to be worked out?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The Government takes over under this bill, if it passes, in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act. If the gentleman knows what is in that act he can answer his own

question. I have not the details before me. As I understand it, that section of the Selective Service Act goes into detail as to how the Government shall operate in case it is necessary to take over a plant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One further question and I will stop. So far as the gentleman knows there are no appropriations made by Congress for the purpose of meeting wages under such a situation, are there?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; and that is one reason why I think if the Government is going to take over and operate plants, Congress ought to authorize it and deal with it, and let it be on a statutory basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And go into the minutest detail?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so, too.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The Supreme Court, as the gentleman stated, has held that picketing is legal.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did I understand the gentleman to say that under section 8 the Board could issue an order that would prevent some of the workers in a particular plant where there is a stoppage of work from picketing?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, yes. I think it is a well-known practice in courts of equity that people can be stopped temporarily by order of the court from exercising perfectly legal rights pending consideration of a matter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But not permanently.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I merely want to call attention to the fact that section 4 describes the jurisdiction of the court. This section provides that this Board, through the action of the Chairman, can take any of these threatened labor stoppages under the jurisdiction of the Board, not [illegible] specifically excludes any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act. On page 9, line 14, the language of section 11 describing the operation of certain plants in the interest of national defense—the language of the bill the gentleman is now describing—provides that if the parties to the labor dispute fail to come to any accord then the President in his discretion shall have power by order on behalf of the United States to take immediate possession of any establishment or facility including any transportation or communication company.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct. The committee deliberately put that language in so that if they do not settle this railroad strike the President of the United States will have authority to take over the railroads.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I wondered why railroads were excluded from the jurisdiction of the Board.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Because we have the Railway Labor Act which takes very much the same process that we propose here for industrial disputes; but the Railway Labor Act does not go the last step that we are proposing here and therefore we put in this bill the right to take over transportation and communication facilities.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I must go ahead. I have taken too much time already.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sorry but I just cannot yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRADLEY of Philadelphia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not now. I want to have a few words to say about this myself.

We have brought you a bill here and if I may have the attention of the committee I want to outline it briefly. This bill provides for the normal process first of settling labor disputes, that is by collective bargaining as contemplated by the National Labor Relations Act. If that fails then it is provided that the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor shall step in.

If that fails, then we give to this Mediation Board, set up just about as it is today, statutory authority with the right to compel the attendance of parties and witnesses, as well as the production of papers and records, and the further right for a period of 60 days to issue a cease-and-desist order to stop the labor dispute while it is trying to mediate. These are the simple processes laid down in this bill.

If all of that fails we provide statutory authority in the President of the United States, in his discretion, to step in and take over the plant. If he does that, while the plant is being operated by the United States Government the wages in the plant will be fixed by a board of three appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and they will decide the question of wages.

It is a simple bill. It does not go as far as a lot of people would like to go. It perhaps goes further than some of my friends would like to go. I say to you quite frankly that it has no support, so far as I know, from any organized labor group. The United States Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the plant-seizure provision. So it is not a bill written in the interest of any group, so far as I know. It is a bill written in the interest of keeping the wheels of industry turning by the simplest possible process, upsetting as little as possible the normal procedure between employees and employers. That is the bill we have brought to you, and that is what the Labor Committee offers to you in an effort to help solve this situation.

I want to say one or two things about certain comments that have been made with reference to Congress legislating on this subject. My friend, the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Green, testified before our committee, as did Mr. Carey the secretary of the C. I. O. and one of the representatives of the Railroad Trainmen. They all opposed any legislation. They said, "Leave it to us and we will work it out in a voluntary way." I said to those gentlemen, all of them, "You have had a year and a half to work this thing out. I had hoped you would, but you have not done it. We are still having strikes."

Mr. Green showed us where the Metal Trades Division and the Construction Division of the A. F. of L. solemnly convened and said, "We will not have any more strikes," yet we all know they have had strikes, and he admitted they could not do anything about it. He admitted he could not settle this situation about the welders who are threatening to strike. The representative of the C. I. O. admitted they have not been able to keep all of their people from striking.

There are only about 2 percent of organized labor responsible for this trouble, and they cannot be controlled by the responsible leaders in their own organization; therefore, I have come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when we have to step in with the strong arm of the law for the safety and the protection of our country and in the interest of 98 percent of labor itself.

Unfortunately, and I think upon reflection he will want to retract the statement, Mr. Green said in a speech the other night that labor would rebel if Congress passed legislation. I do not believe that statement applies to 98 percent of the workers of this country. I cannot believe it. In my opinion, they are just as loyal and just as anxious to maintain production in defense plants as anybody else. All of the witnesses who represented labor before our committee pointed out that the strikes in this country were no greater than they were in Great Britain, that Great Britain had not imposed legislative restrictions, but, of course, we all know they do regulate labor unions in Great Britain to a greater extent than we do. May I say to my friends in the labor movement that Great Britain has been in this war over 2 years and it has not yet won a major battle, so that is no criterion for the United States. If we have undertaken a job of helping to stop Hitler, we have to do a better job than Britain has done so far.

I have made up my mind, Mr. Chairman, and I am not trying to tell any of the Members what to do, that the time has come in this country when we must find out whether or not Mr. Green knew what he was talking about when he said labor would rebel. I do not think he did. However, if that is true, I ask this solemn question: Is it not better for the people of the United States to find it out now than to wait until perhaps we get engaged in a two-ocean war? If we are going to be faced with a rebellion in the ranks of labor in this country, and I do not believe we will be, or if there is any question about it, we had better find it out now before we get any deeper into this situation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will sanely and calmly pick out what it wants from the various proposals that are going to be offered, remembering that the one purpose we have in mind is to keep the

wheels of industry turning. This is not the time, in my judgment, to go into a comprehensive scheme of rewriting the whole labor law of the United States. I do not believe this is the proper time to do that. I believe this is the time to concern ourselves solely with the processes of keeping the industrial capacity of the United States in use every day and every hour of every day in order that we may carry out the commitments that this Congress has made. It is a foolish thing to spend $50,000,000,000 unless we can keep our plants moving.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, consideration by the House today of all bills on the subject of labor disputes in national-defense legislation is made in order by the resolution granted by the Rules Committee for consideration of H. R. 4139, which resolution has just been adopted by the House.

This is the bill which was introduced on March 21, 1941, by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and which was favorably reported to the House by the Naval Affairs Committee on April 21. It is to this bill, particularly, that I wish to address myself.

At the request of the Naval Affairs Committee, of which I have the honor to be the acting ranking minority member, a rule was granted for the consideration of H. R. 4139 in the House, and I want to take this occasion to compliment the Rules Committee, a majority of whom are members of the majority party, for granting the rule at that time in the face of the President's vigorous opposition to this bill or to any other bill undertaking to deal with the question of strikes in defense industries. It was due to that opposition, which, as we soon learned, reflected the majority sentiment in the House, that the chairman was prevented from bringing up the bill at that time, even though the rule had been obtained.

Later, and in a further attempt to secure action by the House on the solution of this important problem, the Naval Affairs Committee brought in a supplemental report, in which the text of the original Vinson bill was substituted for a new text, retaining the best features of the original but modifying some of the provisions which a majority of the membership of the House at that time apparently considered to be too drastic.

The bill as modified retained its original number, designated as H. R. 4139, and the rule, granted for its consideration applies, of course, to the substitute bill.

But notwithstanding the modification of H. R. 4139, the opposition of the President still persisted to such an extent that the chairman of our committee, whose ability as a legislative strategist has been seldom equaled in the House, and who has the reputation of almost never being beaten on any proposal which he brings from his committee to the floor, was obliged again to bide his time until the sentiment in the House should become at least a little more favorable to this kind of legislation.

Well, that change of sentiment was not long in coming. Due to the continued increase in strikes in vital defense work, to the growing and insistent popular demand that these strikes be stopped, and partly, perhaps, to the so-called Democratic revolt in connection with the Neutrality Act repeal, the President finally gave the green light to the House majority leaders, and the way was cleared for consideration of this bill.

As a result of this a number of other bills on this subject have been very recently introduced, chief among which are the Smith bill, H. R. 6066, and the Norton bill, H. R. 6075, and the Ramspeck bill, H. R. 6137. Under the pending rule on the Vinson bill, either the Smith or the Ramspeck bill or any other similar bill may be considered, either in whole or in part, as amendments or as substitutes for the Vinson bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are good features in each of these bills. Each of them, as a matter of fact, and particularly the Ramspeck bill, is based on the principles and the main objectives of the Vinson bill, which is the only bill, in my opinion, which has had the benefit of thorough committee hearings and study. Furthermore, the Vinson bill is the only bill which was considered in a committee at a time when it was possible to give calm and unprejudiced study to the subject, uninfluenced by the hectic events which have since transpired and which were the direct reason why, at this late date, the President has been compelled by public opinion to withdraw his opposition to legislation on this subject.

And so, while I have no objection to whatever good features of other bills that may be offered as amendments, and while I shall support every good and constructive amendment that may be offered, I think it is important to remember that the original bill, the Vinson bill, was considered and decided upon and reported to this House at a time and in an atmosphere of comparative calmness, and that for that reason it has a first claim at least on the calm and deliberate consideration of the membership of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand the gentleman is now talking about the original Vinson bill?

Mr. MOTT. I am talking now about the substitute Vinson bill, because that is the bill to which the rule applies. H. R. 4139 is the number of both the original Vinson bill and the substitute Vinson bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is the second bill about which the gentleman is talking?

Mr. MOTT. I am addressing my remarks to the substitute bill covered in the supplemental report, which, of course, was long ago printed and is now in the hands of the Members.

Let me say further that if we had been permitted to call up the original Vinson bill in the House and to pass it when it was first reported in April, the hectic situation to which I have referred and well-nigh disastrous events which have transpired since would have been avoided. There would have been no coal strikes such as we had last month, and there would not now be the threatened strikes in aircraft factories and other defense industries to damage and hamper and weaken the ability of the people of the United States to perfect and complete their program of national defense in this hour of world crisis.

If, instead of discussing this legislation now, on the 1st day of December 1941, I were discussing it on the floor when it was first reported on April 21, I would have to devote considerable time to the question of the necessity for undertaking to prevent by statute the occurrence of strikes and lock-outs in defense industry. Fortunately, now, that phase of the discussion can be eliminated almost entirely, for nearly everyone now agrees that the only practical way of solving the problem is by legislation. Both the employers and employees have repeatedly promised times almost without number that they would voluntarily see to it that there would be no more strikes or lock-outs or shut-downs in defense industry. Yet these stoppages persist. They continue to occur month after month and week after week. They will keep on occurring to the detriment of all of us unless legislation is enacted to stop them. And so the only question now is, What kind of legislation is best calculated to do that and how far is it necessary to go in order to do it effectively.

The main objective of the Vinson bill is, in the first place, to aid in the settlement of those labor disputes which substantially affect defense production, so that a stoppage of production will not occur. No attempt is made to provide for legislation beyond the present emergency nor outside the scope of defense industry. I do not say that legislation beyond this scope is improper, but I do say that it has little, if any, bearing on the immediate problem to be solved.

To achieve its objective, the bill relies first upon the serious, active, and expeditious use of the machinery already set up by law for collective bargaining. If that fails, the parties in dispute must submit their cases at once to an impartial board of mediation, on which the employer, the employee, and the public are represented.

The bill does not compel the parties in dispute to accept the findings and recommendations of the Board of Mediation, but it does compel them to maintain the status quo ante which existed prior to the dispute, until the Board has heard the case and made public its findings and recommendations.

The Naval Affairs Committee was almost unanimously of the opinion, and it arrived at this opinion only after the most thorough investigation and consideration of all the facts, that if this is done no strike thereafter will occur and that in no case will there be a stoppage of production in defense industry. The evidence before our committee to support this opinion, it seems to me, is overwhelming both in its volume and in its character. It is generally concurred in, not only by those who support this legislation, but also by those who oppose it,

and that latter fact, I believe, is entitled to great weight in connection with some of the pending proposals for more drastic legislation on the subject. In other words, if strikes and lock-outs in defense industry can be prevented by the comparatively mild and equitable provisions of this bill, then there would be no good reason for adding more drastic provisions to it, simply because they are drastic.

This bill gives the President power, on recommendation of the Board, to issue stand-still orders maintaining the status quo and to secure, upon application by the Attorney General, court enforcement of such orders for a period of 30 days, during which time the Board has the opportunity to investigate, to request further collective bargaining and to make and publish its findings and recommendations.

The orders may be directed at employers, employees, or others whose activities affect the status quo. It is not the purpose of these orders to impose upon anyone terms and conditions different from those which obtained prior to the time the dispute arose, but the orders do prohibit anyone from doing anything to change those terms and conditions until the Board's findings are published. The orders do not compel anyone to work, but they do prohibit anyone from preventing an employee from working during the 30-day period by ordering a strike, shutting down a plant, or doing anything else affecting the status quo. Violation of these orders are punishable by the court as for a contempt.

Now, it is objected by some that mere compulsory maintenance of the status quo for 30 days will not necessarily prevent a strike or lock-out at the expiration of that period, that there is nothing in the bill requiring the parties to accept the findings and recommendation of the Board after they are made public, and that production may be stopped either by the employer or the employees the very next day by ordering a strike or lock-out.

Literally, that is true. Practically, it is not; for there are two factors which together will make it impracticable, if not impossible, for either party to ignore the published findings and recommendations of this impartial Board of Mediation composed of representatives of the public and of the employers and of the employees themselves.

One of these factors is a very serious, crystallized, and determined public opinion, against which, at the present time, no arbitrary refusal on the part of the employer or the employees to accept the recommendation and to continue production could stand. The other factor is the power of the President, already conferred upon him by statute, to take over and operate a defense industry in which production has either ceased or slowed down to a point below its reasonable capacity to produce.

This bill not only gives the parties to the dispute every chance to settle that dispute but it sets up simple, effective, and complete machinery to help in that settlement. It provides a fair and equitable and statutory method, which we do not have at the present time, of settling disputes and of actually preventing strikes before they occur.

That is and should be the main objective to be attained through any legislation on this subject. This bill, I believe, will attain it in every future case of labor dispute of which I can conceive. Moreover, in my opinion, it would have attained it in every past labor dispute, and it would have made unnecessary the employment of the drastic remedy which we have several times been obliged to employ, namely, the seizing of a plant and the operation of it under military protection.

We still have that drastic remedy and we can still employ it if this bill should fail to accomplish its purpose. We, of the Naval Affairs Committee, however, are convinced that it will not fail to accomplish its purpose, which is the prevention of strikes, lock-outs, and other stoppages in defense production, rather than the forcible resumption of production after a strike has been called and production has ceased.

To forcibly resume production after a plant has been closed is a comparatively simple thing. We can do that under present law, but that is not the solution of the problem which now confronts us. The problem is to prevent strikes and lock-outs. We believe this bill will prevent them; and that if it is enacted, that strikes in defense industry will not occur again, but that production of defense articles will continue uninterrupted, as they ought to, and as the people of the United States demand they shall.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 4139, to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement, and providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 198, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in reference to the sugar bill that was passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper release pertaining to the production of copper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written me by the American Federation of Government Employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend the remarks he made today by including therein a copy of the bill which he introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are confronted with the unpleasant fact that the administration has led this Nation into an undeclared war. Someone has said, "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." And there are many loyal, patriotic, dyed-in-the-wool Americans who are hoping and praying that we may yet, somehow, some way, be spared the horror of war.

But the facts are, the President has ordered our Navy to shoot on sight. The President asked for and received from Congress authority to arm our merchant marine and send our ships into the war zones. W. Averill Harriman, President Roosevelt's war-aid expediter, declared in a radio broadcast to the British people that "the United States is shooting Germans—German submarines and aircraft at sea." And we all know that the Germans have torpedoed and sunk our ships and American sailors have paid the supreme sacrifice.

These are unpleasant facts, but just the same they are the facts. It is true that Congress has not declared that a state of war exists. But for the present the question of when, how, why, and whether right or wrong we were led into this war is beside the point. The people will decide that issue at a later date. The essential fact is that the administration has led this country into a shooting war and it now becomes the conscientious duty of every American citizen without regard to politics or partisan advantages to give his best efforts to the Nation in order that we may successfully carry out the national policy which has been adopted by a majority of the duly elected representatives of the people. The time for argument on this question is over. The die has been cast, and in this grave hour all Americans should recall those stirring words of Stephen Decatur:

Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

Yet we are approaching this great crisis in our national life in a state of chaos and confusion in the public mind. Disunity is rampant throughout the Nation.

A large segment of the public mind sincerely doubts the good faith and integrity of the President and his administration. The dawdling confusion of our defense efforts, coupled with a labor policy similar to that of France, prior to the downfall of that nation, has shaken public confidence in the administration.

While the Government pleads for abandonment of the business-as-usual policy of private enterprise, many bureaus and bureaucrats high in the administration seem to be wholly unaware that there is a war going on and that this Nation has embarked on a gigantic national-defense program. While commerce and industry abandon business as usual for a concentrated national-defense effort, many agencies of the administration continue to behave exactly as if the most important contribution to the defense of America is the expansion of New Deal bureaucracy.

The Federal Government continues to snipe at private enterprise while demanding of it the full measure of its resources. Worse still, national defense is being fantastically abused as the excuse for perpetuation and expansion of Federal activities which not only are not remotely related to national defense but which divert from bona fide defense activities the energies and resources of the Federal Government. This attitude by the administration, or at least by many of its leading executives, has stirred up grave doubts in the minds of millions of patriotic Americans as to whether the administration is interested in licking Hitler as much as it is interested in using war powers to promote a new social order under the political control of the New Deal.

This administration can never expect nor hope to attain national unity such as Winston Churchill commands in Britain until it lays aside its pet political theories for the duration of this emergency and throws the entire resources of the Federal Government into the sole and single purpose of the successful fulfillment of our national-defense program.

That group of the public commonly called isolationists in a large part would disappear if its members were convinced in their hearts that this administration is not deliberately engaging in a war as a means of escaping the consequences of 8 years of bungling misrule which on the eve of the European war had brought the administration so low in public esteem that it was drastically defeated in the House on some of its major legislative measures, including the spend-lend bill and the P. W. A.

There can be no doubt of the essential patriotism of the so-called isolationists, many of whom demonstrated their love for America by service in France in the last war. They feel, however, that America is being asked to engage in a war the result of which will be the destruction of the American way of life and the substitution therefor of a system of regimented existence controlled from Washington. They feel that this is the real but concealed purpose of our participation in this war.

War in itself is the highest challenge to the capacities of a nation, to its traditions, to its moral fiber, and its character as a nation. Once ensnarled in the toils of war as the American people have been, they are left with no choice for the moment but to win through to victory and triumph.

This must be our national objective from now on until it has been accomplished.

But you cannot expect to find that national unity, without which victory is impossible, when a large portion of the public is sincerely convinced that the administration is making use of its war powers to grind the axes of a political theory—to destroy the middle classes by inflation and to establish a dictatorial control over the lives of all of us.

Some years ago, after a temporary and wholly artificial spurt in business recovery, the President wisecracked that "we planned it that way."

As to the situation in which small businessmen in this country find themselves today, there is a very widespread opinion that the New Deal "planned it that way." The bulwark of democracy is the system of free enterprise, and the bulwark of the system of free enterprise is the small business man. Until the small business man is destroyed as a class, there will always remain an effective, coherent, and intelligent opposition to the type of socialistic or managerial revolution, advanced by deep thinkers of the New Deal.

Perhaps it is only coincidence that the sacrifice which the Government has asked of industry and commerce has had the effect of closing the doors of thousands of small business concerns. The New Deal is not afraid of big business. In one fell swoop by Executive order the administration can take over and put commissars in charge of the big companies. But it must destroy the little man and force him to join the proletariat of faceless people who must depend utterly for their daily bread upon the charity of a paternal bureaucracy.

It is a well-known fact that the first objective of those who would socialize the Nation is the nationalization of the electric-power industry. After power will come railroads, mines, telephone communications, and other big segments of our economy, until the time will come when any young man looking for a career can expect only to work up under some Federal bureaucrat or commissar.

This technique of socializing America by planting political saboteurs in strategic positions was conceived a number of years ago by a professing Socialist-Communist who realized that neither by the ballot nor by bullets could the Marxian concept of bureaucratic operation of the productive machinery of the Nation be imposed upon the American people.

Having concluded that neither by popular majority nor by revolutionary activities could the Marxian scheme of government be put over in America, this same Socialist, writing in the New Leader, the then official newspaper of the Socialist Party in America, advocated a scheme of encroaching control within the Federal Government when he stated:

> We have no caste system in this country. We do not have quite the inferiority complex of the European workers upon which to found our philosophy. The workers of this country are climbing through marriage, the education of their children, and the like out of the proletariat as rapidly as they can go about the business. * * * The chances are against the amalgamation in the near future of these various class struggles into one against the whole profit system.

In the same article he described the method by which Socialists could and should take over the electric industry. He advanced the belief that American capitalism faces no immediate breakdown but, on the contrary, that it is strongly entrenched and efficiently organized. The aim of Socialists and others who seek the abolition of the profit system, he urges, should be to show some results by attacking the existing vulnerable spots of capitalism.

Bear in mind he was writing in 1927, 14 years ago. As to the immediate objective of nationalization of the Socialist group, this prominent Socialist had this to say:

> Here is an industry in which $8,000,000,000 are invested already, and another billion is added every 2 years. We have made three attempts at control. We have set up municipal plants. Their status is changing, and we should face that fact. Outside of the large cities they can no longer compete in rates and efficiency with the new plants being established by companies having the benefit of the connected load of wide interconnection. That many small municipal plants are selling out to private industry is no unfavorable criticism of the efficiency of public ownership. The technical changes in the industry have made isolated plants built years ago less efficient. We have tried regulation by State commissions. * * *
>
> A fourth attempt, which I look upon as much more hopeful, is the one which seeks to set up through Government ownership at Muscle Shoals, at Boulder Dam, and on the St. Lawrence, yardsticks by which the efficiency of private ownership under regulation may be measured.

Elsewhere in this same article he wrote:

> We cannot hope to take over the whole $8,000,000,000 industry successfully, even if it were generally thought advisable to do so at the moment. * * * But a scattered series of great generating plants selling their power within 300-mile radiuses might be expected to have a very considerable influence upon the extension of public ownership to the transmisison lines and the whole industry.
>
> Our long-time aim is the abolition of the profit system for private use. Our strategy is to make and take every opportunity to prove that it works. We must force our experts on agriculture, trusts, coal, power, subways, housing, milk, etc., to tell us correctly which the next steps are, and then take them and identify ourselves with their success.

Here, Mr. Speaker, for the first time the word "yardstick," and the words "power authority" saw the light of day in public print. The New Deal borrowed those words from the Socialist-Communists.

It is more than significant and important that I now tell you the name of the Socialist who so accurately described the

technique later adopted by the New Deal as a means of planting the imprint of socialism upon American economy.

The author of these remarks is none other than Stephen Raushenbush, throughout his lifetime a nationally recognized protagonist of the Marxian theory.

What is Stephen Raushenbush doing today, you may ask?

Stephen Raushenbush has followed his own preachings of 1927 when he advocated the planting of experts within the Government in strategic positions.

Stephen Raushenbush today is practicing his technique of encroaching control as Chief of the Planning and Research Section of the Electric Power Division of the Department of Interior, under direct supervision of that great friend of private capital and democracy, Harold Ickes.

A most revealing public statement as to the attitude of Raushenbush's assistants, in their capitalization of national defense as a means of socializing the electric-power industry, is a recent quotation from Paul J. Raver, administrator of the Bonneville Administration and an immediate associate of Raushenbush.

Advocating the immediate acquisition of private utilities in the Northwest in the interest of national defense, Dr. Raver on August 20 in Seattle said:

> That generating capacities of private power systems could be expanded under Federal ownership but that private utilities have neither the credit available nor could they obtain the necessary priorities.

This statement by a responsible official of the administration raises two valid questions:

First. Speaking for the administration does Dr. Raver mean that R. F. C. cannot or will not finance private companies seeking to expand power production in the interest of national defense? If this is the case let it be known quickly and understood thoroughly with all the implications that the statement involves.

Second. Does Dr. Raver, speaking for the administration, mean that the administration will deny priorities to private industry seeking to expand plant production in the interest of national defense thus using national defense as an additional lever to enforce socialistic doctrines in the name of patriotism and national defense?

Again we have a similar situation a few miles from my home city in the case of the Grand River Dam. Only a few days ago the President, invoking war powers, seized control of the P. W. A. dam owned and operated as an agency of the State of Oklahoma. The dam defaulted on its bonds on October 1. In a similar situation in Nebraska P. W. A. dams have been refinanced on an interest rate of one-half of 1 percent. But in Nebraska the administrators of the P. W. A. dams were and are completely in control of Federal bureaucracy. The case is different in Oklahoma. Imbued with a spirit of pioneer individualism the State of Oklahoma had sought to operate this project independent of control by the Federal bureaucracy. As a result, the Federal Works Administration deliberately forced the Grand River Dam authority into bankruptcy by disapproving its managing board and by disapproving contracts for the sale of power which would have made the project self-liquidating, and now in the sacred name of national defense, communism invades Oklahoma. In the name of national defense the Federal Government is imposing its will upon the people of Oklahoma.

For nearly a year now there has been pending in Congress the Arkansas Valley Authority bill admittedly drafted by David Lilienthal, chairman of T. V. A., at the request of the President. The bill would cover the watershed of the Arkansas River and tributaries from the high Rockies of Colorado to the eastern boundary of the State of Arkansas, an area including eight States. It would superimpose a political and economic dictatorship over an area infinitely larger than that of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

After 8 years the political grip of T. V. A. is so strong that it cracks the whip of political life and death over public officials in that area. The administration now seeks to extend the authoritarian type of bureaucratic superstate over the adjoining regions to the west of T. V. A.

But I sincerely believe Congress is in no mood in this perilous hour to launch forth upon another political adventure such as the T. V. A.

This is particularly true in view of the fact that the one spot in the United States that has developed defense power shortages has been in the region blighted by the power development of the T. V. A. For 8 long years the T. V. A. has been building water-power dams and in all that period private enterprise, paralyzed by fear of Government duplication, has been virtually brought to a standstill in the development of its own generating facilities.

T. V. A. now is confronted with a terrible power shortage, due to lack of water—an eventuality that would have been avoided had T. V. A. never been in existence. The local companies have always maintained a heavy proportion of their generating in dependable steam power, using water power as a secondary source. T. V. A., infatuated with the exploded theory that falling water makes cheap power, reversed that process and built no steam plants until the summer of 1940, after it had been confronted with its first great drought.

In the face of T. V. A.'s record, the apparent folly of attempting to create a second T. V. A. in a period of war emergency is too abundantly obvious for a most complacent Congress to accept.

Therefore, by Executive fiat, exactly after the manner of Adolf Hitler or of Josef Stalin, the Arkansas Valley authority bill in its essential features has become fact.

Without public hearing, which supporters dared not face, and in the star-chamber method of dictatorship, this piece of legislation was simply leap-frogged over the congressional process and became a fact by dictatorial decree.

Although it appears on the surface that only the Grand River Dam Authority has been taken over by the Government, the actual terms of the decree are so sweeping as to authorize the superimposition of a T. V. A. type grid of federally owned and operated transmission lines and generating system to the complete duplication of adequate and efficient privately owned systems of that area.

I consider this one of the most bald-faced attempts to put over a political doctrine by draping it with the sacred American flag. This is the sort of thing that stiffens the backs of those who oppose the war on the grounds that there is no sense in fighting Hitlerism only to obtain Hitlerism at home.

This is not a partisan or a political speech—this is a speech in defense of Americanism and the American way of life. Gov. Leon C. Phillips, of Oklahoma, a Democrat of the old school, a Democrat in the tradition of Jefferson, had this to say about the Federal confiscation last week of Oklahoma's property:

> I don't like dictators anywhere. You know, I wouldn't have believed it when I was a boy growing up and reading American history that State property could be taken on war powers of the President without Congress even passing an act declaring war.

At a time like this it is very grave and serious business to openly cast doubt on the good faith of the administration. To do so without cause, without proof, would be a sad disturbance to the country because in so doing there would be a tendency further to disunite an already bewildered and confused public. On the other hand, if I can point out in some measure the way toward establishing and restoring public confidence in the administration's war effort, I shall have served a patriotic duty. If I can demonstrate the weak spots, which can be remedied and which if remedied would tend to restore our confidence and good faith in the administration, then my service will be wholly constructive. It is with that spirit that I approach discussion of my proposed resolution calling for an investigation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The situation in the R. E. A. needs airing.

In the past 3 weeks no less than five Members of the House have addressed remarks about the shortage of copper for distribution lines which were planned and promoted before the current emergency. Thousands of farm homes are wired for electricity with electric heaters, stoves, washing machines, and all the blessed labor-saving devices which electricity makes possible.

But there is no electricity in these homes. Thousands of miles of poles have been planted waiting for wire to tie in and put in operation these new electric cooperative lines.

The burden of most of these remarks in Congress has been that O. P. M. has been ruthless in thus depriving these farmers of electricity. There have even been charges that O. P. M. is dominated by private company executives who are biased against R. E. A.—this despite the fact the head of O. P. M. Power Division is none other than J. A. Krug, chief engineer of T. V. A., and a simon pure representative of the public ownership viewpoint. From all that I can hear Mr. Krug is an American citizen first and an advocate of public ownership second and has de-

cided that with the scarcity of copper such as it is both private and public agencies must sacrifice equally in nondefense activities.

As a matter of fact the O. P. M. does allot a certain amount of copper for the continuation of R. E. A. lines but allows no copper to private companies for expansion either rural or urban. The private companies can get copper only if they can show that it is required for national defense or for the maintenance of existing capacity.

I know whereof I speak. I became interested in this subject because of a situation existing in my own district and an even more glaring condition in a congressional district just west of mine.

Poles have been planted, equipment purchased and interest is mounting up on the indebtedness to the Federal bureaucrats who are withholding some 150 miles of distribution lines which would energize hundreds of farm homes in my State.

R. E. A. blames it all on Hitler, saying that they cannot get the copper because of national-defense needs.

I here and now accuse the officials of the Rural Electrification Administration of committing a plain prevarication to the farmers of my State. I have pictures here which show millions and millions of pounds of copper hidden away in Texas cotton fields.

This copper will never be used to illuminate a single additional farm home.

It is heavy cable of 3 and 7 strands which at some future day will be energized as high-tension transmission lines to service existing cooperatives whose members are already receiving electric current.

This batch of copper alone totals several million pounds. It is located in the open fields at Gilmer, Quitman, Emory, Troup, Mount Pleasant, and Henderson, Tex.

This job lot of copper was deposited on these fields the first week of October from a 23-car trainload. The R. E. A. bought this copper to serve as a transmission line to connect up 7 Texas electric cooperatives centering around Gilmer, Tex. These cooperatives are already being served with electricity.

The only possible justification R. E. A. can put forward for this misuse of badly needed national-defense copper is that they wish to establish a competitive plant the better to control rates.

But this argument falls down on two scores:

In the first place, the private companies are selling them power at a rate of 8½ mills. This is 40 percent lower than the national average wholesale rate to R. E. A. cooperatives from private sources and even far below the national average of wholesale rates from subsidized public-power agencies.

The truth is that R. E. A. is merely using the price as a palliative excuse to superimpose a heavier debt on the farmer members and at the same time destroy private competition and set up a bureaucratic power empire.

Let me quote from Lynn W. Landrum, whose column appears in the Dallas Morning News:

To be sure, these 23 carloads of material do not account for the full amount of duplication waste alleged, but they do make good the offer of the column to locate hundreds of thousands of pounds of perfectly good copper. They will be used to whip the Texas Power & Light Co. for the crime of selling Texas cooperatives in east Texas current at a cheaper cost than east Tennessee cooperatives can get it from the Tennessee Valley Authority itself. We need not cry about whipping Texas Power & Light (which is now actually furnishing power to the Tennessee Valley Authority to make up part of what the Tennessee Valley Authority can't generate from its own plant). But the question is: Whom are we trying to whip—Hitler or the power companies at home?

You can't fight through a war and fight through a New Deal at the same time. It can't be done.

Secondly, my home town operates a municipally owned electric system. I have served on the city utilities commission and I think I can say I know something about the cost of production of electricity. I have every reason to believe in view of reliable engineering reports and my own knowledge that the proposed R. E. A. plant at Gilmer cannot produce electricity at the load factor now contemplated at less than 18 mills per kilowatt hour or twice as much as the private companies are now supplying the service for.

But the real joker in this picture, the serious fraud in the picture let me say, lies in the fact that these transmission lines cannot be energized in less than 2 years.

Only last week Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, stated that it now requires at least 2 years to install new generating capacity in this country.

And the ground is not broken even to begin the construction of the Gilmer plant.

Meanwhile, while O. P. M. wrings its hands for copper, while the Navy launches ships deficient of copper, while the War Department is begging for copper wiring for shell binding, and while many small business concerns are forced to cease operations because they cannot get copper, R. E. A., like a dog in the manger, hoards its copper on vacant fields in Texas. Copper that cannot be put into use in less than 2 years and when it is energized will not light a single new farm home.

Until R. E. A. comes before O. P. M. with clean hands and shows effective farm electrification with what copper it does possess this should be a suspect agency, conducting activities obstructing national defense as surely as a paid saboteur.

I have told you the story of Stephen Raushenbush, the man who conceived the scheme of seizing control of American productive system by sneaking its men into strategic positions of government rather than by bullets and ballots.

I say to you that the Rural Electrification Administration is teeming with Communists, fellow travelers, and bureaucrats who put political theory above the safety of their country. Spotted in key positions, after the Raushenbush plan of boring from within like termites, there are no less than 34 known Communists and fellow travelers in the Rural Electrification Administration here in Washington who draw a grand total in salaries of $115,720 per year. Supported by the powerful farm vote they are capitalizing on a popular cause—electrification of the farm—to seize control of a large segment of our economic and political life. The records of the Dies committee will support me in this charge.

I say to you that the Gilmer copper steal is merely an example of the mare's nest of chicanery and political connivance that would be exposed by an honest and thorough investigation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Let it be understood here and now that I believe in farm electrification.

I believe that the social values from bringing electricity to the farm are sufficient to justify in normal times the subsidy which the R. E. A. Act bestows upon the farmer. I should say that most all of us believe in the principle of the Rural Electrification Act. It is only when that act is distorted as a means to an end exactly contrary to that of its authors in Congress that friends of the farmer raise their voice in protest. The true friends of farm electrification may as well face the fact, may as well realize that this Federal agency has fallen into the hands of a gang of Communists, fellow travelers, and political second-story workers who do not hesitate to sabotage the national-defense program in the interests of preservation of their political theories and perpetuation of their pay roll.

The single instance of the Gilmer transmission line which I have used is only one of many.

In my remarks today I have fired but one barrel. And if and when an investigation is had, I intend to fire the other barrel, citing by chapter and verse instances where the R. E. A. has sabotaged national defense by improper use of copper while at the same time depriving the farmers of sorely needed copper for the energizing of farm distribution lines.

Much of this trouble sprouts from the policy of Federal bureaucracy building generating facilities and transmission lines which duplicate with wasteful loss of copper existing private facilities. They ignore the necessity for copper in their anxiety to set up a holding-company system of supercooperatives by which the top holding company in Washington can perpetuate and expand its control over a large segment of the farming population.

Let any individual distributing cooperative free itself of the bonds of debt to the Federal Government and then the Washington bureaucracy no longer can control that cooperative, no longer dictate the personnel of its directorship, its rates, and business policies.

In the face of this tragic war situation the Washington administrative staff of the Rural Electrification Administration is seeking to scoop shovelsful of debt upon the heads of distributing cooperatives so they can never pay out and always serve in economic peonage the dictates of their Uncle Shylock masters in Washington.

I have introduced a resolution for an investigation of Rural Electrification and I have cited only some of the complaints that have come before me. A full and fair investigation would go much further.

But whether an investigation is held or not I have presented indisputable proof

with photographs and local news stories to support me:

First. That the Rural Electrification Administration has stashed away millions of pounds of copper in a single instance, and that this copper—for high tension cable—will never be used to illuminate a single additional farm home.

Second. That these millions of pounds of copper cannot be used under 2 years from now.

Third. That meantime thousands of miles of distribution lines have planted poles, farms have been equipped for electricity, and R. E. A. has denied these farmers copper while it has ample supply to meet a large quantity of their requirements.

Fourth. That R. E. A. has misstated the facts to the public and to its cooperative customers in stating that no copper is available because of the national-defense emergency; when in truth in one instance alone millions of pounds of copper will lie idle for 2 years and then be used for transmission lines which are economically unsound.

These facts stand out. They cannot be brushed aside or laughed off or evaded.

The time has come for the Roosevelt administration to fish or cut bait.

Does the administration want to lick Hitler or put over the New Deal in the guise of a war measure?

How can the administration expect total sacrifice of the population in the face of such an example?

I am frank to admit, in this crisis, that those of use who are classified as anti-new dealers, have no right to demand that the President surrender to our desires before we agree to follow his leadership in purely national-defense matters. But, on the other hand, I do say with all my heart and soul that the President, in the interest of national unity, for the time being should lay aside his New Deal theories; forget about whether this pressure group or that pressure group will be with him; forget about whether the New Deal will win the next election and by way of cooperation with private industry, which has been forced to abandon "business as usual" in order to support our national-defense program, require the left-wingers in his administration to abandon their policy of "monkey business as usual."

It is my conviction that the deepest wish of every true American is peace and plenty for his homeland. The most profound emotion next to love of God and home is the simple patriotism of simple Americans. Woe unto him who fraudulently appeals to patriotism, to love of country, and love of home as the pretext for perpetuating a political fraud. Woe unto him who would sacrifice on the altar of patriotism the ideal that is America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. JOHNS) on account of official business.

Mr. DOUGLAS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. SASSCER, for 7 days, beginning December 2, on account of official business.

Mr. FENTON, for 2 days beginning December 3, on account of death in his family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

November 29, 1941:

H. R. 5890. An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

December 1, 1941:

H. R. 466. An act for the relief of J. T. Colter;

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas;

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others;

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer; and

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum.

THE LATE SENATOR ALVA B. ADAMS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and great sorrow that I announce to the House the death of the Honorable ALVA B. ADAMS, senior Senator from the State of Colorado. Senator ADAMS was stricken with a heart attack last week and his friends hoped he would respond and soon recover, but his condition grew worse and he passed away in a hospital here in Washington early this morning.

Mr. Speaker, during such critical days our Nation can ill afford to lose a man like Senator ADAMS. Colorado has lost one of its most distinguished and able sons.

Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 373):

Resolved That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA BLANCHARD ADAMS a Senator of the United States from the State of Colorado.

Resolved That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of five Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as members of the funeral party on the part of the House Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CHENOWETH, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Tuesday, December 2, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, December 2, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, December 2, 1941, on H. R. 6109, which supersedes H. R. 5879.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10 a. m., Tuesday, December 2, 1941, to consider S. 1623.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, December 3, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 6056, to regulate in the United States Court of Claims suits for payment for the use of inventions by or for the Government, on Wednesday, December 3, 1941, at 10 a. m., room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1106. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, Md., with a view to determining whether it is advisable to modify the existing project for that portion between Big Thoroughfare River and Tylers River, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted August 1, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors

1107. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel connecting Herring Bay via Rockhold Creek to West River, Anne Arundel County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1108. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for a general term

of the District Court for the District of Alaska, at Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1109. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1110. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting report showing activities of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6149. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes in the performance of national-defense contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6150. A bill to authorize certain officers and enlisted men of the Army of the United States to accept emblems, medals, orders, and decorations that have been tendered them by governments of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 6151. A bill to amend section 32 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss RANKIN of Montana:

H. R. 6152. A bill providing for transportation home during furlough for noncommissioned officers and other enlisted men on active military service in the land forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6153. A bill providing that personal correspondence of members of the armed forces of the United States on active duty be transmitted in the mails free of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 6154. A bill relating to certain practices in connection with, and certain practices leading to, labor disputes affecting the national defense; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MAY:

H. J Res. 251. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINTER:

H. Res. 371. Resolution to create a Select Committee to Investigate the Rural Electrification Administration under the Rural Electrification Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 372. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate the So-called Democratic National Press, Its Financial Responsibility, Its Personnel, and Its Alleged Extensive Coverage of National-Defense Contractors; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BOLAND introduced a bill (H. R. 6155) for the relief of Charles Francis Fessenden, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2100. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, concerning House bill 5336, the Farm Credit Act of 1941; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2101. Also, petition of the Fleet Reserve Association, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of House bill 6009, for the benefit of dependents or veterans of peacetime incidents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2102. Also, petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the passage of House bill 6009, to provide wartime rates for service-connected disabilities incurred by members of our armed services under certain conditions and to the dependents of those who lose their lives under those conditions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2103. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging all governmental agencies charged with determining policies on priorities or allocations to give due consideration to the problem of providing an adequate supply of repair parts and maintenance materials essential for the proper upkeep of civilian living accommodations, and to the problem of making these repair parts and maintenance materials readily available to the average individual; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2104. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Gary Chamber of Commerce, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and also unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2105. Also, petition of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, New Orleans, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to national transportation and labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2106. Also, petition of the Lutheran Brotherhood, Osage City, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2107. Also, petition of the Air Associates, Inc., Bendix, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the advent of Thy only begotten Son was the fulfillment of "the Anointed of God, the hope of Israel," who gathered to Himself all that is most beautiful and transcendant in the celestial universe. He brought into the realm of sorrow and despair those glorious truths, influences, and hopes which are destined to recover and revitalize the lapses of men. Grant that this Christ may so enrich our lives that we may seek to live by enlightened reason, by our sanctified affections, and by all nobility of soul to which we may attain as the children of the "Anointed One."

We pray that we may not forget ourselves in the midst of disappointment and hardship, blending those qualities of character of utmost strength, courage, and steadfastness. Let every crown suggest a brother's cross, our bread remind us of the hungry, our friends of the solitary, and our manifold mercies of the reason of our sacrifices. O kindle our torch for earth's shadows; steel our souls with calm to bear our crosses, and fill us with Thy might for all future days. In the name of Mary's Holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution:

Senate Resolution 198

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
December 1, 1941.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorro the announcement of the death of Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of 19 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement from the Rural Electrification Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders that may have been entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by the commander of the American Legion in South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the N. Y. A. by the ex-Governor of Connecticut, Wilbur L. Cross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement before the Rules Committee by Mr. B. M. Baruch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in further answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER], who so viciously attacked the R. E. A. yesterday, and further in line with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has just said, it is important to remember that R. E. A. cannot hoard copper; only contractors can purchase copper.

The reason this project has not gone forward in Texas, I am advised by R. E. A., and the reason some copper was piled up down there—and, oh, so little as compared with what the power companies have purchased and hoarded—is that the Priorities Division of the Office of Production Management, which is filled up with dollar-a-year men on fat pay rolls from these power companies, would not grant them priority for a generating plant that was necessary to furnish that power transmission system. These power companies, through their moguls in the Office of Production Management, are sabotaging R. E. A. in this particular instance and in many other instances over the Nation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not necessary to have that copper to connect with the Brazos River power, to put that power to useful purposes?

Mr. ELLIS. Right; and it is going to serve several defense projects.

[Here the gavel fell.]

UNION ACTIVITIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this news dispatch is date lined Monett, Mo., November 26:

> There was so pitifully little to eat that George Walker Gordon, 19, wouldn't sit at the table with his parents and seven brothers and sisters.
>
> George died yesterday. Dr. Elburn A. Smith, Barry County physician, said he had starved himself to death that the others might eat.
>
> The family of 10 lived in a 1-room cabin in the Ozarks, remnant of a house partly destroyed by fire. They were discovered recently when a neighbor noticed a little girl walking to the burnt hulk.
>
> The family had hoed strawberries, picked fruit, and done odd jobs. Recently the American Red Cross paid union initiation fees for George and his father, J. W. Gordon, 52, so they could try for jobs at Camp Crowder. George wasn't able to stand heavy work. He collapsed on his way home 2 weeks ago, carrying home what groceries he had been able to buy with his meager pay.
>
> Dr. Smith was called 3 days later. George was beyond saving, a victim of pellagra, Dr. Smith said.

There was work at Camp Crowder, a Government job, being paid for by the taxpayer's money but a union was in control and neither George nor his father had the money to buy a work permit. The Red Cross, when it learned of the situation, paid the initiation fees for George and his father. But for George the payment came too late.

And Members of this House, on the floor, insist that a union shall have the right to bar from work all who will not, those who cannot, pay the asked tribute.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ala.	Rogers, Okla.
Arnold	Grant, Ind.	Romjue
Baldwin	Haines	Sabath
Bennett	Hancock	Sacks
Buck	Harris, Va.	Sasscer
Buckler, Minn.	Hartley	Satterfield
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Schaefer, Ill.
Byrne	Hill, Colo.	Schuetz
Byron	Kelly, Ill.	Scott
Cannon, Fla.	Kilburn	Scrugham
Capozzoli	Kirwan	Sheridan
Casey, Mass.	Koppleмann	Sikes
Celler	Larrabee	Smith, Pa.
Clark	Lea	Snyder
Coffee, Nebr.	Lesinski	Somers, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Lewis	Stearns, N. H.
Collins	McArdle	Stevenson
Costello	McLean	Sumner, Ill.
Courtney	Maas	Sutphin
Culkin	Magnuson	Thomas, N. J.
Cullen	Mansfield	Tibbott
Delaney	Marcantonio	Tolan
Ditter	Mitchell	Traynor
Douglas	Mundt	Ward
Elston	Myers, Pa.	Wasielewski
Faddis	Norton	Weiss
Fish	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wene
Flaherty	O'Day	Whelchel
Flannery	O'Leary	White
Ford, Leland M.	Osmers	Wigglesworth
Gale	Patton	Wilson
Gerlach	Rich	Winter
	Richards	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in my remarks made this morning I may be permitted to insert certain editorials from New York City newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4139) to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 4139, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I prefer that the gentleman from Oregon yield time first.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the bills now under consideration by this House, as well as similar bills in the Senate relative to labor disputes affecting the national defense, are all no doubt intended to expedite the national-defense production.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire for adequate defense and as expeditiously as possible. While I deplore impediments in our national-defense program, caused by disagreements between employers and employees, it is my mature judgment that the bills now under consideration, in their present form, do not offer a solution of this vexing problem. There should be no ulterior motive behind this proposed legislation. The sole question is, Will it speed up or slow down production?

Mr. Chairman, it is for this Congress to decide between a safe and sane approach to the problem of increased production and one that may be repugnant to millions of God-fearing, home-loving Americans.

During the Revolutionary War, when the American Colonies were fighting for their independence, British Imperialists and Tories were demanding the extermination of what they termed "rebels." Edmund Burke, a great statesman and orator of that age, made a speech in the British Parliament advocating conciliation, in which he said:

I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people. I cannot insult and ridicule the feelings of millions of my fellow creatures.

There are forty million men and women working in business, industries, factories, and on the farms of this country. Hundreds of thousands of men are employed on national-defense work. With the exception of a small number, these loyal Americans are working, sweating, and giving the best that is in them in answer to their country's call for speeding up production.

Mr. Chairman, I deplore strikes. Time and money lost through strikes are never regained. Deplorable as they are, the right to strike is recognized by all democratic governments. Britain is at war, and strikes have occurred there right through the war and up to the present time. We know that in the first 8 months of 1941, 224,000 English workers went on strike to redress wrongs. Regardless of these strikes, the English worker has given the world a record of production during the war period.

In 1940 the strike record of England, Canada, and the United States is almost exactly the same. It should be remembered that in 1940 England and Canada were at war. In each of these three countries slightly more than 2 percent of the workers were out on strike at some time during the year. The figures run closely alike: England, 2.3 percent; Canada, 2.4 percent; United States, 2.3 percent.

Some of the pending legislation provides for a cooling-off period before a strike. The cooling-off period should take place right here in Congress. The Members of Congress should take advantage of the proposed recess or adjournment and go to their respective districts. They should visit each defense industry or factory, go into the mills, mines, shipyards, tank, and airplane plants, and see for themselves how men are working night and day to meet production demands. Should you conclude some are not responding fully, tell them so, either individually or collectively. Talk to them and appeal to their patriotism as Congressman REED of New York and Congressman EATON, of New Jersey, and thousands of other good Americans did during the first World War. DAN REED went to the far West and talked to the miners of Montana and Idaho, engaged in mining strategic minerals, and succeeded in having production raised to its peak. Dr. EATON, with hard-hitting, patriotic labor leaders, pleaded with the men engaged in the shipbuilding industry for greater production and secured results, as the record will show.

Mr. Chairman, our country has a mighty defense job to do. Members of this body may have honest differences of opinion as to the effective way to reach peak production. Therefore, I repeat, maximum production can be attained through mediation and not through the enactment of legislation which may be considered repugnant and repressive. Such legislation is bound, in the end, to defeat its own purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California consumed 7 minutes and yields back 8.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, ever since the inception of your defense program the Nation and a large percentage of the Congress of the United States have been clamoring for an opportunity to do something effective to stop strikes that are sabotaging your defense efforts. The day has arrived when the subject is on your doorstep and the question is presented to you fairly. What are you going to do about it, if anything?

The time has come when we must stop shadow-boxing with the question of strikes in defense industries. You are going to have the fullest opportunity under the rules and under the proposals to be offered today, whatever it is the will and the judgment of this House to do to stop the thing that all of us know is delaying our efforts for defense. Let me call your attention to just a few well-known facts as a reminder.

You know, and you know it from the authoritative records of the Department of Labor, that up to, I think it is October 1 of this year, 24,000,000 man-days—not hours, 24,000,000 man-days—have been lost in strikes. Do a little mental arithmetic. The largest automobile plant in the world, I am informed, is the River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co., employing 80,000 people. You will find that the 24,000,000 man-days lost in the aggregate is sufficient to have absolutely closed the River Rouge plant of the Ford Motor Co. for a period of 1 year. Hitler could have sent his bombers to this country and destroyed the River Rouge plant 3 times, and it could have been reconstructed and put in production with the loss this Nation has had through defense strikes.

Mr. Chairman, there is just one fundamental cause underlying these defense strikes. As I say, there is not any use shadow-boxing any more about this thing. We are up to the hurdle now. You are either going to jump it or you are going to refuse. There is only one thing that is fundamental about this and that is the closed shop. That has caused nearly all these defense strikes; and the question that is going to be presented to you in the bill I have drawn will be: Does this Congress dare to reassert the inalienable right of a man to work without paying tribute to any man? This is the fundamental question in all this legislation. It is the fundamental question that is causing the defense strikes. Let us look at the situation a minute—let us take coal.

In the coal industry you have just been through a strike which loads down the steel operations of this country, and why? There was but one question involved, the closed shop. That was the question: Whether a man should have the right to work given him by God taken away from him by a labor union. Gentleman, are you for it are you against it? This is the sole question presented here.

I noticed by the press and I noticed by the speeches in Congress much talk about John Lewis. Some people have gone so far as to say John L. Lewis was a traitor. I never said so. Why lay it on John L. Lewis? What has John L. Lewis done? John L. Lewis has honestly and bluffly and bluntly told the American people and the American Congress and the President of the United States, "I propose to take advantage of and to operate under the laws that Congress has made for labor." He is operating under the laws you have made—the laws which set labor unions aside, apart, and above other American citizens. Do you blame John L. Lewis or does the blame rest on the doorstep of Congress and this administration? And I ask you the question in all seriousness. I am not here personally to complain about John L. Lewis. I come not to praise Caesar but to bury him. This is the opportunity of this Congress—the only opportunity you have had and the only opportunity you probably will have—to correct the mistakes you know we have made. What are you going to do about it? Let us go on to steel.

Mr. Murray, Philip Murray, lately a member of the great Board that was going to prevent strikes in defense industries, the first time he loses an inning, runs out on you, resigns, picks up his toys, goes home, and says, "I won't play any more."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot yield until I finish the main part of my statement. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question at this point.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Let us see what has been said about Mr. Murray and steel. You know that, with the C. I. O., Mr. Murray can, when he gets ready, call out the men in the steel industry and paralyze your defense production. There is no question about that; nobody is going to challenge that statement; it is a fact—a serious fact. Think about it. What did Mr. Murray say in his speech recently? I quote what I read about it in the newspapers. Mr. Murray said—listen to me, Mr. Chairman—Mr. Murray said:

Nothing must stop the work of organizing the unorganized in America; not even—

I hope the person in the gallery who just applauded will applaud the next statement—

not even a great national emergency must stop it.

That is a solemn statement—a solemn fact—a dangerous situation. Are you going to do something about it today or are you going to continue to shadow-box with the Nation's safety?

It has been said on high authority in this House that the Ramspeck bill does all that is necessary in the present situation, and that is what I want to discuss,

so far as the merits of these proposals are concerned.

Let us see if it does all that is necessary. I differ with the statement. The Ramspeck bill does not start to operate until there is trouble. It only operates when the Board takes jurisdiction of a dispute; then they may issue a stop order or an injunction may be issued to prevent the strike or prevent participation in a strike. You know perfectly well what is going to happen if such a measure is enacted into law which will permit injunctions against strikes after the Board has taken charge. Here is what is going to happen: These unions are going to call the strike first, and they are going to mediate after the strike has been called. The gentleman from Georgia yesterday said if they did that they could be enjoined. I am quite sure if that had been the opinion of the majority of the members of the Labor Committee of the House, the Ramspeck bill would not be here today. The Labor Committee of this House would never propose that we enact legislation which would permit an injunction against a strike.

But, going back to the original cause of all this trouble, which is the closed shop, you will recall that last fall, when this thing first began, numerous bills were introduced to get action. We tried to get action, but we could not get it from the legislative committees. So I and other Members began to offer amendments to appropriation bills which provided that no man should be required to pay tribute for the privilege of working for his Government. That has been the great battle, and we have debated that subject on practically every appropriation bill that has come up. I was defeated every time insofar as those amendments were concerned.

Do you remember what the argument was? The argument was that "This is not the place to do it. We ought to have legislation. These things are an outrage. Let us get a committee to bring in a bill, and let us stop it."

That was the burden of the debate that took place around those amendments. Now that great day has come. You have a bill here, and you have an opportunity to correct the evils which all of you have said exist. What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Chairman, about that time the President decided to set up a mediation board, and I wrote him a letter on March 14, 1941. I have never said anything about that letter, but since I have never received an answer to it, I do not think I will be subject to criticism if I read it to you.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the Clerk read this letter in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I understand it is your purpose to set up, by Executive order, in the near future, some type of labor board for the prevention of strikes in defense industries.

May I urge you, in doing so, not to overlook the cruel wrong now being perpetrated on unorganized workers by the so-called closed-shop requirements almost universally prevailing in Government construction work as well as in other defense industries?

Competent men seeking employment even on direct Government work are required to pay unconscionable fees to union representatives under the guise of initiation fees. Instances of these fees in individual cases run from $23 to $1,500. I have evidence of many instances where inability to pay the required amount has foreclosed the worker from obtaining employment.

The payment of such fees, in many instances, does not admit the employee to membership in the union or to the rights and privileges of union members, but merely gives him a temporary license or permit to work on a single job.

In some instances, in lieu of the so-called initiation fee, he is charged a flat sum per day or per week for a permit to work, for which he likewise receives no union privileges or right of participation in union affairs.

In some instances of so-called jurisdictional controversies, one union, through arbitrary action, will prevent members of other equally legitimate unions from working on Government jobs.

Farm boys, seeking temporary work as common laborers, are refused employment on Government projects in their own vicinities unless they pay the demanded tribute to a union representative.

Competent unemployed men, who are able to pay the required initiation fee, are refused work until all union men have first been employed.

Contractors, through voluntary agreements with unions, encourage these practices.

Closed shop demands are at this moment preventing delivery to the Government of finished materials urgently needed.

I will not trespass on your time with specific instances, but if anyone doubts or challenges any of the foregoing statements, ample and conclusive proof that these practices are universally prevalent throughout the country is easily available and obtainable, and I shall be happy to cooperate in producing it.

I respectfully but urgently recommend that, in any administrative device contemplated for the prevention of delay in defense industries, there be included machinery that will effectively and affirmatively protect the right of any American citizen to work without being required, as a condition, that he pay a tax or tribute to any private person or organization.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, that is the indictment of the situation that exists and has existed in this country in your defense work by the operation of the closed-shop principle. No one has denied the truth of those assertions. Nobody can deny them because they are susceptible of proof and you all know them to be the fact. It just means that through the legislation which Congress has enacted we have unwittingly placed the American workingman in a state of peonage, subject to the whim, the fancies, and the dictation of a handful of labor leaders. The question presented to you is going to be, Are you willing to take him out of peonage? Are you willing to take him out of slavery? Are you willing to do the necessary things by law that will restore to him the right that God gave him to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow? That is all there is to it, Mr. Chairman.

A lot of folks think that it is probably unpopular to do something about these labor unions. Well, there is no better yardstick of public opinion in America than the Gallup poll. They have recently taken a series of polls on the questions here involved, and I want to remind you of them.

Eighty-two percent of the American people are in favor of a compulsory cooling-off period. Do you know that 73 percent of the American people are in favor of an absolute prohibition upon all strikes in defense industries? We in the Congress are just not up with public opinion; that is our trouble. I think you will be amazed, as I was amazed, to find that in those polls 64 percent of labor itself is in favor of a law absolutely forbidding strikes in defense industries. Do you know that, according to the Gallup poll, 77 percent of the American people are opposed to the closed-shop principle? And by the way, we hear about what is going on in England and we should not make any laws because England is not making any laws. The truth is that England started 10 years before we did and England enacted laws, which prohibit mass picketing, they prohibit intimidation and violence, and, according to the report of the President's commission that went to England, the closed shop is an unknown institution in the British Empire.

What does this so-called Ramspeck bill do? I have compared it pretty closely with the so-called Norton bill. I do not know whose baby it is, but it is very similar to the Norton bill. I have gone over the two together and I find that the language is practically the same. It comes to us as the Ramspeck bill. I do not know whether it was sent up some time during the night and dropped on the doorstep of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], or not; but, nevertheless, we have the baby here. I want to tell you some of the things that the Ramspeck bill does not do. For instance, the Ramspeck bill would not touch the infamous Currier case. You know what happened in the Currier case. I think most of you do.

There an employer who employed C. I. O. labor was the low bidder by $400,000 on a housing contract. Because the A. F. of L. said, "If you give this contract to the C. I. O. there is going to be a strike in the Detroit area," the O. P. M. through Sidney Hillman absolutely refused to give that contract to the low bidder, who was saving the United States taxpayers $400,000.

I listened to Mr. Hillman's testimony before the Truman committee in the Senate. The effect of his testimony—I think almost the words of it—was that he knew that if he gave this contract to these people, who were low bidders, and who were financially responsible, it was going to result in great labor trouble in the Detroit area.

What does that spell? What does it spell in plain, common-sense language? It means that, because somebody threatened to strike, the United States Government absolutely surrendered its rights and its powers and its duty to the Amer-

ican taxpayer and to the American citizen and said, "Boys, just don't strike. We won't let this fellow have any work." Is that right? Is this Congress willing to do anything about it? Today is going to be your opportunity.

The Ramspeck bill does not touch that situation. The Ramspeck bill would not prevent any of the great steel strikes that are taking place. It would not stop the strikes that are taking place in the automobile industry or in the plane factories, and one great strike is promised you tomorrow morning in a great plane factory. It would not stop any of the great strikes in Ford, in the manufacture of tanks. It would not stop those outrageous riots which took place in the Ford strike, when the C. I. O. absolutely, through insurrection, assumed the government of the area there, ran the policemen off the place, and took charge with their own traffic cops and their own thugs.

When I was a boy we called that insurrection against the Government. Today some people want to call it the inalienable rights of labor. What is this Congress going to call it? The question is up to you.

The Ramspeck bill makes no distinction between the types of strikes. All strikes are put in the same category. A strike for a perfectly legitimate cause, as to an honest dispute about wages or working conditions, is put in exactly the same status as a sympathetic strike or a jurisdictional strike or the other types of strikes that we all know ought to be stopped.

In the few minutes that remain to me, let me tell you what is in the bill I propose to offer as a substitute. I have, first, a cooling-off period of 30 days, during which there can be neither a lock-out nor a strike, and during which time there shall be a conciliation. I have a strike ballot; in other words, there must be a secret ballot conducted under the auspices of the United States Government before any strike can be called.

I propose to freeze the closed shop in its present status. This means that where there is a closed shop the closed shop may remain by voluntary agreement. Where there is no closed shop I propose to say that there shall not be a repetition of the Ford riots during the time of our emergency merely for the purpose of permitting some labor organization to place in a state of peonage free American citizens who have the right to work without paying tribute to anybody.

I propose to say, as was said in the May bill, that the man who wants to work for his living shall not be interfered with or intimidated or prevented from going to his work by force or violence. Is there anything wrong with that? I wonder that people have the temerity to oppose a provision that merely says that during these labor disputes there must and shall be law and order; yet that is what killed the May bill in this House.

I propose to stop jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, and boycott strikes, so far as they affect national defense. I propose to require the registration and financial accounting of their assets by the labor unions, and I propose to enforce these restrictions not by criminal penalties, but by withdrawing from the violators of the law their rights under the National Labor Relations Act and their rights under the Norris-LaGuardia Act. In other words, all we are saying to these gentlemen is, now, we are in an emergency, we are in the middle of a bad fix, we need to get this stuff made. You can have your unions, you can have your check-off, and you can have all the things you have now. You can have a strike if it is for a legitimate cause, but if you are going to strike for sympathy reasons, if you are going to boycott somebody's product, if you are simply to build up a labor union in this hour when the Nation needs every moment of your time—if you are going to do those things then we, the Congress of the United States, propose to say that for that offense we are going to take away from you the special privileges which Congress has heretofore given you, privileges over and above and beyond those of other American citizens in the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining, I would be glad to yield to those gentlemen to whom I was not able to yield during the course of my remarks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman please point out in what portion of his bill, H. R. 6066, there is exercised jurisdiction over the financial records of the unions?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have made some modifications in the bill which I did not have time to explain, and the gentleman will find that in the bill, H. R. 6149, and I may say for the information of the House that in the revised bill I have added to it the so-called Ramspeck bill. So you now have the picture with the things I propose, plus the things included in the Ramspeck bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. A while ago the gentleman from Virginia referred to the fact that Messrs. Murray and Kennedy had resigned from the Mediation Board. Does the gentleman realize that the reason they got off that Board was not because of their disappointment at a decision, but because they knew that they had been unfairly dealt with and had been double-crossed?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I am just like Will Rogers; I only know what I see in the papers.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman made reference to a provision in the proposed bill which has for its purpose the publication of the financial statement of receipts and expenditures. Is that right?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. What is the purpose of that or what is its ultimate objective?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. One purpose seems to be that 77 percent of the union members themselves would like to know what has become of the money.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. DINGELL. I have not finished.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will come back to the gentleman if I have time.

Mr. DINGELL. I can give the gentleman some information that he ought to know about.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to give the gentleman that opportunity.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman believe that Congress has the constitutional power to pass an anti-strike bill to prevent men from quitting work if they desire to do so?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I doubt it very much, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, although if the gentleman will read the decision in the case that I have forgotten the name of just at the moment, of Justice Brandeis, who is the greatest liberal this country has had in this generation, it states that there is no such thing as the right to strike.

I now want to come back to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. The fact of the matter is——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman wants to ask a question I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. DINGELL. The fact of the matter is that all members who want to know about expenditures and receipts of their respective unions—and they are the only ones who are entitled to know—have that information available through monthly and quarterly reports, and if the gentleman wants to know the chances are he can go down to the Congressional Library and get that information there, too, but only the members are entitled to know about their expenditures and about their receipts.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then there should be no objection to the provisions of my bill.

Mr. DINGELL. It is available now.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWEENEY. The gentleman has stated in his letter to the President of the United States that he has knowledge that some unions were charging $1,500 for a permit or license to work in defense industry. Will the gentleman kindly inform the House what unions that statement refers to?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not remember the union, but the gentleman will find it in the hearings before the Judiciary Committee in the statement by Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman a moment ago stated that Justice Brandeis held that there is no such thing as a right to strike. However, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that was a minority opinion and the last word of the highest court of the land is that a man has a right to strike.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am disposed to agree with the gentleman. If there are no further questions I will yield the floor.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there any provision in the gentleman's bill that would prevent a man from striking?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; not in any circumstances.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the bill has no penalty provisions and seeks to impose no penalty upon those who violate the law?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No. I say no criminal penalty. It withdraws the privileges under the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. COOLEY. And that is the only penalty?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Virginia a short time back was interested in bringing about some amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I observed an Associated Press dispatch in the papers of last Friday in which it was said that in the forthcoming second edition of the President's book, to be released today, the President says that back in 1938, in an off-the-record press conference, he said that the Labor Act should be amended. Was the gentleman familiar with any such suggestion from the administration or the President or any of his appointees on the Labor Board?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think any public statement of that kind was made to me, but I saw the article about it to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKEOUGH].

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful that one who assumes the position I am about to take does not find himself in a majority opinion throughout this Nation. Our company is small today. Obviously there must be a reason for it. We all know that we are engaged in a national-defense program. That calls of course for the finest patriotism on the part of every citizen of the Nation. I shall attempt to develop, with your indulgence and attention, that that institution known as labor has been classified as a result of inspired publicity and efforts as the "bad boy" of the defense program. It is to be regretted that those upon whom much in the way of abuse has been heaped, are not permitted under our form of government to come to the well of the House or appear on the floor of the Senate and make a defense of the charges that are now being made against them. I do not assume today to speak in defense of any individual labor leader of the country. The names of two or three have been mentioned in the debate so far as it has progressed. Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, is one; Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, is another, and Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, is a third, of whom unfavorable comment has been made today. I am not here to defend any one of the three of them. They need no defense at my hands. Fortunately for those who toil they are well equipped to defend themselves; and I think, as we approach the tomorrow, which under the rules of this body require that this House vote either up or down some antistrike legislation, it might be well for us to pause in our deliberations at least, and go back to the fundamentals that are involved in this legislation. I think to get the correct perspective, we have to remember something about the immediate background that precedes this so-called reign of terror, which those who urge anti-labor legislation would lead us to conclude those who toil have caused since the national emergency was declared by the President of the United States. This, of course, will require your indulgence in order that I may put back of the present stage setting a drop curtain, that we might be better able to get a proper perspective of what now presents itself to the House and to the Congress of the country for disposition.

In August 1940, as a result of the urgent call of the President of the United States, whose urgings were supplemented by the gentlemen who then had charge of the Office of Production Management, joined, of course, by every corporate entity of this great Nation, the Ways and Means Committee of this body was called into session by its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

On the first day of those hearings, August 9, 1940, there appeared before that committee the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Compton, speaking for Mr. Knox, the Secretary, who was in Chicago on urgent business. Their testimony was supplemented and implemented by Mr. Knudsen of the O. P. M. The members of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Senate Finance Committee were told very plainly and very openly that the production program that would position this Nation to adequately defend itself against any of its enemies, necessitated a revision of the then existing statutes of this great country. We were told unless from the law of this land we eliminated the statute that was familiarly known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, fathered in this body by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, who now sponsors the legislation we are about to consider—and I compliment him for the vision and for the constructive judgment that was reflected in that law as it then appeared on the statute books—the defense program would be delayed. In passing, may I say that law provided for a maximum profit for those engaged in naval construction work for this Government and in aircraft work for either the Army or the Navy. Representatives of business interests came before our committee, and I am told, and I think reliably so, they appeared before our committee after having had some conferences with the President of this country, and we were told that business would not proceed with the production program unless we struck from the statute books the limitation on profits that the Vinson-Trammell Act provided. We were also told that in order that they might proceed in the interest of national defense we would have to allow them special treatment with relation to expansion of plant or facilities. It was finally suggested as acceptable to business that a 5-year amortization plan be written into the tax bill that we were then beginning to consider. That became the fixed law as a result of those urgings.

Now, I wonder who sinned in connection with production. Back in August 1940 there was very little production and I submit it was not caused by any labor trouble. There was no production because business insisted on its pound of flesh. May I say in passing, that there be no misunderstanding of my position. I have no quarrel with private industry. I subscribe as fully and as militantly as any Member of this House or the Senate or in the Government anywhere to the right of private industry to go forward. I have no particular quarrel with industry, but I do want to keep the record straight and I want to be fair both to industry—as we better know it, to capital—and to the 46,000,000 who toil in this country who, collectively, are known as labor. I want to point out that of the 46,000,000 who toil there are but ten or eleven million of them who belong to what now seems to be the "bad boy" sent to the whipping-post—organized labor. If organized labor, constituting as it does but ten or eleven million of the 46,000,000 who toil, is as bad as we have been led to believe for the past several months, the production of defense material does not corroborate the indictment. One is only required to read of the increased car loadings—increased number of produced airplanes, tanks, ordnance, and other related defense items to refute the claim of labor's lack of patriotism or to deny by competent testimony that labor has failed the needs of its country.

I do not stand here today with any fixed opinion that somebody identified with labor has not sinned. Of course, they have sinned. Their perfidy calls for vengeance that cries to heaven.

I submit that a man who has been elevated to any leadership position in labor who fails in the full discharge of his responsibility is as low a creature as there is housed in the human family. But I say of labor, and those who have led it, thank God I need make no apology

for either those who lead labor or those who toil, for I submit that without them we are not a government; we are not a country. I submit, my friends, those who toil have not failed in their obligations to God or country. Hitler would have been successful long ago if it were not for the contribution those who toil have made to secure all that we hold sacred. You have recently heard on the radio and read in your newspapers that tanks and airplanes manufactured in our country by American labor are now pushing across the sands of Libya and routing the forces of the enemies of democracies.

Oh, yes; labor is the so-called "bad boy." I listened with interest to the gentleman from Virginia. His great worry is the closed shop, as it is known. I wonder if those who were here in the last Congress, I think it was, when, with the same eloquence, the same ability, that cunning that the great lawyers seem to possess, the gentleman from Virginia came to this body, under a special rule from the Rules Committee, of which he is a member, and urged that this House and later the Congress, by action of the Senate, should impose the closed shop in the interest of the milk producers of the States of Virginia and Maryland.

Where was his animosity then to the principle of the closed shop when it related to the cattle of Virginia and Maryland? And he now becomes so exercised when those who are members of the human family, by a kindly and providential design made to the image and likeness of their Master, seek by negotiation to become the beneficiaries of the closed shop principle as it relates to labor. Where is the sin? I ask him. It is only just that we recite these things to an hysterical populace throughout the Nation led by those who hate labor to still the cry "Crucify labor." Away with them. As the scribes and the pharisees of 1,900 years ago cried to the people of Jerusalem: "He is a false leader, away with Him. Crucify Him." And unfortunately, the people of Jerusalem listened to them. But I would feel that my country would have been unworthy of everything that we hold dear and sacred if you, the Congress of this great Nation, listen today and tomorrow to the subtle cry, Away with them. Crucify labor. But if I know my people, and if I know my colleagues, I say that the answer will go out Wednesday night that the Seventy-seventh Congress of the greatest Nation in the world will again rededicate itself to the high principle of human dignity and will refuse to crucify labor, or adopt the Hitler technique of totalitarianism by first destroying the God-given rights of labor as an introduction to the confiscation of property.

I do not want to inflict myself on you much longer. I merely want to point out some things that I think the House should be reminded of at this time. I would ask that everybody today who pays me the high compliment of listening to me turn to yesterday's RECORD, page 9298, where the gentleman from Virginia very thoughtfully read a statement prepared by the Parliamentarian of this body in which he outlined the procedure that will be followed in the consideration of this anti-labor legislation tomorow. I merely direct your attention to it because I am sure that with all the intricacies of the parliamentary handling of these measures tomorrow nobody on the floor will know what the status of the legislation might be with the exception of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] who is acting as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and our very able Parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler; and I might add in tribute to the ability of those who seek to destroy that sacred right of labor, the able lawyers who urge this legislation—oh yes—they will know. But I speak only as one who grew up in a great metropolitan city of this Nation, denied as many of us were in my generation, the happy opportunity of higher education; living as I have lived with those who toil; and I might say if you will pardon a personal reference I have never been a member of a labor union, not because I would not have joined one, but my work was of such character that I was never eligible to join one; but had I been able to I would have joined one; I would have followed the philosophy of those who grew up with me, and who are now the skilled artisans throughout the defense industries and the mills of this country, and are members of labor unions; boys who grew up with me and now are occupying with credit very responsible official positions in the steel and other defense industries of our city.

You say to me that labor lacks patriotism. Why, Mr. Chairman, without labor, what could we do? Labor heads the families and gives to the Nation its stalwart sons and daughters, amongst whom the viciousness of race suicide has not yet penetrated, thank God. When the call to the colors goes out, who is it that responds? Is it that impersonal institution called the corporation? No; it is human beings, the sons and daughters of the toilers of America; they are those who would lay down their very lives that America might go on; and I know that if the day comes for the supreme sacrifice, which God forbid, they will never be found wanting, because they, thank God, are Americans and love their country. I hope as to all this vicious anti-labor legislation, when the vote is taken in connection with the motion to strike out everything after the enacting clause tomorrow night, this House to its undying glory will pronounce the death sentence on all such vicious anti-labor legislation and thus preserve their sacred rights to all who toil.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yields back 7 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the problem before us calls for plain speaking, and, however painfully the truth may fall upon ears which have not heard it hitherto, I am compelled to contribute my share of plain speech about this question.

The problem with which we are confronted today may have been precipitated by John L. Lewis' strike in the so-called captive mines—a strike called in defiance of the Nation's safety and equally in defiance of the best interests of labor. But the real problem roots in events much more remote than last month's walkout in the coal regions. It is a problem which goes back to the very beginning of the C. I. O.; and before I take my seat I propose to show by concrete evidence that the beginning of the C. I. O. was marked by a coalition of communism and criminality. I propose further to show that Communists and criminals have gravitated toward the C. I. O. from its inception down to the present.

No; I am not about to indict the whole membership of the C. I. O. I lay neither communism nor crime at the door of the millions of men and women who work and who alone are entitled to be dignified by the term "labor," whether they belong to one union or another or to none. There are those who say that labor must be curbed in the interests of national defense. I say that labor must be emancipated in the interests of national defense. Wherever Communists and criminals have put labor in shackles, those shackles must be broken.

I repeat that our problem is one that roots in the very beginning of the C. I. O. When John L. Lewis arrogates to himself powers that are above and beyond government, above and beyond law, at least he cannot boast that he is entirely a self-made man. He is, in part at least, the creature of the very Government which he has recently defied. The plain, blunt truth is that John L. Lewis and his organization grew powerful and defiant in the days of the sit-down strikes. The labor boss and his mobs were let alone in their lawlessness and violence. Their mob spirit was officially pampered, though it were no more serious than the ill temper of a 3-year-old child. But I say to you that the official toleration of, and the official silence upon, the lawlessness of the sit-down strikes were perfectly suited to encourage just the sort of arrogance with which John L. Lewis called the miners from the captive mines with full knowledge that his act placed the national safety in jeopardy.

Almost 5 years ago I took the floor of this House to denounce the sit-down strikes. My duty, as I then understood it, would not permit me to do otherwise. I spoke, in part, as follows:

> I refer to the wave of sit-down strikes which is sweeping the Nation and which constitutes, in my judgment, an open challenge to law and order and a bold threat to that stability without which no nation can long survive. To remain discreetly silent in the presence of such a menace, or to condone by inaction this threat to the very foundations upon which our Government is erected, cannot be justified from any point of view. I, therefore, rise, Mr. Chairman, to denounce this flagrant and indefensible violence, which either must be stopped or else the security of personal and property rights will cease to exist.

I further declared on that occasion almost 5 years ago that—

> To my way of thinking, the sit-down strikes are doing infinitely more harm to the cause of labor than to the cause of industry.

The sit-down strikes were a communistic importation from France. At one time in 1936 practically the whole of French industry was in a state of complete paralysis as a result of the Moscow-ordered and Moscow-led sit-down strikes.

French defense industries lost millions of man-days at the most crucial moment in French history since 1789, and at the very time when Nazi industries across the Rhine were working at top speed to equip the panzer divisions and to build the vast fleet of stukas which were to spell the destruction of France. In the perspective of the years which have elapsed since French industry was paralyzed by the Communist-led sit-down strikes two figures appear in an extraordinarily tragic light. They are Leon Blum and Leon Jouhaux. Neither Blum nor Jouhaux was a card-holding Communist, but both of them condoned the work of the Communists in paralyzing French industry. Both of them went further than condoning the sit-downs, however, for both tried to profit out of France's tragedy. Leon Blum, the politician, headed a People's Front government, which had been initiated in Moscow and which owed much of its numerical support to the sit-down strikes. Leon Jouhaux, the labor boss of France, boasted that he had built a labor organization of 5,000,000 members largely as a result of the sit-down strikes. Today Leon Blum has time to think it all over in his castle prison in the Pyrenees. I do not know where Leon Jouhaux, the John L. Lewis of France, is now thinking it all over, but wherever he is he can only contemplate that the so-called labor gains of his sit-down era were long ago erased in the blood and tears of France. Leon Blum and Leon Jouhaux may have wished France well. Their motives may have been good; their outlook progressive. But they, and France with them, were destroyed because they coddled a coalition of communism and criminality at the gravest moment in the history of modern France. They may have worked sincerely for what they conceived to be labor's gains, but their sincerity did not save them and France from Hitler's panzer divisions or Goering's stukas.

I hope that the day may soon come when we purge our minds of the confusion that everything which masquerades as labor is indeed the true representative of the working man and woman of America. May the day soon come when we are able to distinguish clearly between labor's gains on the one hand and the irresponsible power of labor bosses on the other hand. When I disclose the Communist and criminal records of a cross section of C. I. O. officialdom my meaning will be clearer.

It has been shown repeatedly that the Communists flocked to the banners of the C. I. O. when John L. Lewis set out to make himself the all-powerful boss over labor unions in America. Hundreds of Communist Party members were employed as organizers throughout the United States. Earl Browder testified that more than 30,000 of his party's members entered the C. I. O. Certainly we would give little credence to Browder's unsupported word on any subject, but for his claim that more than 30,000 card members of the Communist Party joined the ranks of the C. I. O. he has ample corroborating evidence.

Our committee found unanimously in its report to Congress 2 years ago that Communists were entrenched in the leadership of at least 11 of the unions which are affiliated with the C. I. O. All of the evidence which has been uncovered since that report was made has verified the accuracy of our finding. For example, when the American Peace Mobilization was picketing the White House last spring we found that the main support for that Communist enterprise came from the 11 unions which we had listed in our report 2 years ago.

It is well known that the sit-down strikes of 1937 led me to introduce my resolution calling for an investigation of un-American activities. That investigation has turned up volumes of evidence which establishes beyond any possible dispute the fact that Communists were in the forefront of the sit-down-strike movement and that they have remained in positions of leadership in many of the C. I. O. unions down to the present time.

On several occasions I have taken the floor of this House to call the names of important officials in the C. I. O. who are Communists. In all but two or three instances out of hundreds their records of Communist affiliation have been so clear as to be beyond debate. In order that we may more clearly grasp the nature of the problem for whose solution we are now contemplating some kind of legislation, I cite again a few of the more glaring instances of Communist leadership in the higher brackets of the C. I. O.'s labor bosses:

Joseph Curran, Frederick N. Myers, and Patrick Whalen, of the National Maritime Union.

Michael Quill, John Santo, and Austin Hogan, of the Transport Workers Union.

Lewis Alan Berne and Marcel Scherer, of the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

Ben Gold and Irving Potash, of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union.

Donald Henderson, Emma Tenayuca, and J. Austin Beasley, of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America.

Harry Bridges and Mat Meehan, of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

James Matles, James Lustig, and Neil Brandt, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

Joseph Selly and Leroy Bremmer, of the American Communications Association.

Abram Flaxer and Nancy Reed, of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America.

Lewis Merrill and Dan Allen, of United Office and Professional Workers of America.

O. M. Orton, of the Woodworkers of America.

Grant Oakes, of the Farm Equipment Workers Organizing Committee.

George C. Peacock, Kenneth Eggert, Ralph Dawson, and Alex Balint, of the National Association of Die Casters.

Reid Robinson, of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America.

George Powers, John Steuben, and Gertrude Haessler, of the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee.

The records of our committee disclose the fact that more than 2,000 leaders of one sort or another in the unions of the C. I. O. have been affiliated with the Communist Party or its auxiliary organizations. Time and time again I have called upon the top leaders of the C. I. O. to purge the Communists from all official positions in the organization. The continued leadership of Communists in the C. I. O. can only work for the detriment of the working men and women who are under their control.

Most of this evidence concerning communism in the C. I. O. is now an old story. There may be those who tire of hearing about it, but I shall continue to raise my voice against the victimization of American working men and women through Communist leadership.

What I have to say from now on is not an old story. I have not hitherto spoken of the widespread presence of criminals in the officialdom of the C. I. O. How we came to possess the criminal records of C. I. O. leaders is worth recording. From time to time we discovered, more by accident than by intent, that a certain C. I. O. leader with a Communist record also had a criminal record. For example, we found that the Communist organizer of the National Association of Die Casters, Alex Balint, had served a prison term for the theft of an automobile. We found that the president of the die casters' local at the aluminum plants in Cleveland, Paul Martin, had served a long prison term for a hold-up. Time and time again we discovered that C. I. O. leaders had both Communist and criminal records.

Such ugly facts concerning the backgrounds of C. I. O. officials piled up in our records until they began to make a pattern. I have taken more or less at random a cross section of the more recent additions to our files. I have here the criminal records of a score of C. I. O. officials. Before the end of the year our files will contain similar records of almost 1,000 C. I. O. officials.

In the score of cases which I have before me here, I find that convictions were obtained on the following charges: Grand larceny, burglary, grand theft, carrying concealed weapons, assault and robbery, breaking and entering and larceny, white slavery, hold-up, conspiracy, attempted arson, receiving stolen property, felonious assault, extortion, and forgery.

The C. I. O. officials to whom these criminal records belong are conected with the following unions:

United Automobile Workers of America.

American Communications Association.

National Maritime Union.

Bergen County, N. J., Industrial Union Council.

Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

International Fur and Leather Workers' Union.

United Retail and Wholesale Employees.

Transport Workers' Union.

The records of the following persons, listed alphabetically, are before me:

John James Bonner, Leroy Bremmer, Donald N. Brown, Charles Davey, Joseph Doucette, Benjamin Fields, Ferdinand Galatioto, Melville Glynn, Charles Hansen, Jack Hoffman, Allen Marcus, Edwin Morris, Anthony Panchelly, Irving Potash, Sam Rosenzweig, John Santo, Jesse F. Suttka, Rubin Warsager, Patrick Whalen, and Edward Woodward.

If it were not for the prohibitive cost of reproducing these records, I would have offered 500 of them for your inspection instead of this cross section of 20. You may, however, have them if you so desire.

Five of those listed above have been organizers of the United Automobile Workers at the plant of Air Associates at Bendix, N. J. Inasmuch as that plant was taken over by the United States Army not long ago as a result of some so-called labor troubles, let us look more closely at the records of the union organizers whose activities led to this Army seizure of Air Associates. First, consider the record of Organizer John James Bonner. In 1926 Bonner was sent up for 3 years for grand larceny. Again in 1927, after having been paroled, he was sent up for 3 years for grand larceny. In 1930 Bonner drew an 18-year term for third-degree burglary. Having served 10 years of his last sentence, John James Bonner then became an organizer for the United Automobile Workers. Second, consider the record of Organizer Joseph Doucette. In 1929 Doucette, a man of numerous aliases, had his first encounter with the law. His offense was robbery. From that time onward for about 10 years Doucette was variously charged with and convicted for breaking, entering, larceny, receiving, petty larceny, robbery, and larceny on four counts. In 1941 Doucette became an organizer for the United Automobile Workers at the plant of Air Associates at Bendix, N. J. Third, consider the record of Ferdinand Galatioto, also an organizer at the plant of Air Associates. Most of the time between 1926 and 1941 Galatioto was in the toils of the law. Petty larceny, parole violation, and carrying concealed weapons were the charges for which he served prison terms. In 1941 Galatioto was paroled during the third year of a 7-year sentence which he was serving at Elmira, N. Y. Shortly after his release from Elmira he became an organizer for the United Automobile Workers. Fourth, consider the record of Organizer Allen Marcus. Unlike his three fellow organizers whom I have cited, Marcus had only one conviction, and that was for burglary and petty larceny. Conviction for some kind of stealing seems to have been a prerequisite for getting an organizer's job in the United Automobile Workers at the Air Associates plant, for finally we come to the record of Organizer Edwin Morris, who was sentenced 1 to 2 years for receiving stolen property in the State of Pennsylvania.

I have cited the records of these Bendix, N. J., organizers in some detail because the Army's seizure of the Air Associates plant in that town was a part of one of the most amazing stories of official groveling before Communists and criminals ever recorded. In brief, the following is the outline of the Air Associates story:

United Automobile Workers' organizers with surprisingly similar criminal records succeeded in getting 65 employees (out of more than 650) of Air Associates to go out on strike.

Production of vital airplane parts was obstructed temporarily, but the strike failed dismally, and full production was resumed.

The New Jersey State Mediation Board, headed by a Communist named William L. Nunn, intervened on behalf of the 65 employees and first made the novel suggestion that the management of the plant itself be removed if it failed to comply with his demands.

The National Defense Mediation Board then intervened on behalf of the 65 employees whose strike had turned out to be a fiasco. The National Defense Mediation Board ordered Air Associates to reinstate all of the strikers.

The Air Associates agreed to reinstatement with the proviso that such reinstatement would be completed within 30 days, so that a minimum of friction would result from displacing new employees with those who had gone on strike and were now ordered reinstated.

Richard Frankensteen, national official of the United Automobile Workers, rushed to New Jersey, and announced that he would bring about a five-State stoppage in aircraft production if Air Associates did not immediately reinstate all the strikers to their former positions

Frankensteen then flew to Washington. He walked into the White House and, 30 minutes later, emerged with the announcement that the President had given him assurance of complete support for his demands.

Army officers were sent to the Air Associates plant to observe the return of the 65 strikers to their former positions.

When the 65 entered the plant, most of the 700 employees walked out temporarily in protest against the decision of the National Defense Mediation Board, and some of them undertook forcibly to prevent the return of the 65.

Thereupon the United States Army was ordered to take over the plant and dispossess its private owners and managers.

The final act in this amazing episode has been the resignation, under Army pressure, of the former management of Air Associates as a condition for the return of the plant to its rightful owners.

Let us hope that Richard Frankensteen's threats in the future will be treated like John L. Lewis' threats; with the contempt that a powerful and sovereign Government owes a labor boss whose domain was built on lawlessness. I am indebted to the President for calling John L. Lewis' demand for a Government-sponsored closed shop by its right name. The President called it Hitlerism. Indeed, John L. has been in this sulking and defiant mood for the sole reason that the President has declined to help him obtain the same kind of power over American workingmen that Hitler conferred upon Dr. Robert Ley. You may call it Hitlerism, Stalinism, totalitarianism, or what have you; it is un-American to force workingmen into the shackles of labor bosses who strive to build up personal power for themselves through the use of the Communist and criminal elements that gravitate toward them.

Aping Hitler on this side of the Atlantic is not going to help us smash him on the other side. Zealously must we guard the rights of free labor and free enterprise, lest we lose the power that stems only from a free, democratic, and united people.

I ask that you examine carefully the criminal records which I submit herewith. They make a sickening picture. They make a shameful picture which should impress itself upon us until we come to an awareness of the nature and magnitude of the problem which we may otherwise discuss too glibly.

I wish to point out that there is an inexorable logic in this coalition between communism and criminality. That logic is simply this: A lot of criminals who had found the law an obstruction to their robbery, burglary, larceny, and hold-ups discovered that they had been in the wrong racket. They saw communists committing innumerable acts of lawlessness—violence, seizure of the property of others, obstruction of public highways, stoppage of the mails, conspiracy, extortion, and so forth—in the name of labor unions. They saw Government yield disgracefully before the revolutionary lawlessness of the sit-down strike. They figured that there was at least one racket beyond the law and that they had only to masquerade as labor leaders in order to ply their old trades. The result has been that hundreds of men have stepped out of prisons into union jobs. The records speak the ugly, naked truth of the matter.

Too long have we allowed ourselves to be intimidated into an acceptance in silence of the ugly truth about these matters. The Communists cry "red baiter" when we drive them from cover into the light of day. The criminals and racketeers cry "labor baiter" when we turn the spotlight upon their miserable exploitation of workingmen and women. I, for one, refuse to be intimidated either by the Communists or the criminals, either by the radicals or the racketeers. As long as truth, and right, and the welfare of American workingmen and women are on my side, I care not who cries red baiter or labor baiter.

Five years ago, I denounced the sit-down strike as an instrument of revolutionary lawlessness more harmful to labor than to industry. I expressed a profound conviction of my life that the overwhelming majority of labor—organized or unorganized—would, if it were articulate, join me in my denunciation of that Communist importation from France.

Today I rise to denounce this mass invasion of the C. I. O. unions by men of criminal inclinations and records. I am profoundly convinced that the overwhelming majority of labor would, if it were articulate, join me in this solemn protest against the criminal and the racketeer in unions.

However I vote on any of the questions that come before us in trying to solve the problem of uninterrupted production, I want it understood that I am voting not to curb labor but to aid in its emancipation, not to force labor into any form of totalitarian slavery—whether it be Hitler's brand or that of John L. Lewis—but to aid in driving both the Communist and the criminal from the labor scene.

The investigators' reports previously referred to by me follow:

John James Bonner: Organizer, United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Air Associates, Bendix, N. J.

Address, 610 Riverside Drive, New York City.

Record from finger prints:

Malone, N. Y., as John Bonner, in 1926, grand larceny, 3 years, parole.

Malone, N. Y., as John Bonner, in 1927, grand larceny, first 3 years served sentence.

Malone, N. Y., as John James Bonner, April 18, 1930, burglary, third degree.

Malone, N. Y., county jail, as John Bonner, April 18, 1930, burglary, third; disposition 18 years, Dannemora, N. Y.

Dannemora, N. Y., Clinton Prison, as John Bonner, June 3, 1930, confessed burglar, 10 years.

Applied May 22, 1941, for position Electric Boat Co., Bayonne, N. J.

Finger prints taken June 26, 1941, Bergen County police, Hackensack, N. J., as John James Bonner, applicant for position Air Associates, and prior to report being received from Federal Bureau of Investigation, was hired by Air Associates. We are informed by Captain DuBois that Bonner was rehired by the Army when they took over the operation of the Air Associates plant.

November 19, 1941.

Leroy Bremmer: Secretary, local No. 15, broadcast, American Communications Association, 974½ South Hoover Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Records of W. M. Kerr, registrar of voters, Los Angeles, 1940–41: No record.

Records of Los Angeles Police Department, Bureau of Identification: Hair, brown; height, 5 feet 10 inches; weight, 140 pounds; age, 31 years in 1931; Los Angeles No. 29873 M 14; Folsom No. 17497.

August 7, 1931, arrested and sentenced for grand theft, merchandise.

Donald N. Brown: Organizer, National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Address, San Bernardino, Calif.

Pedigree (1937): Age 30 years.

Records of Jersey City (N. J.) Police Department:

January 14, 1933, as Donald N. Brown, San Bernardino, Calif.; carrying concealed weapons; fined $60 or 30 days.

January 1, 1937, as Donald N. Brown, Hoboken, N. J., assault and robbery; sentenced to State prison for 14 to 15 years and costs. Judge Kinkead.

January 1, 1937, as Donald N. Brown, Hoboken, N. J., material witness; committed to grand jury; recorder Romano.

Charles Davey: Secretary, Bergen County (N. J.) Industrial Union Council of Edgewater, N. J., an organization comprised of delegates from Congress of Industrial Organizations unions at Ford Motor Co., Aluminum Co. of America, National Sugar Refining Co. et al., Edgewater, N. J.

Address, Edgewater, N. J.

Pedigree (1939): 34 years old, 5 feet 8½ inches, 152 pounds, chestnut hair, blue eyes, born in New York City.

Records of Edgewater, N. J., Police Department:

August 3, 1939, as Charles Davey, No. 44301, arrested on assault and battery and disorderly conduct charge, sentenced October 2, 1939, on the disorderly conduct charge to $100 fine, and sentenced October 10, 1940, on the assault and battery charge and placed on probation for 3 years; charge was assaulting a police officer.

February 28, 1940, as Charles Davey, South Hackensack, N. J., charged with assault and battery and fined $15.

In a report submitted by the New York office of the Dies committee under date of October 9, 1941, this same person, Charles Davey, addressed a meeting of the Bergen County chapter of the American Peoples' Mobilization, held in Cliffside Park, N. J., October 9, 1941.

Joseph Doucette, alias Eugene I. Lauter, alias Jean F. Lauter, alias Jean Lauter, alias Jock Frederick Doucette: Organizer, United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Air Associates, Bendix, N. J.

Address, 252 Park Avenue, East Orange, N. J.

Record of fingerprints:

January 10, 1929, police department, Hoboken, N. J., as Joseph Doucette, No. 3673; robbery.

May 16, 1929, police department, Newark, N. J., as Joseph Doucette, No. 11639; charged with breaking, entering, larceny; sentence suspended.

February 2, 1932, police department, Newark, N. J., as Eugene I. Lauter, No. 11639; petty larceny; 6 months probation.

September 1, 1932, police department, Newark, N. J., as Joseph Doucette, No. 11639; grand larceny.

September 6, 1932, special officer, police department, Newark, N. J., as Jean F. Lauter, No. 15402; breaking, entering, larceny, receiving.

October 27, 1932, special police, Trenton, N. J., as Jean F. Lauter, No. 15402; entering, larceny, and robbery; 6 years to 6 years and 3 months.

December 9, 1932, as Jean F. Lauter, entering State reformatory at Rahway, N. J., on 6 years and 3 months sentence.

November 17, 1936, Central Identification Bureau, Union County, Elizabeth, N. J., as Jean Lauter, No. 9755; larceny on four counts.

April 24, 1941, police department, Elizabeth, N. J., as Jock Frederick Doucette, No. 548-E; applicant for employment; prints received April 24, 1941.

May 15, 1941, police department, Bellville, N. J., as Jack F. Doucette, No. 307; applicant for position.

August 29, 1941, police department, Hackensack, N. J., as Jack Frederick Doucette; applicant for position; prints received August 29, 1941.

Hoboken, N. J., police have record of arresting above man in Hoboken, N. J., in 1929; also again arresting above man in 1932 for Newark police; charged with stealing pocketbook; 6 months probation.

Benjamin Fields, alias Isadore Friedman, alias Isaac Friedman: Organizer of National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Pedigree: Wrinkled face; bags under eyes; about 52–53 years of age; sometimes wears glasses; eyes blue or gray; bald head, reddish hair.

Records of Jersey City, N. J., Police Department:

January 20, 1917, as Isadore Friedman, New York City; charged with felonious assault; Officer Stagemole, one hundred and fifty-ninth precinct; sentence, 3 months workhouse.

August 14, 1919, as Isaac Friedman, New York City; anarchy; Officer Neman, of bomb squad.

February 6, 1938, as Benjamin Field, Jersey City, N. J.; disorderly person and dangerous weapons. On February 17, 1938, sentenced 3 months, Hudson County Penitentiary. Held for grand jury on dangerous-weapons charge.

At 8:30 a. m., February 6, 1938, Patrolman William Campbell, of the Hudson County Police Department, stopped a Packard sedan on the Skyway, in which Fields was riding, and found in the car a .45-caliber Colt revolver loaded with five shells. The sedan was owned by the National Maritime Union at Baltimore, Md., and the occupants identified themselves as members of the union who were on their way to a Congress of Industrial Organizations meeting in New York City. A Congress of Industrial Organizations sign was on the back of the car. Occupants denied ownership of the gun, saying that it was in the car because the auto was used occasionally to transport sums of money to various cities.

November 13, 1941, according to information in the New York office of the Dies committee, Ben Field was, prior to 1923, one of the extreme Anarchists in the Workers Party. In 1923 he joined the Communist Party. He speaks Russian fluently and reads German, speaking English with no accent whatsoever. He is about 52 years of age, and has a wrinkled face with baggy eyes; bald with reddish hair, which always protrudes underneath the back of his hat, indicating a home haircut; sometimes wears glasses. He is about 5 feet 8½ inches in height, and weighs about 165 pounds. Has blue or blue-gray eyes. When in New York, which is quite often, he hangs around the district office of the Communist Party.

Ben Field has a police record with the Jersey City police, having been picked up on a dangerous-weapons charge, which is still pending against him and four others, the bail being put up by the National Maritime Union, who has paid the expense of the bail bonds for these five men up to date.

Ferdinand Galatioto (alias Ferdinand Galante): Organizer, United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Air Associates, Bendix, N. J.

Address, 145 Marshall Avenue, Little Ferry, N. J.

Record from fingerprints:

Parental school, 1926, truancy, 1 year.

Returned parental school, 1927, violation parole; released in 9 months.

New York City reformatory September 28, 1931; paroled in 9 months.

Wanted by parole commission for violation of parole; warrant issued February 16, 1933.

April 23, 1937, returned to reformatory for violation of parole.

June 24, 1931, petty larceny; disposition, New York City reformatory.

February 13, 1936, vagrancy; suspended sentence.

March 22, 1938, laws of 1897, gun.

May 9, 1938, carrying concealed weapons, felony; 7 years State reformatory, Elmira, N. Y.; paroled February 3, 1941, to Little Ferry, N. J.

September 29, 1941, as Ferdinand Galatioto, fingerprinted by Bergen County police, Hackensack, N. J., for position, Air Associates, Bendix, N. J., and subsequent to receipt of report hired by Air Associates.

Melville Glynn: Financial secretary, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, 1838 Cedar Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.

Address: 134 West Sixty-sixth Street, New York City.

Pedigree (1939): 40 years old; 5 feet 10 inches; 158 pounds; slim build; spare gray hair; blue eyes; occupation, laborer; born United States of America.

Records of New York City police department:

July 27, 1920, as Melville Glynn, Helena, Mont.; grand larceny; 1 to 2 years, State prison.

July 10, 1924, as Melville Glynn, Wichita, Kans.; white slavery; July 11, 1924, fined $51.90; to farm.

July 7, 1926, as M. A. Glynn, Santa Monica, Calif.; hold-up; convicted in Los Angeles and sentenced to 5 years Folsom Prison.

January 5, 1936, as Melville Glynn, Oneonta, N. Y.; petty larceny; convicted.

October 6, 1939, as Melville Glynn, New York City; grand larceny. (Told detective at time of arrest he was boss in a shipbuilding union at navy yard.)

Charles Hansen, alias Walter Hansen, alias "Scoop": Organizer of National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Address, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Records of the Jersey City (N. J.) Police Department:

Brooklyn, N. Y., truancy; 3 months training school.

April 25, 1910, as Charles Hansen, Brooklyn, N. Y., burglary. Officer McClune, one hundred and forty-fifth precinct; sentenced to Elmira Reformatory.

December 19, 1912, as Walter Hansen, Brooklyn, N. Y., attempted burglary; Officer O'Dea, DD.

April 12, 1913, as Walter Hansen, Brooklyn, N. Y.; petty larceny; sentenced 3 months, Blackwells Island Penitentiary.

November 14, 1913, as Walter Hansen, Brooklyn, N. Y.; petty larceny; Officer Ferguson, one hundred and forty-fifth precinct; 1 year, Blackwells Island Penitentiary.

April 12, 1915, as Walter Hansen, Brooklyn, N. Y.; attempted burglary; Officer Howerline, one hundred and forty-fifth precinct; 1½ years at Sing Sing; escaped Auburn Prison, July 23, 1916.

January 28, 1919, as Charles Hansen, Brooklyn, N. Y.; escaped prisoner; Officer Carberry, eighty-ninth squad; turned over to Keeper Murphy, Auburn Prison.

October 2, 1931, as Charles Hansen, Baltimore, Md.; violation of motor-vehicle law.

October 2, 1931, as Charles Hansen, Baltimore, Md.; disorderly conduct and common assault; fined when pleaded guilty.

March 24, 1932, as Charles Hansen, Baltimore, Md.; violation of motor-vehicle law; fined.

March 28, 1938, as Charles Hansen, Baltimore, Md.; found guilty of violation of motor-vehicle laws and fined.

February 6, 1938, as Charles Hansen, Jersey City, N. J.; disorderly person and dangerous weapons; on February 17, 1938, 3 months Hudson County Penitentiary; held for grand jury on dangerous-weapons charge.

At 8:30 a. m., February 6, 1938, Patrolman William Campbell, of the Hudson County Police Department, stopped a Packard sedan on the Skyway, in which Hansen was riding, and found in the car a 45-caliber Colt revolver loaded with five shells. The sedan was owned by the National Maritime Union at Baltimore, Md., and the occupants identified themselves as members of the union, who were on their way to a Congress of Industrial Organizations meeting in New York City. A Congress of Industrial Organizations sign was on the back of the car. Occupants denied ownership of the gun, saying that it was in the car because the auto was used occasionally to transport sums of money to various cities.

Jack Hoffman, alias Alexander Hoffman: general manager, Cleaners and Dyers Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Local No. 239, of A. C. W. of A., 403 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

Address, 504 Grand Street, New York City.

Pedigree (1940): Thirty-eight years old; 5 feet 7 inches; 170 pounds; stocky build; brown hair; gray eyes; medium build; born in Russia.

Records of the New York Police Department:

July 17, 1929, as Jack Hoffman, Bronx, N. Y., felonious assault

December 2, 1931, as Alexander Hoffman, Bronx, N. Y., felonious assault.

July 13, 1932, as Alexander Hoffman, Bronx, N. Y., felonious assault.

October 9, 1937, as Alexander Hoffman, Manhattan, malicious mischief.

June 14, 1940, as Alexander Hoffman, Queens, conspiracy and attempted arson; sentenced to 8 years.

Allen Marcus: Organizer, United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Air Associates, Bendix, N. J.

Address, 754 East One Hundred and Fifty-first Street, Bronx, N. Y.

Records of the New York City Police Department:

December 4, 1937, as Allen Marcus, at Bronx County, N. Y., burglary and petty larceny. New York County Penitentiary, but sentence suspended by Judge Patterson.

Fingerprints taken August 29, 1941, Bergen County police, Hackensack, N. J., as Allen Joseph Marcus, applicant for position at the Air Associates, Bendix, N. J.

Edwin Morris: Organizer, United Auto Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Air Associates, Bendix, N. J.

Address, 144 Union Street, Hackensack, N. J.

Record from fingerprints:

March 29, 1921, Eastern State Penitentiary, Pennsylvania, as Edwin Morris, C-757, receiving stolen property; 1 to 2 years.

August 30, 1941, as Edwin Lewis Morris, Jr.; fingerprinted by Bergen County Police, Hackensack, N. J., applicant for position, Air Associates, and prior to report being received from Federal Bureau of Investigation was hired by Air Associates.

Anthony Panchelly, alias Joseph Mignone: organizer, National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Address: San Francisco, Calif.

Pedigree (1937): Age 44 years.

Records of Jersey City, N. J., Police Department:

March 31, 1909, as Joseph Mignone, Philadelphia, Pa., breaking, entering, and larceny; 6 months Pennsylvania Industrial Reformatory, Huntington, Pa.

December 3, 1913, as Joseph Mignone, Norristown, Pa.; breaking, entering, and larceny; 3 years Montgomery County jail.

June 14, 1916, as Joseph Mignone, Philadelphia, Pa.; larceny; 60 days in Philadelphia County prison.

November 8, 1918, as Joseph Mignone, Philadelphia, Pa.; larceny; 3½ to 5 years Eastern State Penitentiary; B-9405.

December 16, 1924, as Joseph Mignone, St. Louis, Mo.; booster (ex-convict); no final disposition.

February 20, 1934, as Anthony Panchelly, Lake Charles, La.; assault and robbery; released.

January 1, 1937, as Anthony Panchelly, Hoboken, N. J.; assault and robbery. Sentenced to State prison 14 to 15 years and costs. Judge Kinkead.

January 5, 1937, as Anthony Panchelly, Hoboken, N. J.; material witness. Committed to grand jury; Recorder Romano.

Irving Potash: manager, Furrier Joint Council of New York, International Fur and Leather Workers Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Locals 101, 105, 110, 115, 70; 250 West Twenty-sixth Street.

Address: 1476 Forty-fourth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Pedigree (1934): 32 years old, 5 feet 6 inches, 140 pounds, blonde hair, blue eyes, born in Russia; occupation, furrier.

Records of New York City Police Department:

November 18, 1919, as Irving Potash, Brooklyn, N. Y.; charged criminal anarchy; plea to a misdemeanor; term in penitentiary; Detective Carrell.

December 8, 1920, as Irving Potash, New York City, violation of immigration law. Ordered to be deported on Department of Labor warrant No. 54810-321. Placed on bail of $1,000 for rehearing on February 28, 1921, at Ellis Island. On April 1, 1921, warrant of deportation canceled.

October 15, 1929, as Irving Potash, New York City; charged felonious assault; Detectives Gregory and Lillis, fourteenth squad.

March 4, 1930, as Irving Potash, New York City; charged felonious assault (knife); Officer Braumann, fourteenth precinct.

July 5, 1933, as Irving Potash, New York City; charged felonious assault; Detectives O'Brien and Schultheiss, radical squad.

January 3, 1934, as Irving Potash, New York City; charged antitrust law (racketeer), case pending, United States marshal. No final disposition at present.

Sam Rosenzweig: Manager Local No. 266, United Smoked Fish Employees, United Retail and Whole Employees, Congress of Industrial Organizations, of 87 East Ninety-third Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Address: 135 East Ninety-fifth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Pedigree (1934): 40 years old; 5 feet 8 inches; 220 pounds; stock build; dark-brown hair; brown eyes; born in Russia; occupation, business agent.

Records, New York City Police Department:

B122255, May 13, 1929, New York City, disorderly conduct; May 28, 1929, suspended sentence; Magistrate Vitale, eighth court; Officer Baree, twenty-second precinct.

October 9, 1931, Brooklyn; charged felonious assault; Detectives Kennedy and Gaynor, seventy-third precinct.

February 27, 1934, Brooklyn; extortion; April 19, 1934, 2 to 5 years, Sing Sing; Judge Russell, supreme court; Detectives Gaynor and Kennedy, seventy-third precinct.

John Santo, alias Desideriu Hammer, alias Jack Weiss, alias John Szanto: Member of the Communist Party, United States of America.

Secretary-treasurer of Transport Workers Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, until September 26, 1940, when he refused to run again for office, due to disclosures of the Dies committee.

Arrested September 8, 1941, on a deportation warrant charging him with being an alien, illegally in the country. Freed on $1,000 bail, he was immediately rearrested by Federal Bureau of Investigation, New York City, for fraudulently stating to his selective-service board that he was a citizen of the United States.

Jesse F. Suttka, alias Bud Lee, alias James Malone: Organizer of National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Address: Jersey City, N. J.

Records of the Jersey City, N. J., Police Department:

December 11, 1923, as Bud Lee, No. 17415; received at the Ohio State Reformatory, Mansfield, Ohio, term 1 to 20 years, on charge of grand larceny of a motor vehicle.

September 13, 1927, as J. F. Suttka, Salt Lake City, Utah, No. 2412; on charge of vagrancy.

December 31, 1932, as Jesse F. Suttka, No. 3969; Mason City, Iowa. Held for investigation.

January 31, 1933, as James Malone, Mount Vernon, N. Y. Held for investigation.

February 6, 1938, as Jesse F. Suttka, No. 541, Jersey City, N. J. Disorderly person and dangerous weapons. On February 17, 1938, 3 months Hudson County penitentiary. Held for grand jury on dangerous weapons charge.

NOTE.—As Bud Lee, in the last 5 years has been arrested four or five times for vagrancy, in different parts of the country.

At 8:30 a. m. February 6, 1938, Patrolman William Campbell, of the Hudson County police department stopped a Packard sedan on the Skyway, in which Suttka was riding, and found in the car a 45-caliber Colt revolver loaded with five shells. The sedan was owned by the National Maritime Union at Baltimore, Md., and the occupants identified themselves as members of the union who were on their way to a Congress of Industrial Organizations meeting in New York City. A Congress of Industrial Organizations sign was on the back of the car. Occupants denied ownership of the gun, saying that it was in the car because the auto was used occasionally to transport sums of money to various cities.

November 13, 1941: According to information in New York office of Dies committee, Jesse F. Suttka stands high in the circles of the Communist Party. He hangs around with Anthony Bimba, who wrote History of the American Labor Movement, who is a member of the Politburo and former editor of Lysve, at 46 Ten Eyck Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. Suttka is also a great pal of George Mink. Suttka is a painter but at the present time (1941) is on the goon squad of the National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations. He has visited Russia, having made a trip as a seaman with McQuiston on a vessel which was purchased in the United States of America and delivered to them at Vladivostok. This was during the year 1929. Although he was at one time expelled from the party because of drunkenness and disorderly conduct to a leading comrade,

he has since been reinstated and is at present (1941) a member of the Communist Party.

Description of Suttka: He is about 5 feet 8½ inches tall, weighs 165 pounds, and always speaks through the side of his mouth.

Rubin Warsager: Manager Local No. 150, International Fur and Leather Workers Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, 289 Seventh Avenue, New York City.

Address: 87-14 Twenty-first Avenue, Flushing, Long Island, N. Y.

Pedigree (1939): 27 years old; born United States of America; occupation, union official.

Records, New York City Police Department:

December 21, 1939, as Rubin Warsager, Manhattan, charged conspiracy; on May 21, 1940, 6 months workhouse; special sessions court; officer Hains, district attorney's office.

Patrick Whalen: Organizer of National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Address: Baltimore, Md.

Records of the Jersey City (N. J.) Police Department:

August 10, 1936, as Patrick Whalen, New York City; disorderly conduct; sentence, 10 days workhouse.

August 31, 1936, as Patrick Whalen, Baltimore, Md.; disorderly conduct; discharged.

December 3, 1936, as Patrick Whalen, Baltimore, Md.; larceny; held for grand jury.

February 6, 1938, as Patrick Whalen, Jersey City, N. J.; disorderly person and dangerous weapons; on February 17, 1938, sentenced to 3 months Hudson County penitentiary.

At 8:30 a. m. February 6, 1938, Patrolman William Campbell, of the Hudson County Police Department, stopped a Packard sedan on the Skyway, in which Whalen was riding, and found in the car a 45-caliber Colt revolver loaded with five shells. The sedan was owned by the National Maritime Union at Baltimore, Md., and the occupants identified themselves as members of the union, who were on their way to a Congress of Industrial Organizations meeting in New York City. A Congress of Industrial Organizations sign was on back of car. Occupants denied ownership of the gun, saying that it was in the car because the auto was used occasionally to transport sums of money to various cities.

Edward Woodward, alias Edward Melvin: Organizer National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Address: San Pedro, Calif.

Pedigree (1937): Age 25 years.

Records of Jersey City, N. J., Police Department:

January 12, 1933, as Edward Woodworth, Los Angeles, Calif.; forgery (warrant). On March 16, 1933, 1 to 10 years; probation 9 months county road camp to make restitution.

September 15, 1933, as Edward Woodworth, No. 179911, sheriff's office, Los Angeles, Calif., forgery; September 15, 1933, expires.

Notations: November 15, 1925, L. A. G. T. to county probation officer; committed to Whittier. December 23, 1925, stay of execution granted for 8 weeks. January 15, 1926, L. A. att. G. T. Committed Whittier January 22, 1926. October 13, 1932. L. W. WTD.; forgery, warrant No. 797, file No. 2966.

January 1, 1937, as Edward Woodworth, Hoboken, N. J., assault and robbery; committed to grand jury; on March 18, 1937, sentenced to State prison, 14 to 15 years and costs; Judge Kinkead.

January 1, 1937, as Edward Woodworth, Hoboken, N. J., material witness; committed grand jury. Recorder Romano, police court.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, in approaching this subject I think that it would be proper to analyze the provisions of the antistrike legislation that is before us here today. First, let us consider the provisions of the Ramspeck bill.

A. RAMSPECK BILL

First. A Mediation Board will be established by the President consisting of representatives of employers, employees, and the public. This Board will assume all the functions of the present National Defense Mediation Board.

Second. The Board will have jurisdiction over all industrial disputes which in any manner affect the national-defense program. In the event an adjustment cannot be worked out between the parties the Board will set up a panel which will investigate the dispute and issue its findings of fact and recommendations.

Third. The Board is given the authority to issue orders restraining any strike or stoppage of production. There is contained a clause which is meaningless—that no individual will be compelled to continue at work without his consent. This order of the Board can last for a maximum period of 60 days after its issuance.

Fourth. The Attorney General upon the request of the Board is given the authority to apply to the Federal courts for an injunction enforcing its orders. The Norris-LaGuardia Act is set aside for the purpose of obtaining such injunctions. Of course violations of any outstanding injunctions would subject the violators to contempt of court which would involve criminal penalties.

Fifth. Wherever a labor dispute is not settled through mediation, the President may take possession of and operate the plant. During such operation a wage board is established, composed of three members who will have the final word as to any adjustment of wages. There will be no appeal from their decision.

B. SMITH AND VINSON BILLS

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] have announced that they will present their bills as substitutes for the Ramspeck bill when the latter measure comes on the floor of the House. The Vinson bill goes one step beyond the Ramspeck bill by providing for compulsory arbitration.

The Smith bill would accomplish the following: (a) Freeze all terms and conditions of employment as of the passage of the bill; (b) outlaw practically all picketing; and (c) deny individuals and unions the benefits of the National Labor Relations Act, the Social Security Act, and relief where there is any violation of the Smith bill.

The Ramspeck, Smith, Vinson bills seek to shackle labor, permit employers to run wild with mounting profits, and will only serve to aggravate and increase industrial disputes.

The Ramspeck bill in effect attempts to impose a situation through legislation which the C. I. O. has already accepted and adopted through voluntary action. In other words, the C. I. O. has stated as its express and forthright policy that mediation and peaceful solution of industrial disputes is one of the utmost importance and will be followed. Legislation which seeks to impose this policy can reap no good but merely engender resentment. The voluntary acceptance of this resolution by the workers will actually achieve the end sought.

In addition, the Ramspeck bill authorizes the Department of Justice to obtain injunctions through the Federal courts and setting aside the protection of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This will merely bring industrial disputes back into the Federal courts with the accompanying abuses which gave rise to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. At the present time, when it is so essential to obtain national unity, through voluntary action of all our citizens, compulsion through Federal court injunctions will not serve to assure the attainment of our national policy.

The Ramspeck bill establishes the legislative principle of compulsory abrogation of the right to strike. This creates economic slavery for Americans. What can be done for 60 days can be enlarged to several years. Our struggle against Hitler will lose its intensity through the adoption of any such Nazi concepts.

Furthermore, the Ramspeck bill incorporates the provision of the Connally bill for the establishment of a Wage Board where the President has taken possession of plants in the case of industrial disputes, which Wage Board shall have the final word as to all wages for such plants. The objections that applied to the Connally bill are applicable to this provision of the Ramspeck bill.

The Smith and Vinson bills, of course, are intended to destroy organized labor. They do not in any way even purport to solve the problem of industrial disputes. If anything, they will merely serve to aggravate the situation. Certainly organized labor is not going to sit idly by and watch itself destroyed. The imposition through this legislation of compulsory arbitration would be simply establishing a Hitlerite form of society while we are seeking to destroy Hitler. Labor recognizes what compulsory arbitration imposed through legislation would do to the workers of the Nation. Its very purpose is easily revealed in the penalties that are also suggested that unions and members not complying with the award would be denied the benefits of the Wagner Act, the Social Security Act, and other labor legislation. Employers would thereby be able to discharge all members of the union, they would be denied unemployment compensation and other social-security benefits, and denied relief. In other words, a class of outcasts and pariahs is to be established which would be rich food for Hitler's "fifth column."

Compulsion through legislation cannot and will not solve industrial-relations problems. To the contrary, it can only serve to weaken the national unity behind President Roosevelt's call for all-out effort in support of our Nation's policies.

Mr. Chairman, the world's greatest propaganda machine has been at work for some time against the cause of labor, and in this way attention has been diverted from the real cause of the high cost of the national-defense program. The newspapers have been emphasizing it every day. Criticism of certain activities of labor has been indulged in. Agitation, misrepresentation, and hysteria has ruled supreme. Cries from the group that has always opposed better conditions for labor has been working overtime in its enthusiasm for the enact-

ment of legislation designed to shackle the free cause of labor. This criticism in my opinion, has been brought about through intolerance, lack of understanding, and the very existence of prejudice. The arguments in favor of this legislation are not based on facts.

It might be interesting to note that some thirty-odd bills have been introduced on strike legislation in this session of Congress. I note particularly that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has introduced at least eight pieces of legislation relative to strikes.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been filled with charges that strikes have been the cause of disrupting the national-defense program. As one great American once said: "Let's look at the record." It might be interesting to note that man-days lost through strikes in 1941 were 19,500,000. At first blush you will say, "What an enormous figure." But then as we look further into the facts we find that man-days lost through injuries, deaths, and permanent disabilities in 1940 were 233,840,000, and man-days lost through illness in 1940 approximated 536,000,000. Through the year of 1940 man-days lost through unemployment amounted to 2,500,000,000. You will readily see that the number of man-hours lost through strikes is insignificant when taken into consideration with the whole field of labor.

One of the most important facts—and I want you to mark this well—is that on November 29, 1941, just a few days ago, O. P. M.'s Labor Division reported that only 3 strikes directly involving 1,700 workers were hampering defense production. This, according to O. P. M., represents—and I want you to mark this well:

A new low in number of strikes of primary defense significance.

I think that the very foundation of the national-defense program, the very foundation of democracy, if you please, is the high morale of the people of the Nation. Organized labor and labor in general through its record has as one of its programs the building up of morale in the interest of national defense. Labor leaders, and especially I want to call attention to the C. I. O., have in their convention assembly passed resolutions calling upon all affiliated unions, industrial union councils, and local unions and individual members of the C. I. O. to act at once to impress upon their representatives in Congress the serious danger to American morale to defense production and to our democracy in all the current antilabor bills and to urge instead adoption of the Kelly bill and favorable consideration of long-range proposals embodied in the C. I. O. industrial-council plan. And at this point let me say that President Philip Murray of the C. I. O. recently offered a concrete suggestion and suggested that the President of the United States convene a conference of leaders of industry, organized labor, and government for the purpose of adopting a program which would establish the necessary machinery for the peaceful solution of industrial disputes. Murray pointed out that the voluntary acceptance of such a program would assure its success. Voluntary cooperation is the watchword of national morale. The C. I. O., the American Federation of Labor, and the railroad brotherhoods join together in their offer of voluntary cooperation in building a national morale that will spell success in our fight against the invasion of our democratic rights. Contrast this, if you will, with the condition that existed in France—a country with one of the finest and best-equipped armies in the world—trained, they thought, to meet any onslaught of force. Yes, they were in position with the Maginot line and their well-trained army to meet any onslaught of force, but there were those who failed to heed the cry of national morale. There were those who were shortsighted enough and selfish enough to feel that the laboring groups were being too well treated. And in their own selfish way they made their onslaught against the labor groups and with that onslaught went the very foundation of their whole defense—national morale broke down; the Maginot line evaporated as a fog before the rays of sunlight. I beg of you here today—do not crucify national morale on the cross of antilabor legislation. Upon your heads will rest the stigma of defeat if this legislation ever becomes a part of the law of the land. Let us today commend labor, build national morale, and avoid what happened in this most distressed country today, the nation that should be one of the great democratic nations. France today, under the heel of dictatorship, is an outstanding example of how a nation can be crushed, not with force of arms but with the loss of the most precious thing that democracy needs—the high morale of its people.

Man-days idle during strikes as percentage of total man-days of work available for each of the first 6 months of 1941 averages only four-tenths of 1 percent. Yet the charges on the floor of this House made against labor today are that it is causing delay in the execution of the Nation's defense policies by resorting to strikes. In the name of the laboring man of this Nation I brand such charges as downright falsehoods and misrepresentation of the facts. It is unjustifiable for it does not square with the facts. The laboring man of this Nation, and organized labor in particular, has done everything in its power to promote and expedite national-defense production, and the record shows that it has succeeded far beyond the expectation of reasonable men.

As we look around this great Nation we see huge Army cantonments being constructed far ahead of schedule. We see new airports, new naval stations, new munition plants, new factories springing up by the hundreds—most of them on schedule or ahead of schedule. The seaport towns along the coast are the scene of activity, where warships of all kinds are being constructed, most of them on schedule or ahead of schedule.

We have appropriated over $40,000,000,000 and the program is being carried to completion through the strength, through the skill, through the enthusiasm and patriotic service of millions upon millions of laboring men in this Nation. The program is the greatest our country has undertaken. This program was not started overnight and could not be carried on ahead of schedule if what the opponents of labor, through the press, on the floor of this House, and over the air, say is true. The record belies their contention. Of course, there were mistakes made. But is this great program being accomplished by magic? Is it because of the supermen in the employ of the Government at $1 a year? Is it because of the supermen in admirals' and generals' uniforms? No. It is accomplished by the sweat and the blood of the American workman, the untiring skill, the willingness to sacrifice, and the loyal devotion of millions of American laboring men's families, American workers whom we should be proud of, American workers whom we should be commending for their loyalty and doing everything that we can to better their station in life. We should be doing everything that we can to build the morale of that great bulwark of democracy. I am proud of the fact that no group of citizens in the United States supports the national-defense program more enthusiastically than those who are members of union organizations. The laboring men of this Nation, union organizations, if you please, on the floor of this House and through the press of this Nation, have been accused of sabotage of the national-defense program. Sabotage is a relatively recent term derived from the word "sabot," which in French means "wooden shoe." No one knows exactly how the word came into use. Some trace it to a workman who threw a wooden shoe into a machine to stall it. Whatever the origin of this word is, it is accepted that sabotage means destruction, temporary disabling of machinery, designed by enemy agents to weaken the military strength of the Nation. Is union organization guilty of sabotage? It certainly is not in the face of the wonderful record it has made, and I here and now placard antistrike legislation presented to this House as wooden-shoe legislation designed to destroy the labor movement in this Nation, which in turn will destroy the national-defense program by breaking down the morale of the great laboring class of people.

Thinking men of this Nation oppose this type of legislation, and I have telegrams from manufacturers' associations that brand this type of legislation as exceedingly unwise and unworkable.

Just recently it has been estimated that arms prices have soared over $2,000,000,000, with the costs still going up. In fact, the rising cost of material has boosted original estimates of the defense costs over $2,000,000,000 during the last 17 months of the defense program. Is this because of the increase in wages? Is it because of the increase in the cost of production of strategic materials? No. In my opinion, it is because of the outrageous prices at which contracts are being let. It is because of profiteering and racketeering. And we in Congress fiddle while Rome burns. The Army, Navy, and Marine Commission, lease-lend, and other agencies agree that defense costs so far have gone up over 25 percent because of increased prices. This represents lost money, for which no guns, bullets, planes,

tanks, or ships will be received. Two billions of dollars, if you please.

I know that the catch argument that men are drafted for $21 a month into the armed forces of the United States while those at home wax fat through exorbitant increase in wages are used by antilabor advocates.

It might be worthy at this time to call your attention to the fact that if this $2,000,000,000 was saved and turned over to the men in the armed forces of the United States, they would receive approximately $200 a month apiece for a period of 1 year.

No; it is not labor nor the leaders of labor who are causing this outrageous condition.

Labor has been accused of violence and of causing conditions of disorder and lawlessness. It might be well in the consideration of this legislation to recall the days that Tom Girdler, chairman of the Republican Steel Corporation, self-appointed strong man of the independent steel companies, grouped together as Little Steel to block organized labor. Under the generalship of Girdler industry made its last stand against the Wagner Act and wrote one of the most disgraceful chapters that has ever been written in the industrial history of the United States. Pictures have been painted on the floor of this House of violence in the picket lines. But very little has been said of the fact that the Republic Steel, under Girdler's direction, spent $1,950,000 to break the picket lines and to break strikes. Little has been said of the hired force of company gorillas equipped with tear gas, rifles, pistols, and clubs of the police officers, and hired spies who harassed and intimidated organizers. Little has been said of the fact that Republic Steel bought $80,000 worth of gas, most of the nauseating rather than mere tear-inducing variety. Little has been said of the largest arsenal of its kind in the country that was used to intimidate and shoot down the laboring men.

I want to recall to you the attacks on workers that took the toll of 15 lives and resulted in hundreds of serious injuries. Pitched battles between laboring men and company guards, police, and citizen mobs were deliberately fomented by Republic Steel's officials. Men posed as union members in the pay of industrialists, armed with guns, deliberately set up fake picket lines and brought about riots and disorder. Then the Ohio steel master rose to dramatic heights as he told stories of property rights being outraged and of his own interest in the welfare of his workers. He led the public to believe that law and order was breaking down. He used the press of this Nation to bring about such a thought in the minds of the public. But when the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee got around to its investigation, it was shown that those in the employ of the antilabor groups were the most imposing collection of professional sadists, liars, and fanatics ever assembled, not even excepting those assembled by the Pinkertons, the Railroad Audit & Inspection Co., and other professional strike-breaking agencies.

Oh, of course, they contended that they knew nothing of the spies or backalley attacks upon union organizers, and when they appeared before some of the investigating committees they showed photographs of weapons taken from C. I. O. invaders supposed to have descended upon Youngstown, Ohio; and Tom Girdler testified that thousands of these invaders entered or attempted to enter the city with armed rifles, shotguns, revolvers, and even dynamite to attack their employers, and at one point in his testimony before the Post Office Committee hearings he said, "I will hand you pictures duly attested by the chief of police of Youngstown, showing the weapons of war taken from these C. I. O. forces by public authorities"; but when the La Follette committee disclosed that these were not C. I. O. organizers and most of the exhibition that was offered in evidence was the collection of a gun fancier named S. Russell Gibboney, who explained to the committee that he was a crack marksman with a collection of guns. He tried to get rid of them when he was tipped off that the police were going to raid his home, but the law descended before he could move them. It was these guns that appeared in Girdler's famous photographs. The dynamite which Girdler horrified the Post Office Committee with turned out to be a box of harmless smoke bombs.

I could tell you the story also of what happened in Monroe, Mich., when James Torbic, industrial-relations director for the Republic Steel, instigated the organization of vigilantes and the mob beat organizers into unconsciousness. At Canton, Ohio, where guardsmen attacked children and bystanders after marching into the city arrested C. I. O. members without provocation and at Massillon, where a crowd of young people dancing and feasting at union headquarters after an out-day mass meeting, were trapped and mowed down by vigilantes while the chief of police had gone out of town for a day and given the vigilantes augmented by imported company thugs a free hand. Yes, and there was that fateful day in Chicago on Memorial Day where strikers and strike sympathizers with their women and children marched across a vacant field at the side of the Republic plant where they proposed to establish a picket line, only to be met by a force of police. The police opened fire and 40 marchers were shot down in the back as they tried to flee. Ten were fatally hurt. Wounded were not treated decently as they would have been in a war. The whole grizzly story is contained in the La Follette committee hearings and was told vividly by a motion picture, a film which has been impounded in the archives of the La Follette committee.

Several hundred laboring men met in a place called Sam's Place, near the Republic plant. Mayor Kelly announced that orderly picketing would be allowed. A picket line was established in the front of the plant. On their way to this point they were met by a detail of some 250 police equipped with tear gas, some of them with ax handles provided by the Republic Co. Men were shot down in cold blood without warning. A story is told, by one of the eye witnesses, that is shocking, of 16 men piled in an ambulance, one on top of the other, blood soaking into the clothing of those beneath, blood dripping from their wounds. She said there was terrible screaming and groaning going on in the wagon. Finally, they got to the hospital after having been bumped over rough roads and streets.

Now I want to recall to you the strike-breaking technique used at the Republic plant at Canton, Ohio in 1936. Gorillas were imported from Buffalo and elsewhere for one premeditated attack on pickets. An old man, George Milheim, sitting on the front porch of his home, was wounded. A pregnant woman, Mrs. Mary Reed, was shot down and left bleeding in a ditch by a carload of Republic police as they drove by her on a highway 2 miles from the nearest Republic property. She had 25 bullet wounds in her legs and feet. The Republic Co. sent her roses and a letter of regret.

Oh, yes; I could go on and on telling you of how this great patriot, Tom Girdler, and his crew caused bloodshed and suffering and still led the public to believe that they were doing this in the interest of law and order.

I recall this to your attention because of some of the statements that were made on the floor of this House claiming that the laborers were responsible for violence.

Yes, the cause of labor has been written in blood. But was it because of the fact that the laboring man wanted trouble? I do not believe so. The laboring man upholds democracy with all his strength because it is the only form of government under which the worker can enjoy freedom and hope for progress.

In the present world struggle between totalitarianism and democracy the American way of life has life and death at stake. Union organization—the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen—have favored the strongest possible national-defense program to the extension of every aid short of war to Great Britain. They have officially called upon their membership to avoid strikes in defense production industries, to settle their grievances through conferences and conciliation. I think they have done a wonderful job.

How does our strike record compare with that of England? The actual statistics show that in 1940 the strike record of England, Canada, and the United States is almost exactly the same. England and Canada were at war. In each of the three countries slightly more than 2 percent of the workers were out on strike at some time during the year. It is rather amazing to look at the figures: England 2.3 percent; Canada 2.4 percent; United States 2.3 percent. And yet there are those who would tell you that we need antilabor legislation in order to speed up our national-defense program. This is a fine record, and this Congress should not penalize those honest, sincere workers through the enactment of antilabor legislation. Imagine, if you please, the state of mind that will be created among these loyal, devoted workers identified with the national-defense program when they realize that their Con-

gress—their representatives, the people they trust—enacted legislation that smears them as anti-American and antidemocratic. Do not penalize on the altar of the god of vengeance the millions of faithful workers because of the fact that there may be 1 man who has created a vehicle upon which antilaborites may ride on toward repressive legislation. The 12,000,000 union-organization men in the United States of America will gasp with wonder at the uncalled-for acts of this Congress if we place repressive legislation on the books.

I am certain that this legislation presented here today is couched in terminology that is vague and not understandable. According to the language of the legislation presented, if in the feverish heat of resenting vicious tactics of an employer 1 man should cry out against them and because of his remarks the rest should follow, and leave the plant, he would be smeared as a traitor to his Nation. The right of free speech would be completely eradicated from the Bill of Rights. Oh, the whole field of labor, affecting 130,000,000 people, would be crucified because of a few mistakes and the personalities of 1 man. Their morale would be broken down. They would feel that there is nothing to fight for. Harken back to what happened to France and do not make the same mistake.

The enactment of this antistrike legislation would, in my opinion, by indirection and subterfuge by back-door methods repeal the Wagner Act, Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, the Clayton Act, and many other fine pieces of labor legislation.

We have a propaganda machine known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. This organization has put out a pamphlet known as America's Future, in which they advocate antistrike legislation and in which they advocate compulsory arbitration. I want to call to the attention of that organization that the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Dorchy* v. *Kansas* (272 U. S.) declared forced arbitration to be unconstitutional. Let me quote from that decision:

> A statute compelling employers and employees to submit their controversies over wages and hours of labor to state arbitration is unconstitutional as a part of a system compelling employers and employees to continue in business on terms not of their own making.

That is the supreme law of the land.

Here we have those who claim that they are a committee for constitutional government advocating unconstitutional legislation. I know that you men and women who belong to this great lawmaking body will not enact unconstitutional legislation in this hour of hysteria.

Mounting profits are the shackles of national defense.

I note that there is a secret ballot called for. Let me call your attention to the fact that corporate management does not have a secret ballot in their elections. Employers of this Nation would not accept a provision the violation of which would cause them to go out of business. Employer and employee should be treated alike. But this legislation is discriminatory against the great cause of labor.

In closing, let me again reiterate what I said in a speech on the floor of this House some time ago:

> In closing, might I again plead with all those who are truly interested in the preservation of our democracy to be calm, cool, and collected. Might I especially ask those who have been intemperate in their statements to give labor the credit of at least being loyal, to give the laboring man the credit that he, too, loves his country, to help the great laboring mass of people to become a part of the great program of national defense, so that they may truly do their bit as they wish to do it. I do not believe that there is an un-American in a humble laboring man's home in this Nation. We must create in the minds of the great mass of people the fact that their Government is working in their behalf, that their Government will protect them in the right to live and rear their families in an environment that is comparable to what it should be in a real, true, democratic nation, so that they may go on and build civilization to the extent that we will remove from this world that monster we call war. With the laboring class treated fairly, you will find that the laboring class will treat industry fairly, and then government will be a regulatory body that will bring about the cooperation that is necessary to bring happiness to mankind.

May I call your attention to the fact that I represent a district that produces two of the most strategic metals in national defense. In my district are located the large iron ore and copper mines. Loyal, honest, true Americans risk their lives day and night, leave their health down in the depths of a dingy mine. Those men have not participated in any strikes. They believe, however, in union organization. They are honest, true, and loyal. It is for these men that I plead. They are not un-American. They are not antidemocratic. And I urge you not to place upon them the stigma of un-Americanism by forcing upon them a law that will shackle them in their freedom. I plead also for that large group who do not belong to organized labor, that underpaid group. Yes, I plead for the father and mother of the undernourished family that is now forced to work on the W. P. A. for the paltry sum of $44 to $48 a month. Where, I ask you, is the excessive purchasing power that is charged to th laboring group that there is so much talk about. Those laborers have not seen it. Those laborers do not get it. If there is excessive purchasing power it is placed in the hands of those who have profiteered on Government contracts.

As a parting word, may I quote to you the statements of that great commoner, William Jennings Bryan, when he said:

> Do not crush down upon the head of labor this crown of thorns.

I say to you: Do not crucify labor on the cross of antilabor legislation. Vote down these bills and give the laboring man of this Nation an opportunity to participate freely, openly, and voluntarily as free Americans in the national defense of the country that they love and help protect the principles of democracy.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 124]

Arnold	Harris, Va.	Sabath
Baldwin	Hartley	Sacks
Bennett	Heffernan	Sasscer
Bolton	Hill, Colo.	Satterfield
Buck	Johnson, W. Va.	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	Kefauver	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Kelly, Ill.	Scott
Byron	Kilburn	Scrugham
Capozzoli	Kirwan	Sheridan
Casey, Mass.	Larrabee	Short
Clark	Lesinski	Simpson
Coffee, Nebr.	Lewis	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	McArdle	Snyder
Collins	Maas	South
Costello	Magnuson	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Mahon	Stevenson
Ditter	Marcantonio	Sumner, Ill.
Douglas	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott, Calif.	May	Tibbott
Fenton	Mitchell	Tolan
Flannagan	Myers, Pa.	Vincent, Ky.
Flannery	Norton	Wasielewski
Ford, Leland M.	O'Day	Weiss
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Leary	Wene
Gale	Osmers	Whelchel
Gerlach	Robinson, Utah	White
Gilchrist	Rogers, Okla.	Winter
Grant, Ind.	Romjue	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4139, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 346 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have just experienced the good effects of the cooling-off period that we are to talk about today. I was told to be ready some 2 hours ago, and I now find that even a brief 2 hours of waiting is very helpful in dampening one's enthusiasm. However, I have been able to listen to several good speeches, and I wish to comment on them briefly. Did not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] "spill a good deal of blood" in those remarks of his? Was that why he emptied the Chamber? His bursts of oratory, I hope, did not interfere with your reasoning powers, albeit he did select some blood-spilling thrillers. Of course, he tried to lay the blame wholly on one side. I do not think he was overly successful.

The gentleman from Illinois, who preceded him, interested me. I have not often heard him indulge in outbursts of oratory. He has always been so careful in speech and so sound in his reasoning. However, he made the subject appear to have even a religious aspect, and I have been forced to refresh my memory. He said that the politicians destroyed Christ. I recalled my Sunday school lesson and I was disturbed at my ignorance. I

thought Pilate said "that he found no fault with Him," and that it was the mob that demanded this crucifixion. I must now search my Bible for the real truth of the matter.

I am always interested when one seeks a refuge in religion, when logic is wanting, I had understood long ago that some people embrace religion as a "fire-escape."

Now some of you know about Cape Cod, where I come from. I offer a quotation: "If we want to make footprints on the sands of time we must have plenty of sand." That locality mentioned has furnished me with plenty, and I will now scatter it over the House, that you may have some, if you should need it.

I have been baptized recently in the contaminated waters of one labor union. This baptism has taught me that I am really speaking and pleading for labor, today not for John L. Lewis, the dictator, or William Green, the man of piety, who allows extortion in union dues, and engages in cut-throat jurisdictional quarrels. They seem to hate each other, but the pot calling the kettle black does not interest me at the moment.

I happened to be surrounded recently by some 500 men wanting to work on a defense job, most of them with no money in their pockets, but who could not drive a nail until they had paid a tribute of $75 to a union.

Whom am I representing? The people that want to go to work or a union that wants to enrich itself by forced payment of extortionate dues?

It is not difficult to arrive at a decision after such experiences.

I think if we should have what the Smith bill suggests—a secret ballot—labor could extricate itself from intolerable leaders and conditions. We demand for ourselves in all sorts of elections a secret ballot. We will not let the voters of our own little bailiwicks at home be checked by our local politicians. We protect them in every way possible.

We have a Department of Labor set up at great expense, and we refuse to give that Department the power to demand that a labor union tell about itself. We do not force them to organize. We do not force them to keep or to display their books. Even their own members may not know how their leaders spend the funds. Yet you expect the great Department of Labor to adjust strikes and prevent irregularities, when you give that Department no power to demand information from those organizations. It does seem ridiculous in the extreme.

I have suffered the opposition of so-called labor unions in nearly every election for 20 years. Labor generally in my city has opposed me. We all know there that unless you are 100 percent with labor leaders, they will not support you. Ninety-nine percent is not enough, as is often stated. Do I blame the labor leaders? No; it is their job to elect only those who are 100 percent subservient.

I feel very friendly with many of the labor leaders in my district. For 20 long years I have told them I have not voted for any labor legislation that they could recall, principally because we have not had any. Today we are forced to meet an issue. I find myself constrained to differentiate between labor, in its broader sense, and labor unions, as too many of them are now constituted. I am and always have been a friend of labor in its legitimate aims and aspirations. But how can I be a friend of certain unions which have taken advantage of ever-increasing power to make their own honest members subservient, often by force, to dictatorial methods employed by their leaders for self-aggrandizement, and to acts which are plainly those of racketeers?

We have three bills here. I have been studying them. As to the Ramspeck bill—God forgive him—I thought he was a man of more courage, after hearing his views on the floor the last few years, often seemingly bemoaning the conditions that exist today in far greater degree than formerly. I thought that he would at least flirt with the Smith bill. But at this particular moment he seems to have adopted a policy of appeasement. It is not a good time for an appeasement policy when dictatorships are unloosed upon us.

There is one question that the public is asking, and asking in no uncertain way, "Have we a Government that can lay their hands on a man and for $30 a month send him to face shells, gas, and bullets, and jeopardize his life, but cannot persuade others to work 40 hours a week at high wages and under pleasant surroundings?" Shall these not be compelled to furnish defense materials to protect that boy whose life may depend upon them? You may dodge this question, if you like, but it will take more than a John L. Lewis to protect you from an enraged people.

Read S. Burton Heath in the Atlantic Monthly. I have already quoted him.

You may think I know but little, but when such a one as Mr. Heath speaks the public is impressed. Some of you declare that anyone who dares raise his voice here in protest is a labor hater or a labor baiter.

God paralyze my arm whenever I cease, wherever I am, wherever I live, to do everything I can to find men jobs and pay them a fair price for the work they do. I have always done it, and I pledge myself always to do it even though I remain poor. I love the toiler, no matter what some of you may pretend to think. "But are the dignities and the prerogatives of a few labor leaders more important than the preservation of democracy?" Thus questions Mr. Heath in behalf of the Nation.

Such are the questions that are being asked. Let William Green and his associates protest. Of course they want no supervision or restraint. The record shows that the A. F. of L. unions have carried jurisdictional strike excesses even further than the C. I. O. The craft unions not only quarrel with the industrial unions, but they spend a lot of time needed to fight Hitler fighting those within their own family circle. Is it right to charge $360 to join an electrician's union? Did not even Mrs. Roosevelt cry a little about that? It seems that she did. Did she not think that was a little high? Do you not think that most of those dues are a little high? And worse than that, the young men who want to learn a trade, are they generally allowed to do so? Oh, no, they must not crowd the crafts, lest there be too many workers. The laborer who has to accept $4 a day has to pay his neighbor $8 a day to shingle his house because his union demands it. He might be very willing to work for less. I recall that there came to Washington quite lately a painter who wanted to borrow money of me so he could live here awhile. He was stranded. I asked, "Can you not get any work?" and he said, "I can get plenty of work, but I have to get $8 or $9 a day, because I belong to a union." "Why does not the union help you?" "I do not belong to this particular union. They refuse as yet to assist me."

As I have pointed out, on a defense job $75 in dues were demanded and generally collected; but the union even then refused membership to many of them, explaining that they were not real and qualified craftsmen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. There are many here more competent than I to explain these bills. Still I should like to comment somewhat, although I am not going to assume that I know too much about them. I have read them and tried to understand their different objectives.

I have also read the Walter proposal, a product of that legal mind of his. I do not suppose many of you will take the trouble to read all of the Walter bill, but if you did you would find real reason for reflection. However, I fear you will think its verbiage too difficult for us who lack enthusiasm for technical legal phraseology.

Consider the Ramspeck bill with only the cooling-off period and the implication that the Government may seize the plant if they do not cool off enough. Even compulsory arbitration is not considered there because it is deemed not constitutional. Perhaps it is not constitutional, but much legislation has been declared constitutional recently under the Roosevelt Supreme Court. It is a convenient refuge to assert that it is not constitutional when the policy of appeasement is uppermost.

When John L. Lewis demanded that the President take sides he said, in effect, "You have supped at labor's table, and now when we are in deadly embrace with our enemies, the A. F. of L., we demand that you take our side." The President replied, "A plague on both your houses." That was the most courageous thing I have heard our President say yet in labor matters. Yet it was enough for John L. Lewis to divorce himself from the former bonds between himself and the President. It is freely stated that he now hates his President. Is that possible, after all the President has done for him or allowed him to do against the public's interest? But John L. Lewis made his $486,000 contribution. It was a pretty good supper he served to his President. He thought he had served all the courses. He thought his guest would certainly reciprocate when he came to a "deadly embrace" with the A. F. of L. He seemed to have a fairly good reason for making his demand.

As I peer into the future, "It is not yet to be seen that for the present John L.

Lewis will embrace Mr. William Green." I do not recall the exact lines of this doggerel.

The Congress should now come to the rescue of our President, although Lewis' contribution was accepted. Our President could not be bribed. There is an old adage, "He would not accept a bribe but stretches forth his hand." Other organizations and other businesses are forced to display their books. They are even harassed by their own Government. But these union leaders may organize and terrorize their own membership. They may thumb their noses even at our Labor Department if it should attempt to demand information or order them to desist. Yes; let us protect the men who toil. Our sympathy is with the man who toils, but our sympathy is to get him out of the clutches of those dictators who now have him in their grasp. If I do not represent the larger number of workers, tnen I am indeed very much misinformed.

Do you think those mine workers, when their own President of the United States appealed to them and their patriotism, did not wish to respond quickly and favorably? Do you suppose a majority of those mine workers did not want to go to work at the request of the President? Indeed they did, but they found themselves under a dictator leadership like unto Hitler's and dared only to obey. I would feel sad, indeed, if their "free choice of action" would have been to follow the dictator rather than the appeal to their patriotism by the President of their country. As to the terrorism of the picket lines, does even the Smith bill seem effective? It would be unconstitutional to attempt to prevent picketing. We can regulate it if we have the courage to do it. Many helpless workers may be pleading today that you now free them from the chains forged by some of their leaders. Let labor beware of all forms of dictatorship. Germany furnishes the most startling example. I has one large union called the Labor Front and under complete control of Hitler. Sad, indeed, is the lot of the worker under that head.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Let me read to you an extract from a recent address by Dr. Ludwig Hamburger:

> For all practical purposes the German worker is in the position of a slave. Contrary to what we have believed, the institution of slavery has not been outlived. What has been outlived is our concept of slave labor. This concept has been derived from private ownership of labor. It has to be brought up to date; it needs to be adjusted to the Nazi reality of state ownership of labor.

I wish you might read his whole address. We must beware of dictatorship, whether by government or organization. Again I appeal to you Members. Show a little courage. Let us represent the people today.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

LXXXVII——589

WILL CONGRESS REPRESENT THE PEOPLE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is urgent, in fact, vital need for concerted, effective action by Congress which will solve the so-called labor problem. Overlong this country has suffered because of the refusal of Congress to take effective action to lessen the causes of labor disputes.

The passage of the National Labor Relations Act was a step in that direction, but unfortunately for all, although sponsored and hailed by organized labor as labor's magna carta, it possessed inherent defects, which, through misinterpretation and maladministration of the act itself, not only deprived industry of rights heretofore considered fundamental but gave to greedy and ambitious individuals power which was used in the end to deprive employees themselves of the very rights which the act was passed to protect.

Unfortunately the misinterpretation and maladministration of the act by the Board and by the courts led to a situation where both of the leaders of organized labor, both Mr. Lewis and Mr. Green, condemned in no uncertain terms the manner in which the act was being applied and the results which were being produced.

Before we can have abiding peace in industrial relations; before the rights of employees and employers and the public—and the rights of the public so far seem to have been ignored—are secure, we must have amendments to the National Labor Relations Act which will make it fair and just, not only to employees but to employer and to the public.

As always when you have power, almost unlimited power, and where you have money in large amounts, the greedy ones, the avaricious ones, come in. When the N. L. R. A. went into effect, when it was administered in such a manner that there flowed into the treasury of the union organizations, not thousands, not hundreds of thousands of dollars, but millions of dollars, as might have been anticipated, as we might have foreseen, all of the grafters and all of the bootleggers who had been getting rich under the National Prohibition Act, switched over and wormed themselves into the unions, not because they loved labor, but because they saw there, under the provisions of that law, an opportunity to enrich themselves. Labor did not ask them in; it did not invite them. It does not profit—that is, the individual workers do not profit—by the operation of these grafters, but they muscled in, and they are chiseling the organizations out of a large part of the funds which are collected under the name of organized labor.

That act has not served its purpose. We all know that, that is, those of us who have read the decisions of the courts, and those of us who have listened to the complaints of the laboring man himself, and I cite, as an example, the complaint of the welders on the west coast, who for weeks have been denied a charter by the A. F. of L., and who have been required to pay dues and seek membership in several organizations, in order to carry on their work.

There is a labor lobby in Washington. Their point is that we do not need any legislation. Some of us suspect at times that the administration does not want any effective labor legislation. That labor lobby is here and under one excuse or another, perhaps by the device of having adopted many amendments, perhaps through the device of creating discord in the ranks of those who want legislation, perhaps by some little group, favoring first one bill and then another, they can so divide the membership of the House that we will get nothing at all at the end of our labors. We may have the same situation develop with reference to this bill that we had with the wage-and-hour bill, nothing accomplished.

You cannot make me believe that the American worker does not desire to work. I am firmly convinced that if he has an opportunity, the high wages being paid today will induce him to go back to his job if he can do so unmolested. I believe that the wives who are serving in the kitchens at home will tell the old man when he wants to go on strike, if he is so foolish as to go on strike when conditions are satisfactory, so foolish as to go on strike over a jurisdictional question, I believe that good housewife, that mother of the children will say, "Now, John, you just go back to work and get that check which brings in our groceries, which buys the fuel and pays the rent or makes the payment on the home, buys the books for the kids, and once in a while takes us to a picture show." Is not that the situation? Is not that what will happen?

So these men down in this lobby say there is no need for legislation. That might be true if our laws were enforced. But they have not been enforced, they are not being enforced—the laws which protect citizens in their right to work.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] this morning said there was a God-given right to work. I will go one step further. When the Lord caught Eve giving that apple to Adam do you remember what happened? The Lord fired them out of the Garden of Eden. He sent the snake out with him, too. Do you remember what he told Adam? "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground."

But long ago these so-called leaders, who do not represent anybody except themselves in many cases, who must have an issue if they are to continue in business, they say to the man who the Lord told to work, they say to the man whose wife wants him to get busy and bring in that check every 2 weeks or every month, they say to the kids who want the old man to go ahead and work so they can have a football and a pair of skates and a few other things now and then, these organizers say to that husband and father, "Oh, no; you can't work until you buy this license from me." So they collect. Like those fellows who were recently convicted for their activities on the west coast, Bioff and Brown, they collect thousands—yes; in that case more than

$100,000 which they shoved into their own pockets.

It is to stop those practices that we need legislation.

As was stated yesterday by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]—see RECORD, pages 9298–9299—the public is overwhelmingly convinced that the theory that organized labor can do no wrong, needs no regulation, is fallacious.

For more than 4 years, on the floor of this House, it has been my privilege to point out the ever-increasing danger growing out of the unlawful acts of certain labor leaders, the failure of certain State and Federal officials to enforce our laws, to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens.

The present emergency, coupled with the activities of subversive groups, power-mad, ambitious labor politicians, and the collection of millions of dollars from helpless workers by greedy and avaricious individuals masquerading as friends of labor has focused the attention of the public upon the need for adequate action by this Congress.

Our failure to act is the cause of widespread criticism; criticism which comes not only from editorial writers, from columnists, whose views might well be disregarded were they not a reflection of the opinions held by our constituents—but direct from our home folks.

Overlong the people have been pleading for relief; long have they been asking that Congress do something. Now they are demanding that we take action.

Often of late, by men who are classed here in the House as labor leaders—men like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]—there has been voiced the thought that, unless this Congress takes action to alleviate the present situation many of the present Members of Congress will not be here after the next election.

We are elected to represent the people and, if we do not truly and faithfully and effectively represent them, we should be retired from office at the very first election.

Organized labor, 10,000,000 strong, through leaders, through spokesmen who, I assert, do not at the moment represent the desires of the rank and file, are here in Washington demanding that we do not act on labor legislation.

We are threatened with political reprisals if we enact any law which will curtail the privileges or the actions of some labor organizers and officials.

But let me tell you this, that the workingmen of America desire to work. They want the opportunity to earn the high wages which are now being paid. They desire as well to serve their country by doing their utmost for the national-defense program.

Make no mistake about it. The workers of America, organized and unorganized, want their rights restored to them, and the keystone in the arch upon which rests our whole existence is that of the unqualified right of the individual to work.

This administration and the present labor leaders who are here lobbying against any and all legislation affecting labor have had much to say about compulsion, about mediation. These leaders are now asking the administration to call another conference in an effort to iron out all the present difficulties.

May I be so bold as to suggest that the people are sick and tired of conferences, of committee meetings, of talking. They want action.

Certain individuals in this House who conscientiously believe there is no need for labor legislation; others who yield to the advice of organized labor's leaders; still others who are motivated by other considerations, believe that, by dividing the forces of those who wish to take effective action now, that action can be defeated.

There will be at least four complete bills before the House for discussion. As we all know, there is the Vinson bill, the Ramspeck bill, the Smith bill, the Walter bill, and in the background there is the Hunter bill, the Bridges bill, which I introduced in the House with two added provisions, the Connally bill, many others, among which are several introduced by myself.

The first four bills have been adequately explained to the membership by the gentlemen who sponsor them. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] set forth concisely but clearly the provisions of the Smith bill on yesterday. You will find his observations on pages 9298–9299 of the RECORD.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] did likewise with reference to his bill, and you will find his remarks on pages 9300 and 9301 of yesterday's RECORD.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] made a statement with reference to his bill, and his remarks will be found on pages 9306–9311 of yesterday's RECORD.

The bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] appears in full at pages 9301–9302 of yesterday's RECORD. At considerable length, clearly and in detail, with specific cases illustrating the need for the various provisions of his bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made and has placed in the RECORD a statement—pages 9302–9306—the reading of which will carry conviction to every inquiring mind.

The statements of these gentlemen and the discussion which followed on the floor of the House are sufficient to advise every Member of the merits of each bill; hence there is no need to repeat what has been said.

I only wish to refer to the Ramspeck bill, which came from the Labor Committee, of which I am a member. That bill does not add much, if anything, to the present method of procedure which has been followed in an effort to solve our trouble. It merely provides for talk and more talk and more talk, with a so-called cooling-off period while the talk is going on, and with the further provision that in the end, if the parties cannot arrive at an agreement and there is an interruption in defense work, the President shall take over the plant. The taking over of private industry is a step toword socialism, which I am loath to sanction.

We have heard much of late about national unity. We have heard a great deal about the virtue of mediation. We have been told time and again that the way to settle a question is to sit down around the conference table and there reach a conclusion.

In the sit-down strikes, the parties were compelled by moral suasion to remain in almost continuous session for days at a time. In the recent threatened railroad strike, the papers tell us that there was a continuous session lasting more than 30 hours and continuing until the dispute was settled.

Because there are 435 Members of the House, it is obvious that continuous sessions would be apt to contribute more toward another tower of Babel than to a worth-while solution of the issue.

But, come peace or war, we must have production. Come prosperity or national bankruptcy, if we are to continue to exist as a nation under a constitutional form of government in the exercise of the liberties and the freedoms which we have heretofore known, we must have unity on the economic front.

To my mind, there is just one way to get proper and adequate labor legislation out of this House at this time; to get legislation which will protect organized labor, protect the individual worker, protect the consumer and the National Government.

I want to answer this charge of partisanship that has been hurled at us of the minority so often from the majority side. The majority side, after all, is responsible for legislation. You know, as was cited by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] this morning, all the polls show that the people want action. You can go along, if you wish, with the lobby from the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L. You can go along with some of the wild and woolly new dealers. You can forsake your people at home if you wish. You can go back on the principles of the great Democratic Party if you wish, but in this coming election you will have to answer to the people for your conduct. Once before I called attention to the fact that there was an election, and certain smart newspaper writers said I was appealing to you to forget your country; that I was appealing to your selfishness. Those writers did not know what they were writing about. Do they not know that the chief business, the principal business, in fact, the only business of a Congressman, is to represent his people, and that his people should cut off his political head the moment he forsakes them and follows off after some lobbyist? I am appealing not to your selfishness. I am appealing to you to follow the wishes of your constituents, the newspaper writers to the contrary notwithstanding. That is the point. Do what your constituents, under our system, think you ought to do. Unless they are asking you to vote for vicious legislation to betray the country, to forsake the Constitution, you should represent them, follow their wishes, should you not?

Now, here is the proposition I want to make to my Democrat friends, if I have any. That is this: You have accused us on the Republican side of playing

politics. You and the labor leaders have talked loud and continuously about collective bargaining, about mediation, about conciliation, about sitting down around the council table and solving the questions which were before us. I agree with all of that. That is the procedure we should follow in a representative republican form of government. Are you today willing to accept that procedure?

I want to advance this proposition to you today.

I am a Republican. I am proud of that fact. I have criticized this administration time and again. I have offered what I considered to be constructive legislation. Today, as the situation confronts us, we have these four bills, all introduced by, all the brain children of, Democrats. All these gentlemen who have introduced these bills, who have spoken in their behalf, have long been recognized as regular, working, effective members of the Democratic organization.

I for one now say to this House let the House recess for a few hours or a day. Let these four gentlemen, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the two gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. VINSON and Mr. RAMSPECK], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] go into conference, compromise the differences which exist between their bills and bring forth a measure which will be in the interests of the Nation, of the people of the Nation as a whole. And then I, for one, having confidence in their ability, in their integrity, in their judgment, will vote for the measure upon which they agree. It is my conviction that the majority of the Republicans will go along and support a measure of that kind.

It is my prediction that, unless some such course as that is followed, unless there is unity on the majority side, the will of the people will be thwarted and Congress will recess with little, if anything, to its credit, and the Pegiers of the Nation will once more reflect in no complimentary terms the disgust of our people because of our failure to represent them.

If you believe in conciliation, in mediation, do not forget that in the sit-down strikes they were in almost continuous session day after day. They were in continuous session for more than 30 hours in an effort to settle the railway situation and got good results. So I say to you if you believe in those things I have just mentioned, if you think there is any virtue in sitting down around the table and reasoning with each other, coming to a conclusion, let the House take a short recess, a few hours if you need them, a day if you need it. We have all had opportunity to express our views. Let these four men go off and write a bill. You know the need for the legislation. Let these four men go off by themselves and write a bill, and I as a Republican will support it and do all I can to get you votes over on this side. Now, what have you to say about playing partisan politics when I, a Republican, am willing to go along with four Democrats? There is your board of arbitration, there is your collective bargaining, there is your conciliation and mediation. Now, if you have the ability to write a bill, and I know you have, if you have the courage to write a bill, which I have sometimes doubted in the past, hop to it, bring it in here, and you will not find any partisanship over on our side.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I am very much interested in what the gentleman said about these bills and the observation he made at the opening of his remarks to the effect that in his opinion the immediate problem before us for consideration was the problem of finding a way, if possible, to prevent strikes, lock-outs, and other stoppages in defense industries. I am asking the gentleman this question not only because he has read all of the pending bills on this subject, but because no one has displayed a greater interest in labor disputes in this body than the gentleman, and nobody has talked so much about it——

Mr. HOFFMAN. And to so little purpose.

Mr. MOTT. No; I do not say that. I will get right to the point. I am asking this question. He has read the Vinson substitute bill, of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And listened to the gentleman's explanation of it.

Mr. MOTT. I want to ask the gentleman if in his opinion the provisions of the Vinson bill go far enough to attain the objectives sought—that is, to prevent strikes in defense industry—and if he does not think so, in what respect he thinks the Vinson bill should be amended?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In my judgment, no bill should be limited to the present emergency situation. We need legislation which will protect the individual worker after the war is over. Again, there is no provision in the Vinson bill, as I recall, which has anything to do with a secret ballot before strikes are called. Am I in error?

Mr. MOTT. No; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There should be such a provision. Again, there is no provision in the Vinson bill which has anything to do with the accounting of union funds. Am I correct?

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There should be such an accounting. And there is no provision in the Vinson bill which provides for an enforcement, if I read it correctly, of the conclusions arrived at by the Mediation Board. Am I correct?

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because it is said that under the lend-lease bill the President can take over plants. In my judgment, that is not proper or constitutional procedure. You remember he took over a plant recently at Bendix, in New Jersey, because Mr. Hill, the president of the concern, would not agree to employ only union men who were up in their dues. The Navy took it over; then they employed only those who had paid their dues, which, to my mind, is a vicious requirement. It ran along a few days and then some of the union men thought the dues were excessive and struck against their own union. Then the Navy was called upon, or, rather, Mr. Davis was called upon, to do the very thing—that is, compel the men to pay their dues—which was the thing Mr. Hill would not do. Mr. Hill was fired, the plant was seized because he would not fire the men who would not pay union dues. Then Mr. Davis, acting for the Government, was called upon by the union to do the very thing—the refusal of which caused the firing of Hill, the seizure of the plant.

Mr. MOTT. Now, may I make a further inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MOTT. I am familiar with the gentleman's views in that regard as is nearly everybody else in this body and I concur generally in them. The gentleman has already stated that the immediate problem here to be solved is the prevention of strikes, lock-outs, and other stoppages in defense industry. I am asking the gentleman if he does not believe it would be better to go ahead and settle that particular question and then try to arrive at a solution of the other phase of this labor trouble, namely, the labor-union racketeering, by amendment to labor-union acts, such as the National Labor Relations Act and other acts of that kind, and place that jurisdiction where it belongs, in the Labor Department, instead of putting all of these remedies in one bill, the primary objective of which is to prevent stoppages in defense industry?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That might be true were it not for the situation to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] referred this morning. He stated that he had offered amendments to appropriation bills to correct some of these high-handed practices, to correct something radically and criminally wrong. I have made the same effort, but we have never been able to get anywhere. For 4 years I have offered amendments which would protect the American citizen in his fundamental right, his unqualified right, to work where he could find a job, and I have gotten just absolutely nowhere. Here is an opportunity, because attention is focused on this situation, to get some legislation which will be effective. I have suggested a mediation-arbitration-conciliation-collective-bargaining board, made up of leading Democrats who are the authors of the proposed legislation.

You have these four Democrats over there, all of them fine men; the integrity of none has ever been question. I will go along. There are 435 of us. We all have our pet bills. I have one or two. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] has one, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER] has one, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has one. On your side you have Members with bills. Each of us has been working for our particular hobby. I will throw mine in the wastebasket. Go ahead on your side and do something. Is that not fair enough? Is that not fair enough coming from a Republican who wants to see the New Deal sent to the bottom of the sea? Is that not fair enough coming from a Republican who hopes the

New Deal will be completely thrown out in the next election? Is it not charitable, generous enough to say, "Come on, you Democrats, write your bill and I will go along with you?" What is your answer? The country is waiting to hear.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the latest statistics which I can obtain show that there are about 55,000,000 people on the pay rolls of this country and the Government. In round figures there are about 52,000,000 engaged in agriculture, industry, service, and transportation. In round figures there are a fraction over 40,000,000 nonagricultural pay-rollees in the United States. The figures also show that there are about 10,420,000 of that 40,000,000 engaged as workers on the farms. As I view the picture, we will attain a total of between 56,000,000 and 60,000,000 pay-rollees in agriculture and industry by the time we reach the pinnacle of the wartime production.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. How many did the gentleman say there were in defense industries?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I did not mention the defense industries.

Mr. RABAUT. What was the first figure the gentleman gave?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Total about 55,000,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Was that the gentleman's figure?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that at least 5,000,000 additional female workers will be called into this undertaking before we reach the top of employment in the United States. There are probably between ten and fifteen million of those 40,000,000 workers who are members of so-called unions, and when I say "so-called" I say that respectfully, because we know what the union organizations are and the good they bring.

We have had lots of letters, we have had many press and radio comments and speeches over the country about legislation which will do something about strikes. I have received letters and other Members have received them. In my home town, as best I can determine, there are something like 25,000 or 26,000 pay-rollees, most all of them members of the C. I. O. and A. F. of L. organizations. If I ever had that labor vote as my support, I do not know when it was, but I have no ground to complain about that whatsoever. The Members of this House know how I have voted on labor legislation, what I have said, and what I have not said about labor activities.

We are confronted here with three or four very interesting legislative proposals. Last week I voted against the price-control bill because I felt that bill was a sham, a shadow, and a subterfuge. I felt it was unfair to pay-rollees, agricultural operators, and agricultural workers. I think this House handed the public something last week which the public did not want. I do not think it will control or prevent inflation. I do not think it will hold down the cost of living. I do not think any good will come out of the bill as it left the House of Representatives last week, so I voted against it.

In approaching the pending question, I do not want to vote for or against the Ramspeck bill in its present form or the Vinson bill in its present form. I just do not like to have anything to do with such proposals. Both of them in their present form are awfully cheap to be brought before the House and before the country at this particular time. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has given me to understand that he will make a serious effort to materially alter one or the other or both bills in order to make them somewhat decent. I have not talked with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] about his bill, although I listened very carefully to what he had to say yesterday, and from what he had to say I do not think his heart is back of his bill. I do not think the President wants any of these bills enacted into law. I think he put himself in the hole when he sent the labor letter up here the other day on the neutrality bill, and he wants to get out of that hole. He hopes the Congress of the United States will pull him out one way or another if he can be pulled out.

In other words, if I am going to vote for labor legislation at this time, I want something with teeth in it. If I am going to vote against a bill that moves in this direction I want to vote against a bill that has got something in it so that when I go back home I can tell the people what I did. As I read the Smith bill, it has teeth in it. I think it has alligator teeth in it. I think it has teeth as long as the man-eating clams that you get out of the far eastern Pacific, and those are about the most terrible teeth I have ever seen.

When you read the Smith bill on pages 6 and 7 where an individual who violates some of these provisions loses all standing under the National Labor Relations Act, all standing insofar as relief assistance is concerned, all standing under titles III and IX of the Social Security Act, I am telling you when you lose those privileges you are losing something. That is what I call teeth. You read the bill and you will see why an individual might lose those privileges. Going over to page 7 of the Smith bill, you will find some additional teeth.

Years ago when I left the farm I was about 27 years of age, that is, when I discontinued farm stoop labor and first went into industry, and the most amazing thing I found in the industrial set-up was the situation where corporations refused to publish their financial statements, showing the operating results and their financial position to their stockholders and to the interested public which some day might be stockholders in those corporations.

For almost 20 years I carried on a running fight with corporations, insisting that their managements, that is, their boards of directors, publish those vital bits of information to the public of this country. In most, I think in every case in which I was connected with a corporation, I finally succeeded in getting those figures published. I thought it was good business. I thought it created confidence in the corporate structures of our country. I thought it promoted followers of the capitalistic-private enterprise, private-management, private-ownership system, and I believe that today. I just would not think of heading a corporation or being an important officer in a corporation today with its stock listed that refused to publish its statistical information to the public.

I cannot understand why the labor unions have failed to insist voluntarily upon the public's having this information. If I were directing the fortunes of a labor union I would not permit a Congress to stand up here and say some of the things that have been said in the last 48 hours, because I would beat them to the gun. I would say, "Sure, you can have all of my information any time you want it," and I would sell that idea to my members if there was any way I possibly could. That is the way I would go about it.

If I were at the head of a labor union, I think in sheer decency and for the preservation of my union and my standing in the community, I would fix it so that none of my members injured any person who wanted to work. I would try to maintain peaceful picketing and try to eliminate all types of picketing that are not peaceful. I think in the long run I would gain more support for the labor union, I think I would have a higher standing for my group in the long run than they will ever gain in any other way.

We are engaged in this national-defense program, or war program, I prefer to call it. Certainly we are going to spend $100,000,000,000 on the program. There are no ifs, ands, or buts, about that. We have gone so far down the line now that you could not cut off the spigot quick enough to prevent the expenditure of $100,000,000,000. My mind is reconciled to the fact that we are going to spend directly and indirectly $150,000,000,000 as a minimum on today's price level, and if the price level goes up 25 or 50 percent I think we will rapidly move toward a $200,000,000,000 expenditure.

The people of this country are certainly dissatisfied with the things that are going on. I do not know anybody in my district who has attacked labor as such. I said a while ago there are about 25,000 A. F. of L. and C. I. O. workers in my home town. If you went out there and attacked labor in that home town of mine you would have to attack practically every citizen in the city. I have not had any letters attacking labor, as the gentleman from Illinois tried to indicate here today. I think he set up two straw men and knocked both of them into smithereens.

The people in my district are friendly to labor because practically everybody out there performs more or less stoop labor. We do not have colored people up there in a number of consequence to do stoop labor. We perform stoop labor in my home. We do not have any maid servants or man servants about the home.

We scrub the floors, my wife and I. We have an 8-year-old boy and we are teaching him to scrub the floors. We wash the dishes, we carry out the ashes, we fill up the oil burners. I have a coal furnace in the basement and an oil burner on the first floor. Most of the time you will find us washing the automobile.

We grew up that way and we expect to die that way, and I make no apologies for it. I think you can draw tremendous dividends from performing a little stoop labor once in a while. It has never hurt me. I have seven brothers, and it has never hurt them. All of them that are living except me are today engaged in performing stoop labor. We are a family of laborers as far back as I can trace the family. And, let me assure you, this war will bring millions of our people back to a type of labor with which they are not now acquainted. That is just about my attitude on this labor situation.

If the people of this country want the Wagner Labor Relations Act materially altered under conditions such as we now face as a result of this war participation, it may be quite a good thing for Congress to do something about it, but I think it is about time we should go at it seriously. I do not believe these bills that are presented to us, outside of the Landis and Smith bills—I am referring to these four bills only—are at all serious in their approach.

I believe the so-called laborers in my home town will go along with the Smith bill, for instance, in the long run. They might not go along with it in the next election, but what has that to do with it? It does not, for the country's sake, amount to a hill of beans whether I am returned to Congress in the next election or whether I go back to some other work.

The industries in which I now have my savings invested number four. Two of them are highly organized with the C. I. O. and the other two are what might be called open shops. So there is no reason why I should take any side as between open or closed shops in my personal business.

I have no hatred for Mr. John L. Lewis, and so far I have not taken any part in the feud running between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt. I do not care anything about their personal feuds. Mr. Lewis does not work on any production line, and he does not picket any plant. He is not responsible for getting out the war production or the civilian supply production, and it is just quite immaterial to me what the President and Mr. Lewis do in their personal fight. But it is very material to me about what the "pay-rollees" in the United States do. As far as my district is concerned, I am not worrying about what they are going to do. I have spent enough time in the factories with them before coming down here, in that very district, to know what they are going to do. They are going to work like "Old Harry" to get out production. That is what they are now doing. That is exactly what they are going to do.

I am not in favor of any legislation which will interfere with that work. I think the Ramspeck bill in its present form will create all kinds of trouble and bring about no good.

You take the panels and the boards that are provided for under the Ramspeck bill, and the interference one with another and the way they mix in, and what are you going to get out of that?

Let us look at the proposition of taking over these plants for a minute. You have section 9 of the Selective Service Act and that has a lot to say about taking over plants. You have another bill which we passed here last October 16, 1941, Public, No. 274, which has to do with the taking over of plants. We are bringing in four bills here today, more or less, having to do with the taking over of plants. When the Government goes out here and takes over a plant, and when the President or the Board, or whoever it is in charge, hands those plants back to the private owners, what shape are those plants to be in? Where are the customers to be? What is to be the position of the capital structure? Of course, these proposals provide that a fair and just price shall be paid, but what is a plant worth to me if you pay me a fair and just price or the replaceable value, say, 4 years from now, if the business is all gone, the organization shot, the assets dissipated in the meantime, the amortization on the mortgage not met, and so on down the line? You read section 9 of the Selective Service Act and see if you would like to have one of your plants taken over under that provision. I think we are pussyfooting around here, and I do not think we have written into this bill a sufficient set of specifications to satisfy—and when I say "satisfy" I mean equitably satisfy—the people whose plants are to be taken over.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman made the statement that practically all the bills contain a provision for taking over the plants. The Vinson bill contains no such provision.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand the Vinson bill is to be amended so that it will.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman is mistaken so far as any amendment coming from me is concerned or from the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, let me ask the chairman of the committee a question, although I do not ask him to divulge too much information he intends to give in his speech later. But when you get through your bill, so far as you are concerned, it will not have a provision for taking over plants?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the President has that authority now because he has already taken over two plants, and I see no reason for incorporating such a provision in any other bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I referred to those two laws I mentioned a few moments ago.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And I understand the gentleman from Georgia to say that he does not intend to offer such an amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not intend to offer such an amendment, but, of course, I cannot preclude any other Member from offering it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. Did I understand the gentleman to say that his objection to the Ramspeck bill was that it did provide for the taking over of plants?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I did not say that. The Ramspeck bill does carry that provision and the Smith bill carries that provision, and our friend who has just spoken has indicated that he is not going to offer it to his bill and points out that such a provision is already in two laws approved by the Congress.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is in error. I stated that in two instances the President has taken over a plant and therefore I assumed there was some law permitting him to do so and therefore there is no need to write it into a bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have acted on two proposals heretofore which are now law, both of which carried that very provision and since their enactment the President has functioned in the taking over of plants.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman concur in the statement of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee that in the circumstances there is no need of putting into the Vinson substitute bill a provision for taking over plants, because the President already has that authority under the law?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the statement of the gentlemen is sound because the Ramspeck bill refers to Public, No. 783 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, section 9 of the Selective Service Act with reference to the taking over of plants and if it is already in that law in section 9 of the Selective Service Act, and also in Public, No. 274, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, why do you repeat the provision in these bills?

Mr. MOTT. I do not think we do and, of course, the Vinson substitute bill does not, and now may I ask the gentleman this question since that point has been cleared up. What is his objection, if any, to the Vinson substitute bill if he thinks it will solve the problem we are tying to solve, or if not, why not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think the Vinson substitute bill as it is presented to us in these italics will at all do what the country is expecting us to do. I think what the country expects us to do is primarily set forth in the Smith bill. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. MOTT. That answers my question or that part of my question which was whether the gentleman thought the Vinson bill was sufficient. It does not answer that part of the question which I asked, if the gentleman did not think it would bring about a solution of this problem which is the prevention of strikes in defense industries.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me follow that for just a moment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the gentleman's statement that the bill does not do what the country wants, but that the Smith bill does, of course the gentleman is going to follow the wishes of the country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not smart enough in a parliamentary way to be able to answer that question at this time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I assume the gentleman is going to follow the viewpoint of the country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know what I will do, but if there is a roll call on this, the gentleman will certainly know what I will do. If I knew what I was going to be able to vote on, I would answer the question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thought the gentleman was, because I assumed from his remarks that he is adopting the bill which he says has teeth in it, namely, the Smith bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is the bill that the country wants.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. So do I think it is what the country wants, with one amendment to the bill, and that is taking out the right to take plants over.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish the gentleman would repeat that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the country wants the enactment of the Smith bill with teeth in it, eliminating the section with reference to plants being taken over by the Government, when the plants have not forced the issue, and section 9 of the Selective Service Act is the one permitting the taking over of the plants when the plant refuses to manufacture, but in this bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] the Government may go out and grab a plant, simply because labor has forced them to bring on a strike. In that way you will put industry in this country under government control which is the first step to socialism and nazi-ism.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think now that I can say I am in full accord with what the gentleman from Georgia said. May I ask this question? In the amendments the gentleman proposes to offer to his bill, will you bring it into agreement with the Smith bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am hoping, speaking for myself, that this House will have an opportunity of voting, and they will have, on the clear-cut substitute of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I am hoping the House will adopt that bill, eliminating the section that I have just referred to. If we do that, then we will have written a better bill than the Naval Affairs bill substitute, or the bill that comes from the Labor Committee, which is a copy of the substitute of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the elimination to which the gentleman refers is section 20, page 17, of H. R. 6149.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more. I do not know the section, but I assume that that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us tie it up. Examine the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; that is the section.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I refer to page 17 of the Smith bill, section 20.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And if the committee will do that, then we will have met the demand of the American people and have written a bill that has some teeth in it, which the country is demanding that we do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman has stated the case in a few words which I have been trying to state in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we are going before the country with a bill approved by this House, let us go out of here with a bill that we are not ashamed to mention and stand up for when we get back home, instead of compromising and shadow boxing as we did on the price-control bill last week. The country, labor, and all others are entitled to know our exact position on this question. If it defeats us in November 1942, well and good, because we should be able to get along after working around in this House for many years. Perhaps a lot of us have been here too long. I think my own district has kept me here about 8 years. It may desire a change. But let us put a bill out that means something, or else vote down every misleading bill that is put up here. Let us come clean, be plain in our approach, and do the necessary. When we get so smart politically our people do not know where we stand on great questions it is time for the people to do the necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, Jefferson once said:

> Let this be the distinctive mark of an American that, in cases of commotion, he enlists himself under no man's banner, inquires for no man's name, but repairs to the standard of the laws. Do this and you need never fear anarchy or tyranny. Your Government will be perpetual.

Mr. Chairman, I plead for America, for today America is confronted by the chaos of events. Anarchy stalks abroad in the land, fear rides the wind, and free America is being trampled in the dust.

The "goons" are here. The spirit of Harry Bridges hovers over the portals of this Chamber while we consider whether or not the rights of freemen under the Constitution shall be wiped out by a small minority of racketeering labor gangsters, or whether we shall move to stand by the Constitution, by free government, by the government of Washington, Jefferson, Cleveland, and Wilson—that government which fears no man or any group of men, either beyond the seas or at home.

Someone recently said that if we cannot conquer John Lewis we would better not attack Hitler. I say to you that if any man or any group of men can stand before the men and women of this Nation and assert, as Philip Murray asserted, that no national emergency can be permitted to interfere with the unionization drive, and get away with it, America is no longer free and our people have been betrayed.

I stand here today, Mr. Chairman, to plead for a government by law instead of a government by men. I stand here today to demand that this Congress perform its constitutional duty and function of upholding law and justice, equality of opportunity, and the Bill of Rights.

I never believed the hour would come when it would be necessary to stand up in this body to plead for action that should have been taken long ago. I never believed I should see the time when organized labor leaders would have the brazen insolence to stand up and tell 130,000,000 free men, women, and children:

> You cannot have a national defense, you cannot have security, you cannot have prosperity, you cannot have liberty, except on our terms.

Oh, would to God that we could hark back to the courage of Grover Cleveland. Would to God that we had some of that courageous statesmanship today that could and did rise above all political considerations—the courage that immortalized Andrew Jackson—the courage that was not afraid to stand up and declare the right, no matter what group of men had determined to set themselves above the security of the Nation and above the safety of the people.

Mr. Chairman, historians of the future will find it difficult to phrase sentences that will describe the inexpressibly insolent and subversive attitude exhibited by these so-called labor leaders today.

Let me say that my remarks are not directed against the rank and file of the working people of America because I believe they are just as ready and willing to fight for our national defense and our national security as any other group of our citizens.

But let me remind you, my colleagues in this body, that these labor leaders who profess to speak for organized labor speak for less than one-fifth of the wage earners of America. There are more than 50,000,000 wage earners in this country. Approximately 10,000,000 of them belong to labor unions. And not 50 percent, I am reliably informed, of the members of labor organizations, today, are members who enrolled voluntarily.

Mr. Chairman, the security of this Nation, the very safety of our people, is being opposed and hamstrung by a handful of rapacious, audacious racketeers, lustful for power and greedy for profit.

These racketeers want all the power, they want to dominate industry, and yet they deny that they should have an atom of responsibility. Many, if not most, of these labor leaders who now have their goon squads under the lash of Harry Bridges on this Hill to try to intimidate,

to frighten Members of Congress into evading their solemn duty, have not been elected even by the rank and file of their unions.

Many of the strikes which have impeded the national-defense production have been fraudulent strikes because the union vote which precipitated them was a vote secured by terrorism and by the rank dishonesty of stuffing the ballot box.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we have come to the point, incredible as it seems, in this country, in this hour of our national emergency, our national peril, when interjurisdictional and even intrajurisdictional strikes have come to hold up national-defense production. In these strikes, working conditions, wages, and hours, are not even a consideration. They are strikes which represent only the jealousies and the feudings between these racketeering labor leaders themselves. These labor leaders have made a plaything of the national security. They have made a pawn, in their underhanded and nefarious plottings and striking for power and more power, they have made a pawn, I say, of the safety of American men, women, and children.

In God's name, have 130,000,000 courageous American people reached a point where a few self-seeking, racketeering labor leaders can with impunity defy the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the courts, and imperil the safety of this Nation? Can that be possible, Mr. Chairman? Can there be anybody in this Chamber who will hesitate a minute to vote for the Smith bill, which not only will put the proper responsibility upon labor leaders and labor unions, but which will put a curb on the insatiable lust for power and the immeasurable greed for money which these racketeering labor leaders have displayed? Are free wage earners in America to be enslaved to a labor monopoly? Are the free wage earners of America to be compelled by their Government to pay whatever tribute may be levied against them by these greedy racketeers as the price of their right in free America to make a living, to work, to feed their wives and children?

Mr. Chairman, there is not the slightest point in arguing the merits or demerits of any of these bills. We are confronted with a fundamental issue here. That issue is whether or not a few greedy, brutal, power-lustful racketeers shall defy the Government of the United States and imperil the safety of the Nation. I say to you that if there is any group, big or little, in the United States; any minority, if you please, that is bigger than the United States itself, that is more powerful than the Government, that can intimidate the Chief Executive, or this Congress, then by the living God, free America is gone, the Constitution is a dead letter, the Bill of Rights is a mockery, and we have left only the decaying carcass of that great dream of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the framers of the Constitution—free government.

No fair-minded man or woman can argue for a minute with any degree of logic that organized labor should have its right to place its minority interests above the welfare and safety of the whole Nation. No man or woman can argue with any shadow of logic that organized labor and organized labor leaders should have the power they are exercising today without a shadow of responsibility, either to the Government, the people, or to their own members.

No man or woman can argue with a shadow of logic that these racketeering labor leaders should be permitted to levy tribute, any tribute they please—as they do now—on the free wage earners of America and not even make any accounting of the multiplied millions that they extort from the pay envelopes of the men and women of this country. No man or woman can argue with the slightest shadow of logic that we can any longer with safety leave this question of strikes, or no strikes, to the sense of fairness and the desires so belatedly expressed by these labor leaders themselves. Why do they now come forward after the loss of millions upon millions of man-days of labor in the national defense, and plead that they are ready now to gather around the council table with the representatives of the Government to avoid strikes? Why do they do this? It is because, like Belshazzar of old, they see the handwriting on the wall. They see that shadow written there by the moving finger of an outraged and betrayed people, and they read on those walls—the shadow of events—these words: "Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting."

Mr. Chairman, there is not a Member on this floor who can rise in his place at this moment and deny with truth that these labor leaders have not had every conceivable opportunity that men possibly could want to gather around the council table with the officials of the Government long since and avoid these strikes, to have amicably settled these disputes which have brought these losses of multiplied millions of man-days to the national defense.

No man or woman on this floor can with truth deny that time and again labor leaders have said bluntly and insolently that the hour of the Nation's peril is the time for them to get theirs—and they have proceeded with a vengeance to get it.

Therefore, I want to impress upon you, my colleagues, that this is a fundamental issue of freedom you are dealing with here today, the fundamental issue not only of the freedom of the wage earners of this country to earn a living without let or hindrance from some goon leader, but the freedom of the whole American people—including the men and women and children of the ranks of labor—to prepare their national defense and security without interference.

I warn here and now that if the Congress succumbs to the threats of men who in this hour are on this Hill trying to browbeat and intimidate Members of Congress, that if we do not meet this fundamental issue face to face, if we do not say to these labor racketeers and these goon squads, "You no longer shall impede the national defense," then God knows there is nothing to fight Hitler for, because then freedom is gone.

Colleagues, we must defeat, we must stop, the depredations of these labor racketeers against the national defense. If we do not do it, and do it now, we ought to be ashamed to go back home and look our constituents in the face.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that only the most unspeakable cowardice, only the most inexpressible, craven spirit can prevent this Congress from taking the action that national safety demands, that free government requires, that common, ordinary decency necessitates.

Either let us meet this fundamental issue fairly and courageously, or let us move the statues and take down the portraits of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, and Wilson, and put in their place the Lewises and the Murrays and Bridges and Hillmans. God forfend the day.

My colleagues, on the Kansas shield above this Chamber is written, "To the stars through difficulties." Today let me say to you, not for self but for country, let us take our stand, and take it now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of the House Labor Committee and as one that respects the rank and file of labor in this country and our great labor leaders who have gone along in our defense program. I want to preserve the rights of labor and also increase our defense production.

There have been some misstatements made in the past with reference to the cooling-off period and balloting and mediation. We have had all kinds of mediation. We have had a cooling-off period. We also have 98 percent balloting on strikes today.

I am interested in the main objective, in getting the maximum defense effort with the least number of strikes. In order to do that, legislation will not accomplish it alone, but we must direct our legislation at the cause.

What are the causes of strikes? First, wages and better working conditions, which is a legitimate cause.

Second, jurisdictional strikes. We have had very few jurisdictional strikes in 1940 and in the first 6 months of 1941. Six percent of the strikes in 1940 were jurisdictional strikes, and in the first 6 months of 1941 only 2 percent of the strikes were jurisdictional.

Then we come down to what I call the real cause of strikes; that is, by un-American labor leaders in America. Our legislation should be directed toward these "red" labor leaders. In case the Smith substitute fails, I would like to offer another substitute that would take care of these "red" labor leaders. My substitute is divided in three sections. In the first section, which will take care of the "red" labor leaders in America, it provides:

In the case of any individual who has the status under the National Labor Relations Act of a representative of employees, if the Attorney General finds, after due notice to

such individual and affording him an opportunity for a hearing, that he is a subversive individual, and by order so declares, then for all purposes of such act such individual shall thereafter cease to have and cease to be entitled to such status with respect to any defense contractor or any labor organization in which employees of a defense contractor participate.

It also places the burden upon the union. The unions elect the labor leaders. If the unions have a labor officer who is a Communist or a Nazi or one who wants to destroy our form of government in America, that labor union shall not be given the rights of the Wagner Act as long as they have an officer who is un-American. Whenever the union gets rid of that kind of officer, then that labor union comes back within the act.

Section 2 is with regard to the destruction of property and willful violence and reads:

and for the purposes of the provisions of section 10 (c) relating to reinstatement by any employer who is a defense contractor, does not include any employee who a preponderance of the testimony taken shows has willfully engaged in violence or unlawful destruction or seizure of property in connection with any current labor dispute or unfair labor practice involving such employer, or in connection with any organizational activities of a labor organization among employees of such employer.

That means that labor leaders and the rank and file of labor do not believe in destroying property. If they destroy property, then they are destroying their own jobs.

Then the third section, which has to do with the registration of labor unions, I quote section 5 of the bill:

Every labor organization in which employees of any defense contractor participate shall, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, and thereafter on January 1 and July 1 of each year, register with the Secretary of Labor by filing, on such form and in such manner as the Secretary may by rules and regulations prescribe, a statement, signed under oath by the president and the treasurer of such labor organization, containing the following information, etc.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under what conditions will you be able to offer those three sections?

Mr. LANDIS. This will be introduced as a substitute if the Smith bill fails. If this substitute then would fail, I would want to offer the first section as an amendment to the Ramspeck bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me get this clear. If the Smith substitute does not fail, that is, if it is approved, you cannot offer these amendments, can you?

Mr. LANDIS. No; I cannot.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would you mind telling us what your attitude is toward the Smith bill?

Mr. LANDIS. I am against the Smith bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. We have to think of all the possibilities here. Suppose the Smith substitute would be adopted, would it be your idea to offer your bill as an amendment to that, if that could be done?

Mr. LANDIS. If it is possible.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. While the Smith bill is pending would the gentleman be disposed to offer it as an amendment to the Smith bill?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. There are, of course, a couple of provisions the gentleman contemplates offering that are touched upon in some measure at least in the so-called Smith bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The first section of the gentleman's bill is not in the Smith bill at all, the section dealing with subversive or "red" labor leaders.

Mr. LANDIS. That is right; but plant seizure is in the Smith bill, and I am, of course, against the plant-seizure provision.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I assume a strong effort wil be made to strike that out of the bill. Then if that goes out of the bill——

Mr. LANDIS. It would be a question of parliamentary procedure to amend the Smith bill if that section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman mean an amendment to the Smith bill or to the Ramspeck bill?

Mr. LANDIS. No; the Smith bill. As I understand the procedure, we would not have a right to amend the Smith bill. We would have to wait and amend the Ramspeck bill because parliamentary procedure would not permit an amendment to the Smith bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the plant-seizure portion of the Smith bill were stricken out would the gentleman be more friendly toward that bill?

Mr. LANDIS. I certainly would.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the gentleman's principal objection to the Smith bill?

Mr. LANDIS. That is one of the main objections. Another objection is freezing the closed shop.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman has suggested some very fine amendments and I hope we shall have an opportunity to vote on them.

Mr. LANDIS. One of the main reasons for the collapse of France was the Communist leaders and Nazi leaders in the labor movement in France. Part was due to drastic legislation, but most of the trouble in France was caused by "red" leaders.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to my friend on the Labor Committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire to commend the gentleman for his study of the subject matter which he will propose in amendments to the pending legislation. I would like to have the opinion of my friend as to Harry Bridges, who though not a citizen of the United States, who although applying for citizenship three times, has as many times withdrawn his application, yet is the leader directly and indirectly of thousands and thousands of organized laborers in this country.

Mr. LANDIS. Many labor leaders I have talked to do not like Harry Bridges any more than I do and would like to get rid of him, but it is apparently impossible to get rid of him under today's conditions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. If a law were passed to take care of "reds" like Harry Bridges, this country would be better off. I would now like to make a statement on the difference in strikes. We have read much newspaper comment with reference to strikes, but I call your attention to the fact that in 1917 we had over 4,400 strikes with but one labor organization in the country. In 1940 we have had only a little over 2,500 strikes with two great labor organizations.

The rank and file and the great labor leaders in America, the American labor leaders, have cooperated with the defense program, and I do not want to see them suffer. I want to take it out on the un-American labor leaders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understand the gentleman's record correctly, and I have served with him on the labor committee, the gentleman has always represented union labor, and what he is trying to do now is to get legislation that will protect the unions from these subversive groups.

Mr. LANDIS. That is exactly right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am with the gentleman in his effort.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Could not the situation be likened to the rotten apple in the barrel? One rotten apple will spoil the entire barrel.

Mr. LANDIS. Exactly. Let us take the rotten apples out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I have approached this subject coolly and deliberately, and, I hope, sanely, without any excitement and without being influenced by any person or organization in the world. I hope I shall not be interrupted for I wish to make a connected statement.

The people of the country at last seem to be awakening to the seriousness of the emergency confronting them, arising out of troubled world conditions. They are

beginning to realize the possibility of evil things befalling them. Their security may be endangered—their way of life may be destroyed. A far-seeing few have seen it for some time; now a majority of the people are determined to prepare for any eventuality. In this preparation the people have fully decided that nothing shall interfere with the activities for national defense. The security of the country and their own safety is superior, in their minds, to everything else. Self-preservation is the dominant thought of human existence. Therefore, the people conclude, everything else must give way. The people will not submit to any interference, any obstruction, from any source, to the speedy necessity of defending themselves and their country from danger. Woe be to the man, or men, or group, or organization that they may hold responsible for delay or weakness in their defense. They will overthrow their administration, their legislative bodies, their business, or social organizations, or any organization of whatever kind that stands in their way, and when the people are fully aroused to their danger, they will eliminate those held responsible by them for the failure to protect their security. All individual selfishness must be sacrificed to the common good.

The people are demanding unity of effort on the part of the Executive and the Congress, and they are demanding that those engaged in defense, whether employer or employees, whether business organizations, or labor unions shall cease their bickering. Therefore, every citizen should bend every energy, should make every sacrifice to so prepare to defend ourselves and our country, even to the giving up of life itself, if need be, that our country should not perish from the face of the earth. Such defense requires unity of purpose, and unity of effort, even to the extent of yielding cherished convictions, if such yielding be necessary for the welfare of all. The people are demanding that the leaders of industry shall have the work done that is necessary to the national defense without unreasonable cost. Most of all, the people are demanding that the workers do not impede, delay, or hinder the work of national defense by work stoppages.

The stoppages are largely due to strikes called by leaders of labor organizations or unions, where large forces of workers at one time are ordered to stop work, regardless of the danger to the country from lack of necessary construction. I do not refer in any sense to the right of individuals, acting individually, to work or not to work. That is beside the question. What we are now concerned with is the best method of preventing danger to the country by the sudden stoppage of work by large organized forces of workers employed in defense contracts, acting under the orders of the leaders of said organization or union. There is a wide difference between the constitutional right of an individual to work or not to work and the organized action of large masses of workers who, by reason of exercising such a claimed right, would fail to protect the country and its people. The action of one man, or a few men, acting individually, would not damage the country, but the collective action of organized bodies might prevent the speedy construction of ships or of any other work that might be necessary to the defense of the country.

A large majority, I believe, of the people of the country think that the unions themselves, voluntarily—yes, and patriotically—should pledge themselves not to strike during this great national emergency when engaged in any work necessary to the defense of the country and the safety, security, and welfare of the people. Such a step would end the matter—there would be no need for legislation. All specific grievances could be handled with such machinery as we now have.

However, when we find that one man, arrogant in his power and selfish in his leadership, can injure, perhaps even destroy, 130,000,000 of the people of the country by giving an order to many thousands of men to stop work, then something must be done to protect not only the country but the unions themselves from the dictatorship of such a man. This legislation proposes a procedure to prevent such power being lodged in the hands of any man.

When you find that the present Mediation Board, appointed by the President, has little power to act, and before it acts must have any strike investigation certified to it by the Secretary of Labor, then we realize that there must be mediation directed by Congress instead of by the Executive, and that the Mediation Board shall have the power, given by an act of Congress, to provide for notice to be given before a strike is declared and to use such efforts as may tend to prevent a strike. Such an important matter should be directed by congressional action and not by Executive order.

When you find that the intent of the National Labor Relations Act is flouted by the present procedure of certain organizations with reference to strikes, then there must be legislation which definitely makes such strikes unlawful. Certainly the full membership of the organization should pass on the question of a strike rather than act under the orders of a leader who may not, and sometimes does not, express the majority view of the membership.

When you find that mass picketing is used for the purpose of intimidating and obstructing those who wish to work, then legislation must be perfected that will secure to every man the right to work, if he so wishes, without fear of violence from those who do not work and do not wish to work. If, as the unions contend, every man has a right to work, to make a living for himself and family, which is a natural law as well as the law of men, then the unions are inconsistent in saying that a man has no right to work for a living unless he holds membership in a labor union.

The bills before the House all have some legislation intended to correct the present situation. Of said bills, it seems to me that the bill known as the Smith bill is more direct in its approach and tends to correct the abuses aforementioned more than the others.

If the Members of this body do not pass legislation sufficiently strong to stop strikes, then the various constituencies of the Representatives will take matters in their hands. Their action will not be based upon party affiliation; it will be based solely on one thought—their own self-preservation and the preservation of their country. No man, I care not who he may be, from the most powerful, politically or otherwise, to the humblest citizen, can in this dangerous crisis fail to take every action within his power to prevent the greatest catastrophe with which the Nation has ever been threatened. If he does fail, then the day of reckoning for that man is at hand.

As for me, I am a Democrat; but, first of all, I am an American. I feel confident that this allegiance is shared by all of us, regardless of party loyalty. I am not thinking solely of combinations of capital, nor of labor unions, nor any other organization, but I wish to see action taken that will enable our defense contracts to be carried out, that will enable us to furnish the ships and the airplanes, the tanks and the ordnance, and the ammunition to the American manpower to protect this country and its people from great disaster. To that end the people of the country are willing to make great sacrifice. For the gain of a few cents more per hour, or for any other reason, no one should be allowed to hold up our defense.

This is no time for capitulation nor for bargaining. Directing conciliation and mediation only on such a subject at such a time as this is worse than foolish. If every American is not willing unselfishly to do his part in an all-out effort for the national defense, then legislation must be passed to make such men do their duty.

It is a surprise to me that the leaders of the unions are asking Members of Congress to oppose any legislation of this kind, and they say it is an attack on labor unions. It is most certainly not an attack on labor unions, but it might be considered an attack against the evils of labor unions. Those evils are known throughout the length and breadth of the land, and do not attach to all labor unions, or to all members of labor unions, but only to a few. Therefore it is harder for the people to understand why the unions should resent an attempt to correct the evils and abuses within their own system. This defiant attitude, instead of cooperation, of course, will cause legislation that will probably go further than it would have gone if there had been an attempt on the part of the unions to correct the abuses which existed. Personally, I am not here to represent the views of labor alone, or of capital alone, but I am here to represent the rights of the laboring man, and the capitalist, and of all others, to be secure in the rights which have been given them under our form of government.

Of course, we are preparing for war. There can be no dispute about that. We have spent billions of dollars and are going to spend more; increased taxes have been levied to meet the unusual expense; Army camps have been established throughout the country; a million and a

half of our young men have been put into training; and there has been no dispute about the pay they are receiving, which is less for a month than some laborers are receiving by the week or even for the day. Of course, everyone knows of our preparation for war, and everyone knows that preparedness is as necessary as participation in actual conflict; yet we find certain men, some of them avowed enemies of our country, and others, blindly following these subversive leaders, refusing to prepare unless they are paid unusual and increased wages. The first are certainly not patriots, and the others who are taking advantage of the necessities of their country are making their patriotism a matter of dollars and cents. Patriots do not force their country to pay them to do their duty in defending their country. The term "mercenaries" is applied to those who fight for pay; they are not and never have been credited with patriotism.

Nor does such action comply with the rules of common sense. If the country should be defeated because of the lack of preparedness, these blind strikers for special advantage will not only get less pay but will be forced to work as slaves for no pay at the behest of a conquering dictator. Selfishness alone, with no consideration of patriotic duty, should make such persons realize that they are jeopardizing their security and their lives for a few additional cents per hour, which will be taken from them if their country fails to win the war which impends.

Some may reply that demands are being made for what they call their rights. Yet nearly every strike that I have heard about demands increased pay for the workers, and every strike has been quickly settled when the increased pay has been granted.

It may be that some workers are not in sympathy with these strikes, but if their leaders are responsible they have the power to refuse to follow such leaders. If they are following enemies of their country, all that the patriotic membership of labor has to do is to put out of their organizations every man who is engaged in activities hurtful to the general welfare.

As the above has not been done—and there is no inidcation that it will be—then legislation is being proposed to correct this dangerous situation. The present bill is one instance of it. This bill is a mild step toward a peaceable settlement of labor disputes. It is mild because Congress realizes that the majority of labor is loyal and patriotic, but they are associating with spies and enemies. With them the Congress will have no patience. Quick arrest and quick punishment for those. This bill, we hope, will bring these disputes out into the light, and it may be known publicly who are enemies and who are only misguided and misled. When that is known more drastic action may be taken against these enemies, who are not only enemies to America but enemies to loyal labor.

If this bill does not correct the situation, then there must be readjustment of the laws governing labor and capital, for the present laws seem ineffective in our emergency. The great mass of the people of the country are demanding that something be done to stop these strikes, and in a representative democracy, such as this Government is, the representatives of the people will respond to their command.

The American people have boasted of their Government, and their Congress has passed enough laws, it would seem, certainly to protect the people from danger from any source. Yet, the public is informed that there is no law on the statute books for our self-preservation from annihilation, because a few men are refusing to do their part in our country's behalf and will not permit anyone else to do so. Maybe that was what the president of the A. F. of L. was referring to when he said labor would rebel if Congress passed legislation.

This is a curious situation. The safety of 130,000,000 people is endangered by a small fractional part of the population. What kind of men are these? Are they patriots? To ask the question shows the absurdity of it. By no logical processes of the human mind, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, a man who does, or refuses to do, things which destroy his country could be called a patriot. A patriot is one who loves his country and zealously guards its welfare.

Then, if they are not led by patriotic devotion to their country, what inspires them? Surely they would not plead ignorance of the result of their actions. But if their actions are not patriotic, they must be acting either ignorantly or deliberately. If by any chance they should be declared ignorant, which I do not believe, for the American workingman is the best paid and most intelligent workman on earth, then legislation is necessary to show them the error of their way. If they do not know what will be the result of their acts, then let them listen to their leaders and follow their advice. By their vote they elected the President and the Vice President of the United States—those leaders have been advising against strikes for a year or more and portraying the dangers to the country of work stoppages. If they will not take the advice of leaders whom they themselves elected to leadership, then they are willful and deliberate in their acts. A fair conclusion is that some of them are willful and deliberate. Immediately the question arises, do not they know the first destruction will fall upon themselves—what is the reason for their behavior? Some of them are Communists, spies, saboteurs, enemies of our country who are deliberately trying to stir up strife in order that our enemies should prevail. Some who follow these false leaders, enemies to everything they hold dear, are misled by the reasons given for their acts. They say, in general, they are striking for the rights of labor. Yet, when their rights are sifted down it is found that they strike because some other organization than their own has the bargaining control. The majority control can easily be ascertained, and jurisdictional strikes are unworthy of patriotic men.

Apparently there are many employers as well as employees who do not realize the seriousness of the situation. If we should be attacked by an enemy or enemies and defeated, both employers and employees would lose their businesses and their jobs and their liberty.

From a report recently received the following has been taken:

Recently the Department of Labor released figures covering the period from July 1, 1940, to October 1, 1941, 15 months of the rearmament program. These figures in themselves show the serious effect of strikes and work stoppages in delaying, hindering, and obstructing the progress of national defense. During the 15-month period covered by the survey 24,284,981 man-days of defense effort were lost because of strikes involving 1,960,331 workers. During the single month of June 1941 there was a loss of 1,448,234 man-days. During the month of June a total of 52,218 man-days were lost because of strikes engaged in by 12,039 aircraft workers; 57,146 man-days were lost in shipbuilding strikes. The Navy Department reports that strikes occurred in 411 plants having naval defense contracts, the number of man-days lost being approximately 2,586,000, or 20,688,000 man-hours.

Those days of labor lost were estimated to be the equivalent of the production of a large amount of tanks, machine guns, armor plate, aircraft, ammunition, and all other basic equipment for our military forces. Still, in the face of that statement a month ago, strikes have increased, not decreased, while the flower of our young manhood is waiting in training camps for all of this necessary equipment with which to defend their country and their lives.

This state of affairs cannot continue. Fresh in our minds is the picture of what happened in France, where the French lost their liberty to Germany because they idled and argued while the Germans worked.

It would appear that the people have as great, if not a greater, right to protection for themselves from their Government and the workers as the unions would have to be protected in their rights. These figures show a serious situation. At this point it also might be well to call attention to a report made by the United Mine Workers' Union, by John Lewis, its president, and Thomas Kennedy, its secretary-treasurer, in which the treasury balance of that organization on the 31st of March 1941 had reached the sum of $4,014,075.80, and yet the leader of this organization is still making per capita levies against members of the organization. It is certainly still more evident that the people need some protection against organizations so heavily financed.

The Congress should at this time definitely fix the duties of labor leaders and labor unions with reference to their obligations to protect this country in the national defense, just as it does to other organizations of citizens. The duty of industry has been fixed when its services are called upon for defense. The duty of the young men registered under the Selective Service Act has been fixed in their obligations of citizenship. Now should be fixed the duty of Mr. Lewis and other union leaders, and the unions themselves, whether they can interfere with or obstruct the production of weapons for the defense of the United States.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Labor Committee and I have heard the testimony presented to our committee by the proponents and opponents of the Smith bill, the Vinson bill, the Norton bill, and similar proposals. I represent a highly industrialized defense area. We have some of the largest steel mills in the country. We have two large airplane factories and others engaged in production of airplane accessories. We manufacture auto trucks and automobiles, lenses, periscopes, parachutes, tires, and tubes; we have grain elevators, flour mills, shipyards, marine engine construction companies. We have 2,000 Government defense housing units and 3,000 additional ones will be constructed. I have had opportunity to inspect a number of manufacturing plants in that area. In every one of the plants I learned that contracts are being completed ahead of schedule. Some of them complete their contracts weeks and months ahead of schedule. I have read in the papers throughout the country where battleships have been launched 3 weeks ahead of schedule. But I have yet to see one line or one small paragraph giving credit to the employees in those plants for completing the contracts ahead of schedule.

Congress today is acting in heat and in haste. The proposals before it are not the product of a cool and careful appraisal of all facts, nor of an extended public discussion of their significance. Formulated overnight, the result of scant and superficial study, these proposals are as ill-considered as they are ill-conceived.

This House is asked to give its approval to a bill designed to do away with the voluntary process which has been fundamental throughout the growth and development of American industry and the American Nation itself. It is asked to substitute instead a compulsory process which would subject American workers to forced labor for the first time in our history.

I am opposed to this legislation because the philosophy it embodies is repugnant to the philosophy of those Americans of yesterday who have written the Constitution, who have banished slavery, and who have built the greatest industrial Nation in the world; because its philosophy is repugnant to the philosophy of the vast majority of Americans of today who are determined to achieve a complete victory of freedom against force without surrendering their own freedom to force.

While such is my firm belief, when I call upon the Members of this House to reject this compulsory labor legislation, I ask them to do so on the sole ground of practical expediency; I ask them to reject this bill for one simple, but compelling reason—because this legislation will not work.

The bill pending action of the House is doomed to failure even if enacted. The sole purpose of this bill is to prevent strikes and to do away with industrial conflict in defense production. Whatever else may result from the enactment of this bill, that is the one thing which it will not do.

The proposition that no legislation designed to prevent strikes by compulsion will ever prevent strikes, can be demonstrated by proof which is as simple as it is irrefutable. The entire history of compulsory legislation serves to document this conclusion. The experience of the United States and other democratic countries shows that laws can make strikes illegal, but they cannot prevent them.

In Australia, compulsory arbitration has been in effect for nearly 40 years. In New Zealand, strikes have been illegal for nearly 50 years. Yet in both Australia and New Zealand we find a higher percentage of strikes and lock-outs per inhabitant than in either the United States or England.

Equally significant is the fact that there has been a decrease in the number and extent of strikes in these countries since the outbreak of the war and that this has not been the result of stricter application of compulsory laws. On the contrary, in both instances since the beginning of the war, the Government has been at pains to settle all disputes by voluntary means. The number of peacefully settled disputes has increased. The arbitrators, vested with power of compulsory arbitration, instead of exercising that power, have sought to intervene in disputes by offering conciliation instead of compulsion.

Canada's Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, passed in 1907, requires a compulsory waiting period before a strike or a lock-out can be legal in industries effected with public interest. In the first 28 years of the existence of the Canadian law, 638 cases were submitted to the procedure established by the Canadian law, and in 81 percent of the cases, strikes were averted or ended. But during the same period there were 657 unlawful strikes in which the act was completely ignored. Since no attempt has been made to penalize illegal strikes, it can be fairly said that the only real accomplishment of the Canadian statute has been to foster disregard for law of the kind that we in America could never tolerate.

In Great Britain, the Government has relied primarily on voluntary action by the trade-unions and employers' associations for prevention of strikes in war industries. An order agreed to by the British Employers' Confederation and the Trade Union Congress was promulgated on July 25, 1940, establishing a national arbitration tribunal which includes employer and labor representation. Disputes are reported to the Minister of Labor, and if the trade or industry has collective machinery for handling disputes, the Minister of Labor is directed to refer the dispute to that machinery for settlement. If no machinery exists or if settlement is unduly delayed, the minister refers the case to the national arbitration tribunal, which is empowered to make binding decisions. Strikes and lock-outs are prohibited while the disputes are being handled under this process.

In 1940 there were 922 strikes in England. Of these, 405 took place between July and December of that year. In the same year there were 2,500 strikes in the United States. Since England has a population of 40,000,000, and we have a population of 130,000,000, a simple comparison of the 1940 strike figures shows that on a per capita basis, England at war and with an antistrike law had more strikes proportionately than we had in the United States.

It is significant also that from September 1939 through July 1940, less time was lost in England because of labor disputes than in any comparable period for the 48 years for which statistics are available. Yet the period from September 1939 to July 1940 is the one in which no emergency measures restricting strikes and lock-outs were applied. When the order outlawing strikes went into effect, the number of strikes and the time lost from them increased considerably. For example, between January and July 1940, before the compulsory order, there were 517 strikes, involving a loss of 675,000 man-days. Between January and July 1941, when the compulsory order was in full effect, there were 657 strikes involving a loss of 722,000 man-days. The record is clear that with the advent of compulsory legislation in England, the time lost in strikes rose instead of decreased.

In our own country every attempt at compulsory arbitration, compulsory investigation, and compulsory cooling-off periods has proved to be a dismal failure. The story of the collapse of these attempts is spread upon the pages of labor history of the United States.

When the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations outlawed strikes and fixed wages and working conditions, employers as well as workers refused to obey its decisions. After but a few months of unsuccessful attempts at compulsory procedures, the Kansas court proved to be an utterly useless device. Three years after its creation, in 1920, the Supreme Court held this compulsory tribunal to be unconstitutional.

The Compulsory Investigations Act of Colorado, passed after the coal strike of 1914, made strikes unlawful under a 30-day cooling-off period of investigation, hearings, or arbitration. This law proved to be completely ineffective and strikes as well as lockouts continued in Colorado in disregard of the law at an undiminished rate.

The compulsory features of the Michigan law, which has a cooling-off requirement of a 30-day notice before a strike, in industries affecting the public interest which now include defense industries, have served to foster strikes rather than prevent them. It is the usual practice of unions in Michigan under this law to serve a strike notice even before they begin negotiations. When the 30 days are up and the strike ban is automatically lifted, the arbitrary change in the status of the dispute provides a strong incentive to precipitate a strike even though a settlement may be within reach.

A similar law enacted in Minnesota in 1939 provides for a cooling-off period, but has certainly prevented no strikes. In 1940, a year after the enactment of the

law, idleness due to strikes in Minnesota was six times as great as in 1938, the year before the enactment of the cooling-off statute.

Neither in the United States nor abroad do we find a single statute providing for compulsory arbitration or compulsory cooling-off periods which has achieved the purpose of diminishing labor disputes. Yet in full knowledge of the ineffectiveness of the methods proposed, the proponents of the bill are willing and eager to impose upon American workers a statute which would force American men and women to work against their will under threat of punishment. In the face of the record of failure of compulsory legislation we are asked to impose forced labor upon the American people whose growth, strength, and standard of living have been achieved by the adherence to the ideal of free labor in a free nation.

I believe it is vital to the future of the free American institutions and to the future progress of the defense program to take into public question the soundness of the proposed legislation. The American people are entitled to know whether the remedy is not more destructive than the ill it intends to cure.

On the basis of the figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, it is estimated that all strikes in all industries in the United States in 1941, amounted to only 7 hours per man-year of work. Time lost in industry because of accidents amounted to 26 hours per man-year of work, and time lost through sickness amounted to 40 hours. In other words, time lost in production as the result of normal sickness and accidents was 9 times as great as time lost through strikes.

As compared with the total time worked in industry, time lost due to strikes amounted to less than four-tenths of 1 percent. Even if the proposed legislation could prove effective, our total industrial production would improve by only 0.4 percent, for 99.6 percent of our industrial production has not been affected by strikes at all. Surely, we cannot enact legislation to compel workers subjected to sickness or accident to continue on their jobs. Nor can we compel any worker or a group of workers to turn out effective production, to contribute their skill and ingenuity. This they can do only as freemen.

Teamwork is the method we use in America to do things and to do them best. Effective teamwork cannot be based upon compulsion. There can be no sense of partnership, no spirit of contribution on the part of workers whose production is driven by force.

The contribution to defense our workers are making in factories, mills, and mines is a conscious contribution to our common fight for freedom. In it is the workers' expression of the sense of his worth, his dignity, and his independence. If the ways of life and work of the great mass of our people are set and sealed without their participation and consent, the result is blind obedience, which can yield no contribution to the common cause. Only as freemen in a truly democratic effort, American workers can and will outproduce any system of totalitarian slavery.

In this grave emergency, the responsibility for our defense effort and for the unity of our national spirit rests upon the Chief Executive. The President of the United States can accomplish vastly more by developing practical procedures freely recommended and submitted to him by the parties concerned than Congress can by compulsory, arbitrary legislation.

The machinery now available for the prevention and settlement of labor disputes is by no means perfect. But it is fundamentally sound, and its worth has been tested. Unification of agencies dealing with labor disputes, both through conciliation and mediation, would undoubtedly serve to improve the existing procedures. Creation of regional panels of the National Defense Mediation Board would serve to expedite the settlement of threatened strikes and to lighten the burden of the work of the Board in Washington. These are logical, reasonable steps which should be taken before giving serious consideration to any extreme action. I call upon you to respond to the call of reason rather than to the call of force and reject the proposed compulsory labor legislation.

EMPLOYERS' STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

In the hot and feverish months of the summer of 1940, large corporations in defense industries, individually and in groups, began negotiations with the Government of the United States about terms and conditions on which they would undertake the production of munitions, planes, equipment, clothing, and other things most needed for the defense of America.

The Government's requirements were urgent, and the industry's asking price was high—in many instances much too high even for those businessmen placed in the position of Government negotiators, who were friendly and willing to make most generous concessions. The story of irrevocable demands for 5-year plant amortization, of the last-ditch fight against the profits-tax bill, even though it was but gently whispered rather than boldly shouted in the public press, is today a matter of record and need not be repeated.

We are here concerned with only one fact in that entire story, the fact which, though unheralded in headlines, was by far the most stunning item of domestic news in 1940. Corporation after corporation and company after company, makers of planes, explosives, and guns, refused to go to work on defense production until terms satisfactory to them were finally negotiated and assured by contract.

In the most real sense of the word these corporations went on strike, for they refused to go to work until all issues in dispute were settled to their satisfaction. Some of these strikes lasted as long as six months. In many instances, even the work of planning production and constructing the necessary plant was delayed that long or longer.

On the basis of the whole record of 1940 of negotiations for plant expansion by the National Defense Advisory Commission, and the financing of such plant expansion by the R. F. C., the most conservative estimate shows that at least a million workers were prevented from entering into defense production for at least 3 months. In other words, defense production of 1,000,000 workers was delayed by at least 90 days. This represents a net loss of 90,000,000 man-days due to employers' failure to cooperate with defense. It is plain that during this time the delay of defense production caused by employers was more than 3 times greater than all the delays in production due to strikes.

VOLUNTARY CONCILIATION BASIC

One of the tested methods of strike prevention, a method which has provided us with the major assurance of industrial peace, is conciliation. The United States Conciliation Service is staffed with men who have devoted all their life to industrial and labor problems; who know the problems and know the most effective methods of solving them.

A Federal conciliator can achieve a settlement of a dispute chiefly because he works at the invitation of the disagreeing parties—chiefly because his method of settlement is free of compulsion.

To substitute compulsion for voluntary conciliation would serve to destroy the established machinery of the United States Conciliation Service and make it impossible for the Service to maintain its record of achievement. As soon as an element of compulsion enters into the conciliation procedure, the entire technique of a conciliator becomes useless and ineffective.

What is the record of the Conciliation Service? In 1940, there were 3,751 situations in which workers and management were in dispute. They involved 1,145,000 workers. The Conciliation Service successfully settled 97.4 percent of these disputes at a conference table by achieving full agreement between the disputing parties. All this was accomplished without intervention of armed troops, without tear gas, without broken heads, and, above all, without headlines and public alarm.

In the course of 28 years of its existence, the United States Conciliation Service has successfully handled 30,000 cases, involving some 23,000,000 workers. This record alone proves that the Service has been a powerful weapon of prevention of industrial disputes, and an effective instrumentality of industrial peace.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I do not often take the Well of this House to speak on pending legislation. There have been times, however, when I felt deeply on important proposals which have been before us. On those occasions I have attempted honestly to present my views, believing them to be drawn from considered viewpoints affecting not only myself, my constituency, and my State, but also the American people as a whole.

In the utterances which I now make I shall be very careful to couch my expressions in sensible words, yet to deliver them with an earnestness which I believe this task calls for in our present crisis.

In the discussion of legislation Members should, as far as possible, occupy

this forum and speak to the objectives of a bill rather than to personalities or conditions which may surround its consideration. There may be within my own heart—and perhaps there are—very cogent reasons why I should desire to speak against an individual because I believe that person to be acting not in the interests of labor but in the interests of a small group who are bringing loyal labor and responsible unionism in America into depths. Patriotic workers and employers, each in their sphere, have responsibilities in the defense emergency in which we find ourselves.

I do not believe it is ofttimes appropriate for a Member to sketch his own background for the purpose, as it were, to lay a foundation upon which to state his case. In connection with legislation of this type, I think it fair to myself, however, that I state to the Members now present on the floor what my record has been during the approximately 9 years I have served in this House, as it relates to the so-called gains which have been made by labor.

Personally, as a member of the Committee on Labor, I have fought and have voted for the progressive legislation which has been passed on behalf of organized and unorganized labor in this Republic in recent years. I feel that I shall very briefly go over certain events as background. I ran for Congress in 1930 for the first time. I was successful in the nomination race and was then unsuccessful in the final general election balloting.

Two years later, in 1932, I aspired again to this office, from the Second Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have not only the opportunity but the responsibility to represent to the very best of my ability.

I came to Washington, D. C., a few days after the votes had been counted in November 1932. I came to discuss the possibility and procedure of becoming a member of a certain committee of this body. I had felt for a long time that labor in this country had been crucified on the cross of long hours and short pay and unsanitary working conditions. For that reason there welled up within me, a young man, the desire to seek membership on a committee which I felt might give me a channel through which to work in bringing about a changed condition for workers. I myself had always known from boyhood what it was to toil in various jobs which I undertook.

I remember very, very well that it was the counsel and the advice of a beloved former Speaker of this House that I sought on that occasion. I remember now what Joe Byrns told me. He said he felt that membership on the Committee on Labor was highly desirable. Of course, he stated he could not say to me that I would receive that opportunity to serve thereon, but he would take into account the realization on his part that a Member just elected to the Congress of the United States had asked specifically to serve on the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives. I knew later he aided in translating my hopes into reality.

I was placed on that group, and from that time I have exercised to the very best of my understanding on all occasions my own responsibility to those toilers in field, mine, and factory for whom I felt a deep regard then and for whom I continue to feel a deep regard.

Labor legislation came before our committee and ofttimes through other channels, such as the petition route, as in the case of the wage-and-hour bill, later considered on this floor. I not only worked for such measures in committee; I not only spoke for them on this floor; I not only discussed in private with Members my feelings about the legislation proposed; I cast my votes in behalf of the rightful gains long overdue which have been wrought for labor during the period in which I have served in this House. Wage-and-hour legislation? Yes. Collective bargaining? Yes. The Walsh-Healey Act? Yes. And all the others, which we could number on our fingers and still not cover them all. The man who now speaks to you supported them with vigor and with sincerity.

I have taken the Well of the House again and do so because I believe I have a responsibility to perform here, although there may be certain individuals, as I know there are, who will take opposition to the course I have pursued in connection with defense strikes.

James Russell Lowell, speaking on the subject of democracy, said:

> There is no good in arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wind is to put on your overcoat.

It is useless to argue with those individuals who will not admit the serious situation brought about by jurisdictional and organizational disputes in our preparedness production. Facts speak plainly, and figures prove conclusively that our defense production has been much impaired. Millions of man-days have been lost.

Certainly the Members of this House know that whether we like it or not, whether we point the finger of accusation at the employer or at the employee, down deep within our hearts we recognize this afternoon that defense strikes, unwarranted stoppages of work, have crippled the emergency efforts of your Government and mine. Although we differ as to the proposals here this afternoon, we can well understand that we are charged by an aroused populace to bring about legislation, making no compromise with conscience but showing only courage.

It was a little over a year ago, when the House of Representatives was meeting in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, that I took the floor, on November 20, 1940. I believe I was the first Member of this House to call attention in debate or in public utterance on the floor to the defense strikes which were just then beginning in the United States of America. Asking your indulgence for a repetition of those remarks, I quote them:

> Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us here, as well as the people of America generally, have been grieved in recent days to read of the strike at the Vultee aircraft factory in California. For almost a week airplane building on a defense order has been at a standstill there. We would not set ourselves up as arbiters of the right in the controversy which exists between that company and its employees, but we, as elected Representatives of this Republic, as well as men and women throughout the land, are surely of the considered opinion that when a factory or a plant is engaged in the production of implements to go into the United States armament or rearmament program the differences between that company and its employees should be settled in conference and the necessary and vital production work should proceed. We need these planes—and labor, which has made great gains in the last few years, has a responsibility to perform.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I continue the quotation:

> I believe the discussions should go forward amicably of the points at issue without disruption of the plant operation itself.

I concluded with this expression:

> I think this Congress, and those of us here who have been working for the best interests of organized and unorganized labor, should let those who precipitate such unwarranted procedure know that we look with strong disfavor on what is happening not only at the Vultee plant but in several other factories throughout the United States. We must take steps to see it does not occur in other factories of the country. If these strikes do continue, we should take proper steps to see that such conditions are remedied by law if necessary.

Denunciations from certain quarters were heaped on my head shortly after that speech was made. I had felt then, as I feel now, that certainly there should be no disruption in the work at defense plants of our country. In the Vultee case were just the smouldering embers of the fire, yet there were 25 badly needed training planes that our Air Corps was urgently requesting that were lost by that period of a 12-day strike.

We go from that period a year ago until the last disastrous strike in this country, that which called out the captive coal-mine workers in my own State and many other regions in bituminous operating fields, and what happened? In just one operation the coal which goes to the Carnegie Illinois Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, there was enough production of steel lost in that period of a few days of shutdowns to have given us the necessary metal for 3,000 light tanks, or more than 1,000 fighting planes, or 30 destroyers.

I must not quibble here about what a strike cost a year ago or what the most recent strike has cost, but we do know that the principle remains the same whether the stoppage affects only a few men or many, or whether the results of the shutdowns touch a small part of production areas or spread throughout the United States.

Repeatedly I have stated that the right to strike in peacetime in private industry is a precious right. No man who believes in labor or believes in the Constitution of the United States would want for a single moment to abrogate that right of the toilers of America. I would fight, as you would fight, to see that it continues in effect. However, the right to strike in a time of national peril in the

defense industries of our country is an entirely different matter.

President Wilson, when he had the World War No. 1 Labor Board, set it down as a principle, and we should have seen to it that it is a principle now. It should have been in effect for weeks and weeks and months and months. It is this that employers should not use a time of national emergency to kill the closed shop, and neither should workers take advantage of the emergency to gain the closed shop.

If the Congress of the United States has courage—and I believe that the membership has it—that sort of question should be settled once and for all.

In my concluding remarks I direct your attention to what I believe to be genuine facts. Any defense labor legislation of the type we are considering this afternoon that goes to the present emergency, that is the preparedness program and the defense contracts now in effect, of necessity looking toward work stoppages, would be restrictive in nature. You cannot get away from that fundamental premise. I believe that all legislation that is passed in this House which is restrictive in character is aimed not at the large body of patriotic men and women but aimed at the small minority. It penalizes those individuals who, like a cancerous growth within the body politic, are ruining the great labor movement in our Republic. That is my observation, and I believe that the loyal laborers, the members of responsible unionism, on clear reflection, after this House has acted in a sane and sensible manner, will realize that instead of rendering a disservice to the men who toil in this land, we are actually rendering them a service in time of national need.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Chairman for the additional time. I hasten to my conclusion and it is this.

I know not where the battle lines of this Republic will be drawn tomorrow. It may be on far-away fields of conflict. No one with certainty could state today just what will happen in the future. I do know that the front line of this country tonight is the production line, and no one can deny it. The President of the United States and those in authority have uttered that sentiment again and again. That front line of production is our battle line, and that battle will never be won unless we have sledge-hammer blows by the workers of America in cooperation with patriotic and honest employers and a government which wants to see right done by both parties in any controversies that arise. When did France lose to Germany? Not in the summer of 1940, when the mechanized force of Hitler rolled across the lowlands. France lost to Germany in 1938 and 1939 when Frenchmen, in partial measure at least, were working grudgingly 35 and 40 hours a week and Germans were working 60 hours a week.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman has referred to France, and in connection with France I think it is about time that this House has the truth. France fell because when France went to war she had a shackled labor movement that had been enslaved by the very people who subsequently have been revealed as the traitors and Vichymen of France.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I have respect for the gentleman's opinion, but I disagree with him. Of course, many factors contributed to that nation's downfall. I realize there can possibly be no agreement among all Members or even a large group of Members of what I have said. If my utterances have been thought-provoking, then I will have served my purpose, because when the hour comes to vote I know exactly how I shall cast my decision.

I offer this challenge to the Members of this House, men whom I love personally and for whom I have the highest respect. I trust that not a single individual will be swayed in the matter of casting his vote on this vital subject by any other consideration whatsoever than what he or she feels in their heart or hearts must be done for the welfare of America. If that is done, whether the legislation is voted up or down, this Congress will have acted with courage befitting a body of truly representative public officials.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, there has been much said recently about the sins of labor unions, little said about their merits. Many of the critics have no great understanding of the problems of the workers in large industry, nor of the history of their struggles for economic independence. I myself lay no claim to expert knowledge but have always lived in an industrial district where steel is manufactured and coal is mined. I have been brought up with men who work in mills and coal mines. I am sympathetic with their problems and with the organizations they have formed to assist them in bettering their working conditions.

For many years they have sought to band together in concerted action to deal with their employers and to obtain what they felt was their rights. Frequently in the past these efforts were met by violent repression. Bloodshed was a common incident in industrial struggles. Examples of this have occurred in the district which I represent, and in which I was born.

Violence on the part of employers was frequently met by violence on the part of the workers. It is only by understanding this history of violence that one can approach an understanding of the present relations between employer and worker. In the last 9 years the worker has come into his own, aided by legislation which has protected him in his right to join a labor union. He has successfully compelled recognition of his union by the industries for which he works. Today there are few of the large industries in which the labor union is not accepted and recognized by both employer and employee as the spokesman for the interest of the working people. Relations have improved between management and labor. Many industries have forgotten their ancient quarrel and have cheerfully acquiesced in and cooperated with the new order in industrial partnership. This happy state of affairs does not prevail, however, in all industry. Unfortunately, in some cases, both on the part of management and labor, the spirit of suspicion and hostility has been carried over from the old struggles. But in the main there has been progress. The new technique of cooperation has taken the place of the old technique of struggle.

I personally welcome the unionization of heavy industry. I am not forgetful of the occasional mistakes and excesses that have occurred in the name of unionism, but I know the benefits that organization has brought to the worker. When I remember the working conditions in nonunion shops and mines, the high-handed attitude of many of the employers, and the bloody battles that periodically occurred between employer and men, I look forward with hope to the labor union as the eventual influence for peace in industry. As the union becomes recognized and opposition to it dies down, its leadership should be more pacific, strikes should grow less frequent, and both the employer and the worker should gain in the stability of their relations.

For that reason, I shall always defend the right to strike. The strike is the workers' only threat, for unless he can, by concert with his fellow workers, threaten to walk out of a plant, he has no bargaining power or argument by which he may enforce his legitimate demands. Antistrike legislation is therefore antidemocratic, is antilabor, and is prejudicial to the interest of the vast majority of the people.

But now, in spite of these profound convictions, I intend to support the Ramspeck bill. I am influenced in doing this by the chaotic, well-nigh desperate conditions abroad. The forces of aggression have engulfed a large portion of the world. We know that unless they are checked they will work havoc with our own country. Our only protection against this evil is our economic and industrial superiority. If we fail to produce sufficient of the materials of war to be used against the enemy, we ourselves will face their brutal attack. In the face of this threat against our free institutions, and even our national existence, we cannot tolerate a stoppage of production. It becomes the duty of every Member of the House who recognizes this immediate and pressing danger to insist that our mines and mills and factories be kept working. A failure so to do amounts to a paralysis of government. Economic disputes within our own country cannot be allowed to interrupt the steady flow of materials until we have defeated the common enemy. No objective, however meritorious, can compete with the objective of all-out production.

I think that the most important effect of the passage of this bill is a moral one. It is an expression of the common will of the people speaking through its elected Representatives. It is a declaration

of the national purpose. We will say as a nation, both to our own citizens and to the world at large, that we recognize our national responsibility, we are determined to meet it, and that we will not be diverted from our purpose by any internal dissension.

As a secondary result, I believe that this bill will aid in the solution of industrial disputes. It is not unduly punitive either to labor or to capital. It provides for a waiting period during which disputes as to wages and working conditions can be calmly discussed, and in most cases determined. I think that most questions of this nature can be amicably settled if only each of the parties will take time to candidly state its contention and then listen with an open mind to the opposing point of view.

The bill likewise preserves the status quo during the discussions, and thus prevents either party from secretly strengthening its own position while pretending to arbitrate. As to the plant-seizure provisions in the bill, they have been inserted due to our recent experiences with several vital plants hopelessly struck. They are extraordinary remedies designed to cope with extreme situations. The President should have this power in time of emergency, but everyone hopes, and reasonably so, that its use will be infrequent.

I am opposed to the Vinson bill, as well as other bills which have been introduced. If the Ramspeck amendment does not carry, I will probably vote against any other measure. My sole concern is the maintenance of continuous production. I do not wish to permanently weaken the structure of labor organizations, nor to unduly hamper them in their lawful aims. I do not think it necessary or wise to do so. The impact of legislation too restrictive in its scope may well, in my opinion, hamper rather than promote production by impairing the morale of the workers. Without willing workers all efforts are in vain. Let us not forget that both labor organizations have pledged their support to our foreign policy. They mean this in their hearts. We can help and encourage them by passing a reasonable law.

At this point I pay deserved tribute to the millions of the sincere and patriotic defense workers. No stigma can be attached to their action. I have many friends who are honest leaders in the labor movement. They disagree with my position on this legislation. It is my hope that with sober reflection they will understand my motives were for their welfare and the best interests of those they represent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I was rather surprised to hear the gentleman now in charge of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], state to one of the Members who addressed the House this afternoon that he has decided to abandon his bill and to go along with the harsh and restrictive Smith bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I did not state that.

Mr. HEALEY. If I have stated it incorrectly, I am very glad to be corrected.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I stated that I would support the Smith bill because that is the first vote.

Mr. HEALEY. For whatever reason the gentleman has apparently decided to favor the Smith bill over the Vinson bill. However, he did say that he would make one exception in his full support of the Smith bill, and that was with regard to the provision of the Smith bill for seizure of plants. In other words, I assume that the gentleman is ready and willing and anxious to support all restrictive legislation insofar as it affects labor, but is not willing to go the full distance when industry may be involved. I am somewhat puzzled about that, because from very reliable information I learned that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is in possession of some rather startling facts with regard to defense contracts. I am informed that he will be able within a very short while to bring to this House a report which will indicate that there have been some very startling revelations in connection with these defense contracts. That there is considerable evidence of extortion and unconscionable profits and very reprehensible practices.

The gentleman has been so affected by what his investigation revealed that he now states he will, in the near future, seek legislation which will again place a ceiling on profits on defense contracts.

At the time this defense program was undertaken by this Government, the Vinson-Trammell Act was on the statute books. This act did place a ceiling on profits on ships and on airplanes. It was repealed, however, at the instance of those engaged in the airplane and shipbuilding industries as an inducement to obtain their fullest cooperation in the program.

Mr. Chairman, in Germany there are no labor unions. Labor has no privileges and no rights. In the factories and on the farms of Germany you will find conditions that amount to virtual slavery. As the manpower of Germany has been sent out of Germany to the eastern front and to police occupied countries, thousands and thousands of men of the occupied countries have been shipped like dumb, mute cattle into Germany, there to be forced to work in industry and agriculture. Even the German laborer has no rights. He cannot associate himself with his fellowmen in a union of any sort in order that they may bargain collectively and attain the rights and privileges to which they believe they are entitled.

At the beginning of this defense program there was great despair in this country and in England, too, as to our ability to produce munitions of war as fast as Germany. We were told it would be years before we could possibly reach parity in the vital production of war planes. Yet on Friday, October 23, in Boston, speaking before the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, Mr. Eugene E. Wilson, president of the United Aircraft Corporation, assured the gathering there that we had made great strides in the production of airplanes. He stated that our production had reached a peak that was fast approaching the production of Germany. Other experts have recently pronounced that the combination of England and the United States in airplane production had practically reached parity with Germany.

Let me quote a bit from the article appearing in the Boston Herald on the date of October 24, 1941, reporting the speech of Mr. Wilson:

> With his own industry as an example, he described the speed with which inactive plants were placed in operation and expanded as the emergency became clearer, and he defended American airplanes with facts and figures against erroneous reports that they are inferior as combat machines to those of British manufacture.
>
> "But the real significance of all this is not mere technical superiority," Mr. Wilson declared. "Technical performance is a result of superior leadership. Leaders of industry are first of all leaders of men. The machines will take care of themselves.
>
> "As leaders of men they know that there are two conceptions of leadership—compulsion and cooperation. The driving force of compulsion is fear of punishment; the guiding spirit of cooperation is the hope of reward. Compulsion is a process of slavery. Cooperation is the privilege of freemen. The whole world has shaken down into two warring groups—the one endeavoring to conquer under compulsion, the other endeavoring to flourish under freedom. There can be no question of the superiority of the American way."

My friends, I wholeheartedly agree with the statements of this far-seeing industrialist. This man deals with men every day—with thousands of American workingmen every day in the week—and he has vision enough to realize that you cannot obtain results by compulsion, and that we can and will obtain far greater results by the cooperation of free labor and free enterprise.

There have been many occasions during this session of Congress when compulsory and restrictive legislation has been advocated on this floor and when the Congress itself deliberated on such measures. The Congress has refused to enact restrictive and compulsory labor legislation, and I believe we have acted wisely in so doing.

Events that have occurred recently have brought this thing to a head, and today to have before Congress these restrictive labor measures. The number of man-hours lost this year in defense production because of strikes does not, in my opinion, justify the assault on basic and fundamental principles involved in this legislation. At this point I am including a table showing the number of man-hours lost through strikes this year.

Strike Statistics

Man-days lost through strikes (first 9 months, 1941)	19,500,000
Man-days lost through injuries, deaths, and permanent disabilities[1] (1940)	233,840,000
Man-days lost through illness (approximately)[1] (1940)	536,000,000
Man-days lost through unemployment (1940)	2,500,000,000

[1] These totals for 1941 will be considerably higher if the trend of the figures for the first part of 1941 continues for the rest of the year.

Office of Production Management's Labor Division reported on November 29, 1941, that only 3 strikes directly involving 1,700 workers were hampering defense production. This, according to Office of Production Management, represents a "new low in number of strikes of primary defense significance."

Man-days idle during strikes as percentage of total man-days of work available for each of the first 6 months of 1941:

January	0.11
February	.21
March	.27
April	1.18
May	.38
June	.25
Average	.40

The figures would seem to indicate that strikes have not very seriously hampered the ever-increasing defense production of our Nation. Less than one-half of 1 percent of man-hours have been lost on strikes during all of this year. But you may say even that is enough to require some legislation to outlaw strikes. Personally, I abhor strikes, particularly if called for frivolous or unwarranted objectives. I think it is the part of unwise leadership to call strikes at this particular time, but I reiterate that the one factor that will react against strikes with more force than anything else is the power of public opinion. Labor leaders know that they must have public opinion on their side to win any dispute with management. Industry, too, realizes the value of public opinion. Government knows that it must have public opinion with it in the enforcement of its laws. So public opinion, I am sure, will be, more than anything else, the force that will discourage strikes in defense industries.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. Unless public opinion had the help of being crystallized into legislation, do you not think public opinion would be less effective in matters of this kind?

Mr. HEALEY. I think public opinion, whether crystallized in the shape of legislation or otherwise, is a factor that everyone must reckon with, both labor and industry, and we the Representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. But just what do we seek to do with this legislation? I have read the several proposals that are under consideration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. Gladly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We must also take into consideration that a great deal of the alleged public opinion which is spoken of here has been fomented by the very forces which are more interested in defeating labor than in defeating Hitlerism.

Mr. HEALEY. But in the end I think public opinion always resolves itself on the side of the righteous cause.

You are seeking through this legislation to abridge, to suspend, or to repeal basic and fundamental rights. No one has denied, no one can deny, that under our Constitution the right of men to work or not to work is inviolable; and under the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution we are prohibited from enacting legislation that will force involuntary servitude. We should not endeavor to enact legislation that will invade the basic rights and privileges of men and women who are privileged to work and live under the guaranties of the Constitution of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. LEA. Does the gentleman believe that the Constitution which permits Congress to draft men to serve in the military forces of the country and forfeit their rights yet denies Congress the power to prevent men from combining and cooperating together to provide necessary war material for our defense?

Mr. HEALEY. If the gentleman puts it that way, that men can combine for the objective the gentleman has stated, clearly legislation could be written to meet it. I do not think legislation would be required; I think we have ample legislation already to take care of such a situation.

Mr. LEA. I entirely agree with the gentleman that you cannot prevent anyone from not working if he does not want to, but when he cooperates with others to prevent production that is a different matter.

Mr. HEALEY. Labor unions are a vital part of our economy. Great corporations organize in associations for their mutual benefit and protection and in order to attain and accomplish certain objectives, and so the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively and to take collective action to redress a grievance is an admitted basic principle to which I think all Americans subscribe.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. What provision of the Labor Committee bill can the gentleman point out that takes away any basic right of labor?

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman is referring to his own bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. During the period these disputes are under consideration by the Board provided for by the Ramspeck bill the right to collectively strike is temporarily suspended. The bill provides definite machinery through the process of injunctions to temporarily restrain collective action by workers to redress their grievances through the accepted method of striking. This amounts to the suspension of the right to strike.

The right to strike has been considered a basic and fundamental right of labor. I feel that the gentleman's bill practically effectuates compulsory arbitration. The gentleman admitted yesterday in response to my question that after profound study on his part that he had reached the conclusion that compulsory arbitration was unconstitutional.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; we cannot force people to arbitrate and accept the award. I believe that is right. The gentleman will agree, however, will he not, that we do not take away the right to strike, but simply defer it while the mediation is in process.

Mr. HEALEY. You suspend the right to strike.

Mr. RAMSPECK. For a maximum of 60 days only.

Mr. HEALEY. That is right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. And at the end of that time they can exercise their basic right.

Mr. HEALEY. If that can be done constitutionally, and not in any way seriously affect the rights guaranteed by the Constitution that is very well; but I am doubtful that it can be accomplished. I still believe that it interferes with the basic rights of labor.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. With regard to forbidding strikes during a period of 60 days, we lose sight of the fact that refusal to work is the bargaining power that labor has. It has been the only bargaining power labor has in the economic field, the refusal to work; and timing is very, very important to that right. If, therefore, during that 60-day period it becomes very essential to urge the exercise of that right then you are definitely limiting and in effect destroying the right to strike.

Mr. RAMSPECK. May I make a suggestion?

Mr. HEALEY. I have but two more moments and I want to conclude.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. We have recently seen the disposition of a very grievous matter; one which threatened the whole economy of this country. I refer to the coal strike. By the use of reason, by the consummate skill and the infinite patience of the Chief Executive of this country, that danger has been averted. That dispute will be settled by the democratic process of voluntary arbitration. A great railroad strike, that has been threatening, was settled last night by the use of democratic machinery.

Mr WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman should distinguish between the coal strike and the railroad strike.

Mr. HEALEY. I know what the gentleman is coming to. The railroad people have machinery which they voluntarily subscribed to and uphold, and by the use of that the railroad strike has been averted.

It has been suggested that the President call a conference of industrial leaders, labor leaders, and representatives of Government for the purpose of effectuating a broad, farseeing labor policy which, if entered into wholeheartedly by all effected elements and adhered to in the spirit of patriotism and cooperation, may render wholly unnecessary the enactment of legislation restrictive of fundamental rights. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], a distinguished member of the Labor Committee, will present an amendment embodying that plan. I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Before we get to the point where we evade the fundamental substantive rights of men, before we either repeal or suspend those rights, let us first exhaust every possible remedy. We cannot hope to arouse the workers of our democratic country to enthusiastically cooperate in a supreme effort to produce implements of war to combat and destroy the enemies of democracy if we abandon our own democratic principles and adopt the totalitarian policies of the dictators.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, there was a judge down home who thought it helpful to lecture the convicts whom he sentenced. Upon one occasion there was a 17-year-old colored boy who was to be the recipient of a sentence. The judge said, "My boy, it pains and grieves my father heart to sentence one so young to the penitentiary. I want to warn you solemnly that the next time you come before the bar of justice you may be face to face with the electric chair."

Then, as every judge is required to do, he propounded the question: "What have you to say why sentence of the law should not be pronounced upon you?" Well, it was up to the boy. He stood on one foot, then on the other, and finally said, "Well, Judge, I don't know 'zactly whut to say, but I will say: 'Facin' it ain't what worries me; it's settin' in it.'"

The problem we are considering did not worry organized labor, it did not worry organized government, it did not worry the American people as long as we were facing it across 3,000 miles of water; but now we have come to the point where we are sitting right in the "hot seat." Something must be done, and it should be realistic, practical, and effective.

Wars were once fought by men. Now men merely operate the engines of death. Martial mechanization is just as essential for successful competition in war as is industrial mechanization necessary in these days of mass production. The shoemaker with his awl and needles could not compete with modern shoemaking machinery. He is extinct. Automobiles can be made by hand, but such competition with production and assembly lines is an absurdity.

Forty years ago a great orator loved to talk about a million embattled farmers springing to arms, seizing their shotguns and squirrel rifles and driving any invaders into the Atlantic Ocean. That may have been a real threat then, but it is a joke now. One tank division with a squadron of our fighter planes and of bombers could annihilate a million men, so armed, in an afternoon.

FACTORY FAILURE CONQUERED FRANCE

When shotguns and squirrel rifles were weapons of war, quick arming was feasible. But few homesteads have an airplane or a tank in the garage. So, preparation for modern warfare is a lengthy operation. It takes years. Four years are required, as a minimum, to produce one battleship. It is a race not only against time but also against the same effort of other nations. It took Hitler 4 years to attain mass production of airplanes. France and England could have retained their dominance in the air by competing then. But they did not. They did not appreciate the fact that modern war is won by doing a better job in the factories producing war matériel. So when Chamberlain went to Munich, he had nothing but an umbrella. France was not conquered in 1940 nor on the field of battle in the spectacular sweep of Hitler's air corps and tanks. She was conquered by the failure of her factories to function efficiently during the 7 years preceding. It was not her Maginot line that failed but her production and assembly lines.

Ambassador Bullitt testified as an eyewitness. He says that after France was partially overrun, with many of her airplane factories in German hands, she produced with what she had left, two and a half times as many airplanes in 1 month as she had ever produced in any month of her history when she had all of her facilities supposedly on the job.

No one disputes these facts, and they should encourage us. The Battle of Waterloo may have been won on the cricket fields of Eton. But the battles of Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France were won in the factories of Germany. Hitler's fifth column was powerful. But his sixth column—his factories—was omnipotent.

Nowadays wars do not come to nations who are prepared to defend themselves. Aggressors simply count the navies, the supply ships and transports, the supplies of oil, ammunition, food, and the number of aircraft and tanks and if these equal or exceed their own, there is no war.

NOT A DAY TO SPARE

This should be "right down our alley." We have practically everything—surplus food, clothing, transportation, ingenuity, energy, experience, men, skill, money, plants, raw materials, and, thanks to some remaining isolation and the British Fleet, enough time. But not a day to spare. Our experts have on paper an adequate defense program. Total defense, which would, if realized, guarantee the peace of our hemisphere.

We have drafted $50,000,000,000, and there has been no strike of a single dollar.

We have drafted 17,000,000 men, plus the National Guard. And there has been no strike.

American farmers work 80 hours a week at 15 cents an hour. As a result our national pantry is full and overflowing. And there has been no strike.

The United States is the paradise for both capital and labor. There are more millionaires in America than in the rest of the world. The salaries of management are the highest ever known. Here labor enjoys the highest wages, as short hours, as ideal conditions, and is provided with as good housing, as much leisure as good recreational facilities, and as good health and hospital care as the world has ever known. The cost of living has not risen materially in this emergency. No wages have declined. No right of labor has been denied or withdrawn. Yet in the face of these facts and the challenge to prodigious effort flung by our able leaders, selfishness stalks abroad in the land, and time, the most priceless resource at our command, is wasted. While the time worked compared to the time lost makes the loss seem small, yet who can say that we can afford to lose even 1 day? The summarized history of the defense effort of 14 nations has already been written in two words: "Too late."

Yet, in spite of this repeated handwriting on the wall of recent history, strikes in the United States have caused terrific loss to our defense effort.

The work that has been done demonstrates the preeminent skill of Americans. The last few days of the battles in North Africa have proved that American-made tanks and warplanes are better than Hitler's best. Their performance has been a wonderful tribute to the work of organized labor in the United States and of those who designed them.

Nor is anything like all of organized labor that has participated in strikes. From the bottom of my heart I pay tribute to the vast majority of the leaders and men of organized labor in my native State of Alabama. In the Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to try to represent, there has not been a strike, one minute of lost time, nor a dime's increase in initiation fees or dues, nor a single defense project that has not progressed within the estimated cost and ahead of schedule.

There is not a single provision of a single bill pending before this House today that will hurt any legitimate interest of organized labor anywhere. Those who are going along with the program have absolutely nothing to fear. There are no rights taken away by any pending bill that any one who wants to help Uncle Sam win this war need worry about.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I shall yield back the balance of my time after a short statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to this fact which no one can dispute, and nobody is going to dispute anything I say because I have my figures from the fountainhead and source of accurate knowledge, if there be one in this Government. I got this from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. There have been in the 7 months from April 1 to October 31, 1941, a total of 17,735,347 man-days of work lost by reasons of strikes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Was that primarily in the defense industries?

Mr. HOBBS. No; it was not. That covers the whole.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Caused by what?

Mr. HOBBS. Strikes. But not all in defense industries. This covers all strikes.

But limiting the calculation strictly to strikes in national-defense industries the total thus far for 1940 and 1941 exceeds 30,000,000 man-days of work lost.

What does the 30,000,000 man-days of work lost in 1940 and 1941 mean? One million man-days represents the work of 1,000 men for 1,000 days, or of 1,000 men for more than 3 years. Thirty million man-days is the work of 1,000 men for 90 years, or 10,000 men for 9 years.

They say that this is a mere triviality, it does not amount to anything. It means the work of 1,000 men for 90 years, or of 90,000 men for 1 year, lost in defense industry in the United States in the last 2 years.

Let me interpret that still further. It means that strikes have subtracted from our defense effort the worktime necessary to produce thirty 10,000-ton cruisers, or 105 1,700-ton destroyers, or 150 submarines, or 3,330 heavy 4-engine Army bombers, or 8,165 light Navy bombers, or 18,570 fighting airplanes.

There is your loss. It may be a small percentage of the total of all time worked, but it may mean the difference between victory and defeat.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be charmed to yield, and I am always happy to yield, to the distinguished and brilliant gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman knows the high regard I have for him and also for his great ability.

If the gentleman will pick up this afternoon's paper, he will find a statement made by Winston Churchill that as far as production is concerned, between the United States and England together, they have reached an overflow, and it is men they want. I recite that in view of the fact that the gentleman sought to attach such great importance to the small percentage of man-days lost as a result of strikes, saying that it would mean the difference between victory and defeat. According to Winston Churchill's statement, we find that it is just the contrary.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not challenge any statement made by Mr. Winston Churchill, but the gentleman misquoted me when he said that I said it meant the difference between victory and defeat. I said it may do so.

I say, too, that all that propaganda from Great Britain about the need of manpower is aimed toward one end—to get the manpower of America involved in this war. What we want is to respond to the great Premier's challenge:

> If you give us the tools, we will finish the job.

We have not done it, and we are short by over 18,000 fighting airplanes as a result of strikes in defense industries in the last 2 years.

But in spite of the horror with which the American people view the actual figures just quoted showing an average of almost a million man-days a month of strike-enforced idleness during the first 3 months of 1941, the worktime actually lost in plants closed by strikes does not begin to tell the whole story. The figures I have quoted for January and February are given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. They are accurate as far as they go, but they do not show the time lost in open plants which should be producing defense material which cannot deliver the goods because of the lack of ingredients, the flow of which has been stopped from the plants closed by strikes.

Merrill Meigs, of the O. P. M., a witness before the Committee on the Judiciary, testified as to these disastrous consequences in slowing up airplane production. He pointed out that there were some 2,000 parts needed for the construction of aircraft. These basic parts come from many factories, a large percentage of which are small plants, some working only 100 men, yet the lack of the product of any one of them stops the production of airplanes and bombers just as effectively as though the whole of the huge assembly plant which finally turns out the finished aircraft had been closed.

INDIRECT LOSS MAY BE GREAT

The lack of one kind of casting made of an essential metal stops the assembly line. The failure of the supply of screws of a peculiar and essential kind, when the small plant that makes them is closed by a strike, stops the production of the whole airplane into which they should have gone, though the assembly plant is not closed and is ready to run. Thus a tabulation of the time loss caused directly by strikes cannot give the picture of the full slow-down of our defense effort. Such figures merely give the direct and immediate time loss. The indirect and sometimes remote time loss resulting from strikes may be even greater.

The strike in a wheel-producing plant closed down not only that plant but had an impeding effect upon the production of tanks, airplanes, bombers, and motor vehicles ordered by the Army from other plants.

The Vanadium Corporation strike is a good illustration. Incidentally, this strike, now tentatively settled after reaching its seventh week, is an outlaw strike, called in defiance of the wishes and orders of the regional director of the C. I. O., who warned the strikers that they had forfeited their rights to C. I. O. protection and were victims of irresponsible leadership. The Vanadium Corporation is the Nation's largest producer of ferrovanadium, a vital alloy in producing many types of munitions. The direct effect of this strike was merely to close that one plant. But affidavits of American Locomotive Co., Simonds Steel Mills, Union Electric Steel Corporation, Universal-Cyclops Steel Corporation, Vulcan Crucible Steel Co., North Steel Co., Bethlehem Steel Co., Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, Henry Disston & Sons, Inc.; Dominion Foundries & Steel, Ltd., Hamilton, Ontario; Erie Forge Co., the Midvale Co., Mesta Machine Co., Lukens Steel Co., Lebtric Steel Co., Jessop Steel Co., Hepponstall Co., and Crucible Steel Co. of America certify that ferrovanadium on order for each of them with the Vanadium Corporation is impeding the manufacture of materials ordered from them, respectively, for national-defense purposes. The percentage of defense orders thus impeded in these collaterally affected companies ranges from 58 to 100 percent.

Now, just a word or two about the pending bills. They have been so fully discussed in this debate as to require no further detailed statement of their merits.

What is wrong with the Smith bill? It seems perfectly fair and moderate.

It would maintain the status quo ante; provide for a "cooling-off period," an honest strike election without coercion, outlaw unjust discrimination, violence, intimidation, and conspiracies. It provides for fair enforcement.

To my mind it should go further and prohibit picketing by others than employees of the defense contractor whose plant or plants are strike bound. It is a good bill. Nothing less can hope to meet the situation.

May I call attention to two quotations from two major prophets of labor's rights? Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis, each a distinguished former member of the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Justice Holmes, in a letter to Sir Frederick Pollock, said:

> I have no doubt when the power of either capital or labor is exerted in such a way as to attack the life of the community, those who seek their private interests at such cost are public enemies and should be dealt with as such.

Then Mr. Justice Brandeis:

> You may compromise a matter of wages, you may compromise a matter of hours—if the margin of profit will permit. No man can say with certainty that his opinion is the right one on such a question. But you may not compromise on a question of morals, or where there is lawlessness or even arbitrariness. Industrial liberty, like civil liberty, must rest upon the solid foundation of law. Disregard the law in either, however good your motives, and you have anarchy. The plea of trades-unions for immunity, be it from injunction or from liability for damages, is as fallacious as the plea of the lynchers. If lawless methods are pursued by trades-unions, whether it be by violence, by intimidation, or by the more peaceful infringement of legal rights, that lawlessness must be put down at once and at any cost

So, it is not a sign of enmity to organized labor to say that those who do forget their duty and by unauthorized or authorized strikes stop, slow up, or impede our defense effort, should lose the rights granted them by Congress. It is essentially an act of friendship for the 130,000,000 people of America, including the members of the labor unions, 90 percent of whom are as patriotic, loyal, and devoted to the interests of Uncle Sam as any of us.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have been watching with interest, and I will admit with some serious misgivings, the controversies that have been going on between the leaders of union labor and the administration in connection with the defense program.

In the newspaper chains and the associated newspaper services the same voices seem to be singing in a chorus directed at union labor as the great obstacle in the way of production for defense and the manufacturing of war materials. The columnists, the cartoonists, the foreign correspondents, and the commentators all seem to be in a great rage at the

organized laboring men throughout the country about something or another that these molders of public opinion seem to think is disloyal and unpatriotic.

Union labor, they charge, is refusing to cooperate; they are going on strikes; they are stopping the works when they ought to be stripped to the buff and shoving the hot steel plates from the mill furnaces to the slabs and shoveling coal into the furnaces with willing hands and glad hearts by day and by night, and going into the bowels of the earth and bending their backs at the peril of mine gas and cave-ins to keep the furnaces going.

But there is something about the picture that puzzles me; something that does not appeal to that sense of justice and fair play that we are so fond of citing as the great American way. You all remember the old saying, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander"—or ought to be, anyway.

If union labor is to be condemned because it is fighting for what it considers its right to build up its organizations and put the laboring men in a position to demand collective bargaining and contractual relations in their work, what, I ask, about the company men who own the mines and the mills who are holding things up for what they consider their right to employ and deal with labor according to their own proprietary rules and principles?

If it is disloyal for the union men to insist on their rights of organization and collective bargaining, why is it not equally disloyal and obstructive for the mine owners and mill owners to get particularly stiff-necked at this time in their dealings with their organized employees? Are only the union men at fault when they seek to keep intact what they consider their vital interest? And are the big bosses not at all at fault when they take advantage of this emergency period to take their stand stubbornly for open shops and what they consider their right to employ labor in a competitive market, to deal with their employees as they see fit and that means to keep on blocking the ways of organized labor and making it hard for them to deal in their labor contracts as one organized body with another? I am rather confused about the situation. If union labor is guilty of disloyalty because it is standing up for what it considers its rights as a body, what about the guilt of the other party—the bosses—the men who have the million-dollar contracts, who are unwilling to yield a point, even when it would not lessen their profits, to remove the cause of trouble and speed the great production on its way?

It seems to me that the whole blame for stopping the procession cannot be laid on the shoulders of the labor unions, and the factory and mine owners set scot free and sent forth with blessings and praise for their great spirit of patriotism and loyalty.

Union labor's path to recognition and to fair dealing has not been an easy one. It has been bucking antagonism, lies, propaganda, and hate ever since the movement of organization began. I hear a good deal of talk in the direction of calling out the Army, and that has set my memory going back a little to the labor troubles of the past.

I can recall the day when some of the big industries now engaged in carrying out billion-dollar contracts for the Government were hiring forces of armed Pinkerton detectives to shoot down their striking employees, and when other big industries were closing down to starve them into submission. It is not a very pleasant chapter of our history to look back upon. I do not want to dwell upon it here today in these critical times.

The only point I want to make—if you can call it a point—is that one obstructor is just as bad as another obstructor. If the bosses are willing to close their mines and plants and to turn the workers out because they do not want to recognize them as members of a union, it seems to me that it is not fair for them to point the finger at the striking employees and say, "There are the disloyal rascals; there are the men who are defying the Government; there are the men who are putting their selfish interests above those of the Nation we are trying to defend. We are the patriots holier than they."

Union labor, in whatever industry it has been recognized and employed, it seems to me has been doing its duty faithfully and without complaint from its employers where cordial relations have been established. And the relation between capital and labor in these days should be cordial—must be cooperative. The problem is a reciprocal one. Both labor and capital owe a fundamental duty to their country. You cannot blame the laborer and excuse the employer. If the employers, by a word that would not in the least jeopardize their interests or their obligations to their stockholders, can clear the paths of production of delays and obstacles, it is as much their patriotic duty to say that word as it is to demand that the employees should jeopardize their organized interests and their obligations to the members of their organization by ceasing to advocate the principles that represent their very existence and progress along the thorny and rocky road they have had to travel in the last 50 years.

The fundamental problem that confronts the American people today, as I see it, is not to repress strikes, but rather to ascertain and remove the causes of strikes before they occur.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, the proposed bills under consideration involve legislation of greatest importance; they involve the fundamental question as to whether a democracy can defend its political existence at a period when this existence is imperiled. It may be safely asserted that our form of government cannot be defended if any one selfish and powerful group can stop its machinery from functioning. We have but to turn back the pages of history to learn the fact that selfish group organizations have wrought the destruction of every democratic form of government that heretofore existed on this earth. There is just one way that we can preserve a democratic form of government where the people govern themselves through constitutional representative bodies, and that way is to have intelligent unity and unselfish cooperation of all interests and of all classes. That is what Mr. Jefferson meant when he said:

> A democracy is an ideal form of government provided the people are universally intelligent so that one class or group cannot exploit the others.

I am not hostile to labor and no other man in this Nation is; I believe in the cooperation and the organization of this great power in our national life; I believe in collective bargaining; and I believe in the constitutional right of every laborer to work where he pleases, and when he pleases, and I accord to him the right to stop when he wishes unless his services are needed to defend his Government and his country; this is the sacred duty that every citizen owes this Nation, this is the price he is called to pay for freedom, for opportunity, and for the inalienable rights guaranteed him under the Constitution of this Republic. Physical or mental inability is the only excuse any citizen can give for not defending this Nation when its destiny is imperiled, and if he evades this obligation, he is unworthy of citizenship—he has no right to live and operate under the flag of the United States; if he does not like this land of oportunity and this form of government, he should speedily seek another.

There is no intelligent and no good man in this country who wants to exploit labor—it is of course indispensable in this Nation's life, its rights—its welfare and its honor must be safeguarded by law and by every sacred social instinct, not to do this would be criminal—it would be destructive. I do not believe that organized labor in this Nation is less loyal than unorganized; the great trouble, I fear, is that some organized labor often is led and controlled by men or groups of men who are selfish, who are ambitious, and some of whom embrace destructive philosophies of government and which have for their purpose the overthrow of our Government. This type of leadership is the worst enemy organized labor can possibly have, and it should not tolerate such, in the light of the facts that the purchasing power of a laborer in this Nation per day is more than twice as much as any other laborer on earth, and the educational facilities and opportunities in this Nation transcend that ever offered before to a laboring man or woman since the dawn of creation. The want of cooperation of all groups in this Nation when its destiny is imperiled is most reprehensible, and those who foment such a condition in any group or class of citizens are, in my opinion, nothing less than traitors.

I regret very much that there is any necessity to propose a law to prevent strikes in our industries, when it is necessary and imperative that our industries produce material to protect this country and those who are fighting for the very philosophy of government we cherish and against a cruel dictator who would set at naught the way of life so dear to every freeman and the very religion

that our fathers fixed as the cornerstone of this great Nation. Up to date the only way apparently to avoid strikes and avoid the threats to stop transportation and threats to close the coal mines, the products of which are so necessary for national defense, is to raise the demanded wages of the strikers or else they walk out on their great benefactor—this Government—and in fact and in truth become the allies of those enemies who seek to destroy them and wipe this form of government and freedom from this earth. The Mediation Board does not seem to be able to handle the situation confronting the Nation, and as I understand it the proposed laws seek to empower this Board, or some other governmental agency, to prevent the dislocation of business in time of national emergencies by strikes or any other action on the part of any group or class of individuals. Such a law should be passed. I shall gladly support this measure, and sincerely hope that our purpose may be realized and that it may be hereafter understood that no organization or group of men can or will be allowed to interfere with the defense of this Nation.

The people of this country are aroused; the indignation expressed because of strikes and efforts on the part of labor organizations to establish closed shops and prevent other citizens from procuring jobs is most marked, and it is resented by a majority of our people; they are determined to stop such methods; and these methods should be stopped.

There is a law upon the statute books which sanctions "peaceful picketing"; this is a misnomer: it should be entitled "An act to create a nuisance, assault peaceful citizens, and take property without due process of law." Its principal purpose is to do all three of these unlawful acts, and I would like very much to see Congress take that abortive act off our statute books.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I think we all realize that something must be done whereby our national-defense program will not be jeopardized any longer. The safety of this country depends upon the speed of production of defense material. It has recently been demonstrated that the size of an army does not bring victory, but it is the implements of war, destroyers, warships, guns, tanks, airplanes, and war materials of various kinds.

Slowing down of the defense production, either by owners of industry or by labor, is not only retarding our defense program but is injuring the morale of the young patriotic boys who are training in the Army and receiving only $21 per month as salary. Many have volunteered but those who did not volunteer were and are being conscripted. They must take the training and something should be done to prevent continuance of strikes on national-defense projects.

The subversive element in defense plants must not be allowed to destroy the morale of these boys in training camps.

We owe an obligation to these young loyal Americans who are training for the defense of our country, and that obligation is that we must be loyal, every one of us, and furnish them the materials for our national defense. They are not asking for more money in this great struggle to defend our country and preserve democracy.

The people of this country, especially the young men, as a whole, accepted selective service as a result of the present national emergency. Soon our people will be called upon to accept new tax burdens. These people expect, and have the right to expect, that the defense program will be speeded up and that their money will be put to proper use.

The House Judiciary Committee held extensive hearings for the purpose of speeding up the defense program. The House sometime ago passed a resolution, with only one vote against it, authorizing the Military and Naval Affairs Committees to investigate the underlying causes of strikes and find out who is responsible and to make such recommendations for legislation as is necessary to prevent further strikes on national-defense projects.

If defense activities are retarded further, the Federal Government may be forced to take full control over all industries manufacturing defense products. The people will have a right to demand this course.

Any reasonable man can understand the viewpoint of the young men who are taking military training with the small pay, as I have just stated, of $21 a month, and of the farmers, producing agricultural commodities necessary for our armies and people, who are compelled to work from sunup to sundown and whose pay in many instances is just a small pittance.

I do not understand why the Nation as a whole, including industrial management and organized labor, under the present circumstances, would oppose legislation to curb strikes.

Some law should be passed to remove all members of the Communist organization and the German-American Bund. This is right and proper and certainly no one could object to it. This would be a protection to the thousands and thousands of loyal workers. I am convinced that the rank and file, and probably more than 95 percent of the workers, desire to speed up national defense without further strikes.

Industrial leaders and workers alike in this country surely do not realize the probable danger ahead for America. If they did they would cooperate better, make more sacrifices, and bury the differences during this great emergency.

Someone has aptly said we cannot fight war within a war and win either contest.

It is understood that several amendments will be offered to the pending bill, and I hope that the bill will be so perfected that strikes on defence projects during the emergency will be prevented. I am satisfied that during this emergency practically all of labor desires to continue manufacturing defense material without interruption.

These are unusual and trying times and all must cooperate in this crisis. I am satisfied practically all wish to be loyal to our country and to the policy of this the greatest democracy in the world. All disputes in national-defense industries should be settled without resort to strikes so that work would not be slowed down. It is my understanding that in some sections of this country some of the unions have gone on record endorsing this policy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I realize that public opinion, aroused by the acts of a few misguided labor leaders and the revelation that other unscrupulous labor leaders have prostituted their leadership into racketeering, is demanding antilabor legislation.

However, Mr. Chairman, the sins of labor—and I admit that some of the labor leaders have sinned, and grievously sinned—have, I am afraid, been greatly magnified, not only by some of our newspapers, but by some of our supposed leaders in and out of Congress, until a false atmosphere has been created.

These Peglerites, with Jeremiah complexes, daily giving birth to spasms of fear, I am constrained to believe, have done as much, if not more, to disrupt public-industrial-labor relations, than all the irresponsible labor leaders and racketeers combined.

Will they never calm down and let logic and fair play take the place of diatribes and radicalism? I call upon them in the name of that unity that is so essential to our national defense, to surrender, in the name of patriotism, and I know they are patriotic, their pet panaceas for the solution of our industrial-labor problems, to retain their composure, and give their patriotism an opportunity to grow until its strength will sweep in its wake all ill will and prejudice and hatred and make room for the unity that alone can guarantee our survival.

Let us look the problem in the face in a patriotic, common-sense way. This is no time to debate panaceas and give vent to ill will and hatred, this is a time to bury, in the name of unity, every pet theory, every hard thought, and march forward in a solid phalanx "for God and country."

And yet, Mr. Chairman, while this legislation should be given our best thought and considered dispassionately, in an effort to deal justly and fairly with the toiling masses of our people, and bring about unity, what do we find?

Why, Mr. Chairman, even as a prelude to the consideration of the bills now before the House, no doubt for the purpose of creating the proper atmosphere for the enactment of their long nurtured and cherished antilabor bills, we are being told that this Congress has descended to a level never reached by any of the preceding Congresses, and are again being warned against the baneful influence of the "goon squads" that, we are advised, have been called out by the labor leaders "to browbeat and bludgeon

the Congress," and "those interested in good government" are admonished to "keep their eyes on Capitol Hill where they can expect to see one of the most disgusting, brazen, and concerted attempts of an organized minority to defeat the will of the American people that has ever occurred."

Pretty strong and intemperate charges. Yes, Mr. Chairman; pretty strong and intemperate. And, Mr. Chairman, were it not for the fact that I am fairly familiar with our political history of the past, and have read of similar charges being made in moments of hysteria, and the further fact that these charges do not come from those who have heretofore manifested an interest in improving the condition of those who toil, I would pause, stop, and ponder them with misgivings and fear. Oh, I was here when the great battles were waged over the laws to take the shackles off of labor in free America—laws that both great political parties now embrace—and I recall that many of the men who now, in the name of patriotism, would put the iron heel of the dictator upon the neck of labor, opposed the enactment of practically every bill designed to bring to labor the same freedom, the same liberty, and the same equality proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by our Constitution to the people of this Republic. Yes; they were against the enactment of practically every law that labor, and the friends of labor, are now trying to protect from being emasculated in the patriotic name of national emergency.

As for me, I am unwilling to crucify labor upon the false cross of patriotism erected by its enemies.

Now let us honestly and fearlessly, and with but one purpose in mind, and that purpose the determination of what is best for the safety and security of this Republic, consider the legislation before us.

The only question we should ask is, What is best for America? My answer, Keep American labor free. If we pull through this emergency—and we are going to pull through because we have got to pull through in order to protect our democratic way of life—probably the greatest single factor contributing to our success will be the sweat and brawn of labor and the boys coming from the homes of those who toil. Do you think labor and the sons of labor, unless deep down in their very souls they know that they are working and sweating and fighting to preserve a government of freedom and liberty and equality, will put their hearts into the task? Show labor that this Government is worth sweating for and it will sweat. Show labor that this Government is worth working for and it will work. Show the sons of labor that this Government is worth fighting for and, if the necessity arises, they will fight. And, my colleagues, you cannot do this if, while professing to be fighting for freedom, to rid the world from the tyranny of a Hitler, you adopt Hitler tactics against a large segment of our population. Nor can you justify your action upon the ground that a few misguided and unscrupulous labor leaders have engaged in practices that all patriotic Americans, including 99 percent of labor, condemn. I repeat, 99 percent of the laboring people are as patriotic and as loyal to our institutions as any man upon this floor. Here in free America they have something to sweat for, to work for, and to fight for—democratic institutions that vests in the humblest of this land the same inalienable, God-given rights enjoyed by the most exalted. Let us keep it that way. You have no right to destroy it by visiting upon the 99 percent the sins of the 1 percent.

Mr. Chairman, labor is not only appreciative; it is patriotic and is squarely behind the policies of this administration. And in spite of the criticism being hurled against it, in spite of the present agitation, precipitated largely by hysteria, has to its credit a splendid record of achievement—a record as outstanding as that made by the laboring people in any country on earth. They appreciate the patience the President has shown and will repay that patience with achievements. Let us do nothing to destroy the morale of labor. It would be tragic if, in an hour of weakness, we did that which will destroy the morale of those who labor and thus destroy our own unity.

I know there has been much criticism of the policy the President has pursued. He has, in my humble opinion, pursued the only safe, sane, and democratic course. And as I look down through the years I can hear the sons of those who are criticizing him today, in the tomorrows of this Republic, praising his patience and courage and vision.

My colleagues, let us in this emergency follow the leader. There is no other course that leads to unity.

Mr. Chairman, let us keep America free. Let us continue to follow the vision of those adventurers in idealism who laid the foundation stones of this Republic and whose influence still shines like a lighthouse in a world of doubt. Do nothing, I pray you, in a moment of hysterical weakness, to cause the humblest American to question his liberty, his freedom, or his equality. Do nothing, I pray you, to cause the humblest American citizen from standing in the presence of the most exalted of the earth, and with pride in his voice, proclaiming, "I am an American." By reason of his American heritage, such a one today, though humble and poor he may be, can stand before kings and dictators and find not his equal, and yet if he calls at the humblest home in this land of freedom he who gives heed to his knock and lets him in is his equal. Such is our American heritage. Let us not do that which would mar or strain that heritage with respect to those of our people who toil for a living. I want to keep and preserve that heritage in all of its purity so it will be as dear and as precious to them as it is to me. The only way this can be done is by keeping American labor free.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY].

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to detain the House at this late hour. I have listened patiently for these 6 long hours trying to get some enlightenment and trying to find the objectives of the opponents of this legislation. I have reached the conclusion that those who advocate either one or the other of the three proposals do so because they have a pet peeve against some labor leader or group of labor leaders and they want to take it out on 10,000,000 organized workers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think when we examine the past performances of some of these gentlemen who are advocating this legislation, we will find they have a pet peeve against decent wages and decent working conditions.

Mr. SWEENEY. I thank the gentleman very much. I was going to develop that thought, and state also it was because they want to destroy the gains secured by organized labor over a quarter of a century. They want to go back to child labor and go back to sharecropping and sweatshops, destroying the Wage and Hour Act that has sought to minimize at least the evils of child labor, sharecropping, and sweatshop conditions.

I say this with a degree of charity because we have men in this House who have different viewpoints on social legislation, viewpoints arrived at by reason of geographical lines, industrial connections, or what have you. They are entitled to their opinions, and so am I. However, I think the answer is not in the Ramspeck bill or in the Vinson bill or in the Smith bill, all of which are based on a hysteria of wrapping the mantle of national defense around them as an alibi that they might destroy the labor gains which some of us have helped to create.

Not having come up the hard way, some of you have not had the experience I have had of being in strikes and of necessity going out and exercising violence, if you will, a wrong thing to do, but I had to do that in my early days, long before President Franklin Delano Roosevelt entered public life. I was working in an industry for 14 hours a day and when I sought through the medium of collective bargaining and organized labor to have my hours reduced to 12, I was met with a refusal. Our group was met with a refusal by this industry and we resorted to the God-given right to strike, and through the medium of the strike we secured a 12-hour workday, and later a 10-hour workday. It seems strange to talk about the long hours we had to labor 25 or 35 years ago in this day when 8 hours is a regular standard day of labor.

I was happy when I came to Congress, as a union man who had been in strikes, to support the LaGuardia-Norris Act under the administration of President Hoover in the Seventy-second Congress. At that time I rose on this floor and I made the observation that I was happy to support a bill that would outlaw the "yellow dog" contract and would put a limitation on the power of Federal judges to issue injunctions promiscuously in

labor disputes. Up to that time I had made some observations as a union official on the power of the Federal judges, not all of them but some of them, being controlled by the open-shop crowd or by the advocates of an open-shop industry, if you will, whose nominations were made by the antilabor crowd to the President of the United States and then in due time they would don the judicial gown and some of their first acts were to crush the ambition of labor and to issue injunctions promiscuously, restraining labor from engaging in strikes. I was happy to support that bill, not because it was the Norris-LaGuardia Act, but it was a philosophy that I believed in for many years before I came to this body. I was proud when President Roosevelt started on a campaign of social legislation for the masses, of collectively bargaining for the workers, a Wage and Hour Act, and a National Labor Relations Act for the organized and unorganized workers of the Nation. I was glad to support such measures 100 percent, not because it was recommended by President Roosevelt, but because I believe it is right, and because I had pioneered in that philosophy years before President Roosevelt came to public office. Let me say to you gentlemen who wait for a green light from the White House to guide you on legislation that you will not get any green light from the White House telling you to support the Ramspeck bill, the Smith bill, or the Vinson bill; I do not believe that that green light will be forthcoming because I cannot believe President Roosevelt wants to stab his best friend, organized labor, in the back. Remember, my Democratic colleagues, that it was organized labor that made it possible for Franklin D. Roosevelt to become the first third-term President of the United States. I still think that he is a friend of organized labor, and I still think that he wants to do the right thing, despite the fact that some individuals in this Congress and elsewhere want to tear down what organized labor has secured during the long years. I do not believe in drawing a red herring across the trail.

My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in a very intelligent discussion, laid before us a group of pictures of criminals, convicts, and ex-convicts who are alleged to be officers and members of the C. I. O. It is a fine contribution and information that the rank and file of the C. I. O. should have, but it only draws a red herring across the trail in this discussion and implies that because of the criminal records of a few the many should suffer. I could match that with the names of the convicts and the ex-convicts in industry, particular in the banking fraternity, of men who brought about the destruction of 15,000 banks in this country, of men who dipped into the sacred trust funds for widows and orphans and destroyed the savings of millions of our people. I could match this also with pictures of Wall Street brokers, like Richard Whitney, who served a term in Sing Sing for defrauding the public, but that would also be drawing a red herring across the trail, and it would not add to the discussion or present much intelligence to it. Such attempts only seek to confuse our thinking. That is why it was brought in. It is brought in to stir up the membership of this Congress to take it out on John L. Lewis, because some of his men in the C. I. O. have criminal records. I have a high regard for John L. Lewis as a citizen and as a courageous patriot, despite the criticism hurled against him. I have a high regard for President William Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, with whom I served in the General Assembly of Ohio, as a member of that body back in 1913–14. I have watched his career. He is a splendid type of American, who has contributed much to the social and economic betterment of workers. There may be some men around him whose reputations are not so clean. I am not condoning them or their actions, but rather I condemn them, and also those men around Mr. Lewis who are tarred with the same stick, but I have in mind the clean laboring men and women, millions of members of both organizations, who have made a contribution by their efforts toward securing a living wage and better working conditions today, thanks to the legislation passed by this Congress and by many State legislatures.

Let me say to those who condemn the open shop, and who are concerned about the right of a man to work without belonging to an organization, a fundamental right, to be sure, that you have got to admit that every step along the road of progress that has been beneficial to organized labor, in many cases as a result of strikes, if you will, has also trickled down to benefit and help those in the lower-income group, especially the unorganized workers. It helped those who were not organized in the way of wages and decent working conditions. Some of us remember the insanitary conditions in the shops and factories, and the sweat shops, some of which are still with us. When I was a youngster I used to read of the breaker boys who were 9 and 10 years old, who were working in the mines of Pennsylvania in very insanitary and unsafe conditions, for a pittance. I can remember the time when the late George Baer, the great king of the coal operators of Pennsylvania, when a great strike was on, stating to the public defiantly that he had a mandate from God Almighty to operate the coal fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia according to his light. He properly earned the title Divine Right Baer. We have made progress since those days but the unorganized group did benefit in each instance by the efforts of organized labor, and they are benefiting today. The wage-and-hour law has had much to do with the abolition of child labor, or at least minimizing its evil effects, and that was secured by organized labor and its friends. All kinds of unorganized groups have profited through the efforts of organized labor in a dozen fields of operation. I cannot go along with the statement of those who say that they are going to throw the shackles off those individuals who want to bargain individually, and reestablish the "yellow dog" contract now outlawed in the Nation by Federal law and in most of the States of the Union.

It was the "yellow dog" contract that kept people in subjection for many years. It placed the individual at the mercy of a selfish employer. I know, because I was once the victim of a "yellow dog" contract movement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SWEENEY. So I am glad the "yellow dog" contract is outlawed today.

What is the basic reason for pending proposals to strike at organized labor? I have gone into that question before. Just hatred of somebody; hatred of individuals. Labor will clean its own house. Labor, as a result of the last two conventions of the major organizations, has set out on a course of cleaning house. They are no different than the Stock Exchange of New York City. It had to clean its house after Whitney went to Sing Sing. Industry and other organizations have individuals in their ranks who are not operating according to Hoyle and who, when they are exposed, pay the penalty. Our Government is no different. We could spend the time today rather than talking about Communists in the C. I. O. in trying by legislation to get the thousands of Communists out of Washington, out of the administrative branch of our Government, where they are now employed. If you have any doubt, read the testimony before the Dies committee of thousands and thousands of Communists and fellow travelers who are working here in the Nation's Capital in responsible positions. These termites are already boring into our structure of government and may, if not stopped, help to destroy it.

We could be helping the gentleman from Georgia to curb the profiteers in industry. We might be investigating the dollar-a-year men down here, the superpatriots who pose for pictures and report that they receive $1 a year as salary, when we know and every man of intelligence in this country knows they are drawing their $1-a-year salaries to protect their own or kindred interest with which they are affiliated, and which receive favorable consideration by way of defense contracts.

Every day reports are coming to the Congress of the graft and corruption in our defense industry. Specifications for a $20,000,000 shell-loading plant down south are let by contract, and when it is finished it is $58,000,000. Thirty-eight million dollars more. What are we going to do about that? The defense program is full of similar situations. Before we start going after 10,000,000 organized laboring men and women, and charging them with being unpatriotic, we had better investigate industry and the dollar-a-year men. When the workers find that the steel industry is making 250 percent profit at present, and perhaps next year 500 percent profit, despite your law, if you pass it, putting restrictions on the power of labor to strike, when their budget is unbalanced with the costs of living rising,

when they cannot secure the appropriate remedy by negotiation, they are going to strike and no power on earth will stop them. To prevent them from striking would be a Hitler move. That is what brought Hitler to power, his scheme to regiment people. It is a dictator system: "Thou shalt not, thou shalt not, thou shalt not."

No; we do not have to emulate Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin. We do not have to follow their pattern. Under our free enterprise system, capital and labor have always got along. I subscribe to the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], who I hope will soon grace with dignity a Federal district court in his home State, whose nomination has gone to the Senate and whom I congratulate publicly now as a friend of labor, one of the best that ever sat in the Congress. I subscribe to the sentiment he expressed when he said the answer is in a conference of capital and labor and Government. The answer is the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], calling for a conference, which resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the House hereby recommends to the President of the United States that he convene as soon as possible a conference of representatives of industry, labor, and Government, for the purpose of obtaining an agreement for the establishment of a program of basic policies to govern industrial relations and adequate machinery for the peaceful solution of industrial disputes.

This is a resolution all of us should support. Philip Murray, able, clean leader of the C. I. O., and William Green support this approach to the strike problem.

I have not had any complaint from industry asking for this legislation. I listened to Bill Green's speech before the investment bankers convention in Florida last Sunday night. He got a splendid reception when he said he was for this kind of a conference. Industry and labor can get together. They will get together, as evidenced by the settlement by mediation of the so-called railroad difficulties of today, and tomorrow or in a few days I think the peaceful solution of the captive coal mines strike in which the United Miners and certain steel industries are involved will be forthcoming.

I am going to oppose all three bills. I do not think it is the proper approach. I think you will add to the confusion and chaos if you pass any one of these bills, because then I think labor may rebel, as indicated by some of the leaders, and they have a right to so indicate. If our defense effort is to go forward for the protection of this country, then we must have a unity of all persons. Labor plays the most important part. It sweats. It toils, it furnishes the boys for cannon fodder and it pays and pays as no other group by way of consumption taxes for security of our land. Defeat these measures and you will hasten national unity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

STRIKES IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration the so-called Vinson bill to diminish and prevent strikes in national-defense contracts. Under the rule the substitute Vinson bill may be offered for the original bill. I prefer the substitute. It puts teeth in existing laws and strengthens the original bill. The Smith bill, which is preferable to either the original or the substitute Vinson bill, may and will be offered as a substitute for the Vinson bill. The Smith bill is more comprehensive. As H. R. 6149 it includes the Ramspeck bill. With the Ramspeck provisions it is more effective with the power to take over the plant without fault on the part of the employer eliminated, than either the Vinson or the Ramspeck bills. The Ramspeck bill is the bill reported by the Committee on Labor, and it may be offered as a substitute for the Vinson bill.

Many Members of Congress have advocated restrictive labor legislation, especially since the President proclaimed a national emergency on May 28, 1940. Other Members of Congress have opposed any further legislation. The time has now arrived when a choice must be made. I am one of those who have urged restrictive legislation from the beginning. I will cooperate to secure the most effective legislation to prevent strikes.

The gentleman from Illinois, my good friend [Mr. MCKEOUGH], opposes any legislation at all. The excuse for his opposition is the fact that employers have demanded their pound of flesh, and by inference he advocates that labor may now be permitted to obtain its pound of flesh. He charges that employers have been greedy and selfish. He cites the repeal of the profit provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act. He overlooks to state that one of the chief reasons for the recommendation by the administration for the repeal of the limitation of profits in the act was the materially increased costs in labor, but I hold no brief for selfish contractors. I know it is true that the quibbling of employers and the delay of employers while they quibbled to get favorable contracts with the Government have delayed national defense. I oppose war millionaires and swollen war profits in national defense. The remedy is to recapture all profits above a legitimate return by taxation. The gentleman is a member of the Ways and Means Committee. Congress expects that committee to promote legislation to prevent excessive war profits and to recapture munition profits from those who have demanded their pound of flesh.

Mr. MCKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield if the gentleman desires after I finish my statement.

The remedy for labor is not for labor to demand its pound of flesh, the remedy is not for labor to join with selfish industrialists in delaying national defense, but the remedy for labor is to cooperate with the Government and to prevent strikes in the emergency and to prevent delay in national defense.

CRUCIFIXION

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] compared labor to the Saviour of mankind. I am for labor; my sympathies are with the workingman, but the analogy was unfortunate. It was peculiarly unfortunate, as the gentleman from Illinois was followed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who furnished the names of thieves, robbers, thugs, and felons who are engaged in labor racketeering. The analogy or parallel is unfortunate for his argument. The people committed a great crime in crucifying the Saviour. There were two thieves or robbers available. Congress and the country must not repeat the crime of 2,000 years ago. We have the opportunity to crucify the thieves or robbers, the felons, and the racketeers who put their ambition for place and power above the service of their country. Neither the country nor Congress has any fault to find with legitimate labor or with the rights of labor to bargain or to strike, but the Congress and the country are opposed to strikes that are indefensible and that are hindering and delaying national defense.

Again, the gentleman from Illinois finds fault with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] because the gentleman from Virginia is alleged to have advocated the closed shop with respect to milk in the District of Columbia. What if he did? This is but a sample of the fallacy of the arguments against the pending legislation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in the bill proposed by him does not eliminate closed shop. He leaves the closed shop just where he finds it in the present national emergency. He leaves it in defense contracts just where he left it in the milk controversy in the District of Columbia.

ARBITRATION

I oppose the selfish contractor, and I oppose the selfish labor racketeer. Personally I would like to see the employer and the employee get around the table, and if unable to agree, as patriotic American citizens in the existing emergency, they should voluntarily agree to arbitration. Compulsory arbitration as decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in reviewing the Kansas compulsory arbitration law is void.

VOLUNTARY ACTION

Those who have advocated voluntary action in the solution of labor troubles have heretofore succeeded in preventing Congress from considering restrictive legislation. It is said that the labor situation in the United States is no worse than it is in Great Britain or in Canada. The comparison is not accurate. The population of Great Britain is almost entirely industrial. It is largely agricultural in the United States. It is maintained that not more than 2 percent of labor is involved in strikes. Great Britain, however, is unable to protect or to defend herself. Labor must do more in the United States if the United States is to protect Great Britain and the Western Hemisphere. Since the fall of France strikes have multiplied, labor leaders

have become more bold. Unconscionable fees to permit citizens to work for their Government have been charged. One union has prevented another union from working.

Up to October 1, 24,000,000,000 man-hours had been lost, as stated by the gentleman from Virginia. We have been indulging, as has been said, in shadow-boxing long enough. Voluntary action to diminish strikes has been tried; it has failed. It is time for compulsory legislation. Those who have advocated voluntary legislation are not consistent. If their argument were sound, there would be no legislation to provide for wages and hours. The matter would be left to the voluntary action of employers and employees. If legislation will promote labor, legislation can control labor. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] spoke of bank failures and bankers who robbed. Congress passed legislation to regulate banks and guarantee deposits. If Congress can control banks, Congress can control labor unions.

In the Spanish-American War men were not conscripted for the Army. They volunteered. Conscription was not necessary. In the World War and in the existing emergency Congress has decreed that the voluntary system for war services is not enough. Under the Constitution Congress has drafted men to fight and to die, if necessary, for their country. The voluntary system has been replaced by the compulsory system in the Army. But, it is said that under the Constitution men cannot be drafted to work for their country, even in a national emergency. Such may be the letter of the Constitution, but when men are drafted for the Army, there is a law higher and more important that the letter of the statute, and that is public opinion. Public opinion has been crystallized in the United States. Public opinion, when crystallized, is more powerful than statute or constitution. When the voluntary system in war obtained, the slacker was marked. Now that men have been drafted for the armed services, public sentiment from one end of the land to the other insists that while men may not be drafted to work under the law and under the Constitution, men shall not prevent others from working for their country. Again, the bills were not hastily drawn. The Vinson bill was reported last May. The Labor Committee, I assume, has considered or should have considered legislation for months.

The issue is sharp. Closed shop constitutes the issue. It is unpatriotic to take advantage of the emergency to force the closed shop. The President of the United States was right when he advised John L. Lewis that Congress would not adopt the closed shop by statute. The right to work is involved. It is not a question of collective bargaining. It is a question of one man or one group preventing another man or another group from working for the country and from working to arm the country for defense.

THE HEART OF LABOR SOUND

Labor has made legitimate gains. They have made these gains by statute. Labor dictators and labor racketeers maintain that they are operating under statute. If statutes could be passed to provide for the gains of labor, statutes can be passed to free labor from the domination of labor racketeers. Congress should act instantly. The moral effect would be great.

As I stated, I oppose business seeking to capitalize on labor troubles; I oppose labor seeking to capitalize to the detriment of the Nation, in the emergency.

It is time for labor to clean house. If labor itself will not crucify the Communists and criminals in charge of labor unions, Congress must restrict their operations. Otherwise, organized labor will continue to work itself into public disrepute. Widespread strikes result in injury to labor. The public reaction sets in, and labor may easily lose all the gains it has made. The real friends of labor are those who would free and emancipate labor from the designing and selfish labor leaders and dictators.

RAMSPECK BILL

The inherent weakness of the Ramspeck bill is that it denies protection to citizens willing and anxious to work in defense industries. It may be admitted that man cannot be forced to work under the Constitution, but public opinion demands that those who are protected by their country shall serve their country, and public opinion requires that if citizens themselves do not work, they shall not prevent others from working for arming and defending their country.

There is another inherent weakness in the Ramspeck bill. It is fundamental. If conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration fail, the bill provides that the powers conferred upon the President under section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended shall apply. That section provides that the President shall have power to take possession of any establishment or facility, if the owners thereof fail to cooperate with the Government in national defense. The Ramspeck bill now penalizes the owners and the employers for the unwillingness or inability of employees to cooperate. Instead of authorizing the operation of the plant by the President when the employees fail to cooperate, where the employers are anxious to aid in national defense, the legislation should prevent employees unwilling to work from interfering with the employers in obtaining the services of those anxious to work.

I believe in freedom. I believe in the right of individuals to work or not to work. I believe in their right to organize and to bargain collectively, but in an emergency when the very existence of the country is involved, the country should be put above the labor union; the country should be put above the individual, and national defense should be put above collective bargaining, and the right not to work.

THE STATUS QUO

There will be time enough after the emergency has passed and peace has been restored for employers and employees to settle the closed shop, the union shop, and the open shop questions. The status quo in the emergency should be maintained, as provided in the Smith bill. All efforts to extend the closed shop by legislation should be prohibited.

JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

Many strikes have resulted because of disputes between the two great labor unions. The jurisdictional strike is causing public restlessness. President Roosevelt has said, "Organizational rivalries and jurisdictional conflicts should be discarded." Labor is stronger today than during the first World War. It should be more mature. Many strikes are wholly unnecessary. Many disputes are wholly unjustifiable.

What can the average man do? The answer is that he can do plenty. When there was widespread unemployment, the public sympathized with labor, but today employment is plentiful. Public sympathy is not with any of the leaders of the two labor houses. I say with Mercutio: "A plague on both your houses."

Philip Murray went too far when he said that the closed shop must come even at the expense of the national emergency. William Green went too far when he said that labor would rebel in the national emergency. Labor must now give proof of its good sense and of its patriotism. If labor leadership does not show more responsibility, the hands of the clock are likely to be turned backward, and the gains of liberty, I repeat, will be in vain.

BALLOTS

The member of the labor union should be as free to vote as a citizen. Who is the worker that he should not have the right to a secret ballot? If the labor leader is to be trusted, should not the worker be trusted to vote? The laborer does not sacrifice his freedom. If the secret ballot is good for the country, it is good for labor.

VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION

If there is one citizen in the Republic who should be free from violence and from intimidation, that is the citizen who is working for his country. If the United States cannot protect the laborer in his right to work, from violence and intimidation, how can the United States protect its citizens from Hitler?

ACCOUNTING

The public has been shocked to ascertain that laborers willing to work in defense plants have not been permitted to work unless they paid tribute to labor organizations. Fees for the privilege of working, with the approval of the labor unions, have been charged citizens applying for work in Army camps and defense plants. Unconscionable levies have been made by labor organizations who have made no accounting whatsoever. The light of publicity should be turned on. The indefensible levies should be prohibited. The citizen should be given the right to work for his government without being compelled to pay for the privilege of working.

COOLING PERIOD

Legislation should provide for a compulsory waiting period for conciliation and arbitration before strikes. During the national emergency neither capital

nor labor should be permitted to profit at the expense of the country. The status quo should be maintained as I have stated. The gains of labor should be conserved. The concessions of industry should be continued. It is no time for either capital or labor to profit at the expense of the public. It is time for patriotism, and it is time for those who are not animated by patriotism to be restricted in their greed and in their ambition for place and power.

SHOW-DOWN

Strikes in defense plants must stop. A revolt against national defense is unthinkable. A strike in a defense plant, when soldiers who have been drafted have not been armed for a year after they have been drafted, is unthinkable. There is no justification.

It is not a question of labor being loyal to the labor union. It is a question of loyalty to America.

For five years the United States has put up with the coercive mob methods of John L. Lewis. He is drunk with power. He has defied the Government of the United States. The contest is on. It is a question of closed shop or country. We cannot fight our Government. We cannot strike against the Government. Strikes are a luxury at any time. In war they cannot be endured. Congress is determined to save honest labor from its racketeering leaders. Congress is determined to help labor free itself from the domination of labor dictators. It is time for a show-down. We are either for our country, or we are against our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, perhaps there is some virtue in writing a record, because some day the time is going to come when the people of America are going to be interested in seeing their Congress legislate, and will insist that the Congress legislate independently upon measures that will help build a fairer, more secure life for the American people over the long run.

Every time within my memory when Members have gotten up and asserted that the Congress should begin to legislate independently, it was because we had a bill before us in which the appeal was either to vote no on something or else because we were considering a measure whose effect would be to strengthen the position of those already strong. I tell you, the time is going to come when the people of America will look to this Congress for a constructive program which will enable them to produce to the full to save human life and will give our country a consumer demand that will sustain the employment of all our people. The whole future of democratic government in the world is going to depend on whether we do that or not.

It has been a long time since I introduced my bill to have a commission established to deal with the problem of post-war conditions. I hope we can get that some day.

The gentleman from Texas made a speech today and, in the first place, I think he did no harm to the C. I. O. about which he spoke. To know who the Communists are or who the criminals are in a group of people is extremely important—especially for a labor organization. It should, I earnestly agree, be labor's first task to get rid of such people, and to do it now. But I do want to say—what is obviously true—that if a similar amount of work were put on any group in our society, unfortunately some of the same results would be obtained, at least so far as criminal elements are concerned. The spotlight of publicity is always good, especially if it covers all the nooks and crannies and not just part of them.

What is our basic problem today as we confront the national-defense emergency? Our basic problem is to overcome just one thing, and that is the willingness of any group of people in America to take advantage of the situation in order to advance their own interests, whatever they may be, at the expense of the interests of the Nation or some other group. In this regard many groups—not just one—have offended. It has been said many times in the course of this debate that labor is fundamentally patriotic. Of course, it is. Indeed, tonight there are ships being built, there are airplanes being constructed, there is a vast amount of labor being performed that the Members of Congress could not do and upon which the whole future of mankind may well depend, if the defense program is as important as we believe it to be.

Speeches have been made over and over again in which it has been said that it was necessary that the national-defense program be not interrupted, but there have not been enough speeches made to suit me to point out that it is only because certain men have the skill and willingness to work hard that it is possible to have any defense program at all. If labor feels that the Congress is acting fairly with all groups, if labor feels that Congress is asking the same degree of patriotism from other groups that it is asking of them, it may well be, as Members have said, that the passage of a reasonable bill tomorrow might be accepted, not without appreciation, by a good many people in the rank and file of labor. Working people never want to strike. No one would be as thankful as they if a magic formula could be found so no strikes would ever be called for again. But through the years the conditions of American working people—organized and unorganized—have been established as they exist today because groups of men worked and struggled to establish them.

I want to read a little record here today, and I have another one I am going to read tomorrow. I do not know how many Members of the House realize what the Aluminum Corporation of America has asked of the United States and gotten from the United States. It has received a contract which leaves with the Aluminum Corporation of America control of production and price of aluminum; that is, it can say how much production shall take place and the price at which aluminum shall be sold from plants paid for, down to every dime, by the American people. It has gotten a contract where, in addition to 15 percent of all profits, for every pound of aluminum produced it shall receive a quarter of a cent for overhead expenses that can be accounted for and another half-cent for overhead expenses which cannot be accounted for just as a sort of general proposition, with no accounting necessary to justify the payments; a contract whereby the Aluminum Corporation of America will construct with Government money and have the disposal of a plant built at Government expense large enough to turn out each year 1,000,000,000 pounds of alumina, the necessary element in the manufacturing of aluminum. We need that alumina. But, since the bauxite—necessary raw material—is largely coming from South America anyway, it is hard to see why several smaller alumina plants could not have been constructed. Why is this important? Because, at the end of the term of this contract, this Government plant will be returned to the Defense Plant Corporation and must either be operated by the Government or sold to some aluminum producers. Some of us have hoped that since we the people are footing the bill, some progress might be made toward breaking the monopoly of Alcoa. But here is an alumina plant so big there is not any other agency in America that can possibly afford to purchase it from the Government or use it except the Aluminum Corporation of America. So, by our very own public money it turns out we are building up not breaking down monopoly control.

There are other aluminum companies, one of them by the name of the Bohn Brass & Aluminum Co. They wanted to and were ready to build a plant, too, and operate it for national defense. But are they going to get to build it? I do not know just what has happened, but my understanding is that the Aluminum Corporation of America is going to build this plant for its competitor to operate, and that the Bohn Co. somehow objects to this arrangement, so Alcoa will get to operate it, too.

These things happen, though, in paneled offices. They do not happen in the dust of city streets, where everybody knows about them. My main appeal to the Members of Congress is not that they fail to do the thing that is necessary from a national standpoint with regard to labor, but that they do it all the way along the line.

Now, it has been said that the Ramspeck will not stop strikes, and when that is stated, I understand it to be implied that we have another bill before us that will. I know many, many people want what they call antistrike legislation, but I want to point out that only if and when men are working for their Government and not for the private profit of another can they be compelled to work. The only circumstance where it would be possible—let alone advisable—to compel men to work is if the Government took over the plants.

Therefore, so far as private industry is concerned, it is not possible for Congress to pass a bill that will absolutely prevent strikes. All we can do is everything possible to prevent them. That I agree we must do—as wisely and well as we can. But the ultimate answer is to bring labor and management together and to have them sit down together and develop principles and policies for the conduct of American industry during this emergency. Rules of the game, I call it. As yet we have not them. We need them, I agree, with regard to the closed-shop issue and all the rest. But if they are to do maximum good it is better that industry and labor work them out together.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I merely wanted to make an observation in connection with the information the gentleman has presented with relation to the Aluminum Corporation of America, and I wanted to ask him this question: The information he has given us is not generally known on the streets of the cities, is it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know it is not.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am happy the gentleman has made it a part of the record, and add the hope that somebody might tell the people in a scare headline tonight about this as they would if five men had stopped work for a better wage.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. All of this information is in the files of the Truman committee. They have brought out much of it.

Now I just want to ask the Members of the House who are present to consider what the alternative is to organized labor. I am not blind to its faults, any more than to the faults of other groups. Indeed, I think the day is going to come when the main scourge of mankind will be power—power of finance monopoly, power of industrial monopoly, power of tight labor groups with closed membership and few elections—yes, and power of government. Our job—and it is no easy one—is to see that no power becomes so great that it can destroy other values or rights of people, and to do it in such way that we do not make government itself all powerful.

But suppose we did not have any organized labor in America today. I tell you, you would have chaotic conditions. You would find it utterly impossible to organize the defense program we are trying to organize. And the conditions of our working people would be deplorable. If we are going to have organized labor, then it is necessary, of course, for us to recognize the thing that labor has to do in order to live and be effective.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Now about the closed shop. If a labor organization has a closed shop, and if in addition to that that labor organization exacts an exorbitant initiation fee or exorbitant dues from people in order to become members of that union, then in my judgment that is wrong. Such a situation can be fairly described as very close indeed to denying them the right to work.

But on the other hand it is different where the employer is free to hire whom he will but where a man once hired and after he has been paid his wages is asked to join his fellows in the union that protects them all. And so I can understand how a bunch of men feel who through the years have paid their dues and made their contributions to maintain an organization that has built the conditions under which they work, when they regard another group of men who enjoy exactly the same conditions, that have been built up by the efforts of the first group, but who do not make any contribution toward maintaining them. I say I can understand that. And that consideration is involved here to.

I see no objection to our doing things here which might bring more democratic control of labor organizations, but along the line that I spoke about being fair awhile ago, I think if we are going to do that by means of legislation, in order to be entirely just we ought to do the same thing with regard to corporations, and even insurance companies, so that stockholders would in all cases have something to say about what is going on in their businesses.

What is necessary is for the American people to feel that this Congress is really putting the national interest first, regardless of what pressure group is involved.

There has been talk about bulldozing and bludgeoning Congressmen. I have been bludgeoned and bulldozed a good deal by a lot of different people on most every bill, and I want to say that by and large the labor representatives that come to see you are certainly quite as reasonable and quite as understanding as any other group of people who come here with a particular interest to protect.

I hope I am going to be able to move to strike out the last word tomorrow because I have some other things I want to say, and I want to say them very, very much.

We heard today about 2,400,000 man-days being lost. That is too much. Ideally, if all employers were fair and all labor perfect there should not have been any lost. But I would just like to suggest that that is about two-thirds as much as the man-days that were lost because we took a holiday on the 4th of July, and that it is probably nowhere near as much as the man-days that have been lost by industrial accidents. I know that does not excuse it and I know how people throughout the country feel, and I know how Members of Congress feel about this situation. But earnest, willing, enthusiastic work and production are more precious to us now than anything else. Let us not forget that tomorrow. If we can get a bill that is fair and just and that does not represent an unwarranted attempt to take advantage of all labor because some people are in its ranks who ought not to be there and because some leaders have too great a thirst for power—then, as I said a while ago, I am not sure but what it might be better to pass such a bill than it would be to do nothing, under all the existing circumstances. For so far as I am concerned I spoke of the National Defense Mediation Board over and over as our main hope. And I confess when not long ago the recommendation of that Board was not accepted and a strike resulted, we were confronted by a new and different situation. I say this, even though, as I have said above, I understand the miners' case. But I do not think any bill you are going to pass in this House is going to completely solve the problem.

The strike problem is only going to be solved as you put responsibility in the hands of the responsible leaders of labor in America and on the shoulders of the responsible leaders of industry in America. Unless that is done, and unless that is part of the program, I do not think it can succeed.

I am glad Congress is going to do its job and do it without any pattern from any other branch of government, but I hope we will do a good job, a job calculated to encourage full production, to discourage strikes, not a job to give satisfaction to some who see only the faults of labor and few of the faults of any other group.

Labor, I know, wants no bill at all. I have letters and telegrams from industrialists urging that a bill be passed, but one that will affect only labor and not themselves. I am trying to look ahead into the future, and I am wondering whether we may not be doing labor itself a disservice if we do nothing on tomorrow. Perhaps the results of that—given all the antilabor feeling that unquestionably exists—will produce some measure here at some not far distant day that really would drive that wedge between labor in America and their Government, which every destructive element in the Nation desires. Above all I want to avoid that possibility.

But everything will depend on the kind of bill we finally are to vote on when we come to the end of a long day on tomorrow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, what has been lost sight of in the entire discussion with regard to labor and industrial disputes, in the press and on the floor of this House as well as in the other body, is the relationship of the labor problem to the kind of government the people desire.

I believe history will demonstrate conclusively that you cannot have a democratic form of government unless you have a free organized labor movement. An enslaved or government-regulated labor movement is the basis of fascism in Italy, of nazi-ism in Germany, and the corporate state in all the other various Fascist countries, such as Spain.

We ought to bear in mind some of the history of antilabor laws. We shall find, for example, that the program which is

being advanced here in these four bills originated in the Palazzo Chigi, the Government palace of Benito Mussolini, in 1926. On April 3 of that year several decrees were issued. One decree outlawed strikes; another decree prohibited collective bargaining; and the last decree dissolved free trade-unions and substituted in their place so-called Fascist syndicates controlled, regulated, and maneuvered by the government.

The demagogy used to promulgate those decrees and put them over on the Italian people is the same demagogy we hear in this House today, the demagogy of such phrases as "the Nation comes first and before any individual group," and that "defense of the country comes first before that of labor." In Mussolini's so-called Labor Charter, we find language which is very, very similar and bespeaks the same political philosophy and program that is being advanced here by those who are promulgating the legislation which is before us. For instance, "The Italian nation is an organization having ends, a life, and means superior in power and duration to the single individuals or groups of individuals composing it."

What a similarity. I do not charge that the gentlemen who have been using this similar language on the floor of the House today have taken it from Mussolini's Labor Charter, but I submit that the same political philosophy and the same class interests which motivated the Fascists of Italy and Benito Mussolini to destroy labor unions and establish a Fascist, corporate state, that that same philosophy and the same class interests are motivating the overwhelming majority of those gentlemen in this House and those ladies and gentlemen throughout the country who are seeking to impose upon a free United States an enslaved labor movement.

When Hitler came into power in 1933, on January 30, he, too, emulated Mussolini, and in order to firmly establish his rule, it was necessary that the only real opposition to nazi-ism and to Hitlerism in Germany should be destroyed, namely, a free, democratic, German labor movement. Democratic Germany died because many of the leaders of democratic Germany permitted Adolf Hitler to kill and destroy the democratic labor movement of Germany, and Adolf Hitler, too, issued decrees, and those decrees did what? First, they outlawed strikes; second, they forbade wage disputes; and, third, they abolished collective bargaining. This was done immediately after he was appointed Chancellor.

So we see that in Germany, Italy, and in Franco-Spain, a free, democratic labor movement was destroyed in order to perpetuate fascism on all of the people.

And let me say to the farmers in particular that a shackled labor movement will be the weapon employed for an offensive against the liberties of all the American people and that includes the farmer as well.

Further, there is one great, and I think it is the greatest, historic example which is a deadly parallel to the situation which now confronts us in this House, and that is France.

We have heard Member after Member in this House and we have read article after article in the press in which we have been told that France fell because there was a New Deal in France and because, in particular, French workers were given the right of collective bargaining and that the French labor movement was permitted to win its struggle for a 40-hour week. We have been told that, because of the progress the French people had achieved, France fell, that France was destroyed and that France could not fight. Let us examine the facts.

Yes; the French workers were working 40 hours a week, but at the time the 40-hour week law was abolished there were 3,000,000 unemployed in France—3,000,000 unemployed and the 40-hour law was abolished at a time when because of the large number of unemployed it was most needed in the interest of defense production. But it was not the 40-hour law which made France fall, because when France went to war, there was no 40-hour law. There was no free French labor movement. The 200 families of the Bank of France who really controlled the Government of France, who established throughout France fascist groups, such as the Croix de Feu and the Cagoulards, groups doing the bidding of the 200 families of the Bank of France, which went out and tried to disrupt and destroy the labor unions, and when they failed to do it the minions of the 200 families of the Bank of France—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The minions of the 200 families of France in the French Senate, in the Chamber of Deputies, and in the government of Daladier, what did they bring about? They brought about the abolition of the 40-hour law. The government passed laws forbidding strikes. It broke strikes with the bayonet. It sent to jail labor leaders. So at the moment that France went into war, there was no French free-labor movement. When France went into war, France was in the same condition with regard to labor as we will be if we pass this legislation. So, the France that went into war was a France without a free-labor movement, it was a France with a shackled-labor movement and the same people who shackled the labor movement of France were the same people who today are ruling France as tools of Hitler, the same people who sold out France to Hitler on the battlefield, the same who are today bending the knee before Adolf Hitler. Yes; the whole trouble was that they were more interested in destroying the labor movement of France than they were in the defense of France, and events have proven it. Take the gentleman who went yesterday with Marshal Petain to visit Goering, Count de Brinon, one of the leaders in the movement to enslave labor, or Laval, Darlan, Petain, Weygand, all of them, Vichy men, Munichers, Hitler's tools today, were leaders in the conspiracy which destroyed the French labor movement. They destroyed labor and thereby conditioned France for Hitler's victory over France. They betrayed France and are now rewarded by Hitler with the rule of France.

Daladier and Reynaud, who carried out the orders of these Vichy men at that time, these Vichy men and Munich men, who had sold out to Hitler at Munich and later at Sedan—these same people were not interested in the defense of France. They were concerned with but one proposition. These traitors wanted to hold on to their profits and monopoly just as most of those who are seeking this legislation are concerned with one proposition, and that is to hold on to their monopolistic interests, and their continued exploitation of the American workers. They prefer to fight American labor rather than destroy Hitlerism, just as the French traitors preferred to destroy French labor rather than fight Hitler. The Vichy men sold out France. They gave their country to Hitler because they feared that French workers who were in uniform and who had bayonets would restore a free, democratic labor movement in France, and continue to struggle for a decent standard of living for Frenchmen. These Vichy men who promulgated these laws, laws similar to the law proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], similar to the bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and similar to the proposal of the other gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], were enemies of French labor and now history damns them as enemies of their own country. Remember that the same identical laws were forced on France before France went into war by those who, as Hitler's tools, rule France today. So, when we speak about France, let us bear these facts in mind. Let us therefore remember that France fell, not because of social legislation and a free, untrammeled labor movement in France. France fell because the democratic labor movement was destroyed, destroyed by Munich men, by Vichy men, by the 200 families of the Bank of France, who were interested in monopoly and profit and not in defense of their country against Hitler. The fact that they still own most of what they owned before the capitulation of France, and that they still possess most of their monopolistic interests, and most of everything they had before, proves conclusively that in selling out France, by dividing the people in France with this kind of legislation and by destroying the labor movement, they were serving the interests of Adolf Hitler and not of the French nation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I wonder how the gentleman accounts for the difference in the result in Italy, Germany, and in France, under the theory that he has expressed here, that what caused the downfall of France, was destroying a free labor movement, and also secured the destruction of it in Italy, when we all know that it was destroyed in Germany and yet France fell and Germany became strong.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman asked that question. The men who did it in France,

who destroyed the labor movement of France, had to deal with a Nazi Germany and a Fascist Italy. France was a democratic country. What they had to determine was whether they were going to fight Hitler or whether they were going to appease him and capitulate to him. Their natural interest as real Frenchmen dictated an all-out fight against Hitler, but time and events have shown us that they fought anti-Fascist labor instead, and did not fight Hitler. They were antilabor and Fascist. All of the fighting they did was against the anti-Hitler French working people, and in their interests as Fascists capitulated to Hitler. Certainly, I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia will not advance the alleged efficiency of Nazi slave labor and the very much flaunted efficiency of Fascist labor as an excuse to substitute for our labor the kind of labor movement that would exist if this proposed legislation became law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am after information. Is the labor of Russia free?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We are learning a great deal about Russia. We were told for years that the Russians could not fight, and we are finding that they can, and as we receive more and more truthful information about Russia we will learn that labor rules in Russia. I also say that the Russian people would not be fighting like tigers if they did not feel that they were fighting for something that belonged to them, and that is an irrefutable conclusion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Apparently the Germans are fighting, too.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, yes; and the Nazis are beginning to run. I am confident that the Nazis will be defeated, and they will be defeated precisely because the people of Germany, who are not free, and the peoples of the other enslaved nations of Europe will join up with the democratic people of the world to overthrow Hitler and Hitlerism.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask one question more? I have always admired the gentleman's ability to make an argument on the floor. I always understood—not always, but for some time prior to the entrance of Russia into this war—I understood the gentleman to be against——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, if the gentleman will turn to the RECORD of October 16 he will find that I discussed my stand on the war thoroughly. I am not going to discuss it again now. I went into that fully on that occasion and will do so again when we discuss foreign policy. I now refer the gentleman to what I said at that time. I think the gentleman is trying to take up my time on something that is extraneous.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; indeed. I am willing for you to have an hour.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If I had another hour I would be delighted to give you a lecture on that subject. You agree to give me a half an hour and I will give you a lecture on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Come over to my office. Others are not interested.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I suggest that the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York enter into that debate when we have a larger attendance.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I also say this, with all due deference to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that if we followed his views in this House we would go back to the 10-cents-an-hour standard for the workers of this country. I am sure the gentleman would think that was fine Americanism, because it raised the spirit of rugged individualism about which he is always talking.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are displaying your usual ignorance of my views.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want to attribute to the gentleman any charge of ignorance. It is not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do not want to attribute to the gentleman any charge of ignorance, but I certainly——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I said ignorance of my views. That old 10 cents an hour bought more eggs than your 50 cents an hour does now.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Those eggs must be stale by this time. But certainly you do not want to go back to the day when you paid labor 10 cents an hour, do you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And American trade-unions have lifted labor from that 10 cents an hour to a decent wage and you want to destroy trade-unions in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, yes; you do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not want to destroy a condition which makes it possible for a man who works with his hands to ride in an automobile.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You want to destroy the right of American workers to bargain collectively; you want to destroy the right of American workers to strike, and when you do that you destroy what made it possible for American workers to obtain a decent living.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is no foundation for any such statement as that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are right, it does, and it proves that what you are saying is incorrect.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is no other inference to be drawn from the gentleman's position than that he seeks to lower the standard of living of the American workers.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman referred to the bills now before the House and stated they are trying to do to labor what was done to labor in France. The gentleman who is now speaking served on the Labor Committee with the gentleman from New York. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he ever saw any indication during that mutual service on the Labor Committee of any desire on the part of the gentleman who is now questioning him to shackle labor?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; I want to say this with respect to the gentleman from Georgia, that he personally has been a great defender of labor on that committee and off that committee. I have had occasion to say this on the floor of the House before. But, unfortunately, in this particular instance, unwittingly, the gentleman is advancing through his proposed legislation, legislation which represents a political philosophy, which represents a movement in the direction of Fascism. I certainly regret very much, particularly because of the gentleman's record, to see his name on this kind of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, few cities in the country are more active in behalf of the defense program than industrial Baltimore which I have the honor and privilege to represent, where the most important activities of our national-defense program are to be found.

Conservatively speaking, 100,000 men and women are engaged in defense work in Baltimore and its vicinity without any serious disruptions to the defense program.

True there have been differences, but they have all been amicably adjusted, because in Baltimore management and labor have cooperated fully in order to speed production.

As a member of the Committee on Labor, I have for the past 2 weeks attended meetings of said committee and considered methods of dealing with stoppages and threatened stoppages in defense production. Members of Congress, labor representatives and employer representatives were invited to appear before the committee to give the committee the benefit of their views and suggestions in this regard.

As a result of these hearings and deliberations, it is my humble opinion that compulsory arbitration will break down the morale of the people and impede the defense program. Representatives of both the manufacturers association and labor agree on this. Unity is what is needed to speed production. I would like to see the President, as Commander in Chief, call a conference of representatives of Government, employer and employee, and work out a set of principles to carry on our defense production, so that defense production may continue. After parties to a labor dispute fail to reach an agreement through a process of collective bargaining, conciliation or mediation and voluntary arbitration should be employed.

I think Congress should consider carefully before extending the responsibilities of the Federal Government further into the field of managing-operating and taking over private business. We need laws today which carry with them a spirit of cooperation by all groups in our Nation, dedicated as we are to the destruction of Hitlerism.

In my opinion, we must remember that legislation should serve to express the public will, democratically arrived at. We should not try with bludgeon, or coerce any groups. In these times we need national unity, and we have to work for national unity, not merely say we want it. We need the kind of legislation which will promote harmony in our country, giving us the strength and energy we need so that we can unitedly defend our institutions against any and all aggressors, no matter from which ocean they may come. Let us get labor and management to cooperate fully and let us try not to embitter any part of our population.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by various groups at a mass meeting held in Baltimore on November 13, 1941:

Allied Veterans' Committee of Maryland.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, American Federation of Labor.
American Communications Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
American Legion, Department of Maryland.
Baltimore Association of Commerce.
Baltimore Building Trades Council, American Federation of Labor.
Baltimore District Federation of Women's Clubs.
Baltimore Federation of Labor, American Federation of Labor.
Baltimore Industrial Union Council, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.
Business and Professional Women's Club.
Committee to Defend America.
District Council of Defense for Baltimore.
Fight for Freedom Committee.
Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
International Brotherhood of Firemen, Oilers, and Maintenance Men, American Federation of Labor.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, American Federation of Labor.
International Fur and Leather Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, American Federation of Labor.
International Longshoremen Association, American Federation of Labor.
International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Locals No. 61 and No. 481, American Federation of Labor.
League of Women Voters.
Marine Firemen, Oilers, Water Tenders, and Wipers Union of the Pacific National Maritime Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Maryland Council of Defense.
Rotary Club of Baltimore.
United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
United Electrical and Radio Machine Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
United Federal Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
United Furniture Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

By a militant audience the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the peace of the world and the labors of mankind in making the world a better place to live in are threatened with destruction by the barbaric and ruthless attack of nazi-ism; and

"Whereas the menace of Hitlerism represents a real threat to the security of the American people, to our institutions, to our economic structure, to our American way of life, to our free way to worship as we choose, and to our freedom and liberty which we cherish as the most precious heritage of our forefathers; and

"Whereas we are witnessing the destruction and overrunning of the defenseless free democratic nations that have fallen under the iron heel and yoke of Hitlerism; and

"Whereas organized labor recognizes the inevitable truth that Hitlerism is the negation of any kind of free association and is the complete enslavement of society: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That labor in general, in recognizing its historical position in this world crisis, stand united for the full support of the foreign policy of the United States Government and render all possible aid to those brave countries who are fighting Hitlerism to the finish; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That organized labor accept in full the responsibility of the hour, and in order to insure the defeat of Hitlerism and nazi-ism, the assembly line of the Nation must be geared to the maximum of its production. We must produce more goods, more guns, more planes, more tanks, and more ships. Hitler must be outproduced. Labor will pledge their loyalty and give assurance to our Nation that the production of the implements of war must be continual and uninterrupted. To this effect, labor is expected to make genuine sacrifices, and expects in return that all sections of our great community be ready to sacrifice in a similar way in order to bring about the defeat of Hitlerism and nazi-ism."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4139) providing for the conciliation and mediation of labor disputes affecting the national-defense program, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I desire to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Times-Herald of today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain letters from constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who spoke today on the pending bill, may be privileged to revise and extend his remarks and include certain documents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole and to include a resolution adopted by a group at a meeting in Baltimore.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOEHNE, for 3 days, on account of important business.

Mr. TIBBOTT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 3, 1941, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, December 3, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, December 3, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 6056, to regulate in the United States Court of Claims suits for payment for the use of inventions by or for the Government, on Wednesday, December 3, 1941, at 10 a. m., room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, Executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1111. A letter from the Military Order of the Purple Heart, national adjutant, transmitting the minutes of the ninth national convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, held at Atlanta, Ga., August 3 to 6, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1112. A letter from the acting director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the twenty-third annual national convention of the American Legion, held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 15–18, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 538); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: Committee on Insular Affairs. S. 1623. An act to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 1460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII Mr. LEA introduced a bill (H. R. 6156) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6157. A bill for the relief of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEIDINGER:

H. R. 6158. A bill granting a pension to Myrtle Learned; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2108. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of John Brawley Post, No. 20, American Legion, Charleston, W. Va., calling upon the Navy Department to give proper recognition to the deeds of the naval personnel who were engaged in the rescue of the survivors of the American naval destroyers, *Greer*, *Kearny*, *Reuben James*, and the Navy tanker *Salinas*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2109. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the State of New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, concerning the Wheeler-Lea bill (S. 2015 and H. R. 5949) and the Magnuson bill (H. R. 4785); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1941

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whose presence we wait at the altar of prayer, grant that the lessons taught by our Master, His searching appeals, His noble life and passion, and His solemn warnings may be pondered in all hearts. Thou expressed love of God with all its hidden mazes, let Thy clear light shame and guide these lives of ours. We praise Thee that Thou hast not forgotten to be gracious and dost prompt us to penitence and faith that we may know more of the richness of love, the worth of self-sacrifice, and the sublimity of purity.

"Not as the world giveth, give I unto you." O God may there be a conscience in us that is willing to be guided aright, trembling on some Mount Sinai, beholding the consummation of some Mount Olivet and drinking in its teachings. Amid the world's distractions, give us hearts of calm repose and the blessing of indwelling peace; only on such high planes can we treat wisely and effectively the tumult, the hate, and the malignancy of the human heart, unmoved, above all storms, with placid tempers, enable us to walk forward in strength that shall garrison our souls. For the sake and in the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (Rept. No. 1461), which was reported to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business in the United States with a view to determining (1) whether or not the potentialities of small business in the national-defense program have been adequately developed, and, if not, what factors have hindered such development; and (2) whether or not adequate consideration has been given to the needs of small business engaged in nondefense activity, or engaged in the transition from nondefense to defense activity; and (3) whether or not small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there is a shortage, or in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEOGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY]?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION FOR SOLDIERS ON FURLOUGH

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill which will likely come before this House that was introduced by a young gentleman named EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. He is a Republican, but he is a fine young man, and I hope all Democrats as well as all Republicans will get behind him and help put this bill over. It would provide transportation for soldiers back home from the camps on a short furlough for Christmas. I have been a lover, I have been a son, I am a father, and I know what it means to the mothers, wives, sweethearts, fathers, brothers, and sisters to have the boys at home during Christmas holidays.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article from one of the Navy publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

WAYNE THORNDYKE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the seventh time Oklahoma has been honored by one of its boys obtaining the highest honor that can come to a 4–H Club boy, having won the Moses Trophy for the year 1941. In this particular instance I am happy to state the boy is an outstanding young man from my district, Wayne Thorndyke, of Lambert, Alfalfa County, Okla.

I include in my remarks a newspaper clipping with reference thereto:

ALFALFA COUNTY 4–H BOY WINS NO. 1 TROPHY AT NATIONAL EVENT

Wayne Thorndyke, of Lambert, Alfalfa County, was announced Saturday night as the 1941 winner of the Moses Trophy, highest honor that can come to a 4–H Club boy in the United States.

With the honor, announced at the National 4–H Congress now in session in Chicago, goes a $300 scholarship, which Thorndyke said he will use to continue his studies at Oklahoma A. and M. College, where he is a freshman.

Thorndyke is the seventh Oklahoman to win the top designation, and all of the six other winners are still living in Oklahoma. Ford Mercer won it the first year it was offered, in 1924, and the second winner was Frances Smith, of Geary, who later became Mrs. Ford Mercer. He is now assistant State 4–H Club leader in charge of wildlife projects.

Theodore Lorenz, Blaine County, won it in 1929. He is now a hatcheryman at Guthrie.

The fourth Oklahoman winner was Hugo Graumann, of Granite, in 1933, who now is an instructor in agronomy and coach of the crops judging teams at Oklahoma A. and M.

Viley Johnson, of Eufaula, who won in 1936, is county supervisor for the Farm Security Administration in Madill, and the sixth winner was Bonnie Phillips, of Major County, in 1939, now a home economics senior at Stillwater.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests, one that I may be permitted to revise and reduce the speech I made yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

WESTBROOK PEGLER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the other one is that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, here is a card from Hagerstown, Md., received this morning stating:

Some radio commentator said you were going to put Pegler on the carpet for some reflection on Congress. I read his column almost daily and have not read anything yet but what was mild to what one can hear on most any street corner about the weakness of Congress and none of it would be fit to print.

I did not put Pegler "on the carpet." I only asked that he be given opportunity to offer proof of his charges.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the production of crude oil and the present prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and also to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION FOR SOLDIERS ON FURLOUGH

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] for his very kind remarks and for his most valued support.

I am making another plea today in the interest of the Hall bill which, as the gentleman said, provides free transportation for soldiers on furlough when they go home from the training camps.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a cartoon showing a typical American family in a wonderful American home, with all its atmosphere of religion and goodness. The father is standing with arm uplifted showing a letter from the boy in camp, the soldier who has volunteered in the interest of his country. He is pointing to it and with great gladness in his voice saying, "We got the big present we have been waiting for, Ma. Our boy got his furlough and is coming home for Christmas."

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE JAPANESE SITUATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement by Mr. Vicente Villamin on the Japanese situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excerpt from the Disabled American Veterans' magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 125]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hart	Sacks
Baldwin	Hill, Colo.	Sasscer
Bennett	Knutson	Satterfield
Boehne	Larrabee	Scanlon
Buckler, Minn.	Lesinski	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Lewis	Schuetz
Byron	Ludlow	Scott
Chenoweth	McArdle	Scrugham
Cole, N. Y.	Maas	Sheridan
Collins	Magnuson	Smith, Pa.
Costello	Murdock	Snyder
Creal	Nichols	Somers, N. Y.
Crowther	Norton	Stearns, N. H.
Douglas	O'Day, N. Y.	Sweeney
Edmiston	O'Leary	Tibbott
Fish	Osmers	Tolan
Flannery	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Treadway
Ford, Leland M.	Reed, Ill	Weiss
Gale	Richards	Whelchel
Gore	Robinson, Utah	White
Green	Rogers, Okla.	Winter
	Romjue	Woodruff, Mich.
		Wright

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4139) to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4139, with Mr. COLE of Maryland in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act (relating to naval construction and procurement) entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE III—MEDIATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES AFFECTING NAVAL DEFENSE CONTRACTORS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 301. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the following principles and policies governing the relations between naval defense contractors and their employees should be observed by such contractors and employees, in order that the Nation's defense program may proceed as expeditiously as possible and not be delayed by unnecessary strikes or lock-outs:

"(a) Naval defense contractors and their employees should exert every possible effort to settle all their disputes without any interruption in production;

"(b) In the interest of national defense, naval defense contractors and their employees or representatives thereof should give to the National Defense Mediation Board (1) notice in writing of any desired change in existing agreements, wages, hours, or working conditions, (2) full information as to all developments in labor disputes, and (3) such sufficient advance notice of any threatened interruptions of continuous production as will permit exploration of all avenues of possible settlement of such controversies so as to avoid strikes, stoppages, or lock-outs;

"(c) Naval defense contractors should scrupulously comply with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act;

"(d) The employees of naval defense contractors, in the exercise of their rights guaranteed under the National Labor Relations Act, should not use coercive measures of any kind to induce persons to join their organizations, nor to induce employers to bargain or deal therewith;

"(e) In establishments of naval defense contractors where the union shop exists, such conditions should continue, and the union standards as to wages, hours of labor, and other conditions of employment should be maintained; and

"(f) In establishments of naval defense contractors where union and nonunion employees now work together, the continuance of such condition should not be deemed a grievance, but this declaration is not intended in any manner to deny the right, or to discourage the practice of the formation of labor organizations, or the joining of labor organizations by the employees in such establishments, nor to prevent the National Defense Mediation Board from urging, or any umpire from granting, under the machinery provided in this title, improvement of their situation in the matter of wages, hours of labor, or other conditions, as shall be found desirable from time to time.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 302. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'employer', 'employee', 'representative', 'labor organization', and 'labor dispute' shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act;

"(b) The term 'naval defense contractor' means an employer engaged in—

"(1) the production of arms, armament, ammunition, implements of war, munitions, clothing, food, fuel, or any articles or supplies, or parts or ingredients of any articles or supplies; or

"(2) the construction, reconstruction, repair, or installation of a building, plant, structure, or facility; under a contract entered into on behalf of the United States by the Secretary of the Navy or by an officer or employee of the Department of the Navy, or under a contract, which the Secretary of the Navy by order declares to be necessary to the national defense, with another naval defense contractor, but such term shall not include an employer engaged in the production of farm products on a farm.

"(c) The term 'Board' means the National Defense Mediation Board created by Executive order of March 19, 1941, issued by the President.

"(d) The term 'Adjustment Board' means the Naval Defense Adjustment Board provided for in section 308 of this title.

"GENERAL DUTIES

"SEC. 303. It shall be the duty of all naval defense contractors and their employees to exert every reasonable effort to settle all disputes, whether arising out of the application of collective bargaining agreements or otherwise, in order to avoid any interruption to the national-defense program or to the operation of any naval-defense contractor, growing out of any dispute between the naval-defense contractor and its employees, and every naval-defense contractor shall notify its employees by printed notices, in such form and posted at such times and places as the Board may prescribe, that all labor disputes between such contractor and its employees will be handled in accordance with the requirements of this title.

"PROCEDURE FOR MEDIATION AND FOR INVESTIGATION AND REPORT

"SEC. 304. (a) Whenever any labor dispute in which a naval-defense contractor or any of his employees is involved arises, it shall be the duty of each party to the dispute to give forthwith to each other party to the dispute a notice in writing of his claims, contentions, and demands with respect thereto. Upon the giving of such notice it shall be the duty of the parties to the dispute to endeavor in good faith to reach an agreement with respect to the matter or matters involved in such dispute. In endeavoring to reach an agreement the parties to a dispute not referable to the Adjustment Board under section 305 shall utilize the services of the appropriate now existing mediation or conciliation agency or board of the United States or of the State concerned, unless an agreement is effected without employment of such services.

"(b) If an agreement settling a dispute not referable to the Adjustment Board under section 305 is not reached before the expiration of 10 days from the date upon which any party to the dispute gave notice under subsection (a) of his claims, contentions, and demands to the other parties thereto, such party may give to each of the other parties to the dispute and to the Board written notice of an intention, after the Board has rendered a report upon such dispute, to strike or lock out, as the case may be, or to take some other action which will or may result in slowing down or stopping the work being performed by the naval-defense contractor concerned. It shall be unlawful, in connection with a labor dispute not referable to the Adjustment Board under section 305, for employees of a naval-defense contractor, or for their representative, to institute or aid in the conduct of a strike, or for a naval defense contractor to institute or conduct a lock-out, or for such employees, representative, or contractor, to take any other action which results, or might result in slowing down or stopping the work being performed by such contractor, until a notice of an intention so to do has been given as provided in this subsection and until after the Board has rendered a report to the public upon the labor dispute giving rise to such proposed strike, lock-out, or other action.

"(c) The notices provided for in this section shall be in such form and shall be given in such manner as the Board may by rules and regulations prescribe.

"(d) Upon receipt by the Board of any notice under subsection (b), the Board shall fix a time and place for joint or separate conferences with the parties to the labor dispute upon the matters involved in such dispute, and it shall be the duty of the parties to the dispute at such conference or conferences to make every reasonable effort to adjust and settle such dispute, and the Board shall assist the parties in negotiating and drafting agreements for the adjustment and settlement of such dispute, and shall also take such steps as it may deem most expedient for the purpose of investigating such dispute and preparing a report thereon. It shall be the duty of the parties to the dispute to attend at the joint or separate conferences at the time and place fixed by the Board, and to continue in such conferences until excused by the Board, but not for a period longer than 20 days after the giving of such notice, unless by mutual consent of the parties such conferences are continued for a longer period.

"(e) Within a period of not more than 20 days after receipt by the Board of any notice under subsection (b) in respect of any labor dispute, or within such longer period as the parties to the dispute consent to by mutual agreement, the Board shall render a report to the public upon such dispute. Such report shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(f) Except as provided in sections 309 and 310, it shall be unlawful for a naval defense contractor, without the written consent of his employees or their representative, to make any change in the rates of pay, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment of any of his employees, until (1) after the expiration of 20 days after the date on which such contractor gives to his employees or their representative notice of such intended change, or (2) after the date on which the Board has rendered a report to the public with respect thereto under subsection (e), whichever occurs later.

"ADJUSTMENT OF GRIEVANCES, AND SO FORTH

"SEC. 305. If an agreement settling a dispute growing out of any grievance or out of the interpretation or application of a collective bargaining agreement is not reached before the expiration of 10 days from the date upon which any party to the dispute gave notice under section 304 (a) of his claims, contentions, and demands to the other parties thereto, such dispute may be referred by petition of the parties or by either party to the Adjustment Board with a full statement of the facts and all supporting data bearing upon such dispute.

"SUBMISSION OF LABOR DISPUTES AFFECTING NAVAL DEFENSE CONTRACTORS TO ARBITRATION

"SEC. 306. (a) At any time during the mediation, investigation, or adjustment of a labor dispute under this title, in which a naval defense contractor or any of his employees is involved, the parties to the dispute may voluntarily submit the issues involved in such dispute to a naval defense arbitration tribunal for settlement. Whenever the parties to any such labor dispute agree to submit the issues involved in such dispute to a naval defense arbitration tribunal for settlement, they shall give notice thereof to the Board. Upon receipt of any such notice the Board shall forthwith appoint the members of such tribunal and they shall proceed to consider the issues involved in such dispute, summoning such witnesses and hearing such testimony as they may deem relevant. The tribunal shall make and file its decision with the parties to the labor dispute and with the Board as expeditiously as possible. Such decision shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(b) Each naval-defense-arbitration tribunal appointed under the provisions of subsection (a) shall consist of three members, one of whom shall represent labor, one of whom shall represent employers, and the third of whom shall represent the public. Members of such tribunals shall receive compensation fixed upon a per diem basis by the Board at a rate not in excess of $25.

"NATIONAL DEFENSE MEDIATION BOARD

"SEC. 307. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) The Board shall, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

"(b) Each member of the Board who, during the period of his service on the Board, is not an officer or employee of the United States, shall receive as compensation for his services $25 per diem on such days as he is performing Board duties. The Board shall appoint without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws an executive secretary and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and shall appoint such other employees with regard to existing laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties and as may be from time to time appropriated for by the Congress. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed.

"(c) All expenses of the Board, including all necessary traveling and subsistence ex-

penses outside of the District of Columbia, incurred by the members or employees of the Board under its orders shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Board or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

"(d) The Board may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any member of the Board shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Board. Any member of the Board or any agent or agency designated by the Board for such purpose may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof at any designated place of hearing.

"(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under subsection (d), any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Board shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"(f) Process and papers of the Board, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Board, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(g) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Board, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(h) All process of any court to which application may be made under this title may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(i) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Board.

"(j) Any power, function, or duty of the Board may be exercised or performed by any division of the Board designated by the Board for that purpose, except that no less than three members shall be assigned to any such division and each of the three groups represented on the Board shall be represented on any such division.

"NAVAL DEFENSE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

"SEC. 308. (a) There is hereby created a board to be known as the Naval Defense Adjustment Board, which shall consist of 36 members, 18 of whom shall be selected by the President upon nomination of naval-defense contractors and 18 by the President upon nomination of national labor organizations. If either the naval-defense contractors or the labor organizations fail to nominate representatives to the Adjustment Board within 30 days after the enactment of this act in the case of any original appointment to the office of a member of the Adjustment Board, or in the case of a vacancy in any such office within 30 days after such vacancy occurs, the President shall thereupon directly make the selection and shall select an individual associated in interest with naval-defense contractors or such labor organizations, whichever such individual is to represent. Each member of the Adjustment Board shall be compensated by the party or parties he is to represent. The Adjustment Board shall adopt such rules as it deems necessary to control proceedings before the respective divisions of the Adjustment Board.

"(b) The Adjustment Board shall be composed of such number of divisions, whose proceedings shall be independent of one another, as the Board shall deem necessary to expedite the work of the Adjustment Board. The Board shall designate the members of the Adjustment Board to serve on each such division, but on each such division naval-defense contractors and such labor organizations, respectively, shall have equal representation. Each division of the Adjustment Board shall annually designate one of its members to act as chairman. Each division of the Adjustment Board shall submit an annual report to the Board of its activities. The Adjustment Board, subject to the approval of the Board, may employ and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems necessary in carrying on the proceedings of its several divisions, and the compensation of such employees shall be paid by the Board. The several divisions of the Adjustment Board shall be supplied with suitable quarters in any Federal building located at their respective places of meeting.

"(c) Any division of the Adjustment Board shall have authority to empower two or more of its members to conduct hearings and make findings upon disputes, when properly submitted, at any place designated by the division, but the final award as to any such dispute shall be made by the entire division. Parties may be heard either in person, by counsel, or by other representatives, and the several divisions of the Adjustment Board shall give due notice of all hearings to the employee or employees and the naval-defense contractor or contractors involved in any disputes submitted to them.

"(d) A majority vote of all members of a division of the Adjustment Board shall be required to make an award with respect to any dispute submitted to such division. Upon the failure of any division to agree upon an award because of a deadlock or inability to secure a majority vote, then such division shall forthwith agree upon and select a referee to make the award. Should the division fail to agree upon and select a referee within 10 days of the date of the deadlock or inability to secure a majority vote, then the division, or any member thereof, or either party to the dispute, may certify that fact to the Board, and the Board shall, within 10 days from the date of receiving such certificate, select the referee to sit with the division and make an award. Referees selected by the division or by the Board under this subsection shall receive such reasonable compensation for their services as the Board may prescribe, together with traveling expenses and expenses actually incurred for subsistence while so serving. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid by the Board.

"(e) The awards of the several divisions of the Adjustment Board shall be stated in writing. A copy of the award shall be furnished to the parties to the dispute, and the award shall be final and binding upon both parties to the dispute, and any such award may be enforced in the same manner as awards made by the National Railroad Adjustment Board under title I of the Railway Labor Act.

"UNLAWFUL CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 309. Until the existing national-defense emergency is proclaimed by the President to have ended, it shall be unlawful, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for a naval-defense contractor, by discrimination in regard to hire, terms, or tenure of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization, unless such discrimination is required by the terms of a contract or agreement with a labor organization entered into prior to the date of enactment of this title which complies with the provisions of section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, or by the terms of any subsequent contract or agreement with the same labor organization which complies with the provisions of such section 8 (3).

"SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES AMONG EMPLOYEES OF NAVAL-DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

"SEC. 310. (a) It shall be unlawful for any naval-defense contractor knowingly to employ or retain in his employment any individual whom such contractor has reasonable cause to believe—

"(1) teaches, advocates, or believes in, or at any time has taught, advocated, or believed in the duty, necessity, or propriety of controlling, conducting, seizing, or overthrowing the Government of the United States by force, violence, military measures, or threats thereof; or

"(2) is, or at any time was, a member of, or is soliciting or advocating or at any time has solicited or advocated membership in the Communist Party, the Young Communists League, the German-American Bund, or any organization which teaches, advocates, or believes in, or at any time has taught, advocated, or believed in, the duty, necessity, or propriety of controlling, conducting, seizing, or overthrowing the Government of the United States by force, violence, military measures, or threats thereof; or

"(3) is disseminating or distributing, or at any time has disseminated or distributed, any book, pamphlet, leaflet, or other item of written, printed, or graphic matter (A) teaching or advocating the duty, necessity, or propriety of controlling, conducting, seizing, or overthrowing the Government of the United States by force, violence, military measures, or threats thereof; or (B) soliciting or advocating membership in the Communist Party, the Young Communists League, the German-American Bund, or in any organization which teaches, advocates, or believes in the duty, necessity, or propriety of controlling, conducting, seizing, or overthrowing the Government of the United States by force, violence, military measures, or threats thereof.

"(b) If, in the case of any individual whom a naval-defense contractor has discharged or refused to employ, the Board determines that such contractor at the time of such discharge or refusal to employ had reasonable cause to believe that such individual was an individual described in subsection (a), (1), (2), or (3), no order issued under section

10 of the National Labor Relations Act shall require such contractor to reinstate or employ such individual or to pay to such individual any amount of back pay or any amount in respect of such discharge or refusal to employ.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 311. Any person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of section 304, 309, or 310, or who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Board or of the Adjustment Board, or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this title shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 312. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title is hereby authorized."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act, except section 308 of such amendment, shall take effect upon the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this act. Section 308 of such amendment shall take effect immediately. Such amendment shall cease to be in effect after the expiration of 3 years from such date of enactment.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to further expedite the national-defense program by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith without stoppage of work, and for other purposes."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the bill contains only two sections and the first section is some 16 or 18 pages long, in the interest of time and to focus the issue, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, this means that the bill will be printed in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be printed in the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Does this mean that the entire bill will be printed in the RECORD at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Does the gentleman intend also to print the amendments that are proposed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is doing right now, offering his bill as an amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. So the bill will be printed in full in the RECORD at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that amendments will, of course, be reported and printed in the RECORD.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to H. R. 4139 proposed by Mr. RAMSPECK: Strike out the first section and insert the following as a substitute for the bill:

"Be it enacted etc., That this act may be cited as the 'National Defense Mediation Act.'

"SEC. 2. It is declared to be the policy of the United States that labor disputes affecting the national defense should be settled fairly and without interruption or delay in the production necessary for the adequate defense of the Nation. To this end there are hereby established additional facilities for the voluntary settlement of such disputes as cannot be settled expeditiously by collective bargaining and by existing conciliation and mediation procedures.

"NATIONAL DEFENSE MEDIATION BOARD

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a board to be known as the National Defense Mediation Board (in this act called the Board), which shall be composed of such number of members, appointed by the President, as the President from time to time deems the work of the Board to require The Board shall consist of a number of members representative of employers, a like number representative of employees, and a number of disinterested members representative of the public (in this act called, respectively, employer members, employee members, and public members). The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman of the Board from among the public members. The President is also authorized to appoint such number of alternate public members, employer members, and employee members as he deems appropriate. Upon designation by the Chairman, an alternate member may serve upon the panels provided for in section 5 of this act, and may serve as a substitute for any absent regular member in the same representative group, with full power to act as a regular member of the Board. The members and alternate members shall receive such compensation for their services as the President shall, from time to time, determine.

"(b) In the absence of the Chairman of the Board the Vice Chairman shall be authorized to act as Chairman. In the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice Chairman the Chairman shall designate some public member or alternate public member of the Board to act as Chairman.

"(c) Two members or alternate members from each representative group shall constitute a quorum of the Board. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(d) The Board is authorized to employ such officers and employees not otherwise provided for, as may be necessary, and to fix the compensation of such officers and employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services and, with the approval of the President, the services and facilities of such other departments and agencies of the Government, as may from time to time be needed.

"(e) The Board may delegate to any public member or alternate public member or to an executive secretary such administrative duties relating to the internal management of the Board's affairs as it may deem appropriate.

"(f) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers in any other place.

"(g) Upon the appointment of the Chairman of the Board, the National Defense Mediation Board created under Executive Order No. 8716 of March 19, 1941, shall cease to exist. Thereupon, all records, papers, and property of the Board created by such Executive order shall become the records, papers, and property of the Board.

"JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 4. The Chairman shall determine whether any labor dispute (excluding any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act) substantially affects the national defense and cannot be expeditiously adjusted by collective bargaining or other conciliation and mediation procedures. If he so determines, the Board shall have jurisdiction of the dispute.

"PROCEDURE FOR MEDIATION

"SEC. 5. After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute, the Board, under the direction of the Chairman, shall make every reasonable effort to assist the parties to adjust and settle the dispute and make agreements for that purpose. To such end the Board may utilize, and the Chairman may designate, a mediation panel consisting exclusively of disinterested persons representative of the public or consisting of one or more persons representative of employers, a like number representative of employees, and a disinterested person or persons representative of the public. The persons designated may be members of the Board, alternate members of the Board, or other persons named by the Board. The Chairman or the mediation panel may at any time request the parties to a dispute to negotiate by collective bargaining or to meet with any representatives of the Board.

"VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

"SEC. 6. In the event that a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining or mediation under section 5, the Chairman or the mediation panel shall endeavor to induce the parties to the dispute voluntarily to submit their differences to arbitration. If the parties consent to arbitration, they shall file with the Board a notice of the agreement to arbitrate the dispute. The award of the arbitrator shall be filed with the Board.

"PROCEDURE FOR FACT FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) In the event that a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining or mediation under section 5, or by voluntary arbitration, the Chairman in his discretion may authorize a panel to investigate the issues involved in the dispute and to make findings of fact and formulate recommendations, which may contain appropriate retroactive provisions, for the settlement of such dispute. Such a panel may, in the discretion of the Chairman, consist of the mediation panel appointed for the dispute, a different panel constituted as provided in section 5, or a panel composed of the full Board. The panel may confer with the parties to the dispute, conduct hearings, and take testimony. The Board shall submit the findings and recommendations, if approved by a majority of the panel, to the parties and may make public such findings and recommendations.

"MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

"SEC. 8. (a) After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 4, the Board in order to effectuate the purposes of this act shall have power to issue an order (1) requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute; or (2) requiring the employer, who is involved in the dispute to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation led to the dispute, and which the Board shall deem prejudicial to the prompt settlement of the dispute. No order of the Board or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent, nor

shall any provision of any such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act.

"(b) Such order shall be effective for such period as the Board shall determine, but shall, in any event, terminate within 5 days after the findings and recommendations of the Board or within 60 days after the date on which the order was issued, whichever first occurs. Any further order issued under subsection (a) in connection with the same dispute shall not extend beyond the termination date of the original order but terminate at the same time as such original order.

"(c) The Attorney General, at the request of the Board, shall petition any district court of the United States, or the United States court of any Territory or possession, within the jurisdiction of which any person to whom any order is directed resides, transacts business, or is found, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, for enforcement of such order, and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enforcing the order of the Board. Notice or process of the court under this section may be served in any judicial district, either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person to be served. Petitions filed under this section shall be heard with all possible expedition. The judgment and decree of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals or by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case of a judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari.

"(d) An order of the Board shall be enforceable only at the suit of the Attorney General, and in the manner provided for in this section.

"(e) When granting temporary relief or restraining order, or making or entering a decree enforcing an order of the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, except that sections 11 and 12 of such act shall apply in cases of contempt.

"REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 9. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind regulations providing appropriate procedures for carrying out the powers vested in it by this act.

"PROCURING OF EVIDENCE AND ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES

"SEC. 10. For the purposes of the foregoing provisions of this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to examination, the production of books, papers, and documents, and attendance of witnesses) and of section 5 (f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Board, and may be exercised by any public member or alternate public member, or any employee of the Board authorized by the Chairman. The term "witness" as used in these sections shall include a party involved in a labor dispute.

"OPERATION OF CERTAIN PLANTS IN INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

"SEC. 11. If the parties to a labor dispute fail to reach an agreement through collective bargaining, conciliation, or mediation or the procedures herein provided, or in the case of a dispute within the purview of the Railway Labor Act through the procedures provided in such act, and the President finds that a continuation of the dispute imperils the public interest and substantially jeopardizes the national-defense program, the President in his discretion shall have power, by order, on behalf of the United States to take immediate possession of any establishment or facility (including any transportation or communication facility) in which there is an interruption or threatened interruption of operation arising out of the dispute, and to use and operate such establishment or facility in accordance with the authority contained in section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. In the case of any establishment or facility of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this section, such establishment or facility shall be returned to its owners when this act ceases to be in effect or whenever prior thereto the President determines that such establishment or facility will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense.

"DEFENSE WAGE BOARD

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a Defense Wage Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. The President shall designate one member to serve as chairman.

"(b) The Board is authorized to appoint such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out its duties under this act and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(c) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out its duties under this act.

"(d) A majority of the employees at any plant or facility possession of which has been or is hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 11 of this act or section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or the representative of such employees, may petition the Board for a readjustment of wages. Upon receipt of any such petition, the Board shall make an investigation of the wages paid at such plant or facility, the costs of living in the locality in which such plant or facility is situated, the wages established for work of like or comparable character in the industry, and such other factors as the Board may deem necessary or desirable in the public interest. If, after such investigation, the Board finds that the wages paid at such plant or facility are not fair and reasonable, it shall, with the approval of the President, order such readjustments of wages as it deems will fairly and reasonably compensate said employees for their work. If the Board finds that such wages are fair and reasonable, it shall dismiss the petition. The findings and orders made by the Board under the authority of this section shall be final, and shall not be subject to review by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency.

"SAVING CLAUSE

"SEC. 13. Except as otherwise expressly provided herein, nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect any other statute of the United States, unless such statute should be in necessary conflict with the specific requirements of this act.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 14. This act shall cease to be in effect on the expiration of 2 years from the date of its enactment or upon the date upon which the President proclaims the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by him on May 27, 1941, terminated, whichever occurs first."

Mr. RAMSPECK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this bill has been reported by the Committee on Labor and printed, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment and print it in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered in the nature of a substitute for the Vinson bill is H. R. 6137, and it is available at the desk.

I have made one minor amendment in section 11 of that printed bill, which makes it certain that in cases dealing with transportation facilities the procedures of the Railway Labor Act shall be exhausted before the President shall have the power to take over any transportation facilities. This was done at the request of the Railroad Brotherhoods, and I think it was a reasonable request and in line with the desire of our committee.

I now read you a letter which I think has an important bearing on the issue we are to decide here today.

The following letter, dated December 1, addressed to me, was received by me, and is as follows:

PARLOR CORPORATION,
CORNER CHESTNUT,
GREENWOOD LAKE, N. Y.,
December 1, 1941.

To Representative RAMSPECK, of Georgia,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thought I would hastily drop you a few lines so you can advise the others in Washington that it would be useless to pass any antistrike laws for the Nation, for men are not going to wear themselves out, work 10 hours a day for under pay to make steel men and others interested in fat profits, and not even for the Government, whose officials all get fat salaries.

The results will be less production. It takes about 1,000 men now to produce 100 men's work in shipyards. The men are underpaid, must risk their lives daily, someone hurt and killed every week, while the officials in Washington wax fat on soft jobs. I work in a shipyard and know. Each night I am all in at 10 hours.

Every time a new tax is put on, it's a cut in wages, and for revenge men get even by failing to produce. It's a dangerous thing to pass antistrike laws. It will delay the progress of the work, and men won't work at point of guns.

Better inform the others. I am merely writing this to help you give the others some light on the subject. You know most of the men have been out of a job since 1929 and are deep in debt, and it will be several years before they get out of debt or they refuse to pay. So if you stop them from earning a decent wage, by antistrike laws, they will just further refuse to produce, and there won't be the production even as now. You can't force the men to make others rich

on their sweat. Hope you can see the reason of not passing antistrike laws. I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE R. RILEY.

I read that, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of emphasizing what I said in general debate.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have not the time and I do not yield. I have put it into the RECORD, having read it for the purpose of emphasizing the statement I made in general debate that if the statement in the letter is true, if we are to be faced with a rebellion of labor in this country, the time to find it out is now, and not when we get actually involved in war. I do not believe this letter represents the sentiment of any considerable part of organized labor, but I do believe that in deciding this issue we must take into consideration the reasonableness or the unreasonableness of legislation that we adopt in the minds of the working people themselves. That is why I am going to vote against the Smith substitute, which is going to be offered to the substitute I have just offered. We have given you from the Committee on Labor a reasonable bill that can stop strikes for a period of 60 days, so that the mediation process can work, and if that fails, then it is provided that the President may under statutory authority take over the plant, as he has been doing heretofore under his authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. That is, I think, as far as we ought to go with emergency legislation. The matters contained in the other proposals here I think should be carefully considered by the proper committees after deliberate hearings, and then Congress can act upon those proposals, which undertake to perform a major operation on the body of the labor law that this Congress has enacted throughout the years. This bill that I am offering you provides the processes of collective bargaining, conciliation, mediation, voluntary arbitration, and if all of those fail, then plant seizure under statutory authority. It will stop strikes, because the Board has the authority to use the power of the Federal courts for a period of 60 days to stop picketing, to stop any act that assists in the conduct of a strike. It can stop strike benefits; it can stop anything which undertakes to assist or help in the maintenance of a strike. Therefore, it will be effective, it will do the job, and it is as far, in my judgment, as we ought to go at this time unless we want to run into the danger of alienating the loyalty of the workers, 98 percent of whom have been just as loyal as anybody else in this emergency.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot yield. The workers in my own district have had only one strike during this emergency, and I want the minority, which has caused these strikes, stopped, but I do not want to penalize those who have been going along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an announcement. The Committee on Appropriations will today report out the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, 1942, and Members of the House are apprised that copies of the hearings and the report are now available. We expect to take up the bill for consideration immediately following the disposition of the pending bill—doubtless Thursday morning—with the intention of passing it this week. The hearings are being distributed in the committee room and may be had on application. The committee clerks will be glad to supply information relative to the bill or its consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the Ramspeck proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers a substitute for the Ramspeck proposal, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk reads the bill, have there not been some changes made in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Virginia will explain what they are.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia offers the following as a substitute for the Ramspeck bill: Strike out the first section of the bill and insert the following as a substitute:

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. As used in this act—

"(a) 'Person' means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

"(b) 'Defense contract' means—

"(1) a contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission;

"(2) a contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled 'An act to promote the defense of the United States';

"(3) a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, or repair of—

"(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

"(B) any building, structure, or facility;

"(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

"(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, or repair of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for for national-defense purposes.

"(c) 'Defense contractor' means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, or repairing under a defense contract.

"(d) The terms 'employer,' 'employee,' 'representative,' 'labor organization,' and 'labor dispute' shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

"MAINTENANCE OF STATUS QUO

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for a defense contractor to conduct a lock-out or for employees of a national-defense contractor to strike until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which they or their representatives give to such contractor and the Secretary of Labor written notice of their intention to do so together with a statement of their reasons for such intended strike or lock-out.

"STRIKE BALLOTS

"SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for employees of a defense contractor to strike until after the Secretary of Labor has certified the result of a secret ballot taken, under the direction of the United States Conciliation Service, of said employees employed at the plant, plants, or other place or places of employment, or in the bargaining unit or units, with respect to which the notice under section 2 applies. At any time after the employees of a defense contractor, or their representatives, give notice under section 2, such employees of any defense contractor or their representative may request the Secretary of Labor to take, through the United States Conciliation Service, a secret ballot of the employees at the plant, plants, or other place or places of employment, or in the bargaining unit or units, with respect to which such notice applies, for the purpose of determining whether such employees favor or oppose such proposed strike. Upon receiving any such request, the Secretary of Labor shall direct the United States Conciliation Service to take forthwith such secret ballot, and the Secretary shall by order certify the results thereof, which shall be open to public inspection.

"UNLAWFUL CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for a defense contractor, by discrimination in regard to hire, terms, or tenure of employment, to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization, unless such discrimination is required by the terms of a contract or agreement with a labor organization entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this act which complies with the provisions of section 8 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, or by the terms of any voluntary subsequent contract or agreement with the same labor organization.

"VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION

"SEC. 5. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, by the use of force or violence or threats thereof, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any individual from accepting employment by, or continuing in the employment of, any defense contractor, or from entering or leaving any place of employment of such contractor in the course of such employment.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, it shall be unlawful for one or more persons, for the purpose of inducing any person to work or abstain from working for a defense contractor, to watch or beset a house or place where a person resides or the approach to such house or place.

"JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES, BOYCOTTS, SYMPATHY STRIKES

"SEC. 6. (a) It shall be unlawful, by means of a strike against a person (whether or not a defense contractor), or by means of a concerted refusal to work on, handle, or otherwise deal with articles or materials produced or manufactured by any such person, to induce or require or to attempt to induce or require another person who is a defense contractor to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, any labor organization.

"(b) It shall be unlawful, by means of a strike against a defense contractor, or by means of a concerted refusal to work on, handle, or otherwise deal with articles or materials purchased, produced, manufactured, or used by a defense contractor, to induce or require or to attempt to induce or require such contractor to recognize, deal with, comply with the demands of, or employ members of, one labor organization instead of another labor organization with which such contractor has an applicable collective-bargaining agreement.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 7. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, not-

withstanding the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' to enjoin violations and threatened violations of any of the provisions of section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, and by appropriate order or decree to compel compliance with such provisions.

"(b) Any person violating any of the provisions of section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 shall be liable to a civil suit to any person injured thereby for damages resulting from such injury.

"(c) Any individual who violates any of the provisions of section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 shall on and after such violation cease to have and cease to be entitled to (1) the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act; (2) any employment or other benefits under or pursuant to any act making appropriations for relief purposes; or (3) any unemployment compensation or other benefits under or pursuant to title III or title IX of the Social Security Act.

"(d) Any person other than an individual who violates any of the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 shall on and after such violation cease to have and cease to be entitled to (1) the status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act; (2) the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purposes of section 4 of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'

"(e) In case any individual who violates any of the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 is an officer or representative of a labor organization, then on and after such violation and so long as such individual is an officer or representative of such labor organization, such labor organization shall cease to have or be entitled to the status of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act and cease to have the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purposes of section 4 of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'

"REGISTRATION OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 8. Within 30 days after the date of enactment of this act and annually thereafter every labor organization in which employees of any defense contractor participate, through its president or other authorized officer, shall register its identity with the National Labor Relations Board and shall state under oath the following information and such other information as the Board may require by regulations as provided in section 6: The name of the labor organization; the address at which it has its principal office or does business; the names and titles of the officers; the company or companies with which the labor organization deals, if a local organization; the industry or industries in which the labor organization operates if a national organization or a craft; initiation fees; annual dues charged each member; assessments levied during the past 12-month period; limitations on membership; number of paid-up members; date of the last election of officers; the method of election; the vote for and against each candidate for office; and the date of the last detailed financial statement furnished all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement. With such information shall be filed under oath detailed and intelligible financial statements and a copy of the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization.

"SEC. 9. Every labor organization established after the date of enactment of this act in which employees of any defense contractor participate shall, when established and annually thereafter, register with the Board and furnish the information required of existing labor organizations under the provisions of section 7.

"SEC. 10. Any labor organization which fails to register with the Board and file the information required by this act shall be disqualified to act as the representative of employees in collective bargaining for such time as such failure shall continue: *Provided*, That in the initial registration only if information on a particular point is lacking, the statement 'no information' or 'no record' shall be considered an answer.

"MEDIATION OF LABOR DISPUTES AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

"SEC. 11. It is declared to be the policy of the United States that labor disputes affecting the national defense should be settled fairly and without interruption or delay in the production necessary for the adequate defense of the Nation. To this end there are hereby established additional facilities for the voluntary settlement of such disputes as cannot be settled expeditiously by collective bargaining and by existing conciliation and mediation procedures.

"NATIONAL DEFENSE MEDIATION BOARD

"SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a board to be known as the National Defense Mediation Board (in this act called the Board), which shall be composed of such number of members, appointed by the President, as the President from time to time deems the work of the Board to require. The Board shall consist of a number of members representative of employers, a like number representative of employees, and a number of disinterested members representative of the public (in this act called, respectively, employer members, employee members, and public members). The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman of the Board from among the public members. The President is also authorized to appoint such number of alternate public members, employer members, and employee members as he deems appropriate. Upon designation by the Chairman, an alternate member may serve upon the panels provided for in section 5 of this act, and may serve as a substitute for any absent regular member in the same representative group, with full power to act as a regular member of the Board. The members and alternate members shall receive such compensation for their services as the President shall, from time to time, determine.

"(b) In the absence of the Chairman of the Board, the Vice Chairman shall be authorized to act as chairman. In the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, the Chairman shall designate some public member or alternate public member of the Board to act as Chairman.

"(c) Two members or alternate members from each representative group shall constitute a quorum of the Board. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"(d) The Board is authorized to employ such officers and employees not otherwise provided for, as may be necessary, and to fix the compensation of such officers and employees in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Board may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services and, with the approval of the President, the services and facilities of such other departments and agencies of the Government, as may from time to time be needed.

"(e) The Board may delegate to any public member or alternate public member or to an executive secretary such administrative duties relating to the internal management of the Board's affairs as it may deem appropriate.

"(f) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers in any other place.

"(g) Upon the appointment of the Chairman of the Board, the National Defense Mediation Board created under Executive Order No. 8716 of March 19, 1941, shall cease to exist. Thereupon, all records, papers, and property of the Board created by such Executive order shall become the records, papers, and property of the Board.

"JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 13. The Chairman shall determine whether any labor dispute (excluding any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act) substantially affects the national defense and cannot be expeditiously adjusted by collective bargaining or other conciliation and mediation procedures. If he so determines, the Board shall have jurisdiction of the dispute.

"PROCEDURE FOR MEDIATION

"SEC. 14. After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute, the Board, under the direction of the Chairman, shall make every reasonable effort to assist the parties to adjust and settle the dispute and make agreements for that purpose. To such end, the Board may utilize, and the Chairman may designate, a mediation panel consisting exclusively of disinterested persons representative of the public or consisting of one or more persons representative of employers, a like number representative of employees, and a disinterested person or persons representative of the public. The persons designated may be members of the Board, alternate members of the Board, or other persons named by the Board. The Chairman or the mediation panel may at any time request the parties to a dispute to negotiate by collective bargaining or to meet with any representatives of the Board.

"VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

"SEC. 15. In the event that a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining or mediation under section 5, the Chairman or the mediation panel shall endeavor to induce the parties to the dispute voluntarily to submit their differences to arbitration. If the parties consent to arbitration, they shall file with the Board a notice of the agreement to arbitrate the dispute. The award of the arbitrator shall be filed with the Board.

"PROCEDURE FOR FACT FINDING AND RECOMMENDATIONS

"SEC. 16. (a) In the event that a dispute is not settled by collective bargaining or mediation under section 5, or by voluntary arbitration, the Chairman in his discretion may authorize a panel to investigate the issues involved in the dispute and to make findings of fact and formulate recommendations, which may contain appropriate retroactive provisions, for the settlement of such dispute. Such a panel may, in the discretion of the Chairman, consist of the mediation panel appointed for the dispute, a different panel constituted as provided in section 5, or a panel composed of the full Board. The panel may confer with the parties to the dispute, conduct hearings, and take testimony. The Board shall submit the findings and recommendations, if approved by a majority of the panel, to the parties and may make public such findings and recommendations.

"MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

"SEC. 17. (a) After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 4, the Chairman in order to effectuate the purposes of this act shall have power to issue an order (1) requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute; or (2) requiring the employer, who is involved in the dispute to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation led to the dispute, and

which the Chairman shall deem prejudicial to the prompt settlement of the dispute. No order of the Chairman or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent, nor shall any provision of any such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act.

"(b) Such order shall be effective for such period as the Chairman shall determine, but shall, in any event, terminate within 5 days after the findings and recommendations of the Board or within 60 days after the date on which the order was issued, whichever first occurs. Any further order issued under subsection (a) in connection with the same dispute shall not extend beyond the termination date of the original order but terminate at the same time as such original order.

"(c) The Attorney General, at the request of the Chairman, shall petition any district court of the United States, or the United States court of any Territory or possession, within the jurisdiction of which any person to whom any order is directed resides, transacts business, or is found, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, for enforcement of such order, and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enforcing the order of the Chairman. Notice or process of the court under this section may be served in any judicial district, either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence of principal office or place of business of the person to be served. Petitions filed under this section shall be heard with all possible expedition. The judgment and decree of the court shall be subject to review by the appropriate circuit court of appeals or by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case of a judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari.

"(d) An order of the Chairman shall be enforceable only at the suit of the Attorney General, and in the manner provided for in this section.

"(e) When granting temporary relief or restraining order, or making or entering a decree enforcing an order of the Chairman, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932, except that sections 11 and 12 of such act shall apply in cases of contempt.

"REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 18. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind regulations providing appropriate procedures for carrying out the powers vested in it by this act.

"PROCURING OF EVIDENCE AND ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES

"SEC. 19. For the purposes of the foregoing provisions of this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to examination, the production of books, papers, and documents, and attendance of witnesses) and of section 5 (f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Board, and may be exercised by any public member or alternate public member, or any employee of the Board authorized by the Chairman. The term 'witness' as used in these sections shall include a party involved in a labor dispute.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 20. This act shall cease to be in effect on the expiration of 2 years from the date of its enactment or upon the date upon which the President proclaims the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by him on May 27, 1941, terminated, whichever occurs first."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Ramspeck bill does some good things, but remember this, the Ramspeck bill does not touch those things that have caused strikes in defense industries. If you are going to do anything about this situation there are two features of it that you must take care of. One is to freeze the closed shop and stop organizational strikes in your defense industries. The other is to prohibit violence in strikes, so that men who want to exercise the right to work shall be protected.

Those are the two main features that any comprehensive legislation on this subject must and should contain.

The bill which I offer as a substitute is the same bill which I offered some time ago, H. R. 6066, with the addition of two features. One is the accounting and registration of labor unions which everybody seemed to want. I have then added to the bill which I introduced, the so-called Ramspeck bill, but have stricken therefrom the property-seizure clause in that bill. I made another minor correction in the bill. On the registration of labor unions I have made a slight change so as to avoid any question of its germaneness and have tied it in to national defense. Then I changed the Ramspeck bill so as to provide that in this stop order provided in the Ramspeck bill the stop order might be put in motion by the chairman instead of by the Board. Those are all the changes. If you will take note of those changes you will then have a full and complete story of the bill H. R. 6149.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that brings before you the whole picture and it leaves to this House to decide what and how much you want to do about it. You are at liberty now to offer your amendment to strike out any part of that bill that you think is not necessary or desirable, and then it is going to be up to this House in a democratic way to decide whether you want that clause or whether you do not want it. If you do not want secret elections before a strike occurs, it is your privilege to move to strike out that section.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. In your bill, on page 12, section 15, it purports to set up voluntary arbitration. Is this compulsory or voluntary arbitration?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is the Ramspeck bill. It is compulsory to arbitrate, but not compulsory to accept, as I understand it. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] will correct me if I am wrong. It is not compulsory to accept the arbitration finding.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is neither compulsory to arbitrate nor compulsory to accept the arbitration.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then there is not much to it.

Mr. HARNESS. Then, what would happen to either an employer or an employee in the event they refused to go before the Mediation Board?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, they could invoke this stop order if a strike came. But my main objection to the theory upon which the Ramspeck bill is based is that you cannot have this stop order entered until after the Board takes jurisdiction. Strikes are going to happen before the Board ever gets jurisdiction. In other words, strikes are going to be called that otherwise very likely would not be called. They will call a strike first and they will conciliate afterward.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to correct a statement and give the information?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If any party, under the Ramspeck bill, refuses to mediate after the Mediation Board has taken jurisdiction, they are subject to prosecution under the Federal Trade Act.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman give us his reason for not accepting that provision in the Ramspeck bill covering seizure of plants, which is commonly known as the Connally amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have two reasons. The first reason is that we have it already, apparently, because the President has seized them already. The second reason is that I do not think you should take an industry's plant away from it because labor strikes. I do not think that is necessary, advisable, or fair.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that so many Members want to be heard today, I think it is nothing but fair and proper that all be given an opportunity, and I think we can accomplish that by confining all remarks on each amendment to the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that this is one of the most important issues that has ever come before the Congress.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that is the very reason I want to do that.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Every man does not want to talk 5 minutes, but we would like to hear these Members who have studied the question and are informed on it for longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the principal purpose of holding everybody to 5 minutes—to give everybody an opportunity to participate in the debate and get all the information they want. The gentleman just propounding the question can take the floor and get all the information he desires by asking questions of

the gentleman from Virginia. In that way every Member can be heard, and no one will have an advantage over another Member.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia object to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the issue has now been made. The gentleman from Georgia has offered from the Labor Committee their viewpoint, which is found in the bill H. R. 6137. I might say that practically every word in that bill, at least the skeleton and the groundwork, is similar and practically identical with the Naval Affairs substitute that was reported to the House and voted out by the committee on the 25th day of June.

As far as the Mediation Board is concerned, the Labor Committee is on the right premise. They are proceeding upon the right line for mediation.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has introduced a substitute, H. R. 6149, which contains matter other than is in the Ramspeck bill. The issue is clean-cut. You must bear in mind that nothing will be read by the Clerk. The Clerk will not read the Ramspeck bill by section, nor will he read the Smith bill by section, because they are one amendment. It is in order therefore at any time for any Member to offer an amendment to the Ramspeck proposition or to the Smith proposition, but I hope that the House will first address its consideration to the Smith proposal.

The Smith proposal is set out in H. R. 6149 and it runs from page 1 down to page 9. Everything prior to that is the Smith proposal, everything after that the Ramspeck proposal. This makes the issue clear.

Every Member has a right to offer an amendment to the Ramspeck section, he has a right to offer an amendment to the Smith section, but in the interest of orderly procedure let us first take up the Smith proposition, handle that, and see if the House approves these additional features that are incorporated in the mediation phase of the bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It might be pointed out for the information of the House that the first vote will come on the Smith proposal.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The amendment should now therefore be directed to the Smith proposal and let the House dispose of that either up or down first.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has just stated the sequence in which the votes will come. I think, of course, that the substitute we brought in for our original bill is not as strong, nor does it have as many teeth in it as the Smith bill because the Smith bill carries in it certain provisions that make it stronger.

So I am going to vote for perfecting the Smith bill, adding some teeth and workable provisions to the Smith bill, because I want to say in all frankness and candor that my committee's own handiwork and my own handiwork, which has been adopted practically in toto by the Committee on Labor, lacks the necessary points to accomplish the job.

If the House wants to have a milk-and-cider proposition that will practically accomplish just what is going on now by having a legislative existence for the Mediation Board, you have a workable plan; but if you want to do something that strikes at the very evil that has caused these 24,000,000 man-days to be lost in the defense industry, then write something in the bill along sane and constructive lines as set out in the Smith proposal.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman referred to the Smith substitute as H. R. 6149. Do I understand correctly that in the amendment as submitted here, section 20 of H. R. 6149 has been eliminated?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Section 20 has been eliminated, and section 21 which provides for a wage board has been eliminated.

I hope the committee now—and it is only a hope—in the interest of orderly procedure, in the interest of our having an opportunity to understand the issue we are vitally concerned about, will address its attention to the Smith amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

First, I want to commend the committee, speaking generally, for the spirit in which they are investigating and determining what should be done about this proposed important legislation.

The Committee on the Judiciary has had some of these bills before it. We addressed a communication to the Executive Agency asking if any additional legislation was required in order to keep these plants open. Recently the President has indicated that he desires additional legislation to enable him to keep these factories in operation.

If I may be permitted to observe, it seems to me that in the consideration of this matter criticism of individuals and of unions themselves does not find any proper place. This is a very dangerous matter with which we are dealing. We want to be absolutely fair about it. This labor situation is largely the natural result of well-understood causes. As supporting that statement I want to direct your attention to a similar situation which existed in 1928, and before that, with regard to industry and to the similarity of causes. I called attention then to the danger when we were developing in this country a sort of economic feudalism.

The movement was very rapid, indeed. It was practically free from governmental restraint. The antitrust and similar laws were not enforced. The movement was supported by public opinion; at least, public acquiescence. Those connected with business seemed to have no realization of the danger that was involved in this swinging of the pendulum so far in their direction. Human beings do not seem to be able to exercise that restraint with reference to a movement of that sort in which they are engaged, the restraint necessary to protect the public and themselves against self-inflicted hurt. It is therefore the responsibility and the duty of statesmanship to supply that in which human nature seems deficient—a duty both to the public and to whatever legitimate interests are involved. That restraint was not afforded. The support of public opinion was lost. The pendulum swung backward. Then labor, under its own momentum, the justice of its cause accentuated by the support of public opinion and later added to by governmental action began to acquire in this country a momentum dangerous to its own safety. And now labor confronts the same danger that industry confronted in 1928. That danger is greatly accentuated by the fact that we are moving rapidly into fighting contact with this war. I believe we would arrive at a wiser determination and there would be less internal hurt, if we examined this matter from that standpoint and be guided in this determination by what seems to be sound statesmanship rather than by trying to establish the fact that these problems with reference to labor result from some baseness of character on the part of those engaged in labor. Not only is it a dangerous approach, it is an unfair approach.

Perhaps I can make myself more clearly understood by incorporating some brief excerpts from a speech I made in 1928, 13 years ago, with regard to the difficulty and danger confronted by industry. I said:

> Those who are pressing this movement are not true friends to their own interest. They are getting the country ready for a swing-back. The thing which is happening now has not infrequently occurred during the almost 2,000 years of the history of our system. It is the phenomenon of the swinging of the pendulum which any country boy can see manifesting itself through the old grapevine swing and which students of nature know is a law universal, operating everywhere. Private fortunes can be imperiled in this country only by those who possess them.

That was 13 years ago. As I view the situation, labor confronts the same danger now which industry confronted in 1928. These avoidable strikes in defense industries are driving away with great rapidity the well-earned and well-deserved support of labor engaged in the effort to win for itself a fair opportunity while doing its part of the necessary work of the world.

Members of this House today face a definite duty to labor, to the country, and to the President, the chief executive officer of the Nation, to deal with the situation as justly and as effectively as possible, to provide for labor in this situation that element of restraint in its own interest and in the public interest which human experience demonstrates. It is unsafe and unfair to trust human beings to provide for themselves in such situations. That is the reason why we have government. That is the reason

why there are supposed to be statesmen responsible for governmental policy. As I view it, labor has a larger interest in being protected against the relatively small number of unfortunate occurrences which are hurtful to the public interest than any other part of our citizenship. Their interest is equal to that of any other group of people, and they have in addition to that this peculiar interest in the retention as far as possible of the support of public opinion and public attitude. Can any intelligent laboring man or woman doubt the tremendous effect of these strikes in defense industries upon public opinion and public support? The fact that this character of legislation is now being considered on the floor of the House, that the President has requested legislation, is a result of this adverse development of public opinion, this loss of its support. That public opinion does not come solely from the public outside of organized labor—it is coming up from the ranks of organized labor as well, which shows conclusively that, in addition to the loss of the support of public opinion, there is a loss of intra-organization solidarity and strength.

It seems to me highly important not only from the standpoint of public interest, but from the standpoint of the interest of organized labor and its individual members, that an attempt be made to establish a better method than strikes to settle disputes in these defense industries It is our duty, Mr. Chairman, to give to the President the sort of power essential to do the job which the necessities of this country, in the opinion of the people of this country, require him to do. If there is anything required to see to it that the interests and the rights of the people who labor in these defense industries are protected, I for one would go the limit in seeing to it that it is taken care of by proper legislation. In other words, we must develop in this country and use in this country a better method for settling disputes in these defense industries than paralyzing their production affords.

We do not seem conscious of our situation with reference to this war. As a matter of fact, we are right square up against the shooting now. I am much impressed by what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] said this morning, repeating what he said yesterday:

"That if we cannot keep these industries in activity, we had better stop and find out about it now, before we proceed further in our involvement in this war."

I do not attempt to quote the gentleman exactly.

The other day—and I do not mean to criticize—we voted in this House to send armed men, on armed ships, to deliver contraband of war into the ports of belligerents, into the very heart of the shooting. We had already provided for war materials for one group of these belligerents and for the loan of our ships in which to transport them. We are putting our own men on these ships which carry these contrabands of war, to fight, if necessary, from our shores to the ports of these belligerents. As a matter of fact, this is but little less, if any less, than a miniature A. E. F. which we have authorized to be sent across. That is where we are now. We have no choice. We must speed up our preparedness; we must avoid these interruptions of production, so that we can provide for those whom we ask to go into these danger zones every possible equipment to protect themselves which a people conscious of their sacrifices and their danger can provide. There cannot be any argument about that. When the President asks us for the power necessary to keep these factories open, it is a duty which we owe to him, to labor, to the rank and file of loyal labor, to prevent, if possible, these unfortunate incidents, these strikes, which are unfair to them, unfair to their sons in uniform. We owe a duty to respond to that request with legislation adequate insofar as legislation can be adequate to enable the President properly to discharge his responsibility as the Chief Executive Officer of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order that I might make inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who has just addressed the House. If I recall his language correctly he stated that the President of the United States had asked for legislation that would permit him to keep industry at work in order that the flow of war defense materials might not be interrupted. I think that is what the gentleman from Texas just stated.

The question I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas is this: Is it his opinion, and is he in a position to speak for the President of the United States, with relation to the language offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]? In other words, did the President of the United States give his approval to the language which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] now presents to this body for deliberation? I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas could advise the House. Will the gentleman indicate that?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I may say to the gentleman that I cannot advise the House as to what language the President desires. I understand he has not stated it, but he has said it is the business of Congress and he is passing it up to us. May I say to the gentleman, I am not discussing the Smith bill, as my friend understands.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The gentleman is discussing the proposed legislation that is now before us?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. McKEOUGH. The gentleman has answered the question and it does not indicate—at least it clears up in my mind at least—that the President of the United States has not suggested to the Congress any language; so that it resolves itself then to the language of the Smith bill, the Vinson bill, or whatever language the House in its deliberations today may adopt as the final work of this House in connection with the proposed anti-labor legislation.

I merely want to point out, as I understand the Smith bill, which bears number H. R. 6149, and which was introduced December 1 and on which no hearings were held, at least to my knowledge, there has been stricken from that draft sections 20 and 21. I hope that every Member of this body will examine that language. It strikes out the plant-seizure provision in the event of any stoppage of work, but strangely—and I presume with propriety in the judgment of the gentleman from Virginia—he adds to the Ramspeck bill in the preceding sections of his bill the introduction of activities by the Government, interfering with the functions—internal and private—solely under jurisdiction resting within the union itself to supervise. He asks for a secret ballot, he asks that balance sheets be presented to the public showing the financial statement and the financial status of every labor organization in the country, and other restrictions.

I hope that this House, before it determines this afternoon or early this evening, or whenever it finally votes on this, will pause and consider fully what very dangerous procedures are now presented in the Smith bill for consideration. I hope that when the vote is taken it will be so clearly understood by every Member of this body as to just what language he or she may be asked to vote up or down, there will be no misunderstanding as to its serious effect to our present and long-standing American standards.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, was the sponsor of the first "cooling off" period proposed legislation in connection with industrial strikes. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] needs no word of introduction from me as to his attitude toward those who toil. I think it might be refreshing if we in the House looked over the record vote on the wage-hour bill. It is my guess, and I will be happy to be corrected if in error—with the exception of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], none of the proponents of this antilabor legislation spoke for, or voted for, the adoption of the wage-hour law in this country. I hope we will pause before we apply this fascistic Hitler technique against those who toil.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, it is an old, old procedure when you have no argument against a proposition to charge the author with improper motives.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot now.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am sorry. The gentleman is usually very generous in that regard.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right; quickly, if you please, just for a question.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I do not subscribe, of course, to the gentleman's statement that we are bankrupt of argument in opposing this legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very well. The gentleman does subscribe, I take it, to the other proposition.

Mr. McKEOUGH. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. If there is anyone in this House who wants to find an out or an excuse for voting against the legislation which the people demand, it is an easy proposition. You can do it, because there is something in each of these bills with which some fault can be found. I call your attention to the cooling-off period. For 50 years, according to the testimony of the secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L. before the Committee on Rules on May 4 last, their contracts for years—50, he said—have had a cooling-off period of 90 days, so there is nothing against including that in the bill.

Over on the Labor Committee sits an official of a union. He handed me the other day a copy of the constitution and the bylaws of that union, and in it were provisions for a vote, and there were provisions for an accounting of the funds. The gentleman happens to represent a good union, which abides by the law.

There is nothing in the Smith bill to which there is substantial objection over on this side, as far as I can learn, except these two things: First, that section which calls for the maintenance of the status quo with reference to strikes. Some want that stricken out. In my judgment, that is an excuse, that is an out, so that if it is not taken out, the boys will have a chance to vote against the bill and go along with the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.. And that is their right, which I would be the last to deny.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman think that if we leave out the plant-freezing feature of this bill, we shall touch the real core of this trouble?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The organizing drives will go on; there is no question about it.

Then the other thing to which some on this side, and probably some on that side object is the provision in the Smith bill which would do away with jurisdictional and sympathetc strikes. Is there anyone here who does not believe that under the present circumstances we should do away with all of these jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes? If there is, then I ask you to read the statement put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] on Monday and form your judgment after you have read that.

Those are the only two things in the Smith bill, aside from that provision which would deprive the striker of his rights under the social-security law, and that I understand will be stricken by a committee amendment, and the provision in the Smith bill for the seizure of plants, which I understand will also be disposed of by a committee amendment, so where are we and to what in the Smith bill can we reasonably object?

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said that the Smith bill would come up for amendment. What should we do? I know that some on the minority side want to let the Smith bill first be defeated. Mark you, I do not say they are going to vote to defeat it, but they are willing that the Smith bill should be defeated. Then they propose to take up the Ramspeck bill and offer their amendments, an amendment which would require an accounting, an amendment which would prevent violence, which is the Halleck amendment, an amendment which would do away with subversive activities, which is the Landis amendment, and then an amendment which I shall by request offer requiring registration of unions. They will strike out of the Ramspeck bill the plant-seizure proposition. So that when we got through, we would have under the Ramspeck bill the Smith bill, but out of it would be that provision providing for the maintenance of the status quo, that is, the closed and open shop as it stands today, and we would have out of it the provision which prevents jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes.

There is no use in trying to deceive ourselves. We are not going to deceive the people of this country, not for one moment. They are not so foolish that they do not recognize legislation after they see it at work. Notwithstanding the statements of the gentleman from Illinois, who just left the floor, and notwithstanding all the names we have been called, I maintain today that those who propose adequate legislation who support the Smith bill at this time are better friends of the workingman than those who oppose that legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize, of course, my impotency in trying to persuade this House to do the right and the just and the proper thing on this momentous question, but this is a serious matter, and all eyes in this country today are directed at the Capitol of the United States. The people of this country are alarmed, they are amazed, they are dumbfounded that their will has been so long thwarted upon this question of strikes in defense industries.

I do not know what this Congress is going to do. I do not know whether we are going to get in a fight here between this bill and that bill and do nothing, or whether we are going to intelligently and patriotically work this out. I do not know whether some of us are going to be controlled by labor leaders at home, whether we are going to place this group above the interests of our country, or whether we are not. But I do know the people of this country are looking to this Congress today, they are looking to you and they are looking to me, to take some action on this question that will stop strikes in defense industries.

My distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] on yesterday made a most impassioned appeal against any legislation. Today he took the floor again. I listened to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] and others who represent that school of thought talking about crucifying labor. Nobody is trying to crucify labor. I maintain that the majority of labor, the rank and file of labor, want something like this to protect them from the labor racketeers who have control of them today. I maintain that they are as loyal as the average young man who goes into the armed forces to fight the battles of his country.

The gentleman from Illinois says that those who advocate this legislation have voted against all labor legislation. I challenge that statement. I say to the gentleman from Illinois that there is no man on the floor of this House, not excepting him, who has a better labor record than I have. I have never voted against a piece of legislation, the wage-hour law not excluded, that was for the benefit of labor since I have been on the floor of this House. I say to you that we want some action on this thing, and when I listen to these gentlemen talk, I can almost see in my mind's eye the delegates in the Congress of France and I can hear them making the same kind of appeal the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] made.

Mr. MCKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield, my time is so limited. I would like to debate this matter with the gentleman if I had the time.

Mr. MCKEOUGH. I would like to also.

Mr. COLMER. I have not the time. I know that the delegates in France, in all the crises of that country made the same kind of an impassioned appeal that the gentleman from Illinois made, and today, where is France? Where are the gentlemen who made those appeals?

Mr. Chairman, America is at war. The legislation which we are discussing here today is war legislation. The sooner the American people realize that America is at war and awaken to that grim fact, the sooner the country will become prepared for its greatest undertaking. America is not prepared for the great task that lies ahead, primarily because the country's leadership have not been fully frank and taken the people of America into their confidence. A few days ago this Congress, by its action in repealing the Neutrality Act, placed the country at war by striking the last semblance of neutrality from the statute books. Whether that course was wise or unwise, right or wrong, is no longer a debatable question. The country is at war just as much as if a formal declaration of war had been declared by the Congress. In fact, I doubt very much if any formal declaration of war will be declared. The formality of war declarations in this modern age is a thing of the past. It belongs to the horse-and-buggy days. If anyone doubts the truth of these statements, he has but to await the passing of a few more weeks when our ships will have had time to enter the combat zones before the casualty list will awaken him to a full realization that America is at war. I repeat that whether that policy was right or wrong is now a closed issue. The Rubicon has been crossed, the die has been cast, and it is squarely up to all patriotic Americans with the love of country in their hearts to relegate into the background of oblivion all differences of opinion about that policy. We are today at grips with Hitlerism and all of the evils that it represents. As one who has for years consistently recommended and earnestly advocated the preparedness of this country to meet that day, and as one who believed in all the sincerity of his

being that we should have deferred the last step equivalent to war of sending our merchant ships into the combat zones, convoyed by our naval forces, I am convinced that the duty of all patriotic Americans is now to rally behind the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President of the United States, and to do all things necessary to win the war that we have now set out to win.

But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot win this war in a half-hearted manner. We cannot win this war without a united effort on the part of all Americans. Soldiers alone are not sufficient. We must have the united effort of capital, labor, industry, and agriculture. Today we have the unfortunate spectacle of a house divided against itself. Labor and industry apparently are at cross purposes. We have been pursuing a policy somewhat similar to that followed by the people of France immediately prior to and during their brief engagement in World War No. 2. I do not belong to that school of thought which advocates that we can win this war and at the same time carry on our policy of "the more abundant life" with its policy of shorter hours, more amusement, social uplift, and business as usual. France tried that policy and today her monument in the cemetery of nations who have fallen prey to Hitlerism is the most striking of them all. We must be realistic. We must, while the time still exists, redouble our energies and make the necessary sacrifice to win the goal which we have set out to gain—the destruction of Hitlerism.

Mr. Chairman, today we are face to face with the fact that this Nation, its institutions, and the heritage left us by the founding fathers is at the greatest crisis that it has ever witnessed. It will either survive and flourish as a result of this world struggle, or it too will fall prey to the scourge of Hitlerism, and its peoples will be added to Hitler's slaves. The legislation which we are considering here today seeks to make the disgrace of strikes in defense industries either no longer possible or negligible. So, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is in no sense antilabor legislation. This legislation is prompted by an effort to help the rank and file of labor to help themselves and to give them a full opportunity to contribute their full patriotic measure toward the winning of the war against Hitlerism. This legislation is necessary and essential, therefore, not only to see that the wheels of industry in our defense program are kept rolling, but it is necessary to protect that great mass of workers, who are just as patriotic as any other class of American people, against a small group of labor racketeers who place their own selfish gains and advancement above their duty to the masses of labor and their country.

Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly convinced that the average American laborer, who has been the beneficiary of more advancement and profits under this administration than under all administrations which have gone before in the past 50 years, is aware of the dangers ahead. I believe that the average worker appreciates that if America does not survive in the gigantic undertaking upon which we are presently engaged that he, too, will become but another commodity to be bartered upon the slave markets of Berlin, and, contrary to some of the denunciations of this proposed legislation, I am convinced that the American laborer will not only cooperate but will welcome such legislation. Who, Mr. Chairman, has the right to arrogantly state that American labor, engaged in vital defense industry, is not just as patriotic, given the opportunity, as the young man who is called from every walk of life into our armed forces, sacrificing all, their very lives, if necessary, in defense of their country? The American laborer is just as essential to the success of the cause as is the man in our armed forces. Every man who drives a rivet or contributes to the construction of a gun is as essentially important as the man who sails a ship or fires a gun in the great common cause in which we are all engaged. To my mind, the one has no more right to strike than the other has to desert. Their duties are equally important; yet, in spite of this, we recently witnessed the amazing spectacle of the outstanding labor profiteer in this country, John L. Lewis, attempting to paralyze the whole defense program by calling a strike in the vital coal mines of the country. No one realized better than Mr. Lewis that by that one move he could stop the whole defense program. Without coal we could not have coke, and without coke we could not have steel, and without steel we could not have ships, guns, ammunition, tanks, and planes; and, although Mr. Lewis repeatedly defied the President of the United States, it took an aroused public opinion to force Mr. Lewis into allowing these coal miners to go back to work. May I ask you, in all seriousness, whether there was any difference in the conduct of Mr. Lewis on this regrettable occasion and the conduct of one Benedict Arnold in another great crisis of this country?

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, charged with the responsibility of carrying out this program of the making of this country an arsenal of the democracies, of the destruction of Hitlerism, of the preservation of our great common country, and of winning the war upon which we have embarked, has been most patient and considerate of labor and particularly its leaders in this great crisis. The Congress of the United States, comprising as it does the representatives of 135,000,000 people, largely out of deference to the wishes of the President, has heretofore refrained from taking any action in the deplorable spectacle of strikes in defense industries, engineered by unconscionable labor leaders. Some of these leaders have defied the President and the Congress, and today their henchmen are threatening and browbeating the duly elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States in an attempt to thwart this legislation which all fair-minded men must admit is not antisocial or antilabor. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, to you and my colleagues of the House on both sides of the aisle, that some such legislation is essential. The American people, including the hordes of the rank and file of labor, are looking to you as their representatives to enact legislation that will stop this unwarranted and inexcusable system of strikes in defense industries. Moreover, they have a right to expect such action on your part. I can conceive of nothing that would afford the common enemy greater satisfaction than for you to fail the country in this hour of crisis. The splendid young men who have been forced by the draft law, enacted by you, as well as the hundreds of thousands of young patriots who have volunteered into the country's Army and Navy for a mere pittance in the form of a wage, are looking to you. The mothers and fathers of those young men, and the millions of patriotic laborers themselves have turned their eyes toward the Nation's Capital today, and they all together with the patriotic Americans everywhere, except every Member of this Congress to do his duty faithfully, patriotically, and without fear.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude where I began. America is at war on the Atlantic front and is faced with the possible necessity of becoming engaged on the Pacific front. Let us of this generation be found not wanting. The heritage left us by our forefathers must be protected. The duty which we owe to our children of the next generation is plain and emphatic. Let us as one united American people pursue relentlessly the goal which we have set out to attain. As for me, my own policy from here on out will continue as in the past. My policy in this crisis of my Nation will continue to be such that should my own precious son or that of any other American father and mother be brought back from the firing line in a flag-draped casket that I can look courageously into his pallid face and say, "Ole fellow, I have been honest with you."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of action and intend to vote for the Smith bill, but I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to ask the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for the purpose of clearing up a misunderstanding. I understand that section 20 of the Smith bill is eliminated, the plant-seizure section, because it is understood that is taken care of by existing law. Some of us, however, did not hear the reason given for the elimination of section 21. Is it also taken care of by existing law?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say that either of them is taken care of by existing law. What I said was that they are taken care of by existing practice. The Government has not taken over these plants under statutory authority.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the committee strikes out section 20, there is no justification for a Defense Wage Board, because a Defense Wage Board deals with plants taken over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the Smith bill, are sections 20 and 21 to be voted on.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; but they are in the Ramspeck bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, may I ask this question: In the provisions for mediation are provisions made for determining a just wage?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is nothing in the Ramspeck bill, as I understand, that deals with the question of wages at all, except the wages of a plant that has been taken over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What about the Smith substitute?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The same thing in the Smith substitute. The only theory of a wage board is where the plant has been taken over. There is nothing in the Mediation Board to justify its going into the question of wages, unless it is a part of the dispute that is to be considered by the Board.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there any provision in any of the legislation proposed for taking care of the correction of an unfair wage situation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, except by mediation, and recommendation of the Mediation Board after it has taken jurisdiction of a dispute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And, of course, if the wages paid are unfair that will be one of the issues before the Mediation Board. If an unfair wage situation exists, however, it might be wise to deal with the situation before a strike impends. My father wrote me a letter the other day in which he said that the time to kill weeds is when they are small. The smartest employers I know are those who avoid trouble by forestalling it with fair treatment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the question raised about plant seizure, if the gentleman thinks that should go back in the bill, of course, he has the right to put it back.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Smith amendment, is still the law of the land and authorizes the President to take over a plant.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was my understanding on the reason for dropping section 20. And now I must decline to yield further.

The main objection made to the Smith substitute by the gentleman from Illinois was the implication that in some way he thought the bill was dangerous because it proposes a secret ballot on strikes and an accounting with publicity for the funds of labor organizations.

In my ignorance I want to ask this question: Since when has it become dangerous to freedom or democracy to provide for a secret ballot? Since when has it become dangerous to the freedoms we want to preserve to require a secret ballot, supervised to guard against fraud and secret to protect the voter-workers from pressure and dictation by racketeers?

Testimony has come before the Appropriations Committee repeatedly that key strikes have been doing more damage than the total number of days lost. The fraudulent Allis-Chalmers plant strike hurt national defense because it was a key strike which held up production of important materials for other plants. The Allis-Chalmers strike was ordered on the basis of a fraudulent election.

If that is the only objection that can be raised to the Smith amendment, that it is dangerous to require a secret ballot and supervised elections, then I think it is time this Congress did something dangerous in order to secure freedom and secure democracy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in all the confusion which the debate on this subject has engendered I think there are three facts which stand out as indisputable. The first is that, in this modern warfare, mechanized instruments of war are the dominant factor in the outcome of any martial conflict, and that for the proper defense of our beloved country the production of those necessary implements of war must not be interrupted.

The second is that there have been serious interferences with that necessary production which have kept our program of preparation lagging and below the requirements for our own national defense and for the aid we are seeking to give to those who are fighting for principles in which we believe.

The third is that, through no fault of their own and against their will, honest American workmen are losing the approval of public opinion because of the machinations of subversive agents which those honest American workmen themselves are anxious to see eliminated.

Because of those three fundamental, indisputable facts, it devolves upon us as a duty to pass appropriate legislation not only for the defense of our country, but also for the defense of American laborers who are patriotically interested in the safety of our land and the preservation of its institutions, its ideals, its principles, and its purposes.

In the district I have the honor to represent there are a great number of loyal workmen engaged in various branches of industry, but I thank God that they are patriotically American in their ideas, their sentiments, and their desires to be distinctly helpful to their nation in this time when universal exemplification of Americanism is needed. Our system must not be disrupted by the preaching of hostile propagandists who are seeking constantly to invade the ranks of labor and divert and pervert fundamental American doctrines to the nefarious purposes of foreign dictators.

I think it is generally agreed that practically all of these strikes against our defense production have resulted from the machinations of those who are not in sympathy with our form of government. We must not follow in the path of sorrowing, devastated France. We must travel the American way. We must thwart the insidious efforts of agents inspired from abroad to rob all our people of the blessings of liberty and democracy which have come to us as a priceless heritage from our fathers. If those subversive groups get control of our production in this critical time and thereby largely get control of our Government, we shall not have much in the way of government left.

It is a very important and a very imperative duty which faces us now, to deal honestly and candidly with this situation for the benefit of the American people and for the benefit of honest American labor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make some general observations about the measures pending before the House. First of all, I want to call your attention to this:

> Speed in building United States ships is seen.

This is from this morning's New York Times:

> The rapid progress of shipbuilding for the Navy and the Maritime Commission was described by the spokesmen for the Government and private industry at yesterday's preliminary sessions of the Congress of American Industry of the National Association of Manufacturers at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

Now, let us see who attended that meeting up there. Knudsen, Nelson, Leon Henderson, Mr. Odlum, and I see our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, is going to address them.

What else?

> Commercial vessels for the Maritime Commission are being launched at the rate of one a day and will slide down the ways at the rate of two daily by July, it was disclosed by Lewis Compton, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Shipbuilding is keeping abreast of sinkings by the Axis, Mr. Compton declared.
>
> Mr. Compton, who is assistant to the president of the National Council of American Shipbuilders, constructing naval and merchant vessels, announced that on construction of Maritime Commission vessels shipbuilders were "making very fine time," while launchings of naval vessels were "well ahead of schedule." Many of the merchant ships are of 10,000 tons.

Let us see what is in the Washington Post this morning in regard to production. After all, production is what we want. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] sounded the keynote yesterday morning when he said it was production that we want. That is what you are getting.

What does this morning's Washington Post point out? God knows, that paper is not giving labor any the better of it:

> Only one strike now menaces defense.
>
> The Office of Production Management announced there was only one current strike having a serious effect on the defense program.

These newspaper statements give us a fairly good picture of the stituation as to the state of production. We have seen in the last few days the railroad companies and employees get together and settle their differences. We saw the captive mine owners and employees submit their differences to arbitration for settlement. Every day we see more evidence of a spirit of conciliation being developed between capital and labor during this

emergency. I think the President is doing a mighty good job of handling labor disputes. I think he has all the authority that is necessary for him to take such action as will bring about a settlement of disputes. I think the President has exhibited a remarkable spirit of fairness and tolerance for both sides in these controversial issues and I have not heard his asking for any such legislation as we have before us today, and particularly what is known as the Smith and Vinson bills. I want to say now that I am opposed to strikes and I am also opposed to anything else that will disrupt the production of planes, tanks, guns, and so forth. On the other hand, I do not want to see such shackles put on labor as to cause them to feel their efforts are not appreciated and that after all the Government is against them. I feel that labor is delivering the goods today. This has been clearly shown during the debates on these bills. We must bear in mind we cannot produce any of these materials without our men working. Suppose they, for instance, took a vacation and went fishing. What could we do about it. You know you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. I believe that if we keep our shirts on for a while and rely on the patriotism of labor that labor will continue to deliver the goods with a greater degree of enthusiasm than if we try to make our laboring people feel that they are not loyal, patriotic American citizens. Understand that I am as opposed as anyone against the so-called racketeers in labor groups. I also condemn racketeers in any other classes. There is no class or group of people that has a monopoly upon racketeers and disloyal citizens. I do not believe we should take such steps by legislation that might cause labor to falter in its efforts.

Again referring to the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] yesterday he gave the figures and they ought to be quoted again. In our country and in Canada and England slightly more than 2 percent of the workers were out on strike. England 2.3, Canada 2.4, United States, 2.3 percent. We are doing as well as England has done and she has been in the war for 3 years.

Only the other day 100,000 Scotchmen threw down their tools in the shipyards on the Clyde. They called it a "token strike." The national wage tribunal had delayed a decision on a wage increase and the Scotchmen decided to hurry them up.

Did Churchill order out troops? Did he talk about wiping out all the labor laws on the statute books of Great Britain? No. He is too smart for that. Instead, the wage board was told to get busy and render a decision and the Scotchmen went back to work.

Does any sane man question the patriotism of those Scotchmen? Of course not.

I want to tell you members of the press up here in the gallery that the best and most encouraging news you can send out to the world, including England, today are the figures I have just quoted. Let England know that we are united over here to the extent of more than 97½ percent of production, that we are not engaged in fights amongst ourselves to any extent that would interfere with our help to England.

Right down on one of the main streets in this city recently a building was turned over to the Government that was constructed from foundation to roof and ready for occupancy in 38 days, a great big building. Who built this building? It was built by men in overalls, Mr. Chairman. The contractors did not go into these shops where they trim fingernails—beauty parlors—for help. They did not go into any of these pink tea and other places where they hold meetings every afternoon to tell Congress what to do about labor. They got workers and built that building.

Who are building these ships? It is the laboring men of this country.

In conclusion, Members of the House, I think we should thank God that we have the loyal, patriotic American citizens that make up our great labor groups in this country. It is true a very small percentage of them is not what we would like, but we should not condemn 97 percent or 98 percent of this great labor group because there may be some among them who are disinterested, disloyal not only to our country but to our form of government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With all deference to the gentleman from Montana, I must object, for everybody must have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation we are now considering concerns one of the most vital problems to be considered by this Congress. It is a well-known fact that strikes in industry have impeded our national-defense program to such an extent that the American people are alarmed and looking to Congress for remedial action.

My district is primarily a laboring man's district. Among these laboring men you will find a true cross section of American labor—honest and patriotic, they are interested in the welfare of the Nation. Many of these same laboring men have given their sons in 1917–18 and have sons or grandchildren in the present armed forces of the Nation.

This labor problem is nothing new to Congress. For many months it has been buried under other legislative matters.

I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that the country is without a strong labor policy and as a result we have this labor problem. What the Nation needs is a two-fisted Secretary of Labor who understands the common problems of both capital and labor and who is capable of reaching a middle ground agreeable and just to both sides.

Make no mistake about it, there are two sides to every controversy. We all recall the profiteering days of 1917–18, when millionaires were created overnight. Who will deny that the same situation is not occurring today as billions of dollars for defense contracts are awarded, while the rising cost of living staggers the imagination.

The man who labors must by the sweat of his brow pay taxes, according to President Roosevelt's own statement. He must also provide the necessities of life for his family, in addition to carrying the burden of taxation. Therefore, if the cost of living is skyrocketing and taxes, as we all know, are reaching unbearable heights, is it not simple justice to reflect on the fat profits from defense contracts and ask the question: Are we to create another harvest of millionaires similar to the crop that followed the first World War?

Frankly, I think we will all agree that if this Congress had recognized the experience of this Nation in regard to the profiteers of 1917–18 and passed legislation to curb excessive profits during a period of emergency, we would have solved many of our present-day problems.

I realize the wage question is a small part of the present controversy and that in most instances the betterment of working conditions is the basis of the complaints.

We have before us several bills, each designed in its own way to remedy the situation. I find myself in the position of many more Members of this House who are confused in their efforts to find a suitable measure that will give our Nation a strong labor policy and establish unity between capital and labor.

In our efforts to perfect legislation we must keep in mind that both capital and labor have inalienable rights under the Constitution of the United States. Capital is entitled to respect for their property and a fair return on their investment. Labor, on the other hand, is entitled to a living wage, ideal working conditions, and the right to present their grievances, if any, in a lawful manner. In spite of these constitutional guaranties to both capital and labor, there is a widespread cry on the part of newspapers and their columnists that Congress enact legislation to curb strikes in industry.

As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] rightly asserted on the floor yesterday, it is unconstitutional to deny any American citizen the right to strike or to picket in a lawful manner. I trust that all of us will keep this in mind in our efforts to formulate a strong labor policy for the Nation.

While we cannot deny the American workman his right to strike or to peaceful picketing his place of employment, we can strengthen the labor policy of our country by a plan of arbitration designed for such an emergency as the present, and such arbitration proceedings to be preceded by a suitable cooling-off period.

This is definitely the problem before Congress today. Whatever legislation we enact should be fair to both sides as a further guaranty against future interruption in our national-defense program.

There is truth in the old saying, "Experience is the best teacher." This is borne out in my congressional district where we have had several bitter labor controversies. One of the leading manufacturers in my district who spent years

in litigation with his workers has sent me his observations on the present situation, and I offer them at this time as a timely contribution to our discussion of the subject. He says in part:

1. I am against antistrike legislation. That may sound strange from an industrialist, but this is a free country. Don't outlaw strikes.

2. When an industry finds itself in the jaws of a labor fight and they request a labor vote from the National Labor Relations Board, it should be given them at once so they know whom to bargain with.

3. Before a strike is called every employee should have a vote, and such vote should be secret and conducted by the National Labor Relations Board on or close to the place of employment. Surveys show employees desire this right, yet at our plant 1 week after a strike was called the National Labor Relations Board director prescribed a vote, but it was not held until nearly 4 years later.

4. A cooling-off period of a week or 10 days should be mandatory on employer or employee before a strike or lock-out is called.

5. The individual right of employees should be protected.

He concludes:

We need labor legislation, but it must be fair to both parties, but, remember, don't outlaw strikes. We have been penalized $131,000, and as a result of this bitter lesson we are convinced that outlawing strikes will not solve the problem.

Like other Members of Congress, I, too, have made a deep study of the subject and have resolved not to vote for any measure that will deny either capital or labor their constitutional rights.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has been referring constantly in his remarks to this as being an antistrike bill. Will he be good enough, in all fairness, to point out to the House any provision in either the Smith bill or the Ramspeck bill which prohibits a strike?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can answer the gentleman by saying there is no such provision in either of the bills. We must act quickly to find a solution to this distressing problem because of its importance to the program for national defense, but in so doing let us perfect a labor policy that will be fair and just to both sides.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise this afternoon to attempt to tell anybody in this House how to vote on any of these bills. I would be very careful in attempting to write any law that has anything to do with the courts of the country, because I am not a member of the bar. I am not a lawyer. I am a bricklayer. I came off a wall last summer to run for Congress as a member of organized labor and as a member of the Bricklayers' Union of the city of Providence, R. I.

I am not going to attempt to tell you the causes for these strikes or anything else. There is not a bill before this House today that I intend to support. I am still a member of organized labor. I believe in organized labor. I believe in the closed shop. I know what I have received from being a member of organized labor. I know the benefits that every member of organized labor receives. I paid $107.15 initiation fee to join my union. I will not have to pay this initiation fee every year or two. I pay $36 a year dues to the union. For what? To keep the gains we have been able to make, to keep what belongs to us.

These measures before the House today, regardless of what anybody says about their not being antistrike measures, are vicious antilabor measures, and I will not take that statement back for anyone.

What do we get when we join a union? We get the benefit of the gains made by that union for the past 60 or 70 years. During all that time they have worked to achieve their present gains. New unions have come into existence in the past 2 or 3 years. Many new men have joined unions in the past 2 or 3 years. What have they gained? They have gained and share in the benefits it took the unions 60 or 70 years to build up—shorter working days, better living conditions, the workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, social security, and the right to hold their heads up in any company—the secure knowledge that though they earned their bread by the sweat of the brow, no one had the right to call himself their master.

Why should they not pay an initiation fee? A man gets $1.50 an hour for laying brick now; 20 years ago he got 40 cents an hour and worked 15 hours a day. Why should not those men want to come into a union today and gain the benefits that the older members gained for them?

May I say one thing in reference to the defense work that has been going on throughout this country, particularly on the cantonments in various parts of the country. They have in the great State of Texas, and it is a great and beautiful State, near Corpus Christi one of the biggest air bases in the country. They had only about 450 mechanics in that section when the base was to be built. What did organized labor do? It supplied that district with 15,000 men from all over the country at no cost to the Government and the base was completed in record time. They brought men from San Francisco, Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City to guarantee to the Government that that base would be built.

I have in my district the largest naval air base in the world, that would ordinarily take 3 to 4 years to build. It was completed 1 year after it was started, on last July 12. That is a sample of the accomplishment that organized labor has been giving.

Mr. Chairman, I do not stand up here and attempt to tell you that every member of organized labor is aboveboard. We have some so-called leaders in our movement who are not aboveboard and honest. But name me an organization in this country that has not some of that type. We intend to go along in this program.

The members of organized labor want to clear their ranks of undesirables. We have members at the head of our unions who are capable men, men who have come up from the ranks, and they are not going to stand by and not attempt to stop any such legislation as we have here today. Some Members have said, "Oh, there will be others on the opposite side who will want to find some excuse to vote against this legislation." But, Mr. Chairman, I do not look for any such excuse. What I would like to hear excused—if it is possible—is the complete independence of big business in the defense program. At its very inception big business refused to play ball unless its terms were met—and the record shows they were met. What I would like to hear excused is the hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of machinery which is going to stand idle because little business has to shut up shop. What I would like to hear excused is the growing army of unemployed, increasing daily, while antilabor forces insist on the passage of this legislation—an army of men and women who will walk the streets because of almost total abandonment of the small business man in the interests of big industrialists, who fatten their coffers through brokers and middlemen in defense contracts while small business, which carries the bulk of the burden in normal times, is allowed to starve.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the sponsors of these bill would rather have us go back to the days of the vassal and the slaves. Yes; slavery. Go back to the sweatshop days; go back to the days when men worked 10, 14, and 16 hours a day and on pay day received a slip of paper saying you owed the company store $2 for kerosene or some other commodity, instead of a pay envelope.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I belong to a great many organizations, but I am first an American citizen. I do not find a clause in the bill under consideration here, referred to as the Smith bill, that would conflict with the rights or privileges of any loyal, patriotic American citizen in times like these. There is not a word in that bill that would ever inconvenience the gentleman who just spoke from this Well. And, of course, there are those who resent regulations of any kind. But we live in a democracy. We strive to protect, defend, and perpetuate this democracy. We believe in order, not chaos. We believe in a referee; we believe in our courts, the very bulwark of protection for the citizens of this country, and particularly is that true of the workingman and the underprivileged.

The courts will say, "You shall not be oppressed and no one, great or strong, shall invade your rights." Yet there seems to be a psychology growing up in this country to speak lightly of our courts and to be fearful of them, so far as letting them pass on matters that affect individual rights are concerned. I fear if that goes too far we might wake up some day and find that we have done irreparable damage to the great supports and foundation of our democracy.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain made use of the term some time ago "Blood, sweat, and tears." I fear that term will not be confined altogether to the British Isles. We have appropriated approximately $75,000,000,000 for national defense and the American people do not intend for that amount of

money to be a grab bag. They are willing to make the sacrifices necessary; yes, but they want orderly procedure, they want production and they want a law to stop any man who would hold up production, make no mistake about that.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Just briefly.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman referred to Winston Churchill's "sweat, blood, and tears" statement. Of course, Chiang Kai-shek's has been a war-torn country for several years, and recently he said if we would work more in peacetimes we would bleed less in wartimes.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman. There has been a lot of time taken up here trying to determine who is to blame. If we lose, what difference does it make who is to blame? It will not make any difference. Does it make any difference to France today to sit down and say that some member in their legislative body was to blame? No. They are prostrate. They are under the heel of the tyrant. They might just as well be dead, and I guess many of them wish they were. Yet we stand here in the Well of this House and wear out carpets and lash our tongues trying to determine who is to blame for the present labor trouble.

We do not want to hurt anybody. A man would be insane to come down here in the Well and attempt to do any harm to the laboring people. All of us have been in that same situation at one time or another. Our Government has been challenged. We cannot content ourselves with the continuation of a policy of appeasement. We must take a definite stand and prevent any recurrence of what has been happening. The passage of the Smith bill, in my opinion, will be a step in the right direction and will receive the approval of the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I make inquiry of the Committee as to how many desire to address the Committee on the Smith amendment so that we can give everyone an opportunity, at the same time determine approximately how much time will be consumed on the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will take the names of all Members standing who desire to speak on the Smith amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is that on all amendments that may be offered?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That takes in 10 Members. I will make it an hour and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if at this time he will confine his request only to the Smith amendment itself?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is to the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto. That will afford everyone an opportunity in an hour and a half to discuss that phase. Of course, they can discuss the Ramspeck amendment later on, if necessary.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If this unanimous-consent request is agreed to, does that mean that if one wanted to offer a substitute for the Smith amendment he could not do it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That would be out of order, anyhow. You cannot offer a substitute to the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Smith amendment is a substitute, and a substitute for it would not be in order.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Do I understand, now, that this applies only to pro forma amendments? Suppose a Member has a material amendment to offer, such as to strike out a section or two sections of the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's request includes all amendments. It covers the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto, including two amendments on the desk at the present time.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In connection with the gentleman's request, for the information of the House can the Chair inform us whether, if the Smith amendment is adopted, it then will be subject to further amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Smith amendment is adopted, it will not then be subject to further amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I say I have no motive in reserving the right to object other than to see that any and every Member who desires to do so may have an opportunity not only to offer an amendment but to speak on it, and someone else should have the opportunity to oppose the amendment. If you fix a time limit and restrict recognition to those gentlemen who have arisen and indicated their desire to speak, we shall get ourselves into the same position we very often have gotten into heretofore; some important amendment will probably be offered in the last few minutes and the Member who offers it will have no opportunity to address the House regarding it. I hope that whatever arrangement is made—and I have no objection other than that to any arrangement—will be so framed and so arranged that every Member either for or against it may have a fair opportunity to be heard on this important subject.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which has been on the Clerk's desk all morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has an amendment on the desk, and his amendment is included in the request of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to have some orderly procedure. Certainly an hour and a half is ample time for every Member with an amendment to have an opportunity to offer his amendment. Further, if the Smith substitute is defeated, then other substitutes will be in order. It seems to me that with the time we have already devoted to this matter, the hour and a half requested by the gentleman from Georgia will permit adequate debate on the Smith substitute.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, as I understand it the proposal is to have an hour and a half of debate, but the Chairman does not feel himself bound to divide that hour and a half only among those who stood up.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We can ask them to submit their names to the Chair and let the Chair parcel out the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. We can always have confidence in the Chair on a matter of this kind.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Further reserving the right to object, suppose 20 Members stand up now, is it understood that the Chairman will divide the hour and a half among the 20? Will he allow nobody 5 minutes? Some of the Members on our side who want to speak on this matter are not here, and I cannot reserve time for them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for the present, I object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to ask a question or two of the majority leader or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], all of whom, I understand, have during the past week or 10 days been in conference with the President.

I have always been very much interested in the prospect that, if it is properly done, the labor unions or all organizations engaged in collective bargaining might be incorporated. The press reports of the last week, if they are true, intimate that among the various suggestions made by the congressional leaders to the White House was the incorporation of labor unions, to which suggestion, the newspaper reports, the President was not averse. I wonder if the majority leader can give me some information on this question.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as I am concerned, I think the incorporation of labor unions would be the death knell of organized labor. I am expressing my own personal opinion. I do not know why we should compel labor to incorporate any more than we compel capital to incorporate.

Mr. ANDREWS. We do compel capital to incorporate. I am merely asking if the report is true that the President expressed a preference for the incorporation of labor unions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have seen no such report. I am sure the gentleman would not say he had read something like that unless he had done so, but I saw nothing in the papers about it. Of course, I would never undertake to speak for anyone else on a subject I have never discussed with him, and I do not want to undertake to speak for the President, but I may say that the subject of incorporation of labor unions was never discussed.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe a great many of those who advocate this legislation is, because they have been perhaps disturbed by mistakes which have been made by various individuals connected with the labor movement, are adopting the philosophy that the end justifies the means in an endeavor to punish those who may have been responsible for such mistakes. I wish any Member of the House to whom I make reference to understand that there is nothing personal in my remarks, I am simply referring to what the records of this House show.

My good friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] whom, despite the fact I generally disagree with him, I like very much, personally yesterday presented to this House the records of perhaps 20 men identified with the labor movement who have been guilty of or convicted of crime at some time in their careers. I have no brief for those men. I hope that they are driven out of organized labor. Furthermore, I have no brief for anyone who betrays his trust, but I say this, that it is no fairer or wiser to destroy labor for these derelictions, than it would be for us to tear down our governmental institutions because many men in public life have been guilty of far greater offenses than these individuals to whom he refers. For 4 years my friend has been investigating the labor movement, and he has brought the records of 20 men here. I could in a few minutes name more than 20 who occupied positions of trust in this country, who have been guilty of greater offenses.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I am prepared to give this House the records of 1,000, whenever the House wants those records.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I have only 5 minutes and cannot yield further. The other day we saw in the press where a Federal judge was compelled to resign because of his misconduct in office, and in the State of New Jersey I could name a great political boss who was convicted a few months ago, and is now, if not already in prison, on his way to it. There are thousands of other cases of that kind, but we do not undertake to destroy American institutions because of such individuals.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I have not the time. My friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] I do not think had to wait for an emergency in the matter of national defense to convince himself that he should be an opponent of things that labor stands for, and I am just a little bit concerned whether there are not many who are now using this emergency as a vehicle to destroy labor. Just read the provisions of the bill of the gentleman from Virginia—and I am referring to the bill that he introduced on November 18—before you allow yourselves to be stampeded into affirmative action on this legislation. Read the provisions in section 5, and if they do not abridge the right of assembly, then I am very much mistaken. Then read the penalties of enforcement which his bill provides—penalties for the rest of an individual's life. There is no time limitation. He is deprived of all the benefits under our social-security laws and unemployment insurance, the right to represent labor under the National Labor Relations Act for the balance of his life.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman thinks that there are provisions of that bill that are objectionable, I suggest that he offer an amendment to eliminate them.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Practically everything in the gentleman's bill is objectionable to me. I think the gentleman has been diligent in burning the midnight oil to construct language in this bill which would place a strait jacket on labor and strangle it. He would restrict labor not only for the present, but forever.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman referred to misconduct of a judge. Would it not be well to say alleged misconduct?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. But he resigned for fear of impeachment.

Mr. DITTER. It was alleged misconduct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Alleged misconduct, but he resigned to escape impeachment proceedings. There are hundreds if not thousands of similar cases of record of individuals elected or appointed to positions of trust, who betrayed that trust. I would have the House reflect on this. The gentleman from Virginia, and I speak without bitterness, yesterday said he spoke for the great mass of unorganized workers in this country. Did he have the unorganized workers' welfare in mind when he opposed the passage of the wage-and-hour bill, which was primarily intended for the unorganized workers of the United States? Not only did he vote against that legislation, but he opposed it in the Rules Committee, and I ask you gentlemen to take all of these things into consideration when you render your decision on the proposed legislation.

I realize there have been mistakes, but industrialists are not guiltless of mistakes either, and it certainly is not fair to take from the millions of workers in this country the basic fundamental rights they have, which were only acquired after decades of struggle. Such action will not further the cause of democracy or of national unity.

There has been much exaggeration, regarding some of these situations complained of, by those who are always opposed to labor. Sight is lost of the contribution which labor is making to the defense program. How was the battleship *South Dakota* and the battleship *Indiana* completed months ahead of schedule if it were not for the contributions of men who are members of unions and who worked hard to establish these records? In my city we are doing more defense work than any other area in the United States. The Navy Department has made scores of efficiency awards to plants in our city, which, because of the cooperation between management and workers, union employees if you please, have completed contracts months ahead of scheduled dates. These employees are members of unions which are headed by the finest type of American citizen. Labor leaders who are a credit to our country and the union members are loyal patriotic Americans who are entitled to retain those basic rights which have enabled them throughout the years to achieve a fair living standard.

This Smith bill may utterly destroy labor or render it impotent for many years to come. Perhaps that is its purpose—I do not know. It will contribute nothing to national unity in our defense effort and although I am not a lawyer, I seriously doubt its constitutionality, because its provisions are so far reaching and, in my opinion, destructive of basic rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS to the Smith amendment: Page 5, between lines 5 and 6, after section 5 (b), insert the following:

"(c) It shall be unlawful, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for one or more persons acting in contemplation or furtherance of a labor dispute, to attend at or near a place where a defense contractor carries on business, for the purpose of obtaining or communicating information, or persuading or inducing any person to work or abstain from working, unless such persons so attending, were immediately prior to the beginning of such labor dispute, bona fide employees of such contractor."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the sole purpose of this amendment is to implement the section which would seek to prevent violence in picketing. Mass picketing is in itself a nuisance, if for no other reason, because it chokes the highways and sidewalks, just as we saw on the Jelleff-building job. There the contract went to the C. I. O., a 100-percent union job. A. F. of L. pickets picketed the job as unfair to organized labor. The C. I. O. threw pickets around the A. F. of L. pickets, saying that the job was not unfair to organized labor, but that it was preeminently fair. And finally Jelleff put

pickets around both the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. pickets; so that no other pedestrians could use that side of F Street. But aside from that we are all, organized labor and unorganized labor and everyone else, sincerely desirous of trying to eliminate violence and bloodshed. One of the main causes of that in picketing is the imported and employed picket, who knows nothing of the job or what the strike is about. So this very simple amendment would require that before one can picket he must have been immediately before the strike an employee of the defense contractor.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As I understand the amendment, it applies to strangers or nonemployees being brought in to picket?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; that is all there is to it. It seems to me to be very fair. Any defense contractor may have a million employees and every one of them is eligible to come there and picket the struck plant or plants, but no one could hire an outsider, or a stranger to the job, to come in there and be a picket.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield gladly to my colleague of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman's provision is similar to the law enacted a few years ago prohibiting the use of professional strikebreakers?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; the purpose of each provision is the same, but the present law you cite prohibits the importation of strikebreakers by the employer. This would prohibit the importation of pickets, strangers to the dispute, by the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to invite you and every other Member of this body to read, mark, and inwardly digest the following quoted part of the testimony of Mr. William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, given before the Judiciary Committee of the House, in response to questions propounded by the gentleman from New York who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Green, before you go on, there is another phase I would like your opinion on. A few years ago we passed a bill prohibiting the shipping of professional strikebreakers from one State to another. What would you think of a bill to extend that prohibition to professional picketers?

A good many in the public feel that professional strikebreakers and professional picketers are responsible for most of the bloodshed and disorder and bitterness that arise in strikes. They prevent employers and the employees from getting together. They are there as troublemakers, and if it is wrong to ship professional strikebreakers from one point to another, what is the objection to a similar law for professional pickets?

Mr. GREEN. You mean the transportation of professional pickets across State lines in interstate commerce?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; a similar law to the one we have now prohibiting professional strikebreakers. We have outlawed that, so far as we could.

Mr. GREEN. I fear, Congressman, that that would not work well, because we would have to go into every phase of that situation. I do not think that this business of privately employed pickets is a good thing. It has always been the rule that the men who picket a plant are the men who are on strike—men or women who are directly interested—but there has developed now a sort of professional service of paid pickets. But I do not believe you could reach that very well by legislation. That is my own judgment.

Mr. HANCOCK. We have adopted it with reference to professional strikebreakers. In principle it would seem to me to be desirable to settle disputes just as far as possible by the employers and the employees and their chosen representatives. That is democratic. That is fair. But these outside troublemakers cause the damage. At least most of us think so.

Mr. GREEN. The reason legislation was passed prohibiting the shipment of strikebreakers from one State to another was because it resulted in bloodshed. You will remember the Old Homestead strike, will you not, and the Latimer strike in Pennsylvania, where men were shot down? It always resulted in that, and it was for the purpose of preventing loss of life.

Mr. HANCOCK. The members of this committee unanimously favored that law.

Mr. GREEN. But there is a difference in this measure that I think would have to be considered, and I do not think you could reach it that way.

Mr. HANCOCK. Can you make any good distinction?

Mr. GREEN. I think there is a difference. There is a distinction between a professional strike picket and a professional strikebreaker.

Mr. HANCOCK. They both make trouble?

Mr. GREEN. Well, we may both agree that they are troublemakers; yes.

Fairly construed, it seems that Mr. Green does "not think that this business of privately employed pickets is a good thing," but does "not believe you could reach that very well by legislation."

Confidently, I submit to the judgment of the House that this amendment will do what Mr. Green joined us in wishing: That it reaches what he did "not believe could be reached very well by legislation," in an acceptable way.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman's amendment would make it illegal for a member of the union who is not employed in the plant to assist his brothers in that strike by taking the picket line and relieving him on the picket line?

Mr. HOBBS. The only quarrel I have with the gentleman's question is the word "assist." I think it would hurt them, rather than help.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, let us get it straight. The only people who are permitted to picket, under the gentleman's amendment, would be those employees who were working at that plant?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; working for the defense contractor in any plant.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Working for that employer?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Other members of that same union could not follow the time-honored practice of good unionism of assisting and aiding their fellow union members on the picket line?

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly right. In other words, you must have some personal part in the quarrel in order to participate.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HOOK. This provision would not prevent a defense contractor from bringing in outsiders to break the strike?

Mr. HOBBS. Well, that is already outlawed by the law we passed several years ago.

Mr. HOOK. That is, from one State to another?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir. That is all we have jurisdiction over. But the policy is plain and it is not done.

Mr. HOOK. But this provision here applies to defense strikes, which gives us authority, does it not?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right; and gives me an idea that had not occurred to me because I had been thinking the present law covered and prohibited importation of all strikebreakers.

Mr. HOOK. And in this case the previous law would not apply in some instances?

Mr. HOBBS. You are right, sir; and I will be glad to offer an amendment to my amendment to make it apply both to stranger strikebreakers and to stranger pickets.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend this amendment so as to make it apply to both the employer and the strikers, both to stranger strikebreakers as well as to stranger pickets. I ask that such an amendment be prepared as nearly as may be in the words of the anti-imported strikebreaker law.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama while the amendment is corrected.

Mr. HOBBS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. May I again thank the gentleman from Michigan for his suggestion which has enabled me, with the consent of the House, to improve the amendment? This gives us two barrels to our gun with which we may accomplish the single purpose I had in mind: To eliminate one great cause of violence, intimidation, and bloodshed in picketing strikebound plants.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. It is even more pleasure than usual to yield to our colleague now soon to become a Federal judge.

Mr. HEALEY. Under the gentleman's amendment, I understand that not even an officer of a union to which this man may belong could appear on the site where the strike is being conducted?

Mr. HOBBS. He could appear. He could talk. He could do anything in the world that he wished except to join the picket line if he were not a party to the dispute.

Mr. HEALEY. Do you think he could communicate at all with the members who are on strike or those who are picketing the place? Would it be possible, under your amendment, to even

communicate with those who are picketing the plant?

Mr. HOBBS. Not for the interdicted purposes while they are on the picket line.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that it will take some time to modify the amendment which the gentleman has offered. The Chair will recognize anyone in opposition to the amendment. [After a pause.] If no one desires to be heard in opposition to the amendment, the Clerk will report the amendment in its modified form.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, between lines 5 and 6, after section 5 (b), insert the following:

"It shall be unlawful, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for one or more persons acting in contemplation or furtherance of a labor dispute to attend at or near a place where a defense contractor carries on business for the purpose of obtaining or communicating information or of persuading or inducing any person to work or to abstain from working, unless such persons so attending were, immediately prior to the beginning of such labor dispute, bona fide employees of such contractor, or for a defense contractor to employ any person who is to be employed for the purpose of obstructing or interfering by force or threats, (1) with peaceful picketing of employees during any labor dispute affecting wages, hours, or conditions of labor; or (2) the exercise by employees of any of the rights of self-organization or collective bargaining."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let us have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. No one desiring recognition in opposition to the pending amendment, the Chair will put the question. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], as modified.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON of Georgia) there were—ayes 58, noes 54.

Mr. HOOK and Mr. MARCANTONIO demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. HOBBS and Mr. HOOK.

The Committee again divided; and the tells reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk report the next amendment, and ask that the Chair recognize the next Member who has an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has an amendment pending at the desk, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIES: On page 3, line 3, of the Smith substitute insert a new section to be known as section 2 (a), as follows:

"Any labor organization which knowingly or negligently permits any member of the Communist Party of the United States, or the Young Communists' League, or member of the German-American Bund, or the Kyferhauser Bund, or person who has been convicted of a felony involving moral turpitude, to hold any office, appointive or elective, in such labor organization shall cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act so long as such person continues to hold such office."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is self-explanatory. It merely provides that any labor organization which knowingly or negligently permits any member of the Communist Party of the United States, Young Communists' League, German-American Bund, or the Kyferhauser Bund to hold any office in the union shall cease to be entitled to its rights under the National Labor Relations Act as long as such person holds such office.

For 4 years we have shown the country that certain officials and officers of labor unions in the United States are members of organizations that are under foreign control. It would seem to me, therefore, that, regardless of the views of Members with respect to pending legislation, whether they are opposed to antistrike legislation or favor some kind of antistrike legislation, the Members of the House should agree to this amendment.

Four years ago, and before this committee began its work, I went to the offices of John L. Lewis and conferred with him for the purpose of undertaking to persuade him to get rid of the Communist element in his unions. I told him then that if the labor organizations would take the initiative and satisfy the American people that they would not permit agents of a foreign government, people whose activities are controlled from abroad, who have no interest in the legitimate object of labor unions, but who are seeking to use such unions for revolutionary purposes, that if labor would take the initiative in getting rid of this element there would never be any occasion for legislation on the subject. The labor organizations not only did not take the initiative, but from that moment until the present moment the C. I. O. leaders have consistently condemned me throughout the United States.

I present this matter as a simple issue to this House. There simply is not any question but that there are hundreds of Communists entrenched in positions of leadership in labor unions. It is true they are a minority, and a small minority, but as long as they hold positions of leadership in these unions the unions will be discredited, strife and disturbances will continue. I have definite and conclusive proof that much of the labor disturbances in the United States can be directly traced to people who hold positions in these unions and are serving a foreign government.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I have no objection to the purpose the gentleman from Texas seeks to attain by his amendment, but I am wondering if he has thought enough about the phrase "or negligently"? The word "knowingly" is perfectly all right, but I think that the phrase "or negligently" raises a burden that is not fair.

Mr. DIES. The reason I used the phrase "or negligently" is because in my own Texas jurisdiction it has a well-understood meaning.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I would like to have the gentleman define it.

Mr. DIES. It means the failure to exercise ordinary care. In other words, what I am trying to get at is a labor union that knowingly permits a condition to exist or a labor union that does not exercise ordinary care to find out about the foreign affiliations of its people.

Mr. McKEOUGH. What I have in mind is, in the event this language is incorporated and becomes law, it is fair to assume that with the spread of time some new development in the way of a new officer may come about and the organization not in any way responsible because it did not know at the time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman's amendment applies to officers of labor organizations?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The evidence submitted yesterday pertained to organizers.

Mr. DIES. Those are officers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is an organizer an officer?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let us be positive about that.

Mr. DIES. An organizer is appointed by the labor officials. I assume there is no question about that.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. To clear up a question raised by the gentleman from Illinois, may I ask who would have the authority to determine the meaning of the word "negligent"?

Mr. DIES. The National Labor Relations Board, in denying rights for collective bargaining.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. Chairman, I realize perfectly well the disadvantage which confronts one who rises to oppose a proposition advanced by the gentleman from Texas in a body which has been worked up to a state of hysteria in a drive against the fundamental rights of labor. In this amendment we go further. The attack goes beyond the fundamental rights of labor. This attack is aimed at the constitutional rights of American citizens.

As I see it, the issue raised by this amendment is not the issue of communism at all. The issue raised by this amendment is an issue of democratic rights, the constitutional rights of American citizens. This amendment would subvert the American proposition that there shall be no discrimination against anyone, irrespective of color, race, creed, or political affiliation. Thoughtful men throughout the country today are beginning to realize, and men who understand the technique of Fascist conquest from within are beginning to recognize the great danger that lies in the proposal advanced in this amendment. I can understand perfectly well why Mr. Wendell Willkie has volunteered to defend the right of a naturalized American citizen whose citizenship is being challenged because of his political affiliations, because of his membership in the Com-

munist Party. No one can charge Mr. Willkie with being a Communist. In accepting the case he stated what I said here, that the proposition involved is a proposition of democratic rights and constitutional rights.

The most serious danger in this amendment is that it follows a pattern which was employed by Adolf Hitler and Mussolini in their respective countries and by Petain and the Vichymen and the Munichmen in France.

An offensive against the Communists has been the vehicle with which and behind which nazi-ism has marched into power in the various former democracies of Europe. The anti-Communist offensive has been the weapon employed by the Fascists and Nazis not only to come into power in their own countries and in Italy, Spain, and Germany, but to divide and disunite the people of other countries so as to condition them for conquest. France is the historical example. This amendment, therefore, follows the Hitler technique of conquest from within. This proposal is part and parcel of domestic Hitlerism.

It is not an accident that those same gentlemen who support this antilabor legislation similar to that which was imposed on Germany and on Italy by decrees of Mussolini and Hitler are the same people who are also employing the technique of Fascist conquest from within by means of an anti-Communist drive, because antilabor laws have always been forced on people behind an anti-Communist smoke screen. This has been the experience of all democratic countries which have been conquered either from within or from without by Hitlerism.

I also want to make mention of some facts in connection with the charges made yesterday by the gentleman from Texas with regard to criminals in the labor movement. Why, I could stand here and mention criminals who were in his own employ, on the pay roll of his own committee, not only stool pigeons who received funds through that committee, but I am also referring to a person who was in an administrative capacity on that committee, the former chief investigator of the committee, a certain Edward Francis Sullivan, whose police record is a mile long. The gentleman from Texas was apprised of that criminal working for his committee, on his pay roll as chief investigator, and when I say "his" I mean his committee pay roll. When the gentleman was told about it by Mr. Oliver, of Labor's Non-Partisan League, what did the gentleman say? According to the New York Times of August 27, 1938, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] asserted that the charges were beside the point. I am not so sure about that. However, I say that the gentleman's charge about criminals being in the labor movement is definitely beside the point and only an attempt to smear a great American institution, the organized-labor movement, in order to bring about the enactment of legislation which will deprive labor of the right to organize, bargain collectively, and strike if necessary to obtain a decent living. This amendment and all of the bills before us constitute an assault on the democracy of our country and are the beginnings of domestic fascism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to the Dies amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put after the word "office" the words "or organizer."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman ought to use the word "employment."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in certain particulars. Is there objection?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the Dies amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I propound the inquiry whether any more amendments are on the Clerk's desk to the Smith substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. There are no more amendments to the Smith amendment at the desk.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, America is at the crossroads today. Representative government is on trial. Our American way of life, our sacred institutions, our Christian civilization is being attacked by fascism from without and communism from within. I recall that a few years ago Sir Auckland Geddes, the then British Ambassador, made a speech in this country in which he said, "An age is dying in Europe. The waves caused from its death agonies are lashing the shores of America."

We are today walking down the same path that led European countries to their ruin. When I say European countries, I mean Germany, Italy, Russia, and France. We cannot afford to permit subversive elements under the guise of representing labor to undermine or destroy our form of government and our way of life. The time has come when Congress must assume its responsibilities and stop these attempts to undermine and destroy our sacred institutions.

I am as sympathetic with labor as any of these kid-glove gentlemen who have spoken here today. I know what labor means. I know what it is to toil in the hot sun. I know what it is to work in the mill. I know that labor is going to pay the penalty for these "reds," these alien influences that are undermining and destroying confidence in the labor movement in America. This bill is really in the interest of the honest laborers of this country.

Besides, all labor is not organized. You would think to hear these men talk that all laborers were in a union. I represent thousands of unorganized laborers, American farmers, who toil in the hot sun day in and day out, and whose average earnings are less than one-third, yes, less than one-fourth the average wage now paid to industrial labor, according to reports of the Labor Department itself.

Not only that, but we are drafting the sons of those farmers to go to war. They say it will probably take 10,000,000 of them before it is over. We pay those boys $21 a month; yet we are having trouble putting a stop to racketeering in defense industries—the very industries that must supply the weapons of war for these young men to use in defense of our country.

We ought not to stop with defense industries. If the Bill of Rights means anything, it means the right to work for your daily bread. When you deny that right, you might as well strike the Bill of Rights from the Constitution of the United States.

If this thing continues, we are as surely headed for trouble in this country as time goes on. So, regardless of the pressure that is being brought, I sincerely trust that every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate will rise to his responsibility and pass laws here that will guarantee every man the right to work without paying tribute to some racketeer for the privilege. This will guarantee that when our country is in trouble our defense industries will not be interfered with.

Hitler and Stalin together could wreck many industries in America tomorrow. The Ogpu in Russia has its agents all over this country, and the Gestapo in Germany has the same thing. If those agents do not do what they are told to do, their families will likely be killed. That is the strongest pressure that can be brought. How do you know how long it will be before those two dictators will be together? It would not surprise me to see that happen any day. Then you will have all this power in the hands of a foreign foe that can destroy many American industries and to that extent break down American defense. Then there is Japan, the most insidious influence in the world today. She would like to see all our industries destroyed.

Our duty is plain; we must pass legislation that will protect our country against any kind of sabotage during these trying times.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as our friend and colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] stated this morning, the eyes of America are focused more directly upon the Congress at this time than heretofore. As soldiers of the Republic and as Representatives of all the people, the hour has come for us, for you and me, to demonstrate our worthiness of the honors we wear. I trust that on tomorrow each and every one of us will find ourselves at peace with our consciences in the thought that we did not fail our country.

This is what I want to say to you, and the suggestion came to me from a beloved Member of this House on the minority side. It would be better if we did nothing than to enact a bill minus of teeth, minus of guts, minus of brains, and minus of character.

I believe the Smith bill is the answer to the needs of the moment. I believe the Members of this body should unite in support of that bill and give the people of this country the answer to the question they are propounding to us today. What are you going to do for the safety of home and country?

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, a man who has a salary of $10,000 per year, no doubt can safely talk about and is even willing to freeze wages. But what about the fellow who draws $50 or less per month who must live and meet constantly rising prices.

I believe if the authors of such bills were among such wage earners, while they might be afraid they would freeze this winter, certainly they would not be advocating a bill that would make this terrible death possible.

After listening to the debate on this subject, I am convinced that some people believe that the union-labor man can only think of using his organization to hamper and injure his country in every manner at his command. Therefore he causes useless strikes and labor tie-ups, for the sole purpose of aiding those who seek to destroy the American Government and way of life.

I believe I can truthfully refute this mistaken and erroneous conception of the use of labor's only weapon against unjust and unfair working conditions that existed for centuries against laboring men, and at the present time continue in isolated cases.

Mr. Speaker, everyone dreads and abhors the necessity of strikes, even the union men themselves, who from time to time are forced to resort to these drastic measures. For, in forced shut-downs, none suffer so much as the striker and his family, not even the gentleman from Virginia, when the loss of pay to the wage earner brings suffering and hunger to his family and himself.

But like war—the action of strikes is sometimes necessary to prevent intolerable working conditions from continuing on and on so that future generations may secure for themselves at least an honest living commensurate with the American standard of life.

So, in considering legislation that will encroach upon labor's inalienable rights that have been guaranteed to him, not only by acts of legislation passed by this body itself and upheld by our highest court, we should be careful that we do not infringe upon the acknowledged privileges of labor and send him back to work embittered by the idea that he and he alone must be restrained of rights that are his and are necessary for him to prevent his falling into the category of passed days—a mere wage slave. Because if the laboring man is convinced that legislation we are now considering will bring down on his head such conditions, then we will have done vastly more harm than good, by the enactment of such legislation.

I am amazed at the charge that the laboring man is seeking by strikes to injure his country in an endeavor to prevent the continuous output of materials that are needed for our preparation against war and invasion.

In my State the greatest industry is coal. West Virginia today produces more bituminous coal than any State in the union. More than 110,000 men are employed in this industry, and more than 140,000,000 tons of coal will be produced this year. Each miner will average a production of more than 5 tons for each working day.

When we learn what this really means, I believe all of us here today will be very careful of boasting of our own ability to aid the preparedness program.

The production of 5 tons of coal per day will heat at the very lowest cost 5 homes for 30 days, or 100 homes per month. And the production of this daily output of coal will turn out 4 tons of steel each working day. Therefore our effort to aid preparedness in any other profession or industry, must seem puerile and meager indeed, compared with this great contribution to our national preparedness program.

Do we want to pass legislation that will embitter these greatest of preparedness workers? Do we want to bring unrest and shutdowns in the great coal industry? If not, we will be careful and considerate and try to keep the good will and faith of the American workmen in any legislation we may pass on the question of labor today. Let us remember that we cannot dig coal with bayonets nor can we operate steel mills with statutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Having listened to this debate pretty consistently right straight on through, I have come to one or two conclusions, with reference to this matter, and for what they are worth, I desire to hand them on to the Members of the House. I am convinced that in this critical hour, the responsibility of the Government of the United States has received a flat and open challenge. The answer to that challenge is during this hour squarely before the representative branch of the Government of these United States. We represent, each and every one of us, a district within a sovereign State, that State belonging to the Union for which the Declaration of Independence was drafted and the Constitution of the United States was adopted and ratified. The challenge to the responsibility of government is so far-reaching in its impact, as to have reached down deep into the neighboring republics to the south of us. In a recent tour, which took us into 16 of the 21 countries of South America, the question was presented to each of us, to all of the members of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents at various times and in most cases to all of them, "What are you in the United States going to do concerning the stoppage of the defense industries in your country?" That question has now returned and is back here squarely before us. With utter discretion, with prejudice and malice toward no citizen or group in this Nation, after listening to this debate I take this moment to adjure you, my fellow citizens and colleagues, that this is the time for the true expression of the value that the membership of this House of Representatives places upon the Constitution of the United States and that flag. No law-abiding free citizen of the United States, be he a member of an organized labor union or not, can oppose legislation for the direct and sole benefit of his country and the continuity of the liberties of American citizens. I shall vote for the Smith bill. The Smith bill is an American bill, as I see it. It meets the issue squarely, and if within the Constitution, that immortal instrument, there is a certain and specific statement with reference to certain rights guaranteed to all persons, the right to keep and bear arms, without infringement, surely before our common God all Americans have the right to work without that right being abridged, and surely all Americans have the right to offer employment and to take employment and to work under the Constitution of the United States without abridgment of any sort, save that of our common God, when He calls the end of the days which are numbered to each and all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall vote for the Smith bill.

One of my distinguished colleagues has rightly keynoted the legislation which we have before us today dealing with the labor problem. He said that—

> The hour has come when we in this Congress can no longer avoid the issue so squarely placed before us; when we can no longer dodge the responsibility for taking action toward curbing unjustified strikes in defense industries.

Surely the day has come in America where, rightly, the people of the United States are demanding of this Congress in an unmistakable way that something must be done—something tangible, something worth while, something to end for the time being this constant labor agitation and dispute while the Nation spends its resources to prepare to defend itself.

Under the influence from high places, we have delayed too long some action on the part of this Congress in its responsibility to the people and its responsibility to labor. If the fathers and mothers of this Nation are to give up their sons to answer the call of Government in the service of their country, then the fathers and mothers have the right to ask of us that we put an end to these stoppages of production. All too often, when reference has been made to legislation of this character, we have been reminded that we cannot indict all labor for the sins of the few. I do not propose to indict all labor. But by that same logic, can we rightfully say we cannot indict the German people for the leadership of their Chancelor, but we are preparing to make war against the German people and the German people will die as a result of war—not the German Chancelor, but the German people must assume responsibility for their Chancelor; and organized labor, high-minded though it is, must assume some responsibility for its leadership. There is no other route to travel.

Yes, whenever there is suggestion of corrective legislation against labor, we are reminded over and over again of the

sins of the employer of the past generations. That is not the question we have before us today. Well may we admit those sins and well may we regret those sins, but our responsibility as a Congress today is to see that American factories produce. I should want to be listed among the first who will place legislation on the books to take from employers excessive profits. This is no time to make millionaires.

At the same time, let us remember that unwarranted stoppages of production affect not only the defense program but the general consumer as well. The restraints and the arbitrary rulings imposed by uncontrolled labor unions today affect the consumer by increasing the cost of the things he buys; they affect the farmer because they increase processing and transportation costs, which costs come out of his pockets and therefore reduce the farmer's income.

We have been told times without number that if private enterprise fails to fill its responsibility to the people that the Government will answer the call of the people and move in to do the job. If this is a logical statement and if this is a reasonable procedure, I ask you, my colleagues, this question: Do not the numbers on the yardstick run both ways? In this great period of emergency, Congress must courageously face its responsibility. I cannot bring myself to believe that within the ranks of labor exists any sizable number who believe in the policy of some of their leaders today. My contacts and my observations with men who carry the union card are quite the contrary.

Can it be possible that we, as a Congress, representing 132,000,000 people, find ourselves in the position where we bow to the demands of a few selfish leaders who pretend to speak for seven to ten million citizens? Can it be true that the remaining 125,000,000 must forever yield to a Government dictated by a unit of our society, the leadership of which, in many respects, does not represent the wishes of the rank and file of its membership? I should not want my position as regards labor to escape attention here. Organized labor has a place in the scheme of American life, and I shall always vote to defend it on the things in which it is reasonable. But surely there is a common meeting place in this hour of great concern where the forces of our American society can join hands in a common cause. The time and the place of that common cause has arrived.

Congress must act to save labor from itself; to restrain those leaders of labor who are responsible for the fact that public opinion in American today has become so antagonistic to labor as a whole because of the activities of its leaders. We can no longer dodge this issue. The time has passed for pussyfooting. The people of the United States expect this Congress to do its duty and to enact legislation which will effectively eliminate the greatest curse on our defense program today.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I am not a former bricklayer or lawyer or a member of any union. I am an employer, and the publisher of a daily newspaper which negotiates and deals with three separate unions. I have had my business controversies with the unions, but in each instance I have been able to negotiate and mediate a settlement of all controversies. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] stated a few moments ago that the eyes of America are upon this House of Representatives today. Yes; the eyes of America are upon the House of Representatives today. The eyes of America are watching us to ascertain whether or not we are going to crucify the people in this country who toil by the sweat of their brows. The eyes of America are upon us to ascertain whether or not we are going to take away from labor the hard-earned rights for which it has fought for many years. The eyes of America are upon us to ascertain whether or not we are trying to put shackles on labor while it is trying to carry out this defense program. I do not condone the recent test of strength by John L. Lewis in the captive coal strike, and if it had not been for that happening we would not be here today considering legislation of this nature. I say that we cannot destroy the rank and file of honest and hard-working people for the acts of a few men.

I have previously stated on the floor of this House that if we are going to adopt legislation, let us adopt legislation which will rid this country of the Communists and racketeers who have been allowed to creep into key positions in labor unions. Those men are the ones who have caused the trouble. Those men should have been deported or placed behind the bars long ago. They have no place in the American way of living. Thank God we have none of this type in Connecticut. We are proud of labor's defense record in our State.

This defense program has given the haters of labor a splendid opportunity to blast labor and to remove it from the position it now holds in this country. This has been proven by the remarks here today. I do not believe that any Member of this House would dare to stand up today and question the patriotism of the rank and file of labor.

I recently returned from a trip which took me from coast to coast. I had an opportunity during that trip to inspect many of the large defense plants of this country. I had an opportunity to watch the men and women of labor toiling in the factories and shipyards, turning out ships, guns, planes, and ammunition; and, after making that trip and watching those people at work, I say to you that I have no fear for the defense of our country. I have no fear for the future of this great Nation. None of us likes strikes. We hate to see them take place, but antistrike legislation is not going to remedy the situation.

I am opposed to the Smith resolution. It will take away the hard-earned rights which labor only gained after years of fighting. I cannot agree with the gentlemen who have stated that labor is sabotaging our defense program. I urge you to vote down the resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman who has just left the floor, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS], I, too, speak in the best interest of the toiling masses. I do this for a number of reasons. First, I come from those masses of common people. They have a greater stake in American democracy than has any other class. Such democracy is about all they have to protect. These masses want no slow-down or stoppage in defense industries.

The gentleman thinks the passage of the Smith bill will place shackles on labor. I think quite the contrary. None of us want to place shackles on labor; neither do we want shackles placed on any other group of honest American citizens. Through the passage of the Smith bill we seek to avoid these results both now and hereafter.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted, unequivocal support of the Smith bill. The Smith bill is the strongest of the several bills from which we must choose at this time. It is an honest, courageous, straightforward method of dealing with the strike situation. Too long, much too long, have the President and the Congress vacillated in this matter. For 18 months our foreign policy has been fixed, but for 18 months our domestic policy has remained unfixed and uncertain. We are more endangered at this time from our failure to deal with domestic issues than from our failure to deal with foreign issues.

For 18 months we have been carrying on a serious economic war, a battle of production. Upon the success of this economic war, this battle of production, will depend our chance to escape a shooting war. Certainly it is better for all our citizens to sacrifice profits and unfair economic advantage than for some of our citizens to sacrifice their lives.

Had the Smith bill been law 1 month ago, the mine strike called by John L. Lewis would not have occurred. If the Smith bill now becomes law, such unnecessary and unreasonable strikes will not be called in the future, or, at least, during the continuance of this emergency. Let us not pass a milk-toast bill. A weak and equivocal measure passed at this time will simply be an invitation to further labor and industrial trouble rather than a discouragement of the same.

There comes a time when all must have less liberty in order for all to have more liberty, or else all will have no liberty. This is such a time. Let us arise to the needs of the hour and support a bill with some teeth in it. For the sake of American defense, let us pass the Smith bill, and do it now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach some agreement as to when the debate on the Smith proposal may be brought to an end? I see about 15 Members who desire to speak. I am wondering if we cannot conclude this debate on the Smith provision and all amendments in 1½ hours. That will be 3:30. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on the Smith substitute and all amendments close at 3:30.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent

that all debate on the Smith substitute and all amendments thereto close not later than 3:30. Is there objection?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire how the time will be divided in that case. Will it be divided among those who have stood and signified their desire to speak?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That will be determined by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair of course will have to recognize gentlemen seeking recognition. It will be the purpose of the present occupant of the chair to take the names of those now standing and divide that number into 1½ hours and allocate the proper time to each one.

Is there objection?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have a substitute to the Smith amendment on the desk. Would that be affected by this request.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is out of order for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask all gentlemen to remain standing in order that the Chair may check the names and try to be accurate.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have 5 minutes reserved for the majority leader. He asked me to do so for him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the names of those noted as standing requesting to be heard on this amendment: Messrs. HOOK, ELIOT of Massachusetts, WEST, RUSSELL, WICKERSHAM, FADDIS, COOLEY, PATRICK, PACE, POAGE, VOORHIS of California, GIFFORD, KEEFE, TABER, BURDICK, and MCCORMACK.

Does any other Member desire to be heard on this amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my name be placed on the list also.

The CHAIRMAN. The names of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] have been noted.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it is understood, is it, that the Chair will parcel out the time to the gentlemen whose names have been called and that the vote on the Smith amendment comes at 3:30?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, except that the last 5 minutes of the time will be reserved for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in this House as to my vigorous fight against communism. I had the occasion to show my colors when it meant the possible loss of thousands of votes, and I do not believe there are many Members on the floor of the House who have had a similar opportunity. I was endorsed by a very large group supposed to be representing labor during one of my campaigns, an organization having some 4,000 or 5,000 votes in my district. After investigation I discovered that there was a Communist leader in their midst. I then openly, before the public and over the radio, refused their endorsement until they would rid themselves of that Communist element. They did just that, and I know of no Communist in their midst since that time.

Mr. Chairman, ever since the Dark Ages there has been a fight for liberty. Socrates died for the right of free speech. Huss and Joan of Arc were burned at the stake rather than surrender in their fight for liberty. Yes; and if you will recall your history you will remember that when Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson were fighting for the Bill of Rights and they thought their cause was lost. They convinced Madison of the righteousness of their cause and were joined by Madison the conservative.

It was with the help of Madison, the conservative, that the Bill of Rights became the law of this Nation, the law of this land. Both Patrick Henry and Jefferson in those days were considered radicals.

The right of free speech, the right of liberty, and the Bill of Rights are on trial here today. Time will show the righteousness of the cause of labor. At times it may seem liberty is losing out, but it never does. As civilization progresses liberty and justice become more pronounced. Illustrative of our approach to this legislation, let me refer to the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Alabama on the question of picketing. Right while he was discussing the amendment, I questioned him as to the importing of strikebreakers and he admitted that the proposed amendment did not cover the problem he was concerned with and saw the mistake in his amendment. He asked that it be modified. I do not even know what the modification is. I have not heard it read. He called on the drafting service to help perfect or modify it. They went to the desk and did some writing, but it has never even been read to this House in its modified form; I do not believe anyone in this House knows or understands what the amendment is; yet you men walked down through the line and passed it. It is a sorry day for America when legislation is written in such a manner. Then there was the Dies amendment. I am wondering why the Silver Shirts were not included in that amendment. I am wondering why the Christian Front was not included. The fallacy of the whole thing is that they can leave the German Bund, join the Silver Shirts, and the amendment is not worth the paper it is written on. Yet this House in a state of hysteria passes such legislation. This is the Hitler type of technique. I fear for the future of America and our democratic institutions.

A surrender to the Fascist element will crush the very thing we are fighting to defend. Kenneth G. Crawford in his book The Pressure Boys said:

> Where the right to "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness," the theoretically inalienable prerogatives, has conflicted with the right to hold and exploit property—a mere civil privilege—the inalienable rights have too frequently been alienated.

These rights are being alienated here today. I recommend that the Members of this House read that book, and they will find out who is behind all of this wild hysterical move to destroy labor.

The question here today is not only the right of labor but whether constitutional government shall live or whether we shall go back to the days before the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution were adopted. God forbid that America today decay that far.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, in this great national crisis no man has a right to be guided by the allurements of greed. In this great debate, in the consideration of this important bill, no man has a right to be motivated by the promptings of angry passions.

I hate and despise the technique and the tactics of John L. Lewis, and I abhor the character and the conduct of his communistic labor agitators; but here we must approach the performance of our duty with calmness and becoming dignity and with an understanding of the great task which is now before us. As the gentleman from Mississippi has said, our way of life is threatened, but the true manhood of America should rise above sinister impulse and selfish motives. The gravity of our national situation addresses itself, Mr. Chairman, only to the true nobility of our souls and to the finest virtues of our patriotism. As this is no time for angry passions, it is likewise no time for indecision. America has made up its mind and America is demanding action, action which will lead this Nation on with rapidity and speed to the consummation of our great national-defense program.

My labor record is an open book, and my friendship for the laboring man is known to all of you. I know what it is to labor, and I agree with Henry Van Dyke, when he said:

> This is the gospel of labor;
> Sing it, ye bells of the kirk;
> The Lord of Love came down from above
> To live with the men who work;
> This is the rose that he planted,
> Here is the thorn cursed soil;
> Heaven is blessed with perfect rest
> But the blessing of earth is toil.

When I think of the man in uniform and the man in the mine, when I think of the greed of some, when I think of the sacrifice of many and the cause of all, when I look out across America and on the horizons of the world, I wonder with Thomas Hood:

> O God, that bread should be so dear
> And flesh and blood so cheap.

I agree with the great chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, "a billion dollars will not drive a single rivet in a battleship." It will not build a single armor plate, a single tank, machine gun, or bombing plane. Yet at the same time you know and I know that we cannot instill patriotism into the breast of man by the enactment of law. We cannot by the enactment of law purge the human race of its less admirable traits. The laws we here enact will not save America nor its institutions. Only when the people of this Nation—and I mean the working

people of America—fully understand and appreciate the deep, dark meanings of the European conflict and understand the morbid ambition of the man who has precipitated it; only when our people appreciate and realize the fact that the fate of freemen and the fate of the world depends not only upon our soldiers but our citizens as well, will we have a unity of thought which will solidify all of the forces of the Nation. When this happens we will have a display of patriotism the like of which the world has never seen.

Not upon this law nor upon the enactment of any set of laws, but rather upon the character, the courage, the fortitude, and the patriotism of our people depends the future welfare and destiny of our Nation. The laws we here enact may reflect but they can never control public opinion. Public opinion will support, yea, public opinion is demanding, a law which will effectively control labor racketeers, and I welcome an opportunity to vote for a bill that will do the job.

Although we today pray for peace we are at this hour preparing for war—war with all of its agonies, its wants, and its woes, its bloodshed and its broken hearts, its ghastly ghosts, its tears, its torn and twisted lives, and all that rides in the bloody wake of the vortex of modern warfare.

Although we love life we are building instrumentalities and machines of death. Yes; we are building all of the devices of death and destruction that the ingenuity of man has developed through the ages. Though we love life, we are preparing for death—death under the surface and upon the bosom of the seas—death upon the earth and in the air. We are preparing to meet that evil genius who is responsible for the conflict and carnage which curses civilization at this hour.

Not only are we building machines of death and destruction but from the homes and firesides of America men have been called to the arms. A few months ago the whole world was profoundly impressed by a rather strange yet inspiring spectacle. You and I as Americans were proud when our Nation called for men to register for service in the armed forces of the Nation. Seventeen million red-blooded, patriotic American boys marched to the places of registration in all of the cities and villages throughout the length and breadth of this great land. Seventeen million, and not a single shot was fired and not a single drop of blood was shed. Yes; they are now dressed in the garments of glory, their Nation's uniform, and they are preparing to defend the glorious cause of our country—they are the heart and the hope of America.

Thousands upon thousands of those boys are now out on maneuvers, and they will sleep in the woods tonight, out under a bleak December moon, far from home and fireside, beneath the rugged pines of the Carolinas. They need, and they shall have, the best and all of the equipment that the rich resources of a mighty Nation can provide, and public opinion in America will no longer tolerate unnecessary strife and strikes in industries which are vital to their preparation and their well-being and essential to the defense of this Nation. We are, therefore, face to face at this moment with the necessity of preventing delays in the production of fighting equipment and we must at all cost curb and control communistic labor agitators, and as has been well said during the course of this debate, we must strike the shackles from American workers and protect them in their right to work and in their desire to contribute to the cause of national defense. Yes; we must do this job and we must do it in the American way and within the framework of our Constitution.

I have an abiding faith in the loyalty and the patriotism of the workingmen of America and in their devotion to the common cause of our country.

While I appreciate that patience and tolerance are the watchwords of our democracy, you know and I know that even the patience of America will not endure all things. You know and I know that America will not longer tolerate an intemperate use of economic power which jeopardizes the defense, the welfare, and the security of our Nation.

Upon the success of our efforts to aid those who are pouring out their blood upon the altars of freedom in other parts of the world may well depend the supremacy of our own system of government here in America. To this system of government the workingmen of America are devoted and in defense of it they will bare their breasts and give their lives if the emergencies of the future are such as to require it, and this legislation is in the interest of the honest, loyal, and patriotic workingmen of the country.

Though there is much opposition, it is strange to observe that no one who has spoken in opposition to this bill has dared to discuss its provisions. Can there possibly be any opposition to the "cooling off" period provided? Can there possibly be any opposition to the ballot provision which provides for a secret ballot in an election held under the direction of the United States Conciliation Service? Does anyone object to the fourth section of the bill which makes it unlawful to discriminate between workers. Is it possible that someone objects to the provision which makes violence and intimidation unlawful? This provision only seeks to protect American citizens in the exercise of their inalienable right to work. Are you in favor of delaying the defense program by judicial disputes, boycotts, or sympathetic strikes? If you are, then, of course, you have a cause to be against the pending bill. Can any sound reason be given for an objection to the provision which requires registration of labor organizations and is accountable to its own members and to the public? The remaining sections of the pending bill provide for the creation of a National Defense Mediation Board and defines the jurisdiction of the Board and the procedure for mediation and voluntary arbitration, and the last important provision is the provision which provides for the maintenance of the status quo insofar as labor organizations are concerned.

The farmers of America will not; the soldiers of America cannot, and the laboring men of America must not, strike against the defense and the security of our Nation.

In this hour of our Nation's great peril we should all have one grand objective, our country and our country's cause. In the interest of America I urge the approval of the Smith bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot discuss the subject matter under consideration without paying tribute to the wage earners of my district. There is located in the Third Congressional District of Georgia what is probably the greatest military establishment in the world, Fort Benning. Today there are stationed there approximately 60,000 troops. There have been millions and millions of dollars spent in construction down there.

Months ago, members of the American Federation of Labor met and said:

> The welfare of our homeland is at stake. We hereby agree that we will undertake to settle our disputes by negotiation, and if that fails we will arbitrate our differences and stand by the award of the arbitrators regardless. We will not strike on defense projects.

Up to this hour, with thousands and thousands of men at work, with millions and millions of dollars expended, they have not lost the first day. They have not lost the first hour. They have not lost the first minute from preparing the defenses of this Nation. They are proud of that accomplishment and I am proud of them. They have said:

> God willing, in this emergency we are going to stand by our country.

I cannot find in my study of this legislation any justification for the charge made here that it will enslave labor. In the first place, you utterly overlook the fact that it is purely a defense measure and remains in force for only 2 years. I regard it as a defense measure as much as the Selective Service Act. We did not enslave those boys when we ordered them to the training camps for 12 and 18 months. Let us keep the Selective Service Act in mind a minute.

What does this bill do? It says that before the men strike on defense production they shall wait 30 days to cool off and deliberate on their action. Is that enslavement? When our boys went to training camps they went there for 12 and 18 months. Many labor groups have voluntarily put such provision in their contracts. How can I object to asking that all contracts contain such a provision? The next provision says that the employees shall have the right to vote on whether or not to strike. When their jobs, their pay, their working conditions, their welfare is at stake, they shall be given the right to vote on whether or not they shall leave their employment. Is that enslavement? It is admitted by all that several strikes have been called in defense plants against the wishes of a majority of the workmen and these workmen have returned to the plants as soon as they were given protection. Is it slavery to say that these men shall be given a voice in the question of whether or not they shall work? It is also admitted that several of these leaders, calling out the

men, were doing it to sabotage the defense program.

What is the next provision? It says that no employer shall encourage or discourage a man about joining a union. You cannot object to that.

What is the next provision? It prohibits force and violence in picket lines. That is law and order. Can that be enslavement? Can any Member defend the slaughters that have been committed around picket lines during the last 2 years? Is there any good reason why we should approve their continuance?

What is the next provision? It prohibits jurisdictional strikes. When the welfare of this Nation is at stake, when we are facing the most critical hour that ever faced this Nation, is it wrong to ask the wage earners that they shall not stop defense production to settle their own little family affairs? Why, you have jurisdictional strikes within the same union stopping defense production. Is that enslavement? I have never heard of any sensible defense of the jurisdictional strike, and with the National Labor Relations Act in effect there is no justification for such strikes.

This amendment next provides that labor organizations shall register with the National Labor Relations Board and certify the names of its officers, the amount of its assessments, the number of members, and so forth. Certainly it cannot be denied that the public has a deep interest in any organization that has millions of members and so greatly affects the public welfare. I regret, however, that the rules of the House forbid the offering of an amendment to this section so as to broaden it and require that all organizations be compelled to register and give full information concerning themselves. These should include organizations of employers, propaganda organizations, and all others. I would like to know, and the people are entitled to know, for instance, where the America First Committee is getting all its money.

This amendment then gives legislative sanction to the National Mediation Board and gives the President authority to enforce its decision when the safety of this Nation is imperiled. I have heard no one question the wisdom of that provision. That is not slavery.

On yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] gave us a partial report on the 2,000 officers and organizers in the C. I. O. who are either connected with the Communists or have long criminal records. The loyal American workers do not like that; they do not want it. I know the wage earners of my district do not and that they want that type run out of the labor movement. This amendment prohibits that type from holding office in labor organizations, as recommended by the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not require organized labor to surrender any of its rights or give up any of its gains during the last few years. It simply asks that labor keep its head, consider first in this hour of peril the security and safety of our homeland, and run out of its ranks those few traitors and hotheads who will do anything for their own private gain.

There has been a great deal of false propaganda sent out about this bill and I have received some telegrams asking me to vote against it. But I believe I know the wage earners of my district. They love their country and they intend to support and defend it. They know I shall never ask of them any more than I shall give myself or require of my own son, who is now preparing for military service, and I know that when they understand this bill they will see that it requires no more of other labor organizations than they have voluntarily agreed to themselves.

To me, Mr. Chairman, there is only one real issue here today: Shall we support and sustain the President and our boys in the service, or shall we permit John L. Lewis, with the fate of our Nation in the balance, to dictate when and how much we shall produce to defend our loved ones against the attacks of a hated Hun who would delight to see this bill defeated?

To me there is but one choice. I believe I know what my duty is. You can tell our sailor boys out on the high seas tonight that, with God's help, I shall not fail them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak very briefly, simply as an American who, like most of us here, is interested primarily in having full and continuous production for national defense.

I want to make one point about the amendment before us. I will deal only with the provisions in this bill which in one way or another make it illegal to strike. The bill deals with different situations in different ways, but it says that certain types of strikes shall be illegal, or that it will be illegal to strike until certain formalities are complied with, or that it will be illegal to strike within a 60-day cooling period.

I heard the gentleman from Tennessee a little while ago say that if this bill had been law a month ago there would have been no coal strike. I fear that he was overoptimistic. The record of other countries and this country in connection with laws attempting to outlaw strikes does not indicate that they do achieve the goal of full and continuous industrial production. Quite the contrary.

Let me recapitulate very briefly. In Australia they outlawed strikes over 40 years ago by imposing a system of compulsory arbitration. In the intervening years between then and now they have had more strikes, compared to their total number of men in industry, than we have had. The law did not work. It did not assure full and continuous production.

In England during the last war it was made a crime to strike. Three men were convicted of that crime, and promptly 97,000 shipyard workers gave notice they were going out on strike in protest. The law became a dead letter. It did not result in full and uninterrupted industrial production in Great Britain.

Finally, let us take the example of France, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] told us most dramatically that we should remember prostrate France. Yes, indeed; we should remember. They did just what we are asked to do here today, only more so. They outlawed strikes and they did enforce the law. They court martialed a man and treated him as a deserter if he struck. What happened? Industrial production in France just before the war broke out, and during the first months of the war, fell to considerably lower levels than during the strike-torn regime of Premier Blum. That law, measured by the standard that we need to put up before us of full and uninterrupted production, did not work.

It may be said that the pending bill primarily is a cooling-period bill and contains nothing as drastic as what has been tried in these other countries. Unfortunately, we have in our own country some experience which enables us to see whether cooling periods actually do assure full and uninterrupted production. As was pointed out here yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER], in one State that recently enacted a cooling-period bill, eight times more strikes occurred after the enactment of that law than previous to it.

There are other objections to cooling periods and the possible abuse of them by a few employers who are still fighting organized labor, who can use them to fire the leaders of the union and recruit strikebreakers and to terrorize the employees during the alleged cooling period. I do not think that would happen in many cases, but I do not doubt it would happen in some. The cooling period would do no good, based on the experience that we have had, and is likely to do some harm.

I think we all need a cooling period right here in the House. Drastic action, taken in anger, might relieve the feelings of some of us, but it would not help the country. As a nation we are much too prone to try to solve every problem by saying, "There ought to be a law."

Last Thursday, over the radio, William L. Batt, Director of Materials of the O. P. M., made a very informed speech on this subject. Mr. Batt is a leading industrialist; he certainly does not speak as a representative of organized labor. He saw the folly and futility of trying to assure full production by passing an antilabor law.

Mr. Batt urged that the President call a conference of representatives of management and labor and government to promulgate an industrial-relations policy for the emergency.

Such a voluntary agreement—

He said—

implemented by the President's acceptance and declared by him to be a vital factor in the safety of the country, would be a standard around which every liberty-loving American, in or out of the ranks of labor, could rally.

I hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] will have an opportunity later today to offer his resolution recommending just such a conference.

The need for harmony is greater than ever before—harmony, not embittered disunity. The need is for faith in America, faith in democracy, faith translated into works—not the deliberate creation of an inevitably sullen minority. The

working people of the Nation are good Americans. There will be no danger of their following false leadership, if they are recognized as equal partners in a great national effort. Free men will work in the defense of freedom.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, when we had the first sit-down strikes certain administration leaders were warned the time had come when they must decide whether we were to have law and order in this country or mob rule. As everyone knows, no action was taken to stop these unlawful acts and as a consequence they have gone from bad to worse until now they have reached such mammoth proportions as to threaten the very existence of this country's security and form of government.

Those of us who were anxious to stop these strikes have been repeatedly told that no legislation was necessary, as there were sufficient laws to handle the strike situation. At this belated hour we are now called upon to pass legislation to put an end to these unlawful acts. Again we are faced with the decision of whether law and order and our form of government is to continue or whether we are to have mob rule, racketeering and traitors set up on a pedestal among us.

There is no question but what the great majority of the members of organized labor are patriotic, liberty loving, and as fine American citizens as may be found anywhere, but, unfortunately, they are in the clutches of labor racketeers, Quislings, and others who put their selfish personal interests ahead of the welfare of the country. The ranks of labor unions and the laboring men are furnishing their quota of sons for our national defense, and they, no more than you and I, want to send them to battle inadequately trained because of a lack of arms and equipment.

The American people are far too intelligent, patriotic, and liberty loving to longer permit this festering sore to remain in the body politic. Each and every one of us has a high and sacred duty to perform in passing on this legislation. I beseech those of you who are wavering to lay aside your prejudice, your personal interests, your political future, if need be, and vote for the continuance of a government of free people, for a government that will not sanction the payment of tribute to traitors and racketeers for the privilege of exercising a God-given right to make an honest living for themselves and their families and to participate with other patriots in doing their utmost to avoid the fate of France befalling this country. Personally, I favor the Smith bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, some newspaper reporter here has written a lot of articles about Congress, and he has come to the conclusion that the Members are principally a bunch of jackasses. The only fault I find with that statement is that it is about half true and we have demonstrated that here this afternoon.

I am going to take the position that we are not in war until this Congress declares war. The President may have all the shooting incidents he wants, but we are not at war until we declare it. It seems an action at this time against 10,000,000 workers, when 9,550,000 of them have been as loyal to this Government as anybody sitting on this floor, is not proper. To reach a few wrongdoers we should not indict 50,000,000 workers, organized and unorganized.

There is no use getting excited about anything. Just take it cool. A lot of you here this afternoon think the eyes of this Nation are upon you, and I think they are, too; at least they will be tomorrow morning when they find out what we did today.

This is what you did. Because there are 20 Communists occupying positions of leadership in labor organizations, this afternoon we have jumped on organized labor and said, "You have to put those men out," while at the same time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and every man sitting on this floor know that we have 20 times as many Communists occupying positions of trust in the Government here in Washington as there are in the labor organizations of America, and we have not done anything about that. Do you not think the eyes of this Nation will be upon us tomorrow?

If you amended this Smith bill to suit me in every particular, and let me amend it, I will still vote against it. Vote down the Smith amendment and we shall have the Ramspeck bill left, which is a much more just measure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as I see this picture, I agree with those gentlemen who have said that the decision of the Congress today is going to be fraught with tremendous consequences. I happen to believe that it would be a mistake under all the circumstances for us to do nothing. I think when the recommendation of the Mediation Board was rejected in the captive coal-mine case we were confronted with a situation that called for action by the Congress. I am prepared to vote for the Ramspeck bill or a measure similar to it. But I know it would be a great mistake for us to have an antilabor field day here because of the fact that there is tremendous concern about the problem of stoppages in industry, and because of the existence of a great surge of antilabor feeling throughout the country. Some of that feeling is, I believe, justified. But it is our job to consider what the real results of what we do here today are going to be.

A number of Members have spoken about the fact that they think a lot of the rank and file of labor would at least not be opposed and might be in favor of certain types of legislation. I hold no brief whatsoever for such abuses as the establishment of a closed shop and the charging of exorbitant initiation fees at the same time. But I think it is obvious that a wholesale piece of legislation, doing almost everything that anyone could think of with regard to labor, is not going to be regarded by the rank and file of labor as fair to them nor by the country generally as careful legislation in this field.

Are we going to pass a labor code here this afternoon or are we going to pass a bill to try to keep down strikes? Which is it going to be? In my judgment, it ought not to be both. The time will come, if labor ever achieves anything like full organization in this country, when we will pass a labor code, and we shall have to sit down and make one to prevent that power from becoming too great; but today, as I understand, our problem is to prevent strikes.

I am impressed by the fact that a number of Members have spoken about their being for something that will be effective in that regard, and then they wind up by saying that they are against any type of legislation that makes it possible for the Government to take over plants. I submit that you are going to operate in one field or the other. Either you are going to operate in the field of mediation, of calling together labor and industry and telling them to make a code, a policy to be followed during this emergency, to which both will agree and which both will follow—either you are going to operate in that field of mediation and voluntary arbitration, or else, if you are going to compel men to work, you must say that they must work for the United States Government and not for the private profit of somebody else. So if you want in this bill a power to absolutely stop strikes, if you want to say there cannot be strikes, then it is necessary that you do that in the only constitutional way there is to do it and empower the Government to take over plants at least temporarily, and until the grievances and difficulties have, in the judgment of an impartial tribunal, been fairly settled.

I believe these things have to be thought over. As I said yesterday, I think it is necessary that we be fair, that everyone see that we are trying to be fair. It is necessary that the rank and file of labor that has been spoken about regard us as being just as concerned about other groups that try to take advantage of this situation to gain a position of increased power as we are about labor. I do not think we can overlook any of them.

There have been a lot of very fair and just contracts entered into by manufacturing concerns with the Government for plant expansion. Most manufacturing concerns have come in and made contracts that are fair to the Government of the United States. However, I have before me information about one such concern that has asked for a contract that provides as follows: The Government to spend $55,000,000 of the people's money to construct a plant on land belonging to this corporation—it is the Bethlehem Steel Corporation—that plant to be leased by Bethlehem Steel from the Government, but the Government to lease the land beneath it from Bethlehem Steel, both leases to run concurrently, so that any time the Government is compelled to cancel that contract the land lease is immediately canceled, and all the recourse the Government has is to

remove the facilities. In no other case, so far as I know, has a Government plant been built on privately owned land unless a binding long-term lease could be obtained.

Further, in this contract Bethlehem retains control of the rate of production, the one thing we care most about, and the only time the Government can cancel the contract is if Bethlehem fails to produce at 25 percent of capacity or more for a 5-year period. How does this sound from the standpoint of pushing forward the defense program? And, finally, this lease is to run until 1977—just about as long as the useful life of the plant itself.

If Bethlehem refuses to give priority to a Government contract in this Government-owned plant the only recourse of the Government is to remove the facilities from the land.

Now, the question I want to ask is this: What are the other manufacturers who did not try to take advantage going to say if Bethlehem gets this contract? I earnestly hope such a contract will never be signed.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot overlook things like this. I know the House does not know anything about it. I know you never hear about it in the House. But I am concerned about it. I am not trying to distract attention from the labor issue. I have said I would vote for a fair bill—and I will. But I think we have to do a fair job all around, and a careful job. I do think we have to meet these issues. I think we have to meet them fair and square. I said yesterday and I say again today, I do not think we can overlook it. I think the kind of a bill we vote on tonight is all important. Our duty at the moment is not to pass a bill containing a great number of half-considered measures to regulate labor. Our duty at the moment is to do what is best for our defense program. That means to pass a bill containing the best possible formula for the avoidance of strikes, the ultimate governmental power to take over the plant if necessary for temporary periods, and a provision to bring labor and industry together with the duty and responsibility of developing a code of principles and policies to govern industrial relations during this emergency.

I make my appeal not because there is going to be any rebellion in the ranks of labor whatever the House does. Such talk is wrong. But enthusiastic, earnest, eager work with a spirit of high morale is quite as important as the number of days people work. I do not want to hurt that spirit or that morale.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I am greatly worried about the procedure, lest we get confused. I wish I could help make it plain by a brief statement. The Smith bill contains nearly all the provisions of the other bills except the seizure of plants. It contains the Ramspeck bill, with the seizure provisions deleted. It contains the "ice-water" section, that is, the cooling-off clause, which is in the Ramspeck bill. I understand that the Landis bill that will be offered is a substitute. I trust it will not be offered in that manner. It should be offered as an amendment and only the portion containing the subversive clauses. The rest of this bill is already in the Smith bill although not exactly identical. Therefore only a part of the Landis bill should be offered as an amendment. Do not try to substitute it for the Smith bill. We can amend the Smith bill by striking out and by additional sections if desired. This is as I understand it and have been so assured by its author.

I am much worried lest we get confused on this procedure. I am trying at this moment only to make it clear. I also favor the Landis provisions, but not a substitute measure. In the Smith bill there are instructions to unions to report their "method of election." And in the matter of these strikes affecting the public interest, even the national safety, we should protect the individual by a secret ballot. Why do we hesitate to do this—certainly the membership of any union ought to desire such protection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is the gentleman in favor of the enactment of a law which would compel large corporations to have secret ballots of their stockholders?

Mr. GIFFORD. Indeed I would, if they were affected with a public interest, such as affects the safety of the Nation. They can at any time have a secret ballot of their stockholders if the stockholders might desire it. You cannot compare an organization of stockholders with the great organization of John L. Lewis and his dictatorship methods. Certainly I would vote to protect stockholders if need be shown. I earnestly believe that if those miners had had the opportunity of a secret ballot last week, they would have voted with the President of the United States, after he had appealed to them and not with John L. Lewis. If I could not believe that I would indeed fear for my country.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, of course we have all heard from the country and everybody knows that Mr. and Mrs. America want some legislation here that will curb strikes in defense industries. Of course the eyes of America are upon the Congress of the United States in a measure. You ask any ordinary American as to who represents the Ninth District of Alabama and he will say some Democrat, he supposes. The eyes of America are upon us somewhat as they still will be 2 years from now, and if we jump up and pass too drastic an act at this time, we can say to ourselves, oh, we were excited at that time—yes, but the reply will be that the people of the country do not expect gentlemen down here to get excited and pass a law. They will say that they want to be allowed to grow a little excited themselves, at times, but they expect us to be cool and calm at all times. They demand that of their Congress. They will look back when they are not excited and hold us to account for all time.

I think the Ramspeck bill will do what it purports to do. I think it provides for voluntary mediation of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and requires maintenance by employers, and so on, of the status quo, which is all we are after. No plants will actually be taken over. If we go too far, then we lose the effectiveness of the very thing that we are trying to do, because those to be most greatly affected will lose confidence in the amicable nature of the law which we pass. For that reason, I shall stand by the Ramspeck bill in as near a pure form as it can come out of committee.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not yield until I get my statement in. Do you know why this law will be effective? Because America through its lawmaking body will have spoken, and then the majority of all voices in America will join in chorus.

That is nine-tenths of the whole battle. Why? Labor has been successful because the strikebreaker has been called a "scab" and has had the mark of Cain placed upon him. By popular feeling he has been discredited and winged. Even his family has suffered in consequence. Now, the organizers began going too far, as they belatedly saw. That is why the recent strike was called off. Do not let anybody tell you otherwise. Because then a man could become a strikebreaker—a man could say, "I am going into the mine and you may call me a scab or whatever you please. I am going in there and work for the defense of my country." He became a hero, nothing was against his name, and he came out fine. The labor leadership was destroying the very thing that has sustained and supported the successful program of labor during these years. This will continue to do that. This will leave it in that shape when groups insist on breaking over, and that is good democratic Americanism. The Ramspeck bill is enough, and I will support it, and I wish to go no further. However, I expect to be able to sustain the antistrike bill this committee shall report.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It seems to me the Ramspeck bill is not an antistrike bill but merely a confiscation of property bill, since it gives to the employer the privilege of yielding either to the union or to the United States Army.

Mr. PATRICK. I simply do not agree with that application. I think the bill is a reasonable approach. If I felt that it would actually result in any measurable property confiscation, I would oppose it myself. The Ramspeck bill is a step in the right direction. The Smith bill may carry the danger of becoming a step in the wrong direction. There is a lot of difference between the successful outcome of a bill which goes in the right direction and a bill which moves in the wrong direction, even though they have the same potency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is recognized.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the American way of life has been threatened. I say the American way of life and the mode of living has already changed and unless needless strikes in defense industries are stopped, it may continue to change still further, not favorably, however, but likely to suit the whims of Hitler.

I want to say at this time the farmers have not struck. The ministers have not gone on a strike. The little clerks, small business men, teachers, and in fact many classes of the laborers have not struck. A few un-American leaders interested in their own selfish motives and not in the laborers or the public have caused the people of this country, the general public, laborers, and this Congress all of this unnecessary delay and trouble.

I desire at this time to compliment the laborers, both organized and unorganized, in Oklahoma. We have not had any strikes of any kind during this emergency. These Oklahoma laborers are true Americans.

I desire to compliment the old people. They have not struck. They are the pioneers who made this country. We owe them an obligation and though we pay them a very meager amount of $10 or $15 a month, we have not heard nearly as much complaint from them as we have from the others. We should give them at least $30 per month Federal pension.

When you gentlemen cast your votes I hope you will not vote personalities, regardless of which side you are on. You and I both have friends supporting both phases of this bill. I hope you will vote in the interest of the land of the free and the home of the brave.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have been here since the inception of this debate, trying to see if I could not understand this legislation. I heard the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS] make a speech in which he very violently proclaimed that Congress is now in this fateful hour about to impose shackles upon labor. He makes a speech of that character. Then somebody else makes a speech equally as violent and says, "We are now, in this fateful hour, about to strike the shackles from labor." Somebody must be mistaken. Both gentlemen cannot be right.

I have heard very few Members stand here and say anything about what is in the Smith bill. So I have been trying to study the bill. What is there in this bill that places shackles upon labor? What is there about this bill that makes some so apprehensive? Oh, I remember back in Wisconsin when they passed the Wisconsin labor-relations act 2 years ago it was said that labor would go on a general strike and that the laboring class of Wisconsin were to be put forever into subserviency because of the passage of that law. I talked with some of the boys from Wisconsin yesterday who were here representing the C. I. O. unions, and they said, "We do not have a labor difficulty or a labor strike in Wisconsin, due to fine administration of the act." The only blot upon the escutcheon of labor in Wisconsin was that caused by the unauthorized, fraudulent Allis-Chalmers strike, which labor itself repudiated and the citizenry of Wisconsin are ashamed of.

Now, this bill says that labor is entitled to a secret ballot, to be supervised by the United States Conciliation Service. If this bill were law when they took that strike ballot with the C. I. O. union in Wisconsin in the Allis-Chalmers plant, the chances are that the strike would have been averted. Their bylaws provide for a secret ballot, and yet the deceitful, fraudulent representatives of that union stuffed the ballot nevertheless and succeeded in calling that strike and maintaining it by fraud and deception. I do not know of any honest labor leader—and I know a lot of them—who is opposed to any such provision as that. I do not know of any honest labor leader who is opposed to many of the provisions in the Smith bill. I would like to have the gentleman from Connecticut, who made this violent speech for labor, or some of these other gentlemen, come down here in the Well of the House and specifically point out in this bill or in any of these other bills what is the thing they are objecting to

We are not talking generalities; we are talking about a piece of legislation. We are discussing the specific provisions in the bill. Those who are opposed should get down here and talk common sense and facts. Let us know what you are opposed to. What is there in this bill that you oppose? Or are you just making a speech, perhaps, for the consumption of those whom you think might like to have you utter such sentiments? I am charitable enough to believe that perhaps some statements may be made with some such purpose in mind. But if I am going to vote on this, I am going to vote on this bill as it is written, as it appears here, not as some people prophesy it may be. I cannot vote merely because some may generally claim that there is some sinister thing that can be read into this bill which in truth and fact does not exist. Let us be fair about it, and let us meet this issue fairly and squarely.

I know you are not going to get production by attempting to intimidate the workers of America. You are not going to produce goods by having a soldier with a bayonet back of the American worker; but I know further that you do not have to have that, because 98 percent of the American workers are working today and all the workers in my State are working. They are working hard, they are working busily, they are not striking, and they are making their contribution. I know there is provision after provision in this bill they would not object to.

I should like to have somebody discuss section 5 of the bill, the provision which attempts to prohibit violence in strikes, and tell us why you do not enforce the laws you have in every State of the Union today, and why we need that provision. I regret that limitations of time do not permit me to fully analyze this bill. Careful study has convinced me that the fears of honest labor are not justified, and that Congress intends to legislate in its interest rather than against it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to take time to discuss this bill because I felt it was better to speed up action this afternoon than to spend any time in unnecessary discussion, but since there have been so many statements made on this floor indicating that the speakers felt that those of us who support this legislation were trying to impose on the working people of this country, it has seemed appropriate that we ask for a bill of particulars. Gentlemen have urged that the pending Smith bill would be unfair to labor, that it would require sacrifices from laborers all together out of line with any sacrifices that our Government asks of other groups, but none of the opponents of action have been specific. It seems to me to be appropriate at this time to ask: How are we imposing on the workingmen of America by requiring that before they strike and shut down a defense industry that they go through the democratic processes of an election? How are we taking from the workers of America the rights of American citizens when we provide for them the same processes we have provided for all other citizens of America? How can it be said that we are imposing on honest, upright laborers when we say that we will no longer condone violence in labor disputes? Does any other group enjoy the privilege of resorting to force to secure its ends?

Nor do I think it is entirely fair to suggest that this bill, the Smith bill, is an effort to take from any individual citizen of America the right to work where he pleases, to quit work when he pleases, to work or not to work as he pleases. This bill in nowise prohibits any man from quitting work; does not force any man to work against his will; but it says that you cannot form a conspiracy, you cannot get together and agree to stop work and to call upon your neighbor to stop work and to shut down a defense industry on which the lives of American boys are dependent. There is a vast difference, Mr. Chairman, between requiring an individual to work against his will and prohibiting an organized effort known as a strike. This bill does not attempt in anywise to interfere with the right of any individual to work or not to work, but it does attempt to say that no group of individuals, whether they call themselves a labor organization of whether they go by some other name, may seek to bring about a unified stoppage of work in a defense industry in a time of national emergency as John L. Lewis has so recently done.

It has been suggested that the laboring man has been singled out to have certain rights taken away from him. This bill subjects industry to regulation. Long ago we subjected industry and business to all manner of regulation in the public good. We have subjected the farmers to regulation. We have conscripted the boys of this country. Certainly the most biased pleader for John L. Lewis would not contend that any American citizen did not have a right to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington or Austin Avenue in Waco,

Tex., any time he pleases, but when the United States taps him on the shoulder and says: "Come with me buddy. You are on your way to camp," then that boy's right to walk down Main Street, to go fishing, or even to go on a strike is suspended so long as Uncle Sam wants him. Is it necessary that a man be drafted before his personal privileges bow to the common good? I do not think so. It seems perfectly clear to me that the same government that can control business, industry, the learned professions, and even the lives of all other citizens of this country can and should require the cooperation of labor in an hour of national need.

No; I do not want to single labor out and ask of labor any greater sacrifices than I ask of every other group in America, but I voted for the draft bill and the plant-seizure provisions thereof. I voted for the tax bills and expect to vote for more. I have voted for limitations without number on the privileges of individuals for the good of America. I believe labor has a greater stake in the preservation of America than any other group. I would not assume that labor was not just as ready to accept limitations on its privileges in the cause of national defense as any other group. Therefore, I am not going to single labor out and say: "There is the only group of American citizens who refuse to put their country above their personal privileges."

No, Mr. Chairman; in spite of the disloyal statement of Mr. Philip Murray at Detroit, where he recently stated in effect that the welfare of the C. I. O. came ahead of the welfare of the United States, I still believe that the great mass of American workers are loyal and that they will not only agree, but will willingly agree, to surrender certain privileges they have long enjoyed in order that their fundamental rights may be protected not simply for a day or a month, but for all time to come. Without the suspension of those privileges during this emergency it is doubtful that labor will in the future enjoy any rights whatsoever. The rights of all American citizens are jeopardized. The rights of the coal miner no less than the rights of the banker. Let it not be said that simply in order to protect ourselves from the criticism of certain well-organized groups that the Members of this House did not have the courage to go along and do the thing necessary to protect this Nation for all time to come. And America cannot be safe as long as John L. Lewis has the unlimited power to stop work in our coal mines or our steel mills.

The Smith bill, if passed, will take that power from Lewis and his type. The Ramspeck bill is little more than eyewash. We are dealing with stern facts. We must meet the situation with stern action. I shall vote for the Smith amendment. No one has advanced any reason why it should not pass. I hope it may receive a resounding majority in this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the adoption of the Smith amendment.

The authors of the various labor measures now before this body have clearly and forcefully presented their respective views on the measures and have explained the contents of the bills which they are sponsoring. There is therefore little need for me to elaborate upon the question further or to go into unnecessary detail in presenting my views and my reasons, which for the most part have already been so ably brought to the attention of this body.

There is one point, however, which it seems that the industrial laborer and those engaged in defense work have almost completely overlooked. We have drafted the young men of this country to go into the armed service whether they wished to or not and we have arbitrarily set the wage they are receiving without once giving them or any spokesman of the group any opportunity whatsoever to say what the wage should be or the conditions under which they must undergo this military training. They have had no say in wages or working conditions. Yet they are giving not only their time but in the event of actual conflict we all know that many of them will give their young lives.

At the same time we are permitting men to be given a deferred status as to military training should they be engaged in labor on vital defense projects, and they have the right to demand their own wage, set up their own working conditions, refuse to work if their demands are not met, and even prevent others who want to work from working. They have the power to tie up vital defense projects and stop the wheels of industry from turning out defense materials and equipment for the use and the protection of the young men who have been forced into military training and for the defense of this country.

Labor has this tremendous power and labor is not only exercising it but also abusing it. Perhaps it is only a minority that is guilty of this abuse, but all the Nation is suffering from such abuse. This should no longer be tolerated in this Nation.

The Government, through divers means, is keeping down the price of farm products. The rural communities are enjoying very little, if any, of the benefits of the prosperity this Nation is enjoying on account of the enormous defense program. The wage earner is enjoying it. Wages have gone up by leaps and bounds, and the work available has increased tremendously. At the same time farm prices have been kept down and farm production remains limited.

This measure does not limit the wages of labor, which keep rising each day, but certainly this Nation should take action to prevent labor, while enjoying this great relative benefit over agriculture, from exercising powers which can and, if carried far enough, will destroy the effectiveness of our defense program and even the Nation itself.

Agriculture is just as essential to the defense and welfare of this Nation as is labor. Why should one go unbridled and be left free to wreck our country, if it so desires, while the other is curbed, regulated, restricted, and supervised on every hand by strong Federal laws?

I am not unfriendly to labor and I fully recognize the fact that the laboring man has a right to be treated fair and to receive fair and legitimate wages for his labor just as any other citizen has. I know that there are many instances where his rights have been denied and where he has not been given the wage he is entitled to. Likewise, I know that many young men who have been forced into military service have not gotten quite a fair deal, and I know that certainly agriculture has never come in for its fair portion of this Nation's income.

This measure does not take away any basic right of labor, nor does it give any more rights to the soldier or the farmer or any other citizen. It is aimed at remedying an abuse which is being perpetrated by a very small minority, and which bids fair to wreck this Nation if it is not stopped.

America is demanding that something be done, and I feel we will be meeting the demand, at least to a degree, if we adopt this amendment and pass this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken five times in this session of Congress on the question confronting the House at this time. My position has been made clear to all on this important question. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for appearing here, as he said, on behalf of and in defense of the 46,000,000 American citizens. I join with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] in defense of that part of the American citizenship. But I want to go a little further and represent some others.

The very distinguished and able gentleman from Illinois said yesterday that there were 46,000,000 workers in the United States of America. He said out of those 46,000,000 workers there were 11,000,000 labor-union workers in the United States of America. According to the census report that reached your office and tables this morning from the Census Bureau, there are approximately 132,000,000 people in the United States of America. Eleven million from 132,000,000 leaves 121,000,000 citizens of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that I speak on behalf of 121,000,000 citizens of this country who are as much entitled to representation during these trying times as the 11,000,000. I want to go a little further than that. I not only want to represent those 121,000,000 citizens, but there are some more I want to represent. Out of the 11,000,000 the gentleman from Illinois described so eloquently to us yesterday, without reason or logic, there are at least 80 percent I want to speak for. I want to speak for them on this occasion because they are as much interested in the outcome of the legislation here as anyone else.

You ask me, perhaps, why speak that way? I will tell you. My actions here in Congress since the first of the year

have told the world where I stood on this question. I believe in the old-time democracy of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. I believe that is applicable to labor unions and non-labor unions alike. I believe that America guaranteed this right to us more than 150 years ago, and for this reason I have spoken my sentiments time and again on the floor here. These labor-union boys have heard of that. They have come to my house on Sundays, they have come to my house at night, not one time but scores of times, in ones, twos, and threes. They have come and introduced themselves to me and showed me their card in order that I might see they were in good standing with the labor union. Not a single one of them has condemned the stand I have taken, which was to prohibit strikes in defense industries.

I made the statement here one time that it should be just as much an offense for a laboring man to strike in a defense industry engaged in the manufacture of defense equipment or in the procuring of such equipment as it is for the boy today who is in the Army camp under orders of the United States Government to "go over the hill." If these labor-union boys are emancipated, if this Congress would give them the right to express themselves and enjoy the rights guaranteed to them under the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, they will not cause any trouble, for they are more than willing to go along with the patriotic American citizens during these trying times. They have so informed me in person; and they condemn these un-American strikes as much as I have condemned them.

I have received letters from union men in my district—yes, from union leaders—commending the stand I have taken; and in some of these letters those men have included articles which they asked me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some of these articles I thought were too radical to put in the RECORD, and I have so written the men who sent them to me. So I say, Mr. Chairman, and to the Members of this House here assembled, that 8,000,000 of those labor-union boys want the shackles of the Gestapo taken off them in order that they might have the opportunity to fully express their American citizenship—without fear of death or bodily injury.

Perhaps you ask me why I make this last statement. My answer, ladies and gentlemen of the House, is that most every one of these labor-union boys who have come to see me have stated that they have never voted and were afraid to vote; that they had to work and wanted to live, and for that reason they would not take any part in the voting because their votes would be well known to the leaders and to those who are at the head of this racketeering bunch.

Is it not fair to them along with the other 121,000,000 citizens in this country, to give them a square deal? I say now, at the hands of this Congress they must have a square deal.

I have studied the three bills which are now under consideration and have come to the conclusion that the Smith bill comes nearest righting the wrongs that are being perpetrated upon the citizenship of America today by the un-American leaders of the labor unions.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is as much the duty of this Congress to protect the man who does not belong to any union in his right to work as it is to protect the labor-union man. It is a God-given decree that all men shall earn their living by the sweat of their brows. This divine decree was placed upon mankind after the fall of our first parents; and it has never been revoked, repealed, or modified. It is a sentence of divine origin placed upon mankind today.

Then shall we, as Members of the greatest legislative body in the world, sit idly by and let racketeers destroy this divine decree? The right to work is a sacred right. It is a command of the Creator himself, and I ask the House at this time to pass the Smith bill which will give protection to the man who wants to work but who is prevented from doing so unless he pays tribute to a labor union.

I know a man who served in France during World War No. 1; who went over the top several times. This man was just as great a hero as America has ever produced. He came back to this country, and during this winter presented himself at a camp under construction—a defense camp, paid for and constructed by the United States Government—and this man who had gone over the top and risked his life for his country, who needed and was qualified to fill a place in the building of that camp for the defense of his country, was denied the right to work unless he would pay tribute to a labor union; to start with, the principal amount of $50.

This man who had shown his patriotism in a dark hour; this man and this man's people who were all helping pay the bill—this man whose offspring were being placed under bondage perhaps for years to come by the financial outlays of the defense program—was denied the right to work unless he paid $50 to a labor union.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, America is looking to us today. Civilization is looking to us today. The eyes of the world are on us today, and 129,000,000 American citizens are appealing to us to right these wrongs against their country, our country. Let us pass this legislation which will free these 121,000,000 citizens and take these 8,000,000 loyal, patriotic, labor-union men out of bondage forever.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to detain the House. My views are well known from the numerous speeches I have made on this subject. I think it is of vital importance that we should enact legislation to prevent strikes in defense industries, and I am glad the House is going to vote on that question. If I had had my way, legislation of this kind would have long since been considered and passed.

The vast majority of the laboring men of America are patriotic and want to do their part in the defense of America, but there are a few labor racketeers who would sabotage America's defense, and it is necessary that legislation be passed to curb and restrict these enemies of democracy.

Believing that the Smith amendment is the best designed to accomplish this purpose, I shall vote for it.

The sentiment of the American people is crystallized in favor of this legislation, and I hope the House today, by a decisive majority, reflects the sentiment of the American people, by passing this bill designed to prevent strikes in defense industries, and thereby expedite the production of materials for our defense, in this the gravest crisis of our history.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, my position with respect to preventing delays in our national-defense effort is well known to the membership of the House. For many months, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I have been insisting that our defense efforts be uninterrupted, and I am thankful the House today is considering legislation designed to aid the cause of national defense. May we here today do that which will make more secure the welfare of the 130,000,000 people who live in and love America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, some of those who are opposing legislation to prevent strikes in national-defense industries have indicated that all the friends of labor are opposing the legislation. I know that I can be classified as a friend of labor. Time and again I have voted for legislation favoring the laboring man. I have a good labor record and I do not apologize for it. Despite some of the trouble we are now having with certain labor leaders, I am going to remain the friend of the laboring man.

In my opinion, the great heart of the American people beats in sympathy with the workingmen of this country, and if we pass any legislation today it will be passed by the men in this House who are friends of labor. As a friend of labor I am interested in helping labor, because labor is a vital part of this country; labor has a stake in this country; labor must continue to survive in this country; and labor is entitled to a square deal from the people and Congress. If I have my way about it, and if most of you have your way about it, we are going to give labor, we are going to give our country, legislation on this subject in order that we can be more united and in order that we can progress with greater speed and effectiveness with our national-defense program.

I have not frequently followed the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who

has offered this particular amendment. I often differ with him, but I am in favor of those provisions in his bill which would tend to prevent shut-downs and strikes in national-defense industries. So, in the interest of the laboring man and in the interest of the country generally, I am going to vote today to try to keep a handful of racketeers from wrecking the great program of 130,000,000 American people.

The people of this Nation are aroused as they have seldom been aroused before. I am confident that at least 99 percent of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent want action. As early as April 3 this year I arose in the House and urged action by the President and the Congress against strikes and hold-ups in national-defense production.

Those of us who have been pleading for action for months are glad that at long last we have a chance to vote the will of the American people. There can be no doubt as to what the will of the American people is. They want legislation sufficiently drastic to stop strikes in national-defense industries. As far as I am concerned, they ought to have had it long ago, and they are going to get it now. Effective action today will mean much to the cause of unity and national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to use all of my time. I do not intend to use enough of it to justify coming down to the Well of the House. I am going to use only enough time to make an observation that has occurred to me while listening to the 3 days of debate on this legislation, which legislation primarily is for the purposes of preventing the sabotaging of our national defense program, and for protecting the honest, patriotic American workingmen, the public, and the Government from being exploited by labor racketeers and agitators who thrive on the fomenting of discord between management and labor. The observation is simply this, that, if by some magic formula, by some alchemy, if you please, every member of every labor union in the United States could have his legal residence changed to the voteless District of Columbia, any one of these bills—the Smith bill, the Ramspeck bill, or the Vinson bill—would appear on the Consent Calendar of the great and fearless House of Representatives of the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH].

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who is perhaps the greatest political and religious philosopher this country has ever produced, said:

> Every excess causes a defect; every defect an excess.

He said further:

> You cannot do a wrong without suffering a wrong.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to point out at this time wherein a few labor leaders who are hungry for power have indulged in excesses and have committed wrongs. Therefore, it becomes necessary for the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary in order that further excesses and further wrongs may not be committed at this crucial time in our Nation's history.

I had hoped that legislation such as this would not be necessary, but the situation has become progressively worse, until a few weeks ago we saw one of these labor leaders defying the President of the United States and threatening to prevent nine-tenths of the honest men in union labor who want to work from doing so, thereby crippling our entire defense program.

Must we permit that situation to continue?

What does the Smith bill, which I am supporting, do? First, it freezes the closed shop as of the date of the passage of this legislation. Certainly that is not a very extreme thing to do. Further, it prevents strike violence or violence on the part of the so-called picketers.

Violence of this kind and character should never be permitted. The States have not been able to cope with the situation; therefore there is nothing left for the Federal Government to do but to step in and prevent it.

The Smith bill outlaws jurisdictional strikes. I submit to you that in times such as we are now passing through we cannot afford to be tied up by disputes as to whether the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., or some other labor union shall carry on the work in the mines and factories of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to remind my colleagues again that there is too much sentiment in this country for entering the world conflict now raging abroad. These people have not fully counted the cost. Many of us are too willing to assume responsibilities for something that will begin at some unknown future date, but have not been willing enough to tackle the problems that are now on our doorsteps. The bill before us this afternoon is a splendid example of what I am talking about.

Mr. Chairman, the increased taxes we are going to have to pay and the labor advantages which union labor will have to forego for the time being are mighty small sacrifices indeed compared with those the boys who will put on the uniform and fight if we go to war will have to make. Indeed, this is true as it relates to their compulsory military training, even if we are fortunate enough to remain at peace.

Mr. Chairman, if we are forced into this war that is something else, but I am here opposing the increasingly large and vocal group who are wanting us to declare war on Germany now. I am for England in this struggle, and I am against Hitler, as I have been from the beginning. My first and main concern, however, is for America and especially for the American boys who will have to fight and die on foreign battlefields if we enter this awful conflict. Make no mistake about it, it is easier to get in a world war than it is to get out, and we cannot best keep out by plunging in, as some would have us believe.

Only a few months ago we were told by Mr. Churchill that England would do the job if we would furnish the material and supplies. That we are supplying, and will continue to supply, planes, tanks, guns, food, clothing, and medicine cannot be denied. At this time the war now raging is not our war, and we ought not to sacrifice the youth of this country until it becomes absolutely necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Smith bill, which really undertakes to grant some relief and at the same time is not drastic or oppressive, should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my sentiment in favor of the Smith bill. It incorporates all the good features of the Ramspeck bill and deletes the property-seizure provision of the Ramspeck bill, to which I am opposed. The Smith bill also incorporates other provisions that are highly necessary. The people of this country are demanding action. I hope the House, today, will pass the Smith amendment to help to restore some confidence in the future of our American system of free enterprise. Let us do something to curb these C. I. O. labor racketeers who are sabotaging national-defense production before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a letter addressed to me today by the three great national farm organizations of America, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange. I desire to read a few extracts from this letter:

> AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
> NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
> THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
> *Washington, D. C., December 3, 1941.*
>
> Hon. HOWARD SMITH,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The farmers of America stand united for all-out aid to national defense, and are doing their full part by producing increased quantities of supplies of food and fiber for defense. They are rightfully aroused over the strikes and stoppages of industrial production which are interfering with and jeopardizing our national-defense effort when the greatest amount of production must be accomplished in the shortest period of time. This is no time for bickering over issues that interfere with the principal objective of defeating totalitarianism and the use of coercive power and duress. The welfare of labor, agriculture, and the Nation itself are all at stake.
>
> At a meeting last June of representative leaders of each of our organizations from every section of the United States, the following statement with respect to these matters was unanimously agreed to:
>
> "Agriculture recognizes the seriousness of the present national and international situation affecting the lives, liberties and security of all our citizens, our democratic ideals and institutions.
>
> "During this acute emergency it is imperative that we have national unity and a willingness to toil and sacrifice on the part of all citizens and all economic groups. We have already demanded of our boys that they make heavy sacrifices. This is no time for any

group, whether in industry, labor, or agriculture to seek a selfish advantage.

"True patriotism and the security of all demand that all groups should contribute their utmost to produce everything essential to national defense with maximum speed and efficiency. Adequate defense requires that there be no stoppage or delay in production and distribution of essential materials or services in industry or agriculture. National safety demands that immediate action be taken to provide adequate means for continuing operations whenever disputes arise, until differences are composed. We recognize the rights of labor and agriculture to organize and to bargain collectively, but the emergency requires immediate, effective authority and action to eliminate all acts or threats of violence, destruction of property, intimidation, coercion, and illegal collusive practices whether in industry, labor, or agriculture."

The power to deal with this situation resides in Congress. We believe that Congress should no longer temporize or deal ineffectually with this grave situation when our national security and democracy are at stake. Positive action that will stop all strikes in defense plants, eliminate acts or threats of violence, destruction of property, intimidation, coercion, and illegal collusive practices, and that will effectively put an end to abuses which defeat the national-defense effort should be taken now.

Respectfully yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.
JOHN D. MILLER,
President, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
A. S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

This letter is signed, as I said, by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped during the course of the day's debate that somebody would point out what is the matter with the so-called Smith bill. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] when he challenged those who oppose this bill to say what is the matter with it. Nobody accepted that challenge.

Who wants to get on this floor today and deny the right of the American workman to work without paying tribute? Who would dare to take this floor and say that they are in favor of violence in these strikes? Some of them have said that that is not the business of Congress because the States ought to take care of it. You all know the States do not take care of it. One very good reason why the States cannot take care of the situation is that this Congress, through its own action, has taken the National Guard and the means of protection, away from every State in the Union. There is no use, as I said before, in shadow boxing about this situation. Before this debate is closed, somebody ought to meet the issue.

Somebody ought to be willing to stand up here courageously and boldly and say that he is opposed to legislation that will stop violence, that he is opposed to legislation that will stop sympathy strikes, that he is opposed to legislation that will stop boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. Let them get up here and say "We are opposed to the democratic method of permitting employees to have a strike ballot before they strike and letting them say they are opposed to an accounting of the funds held by labor unions."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, industrial production in connection with national defense has been slowed down more indirectly than it has been directly. Thousands and thousands of men have been out on strike. The situation has gotten to a point where it needs attention, and there is not anyone who hardly dares get up and say that it does not. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has offered a substitute bill. I have listened to the debate. I have failed to hear one of the opponents of the bill get up and point out where in any way any real right of labor is infringed, or where labor is imposed upon. The interest of the country at this time demands that we should do our duty and pass legislation which will promote defense production. It is absolutely necessary that we do this. With a bill that will do something, with no one pointing out why we should not enact it, let us pass that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made during the debate to goon squads. I cannot respond very favorably to arguments of that kind, directed at labor when the representatives of labor come down here when a matter is pending of concern to them, to express their views and exercise their constitutional right of petition. One of the fundamental rights of an individual under our set-up is the right of petition, as well as the right of peaceful assembly. When important legislation is pending affecting other groups, it is perfectly all right for their representatives to come to Washington, and I would oppose the utterances of anyone who would condemn them; and in connection with the utterances made in the nature of condemnation of the representatives of labor who might be in Washington on this occasion, I just as vigorously oppose those utterances and speak in defense of their right to be here as I would if the large employers and representatives of capital in this country, as they have been on many occasions in the past, were in Washington on this occasion in connection with a bill that was pending before this body that vitally affected them. It is not a question of the strongest piece of legislation that we could pass. The question is what legislation is necessary that will protect in this crisis the interest of the Government. There are three interests involved, the interest of the employer, the interest of the employee, and the interest of the Government. It seems to me that the paramount question that concerns us all is what steps are reasonably necessary, consistent with good understanding, to assure the best interests of the Government, because, so far as the Government is concerned, whether we are a member of a labor union or not, whether we are employers or professional men, no matter what our economic or social position may be, each and every one of us has a card of membership in the greater Union, that is, the Union of the United States of America. We do not want to do anything in haste today that we might repent at leisure. I am in favor of the passage of legislation, but legislation that will bring about a better understanding, not legislation that will be punitive in its nature. Respecting the high motives of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] as I do, I believe the adoption of his substitute will be construed as a punitive action against labor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman favor the practice which this House has been complaining about during this past year, of permitting any labor union or any other institution to charge workingmen for the right to work on Government jobs?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to discuss the gentleman's substitute and show a few weaknesses in it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman not answer that question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to answer specific questions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not think you would.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, now—the act of the racketeer we all condemn, but I am not going to answer that question, and in answering that question indict 100 percent for what 1 or 2 percent might do. Your question is one of those two-edged questions, and you are damned if you do and damned if you do not.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, my question is very simple, whether you favor the practice or do not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am opposed to any practice, without regard to what it is, that is inconsistent with decency. That answers the gentleman's question and goes far beyond it. But I am not going to indict 100 percent for what 1 or 2 percent might do.

Now, coming to the Smith substitute, there are two provisions in this bill which in my opinion are more far-reaching than are necessary under existing circumstances. I refer to the provision calling for the registration of labor unions. If there is one thing that organized labor properly resents and properly opposes it is any legislation which is close to the line of compulsory incorporation of labor unions. I remember back in 1920 as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature I opposed a bill pending in that body calling for the incorporation of labor unions. The incorporation of labor unions is the act of the enemy of labor. It was conceived years ago by the enemies of labor. Labor well remembers the Danbury Hat case experience, and well might they remember that, and other similar experiences of the past as well. The registration of labor unions is very closely related to the incorporation of unions. Why should we compel labor unions to incorporate when capital is not compelled to incorporate? Incorporation is a voluntary act and forced incorporation or anything which relates directly to it or is closely related to it should not be imposed upon labor unions unless the circumstances are such that the best interests of the country abso-

lutely call for such action. That situation does not exist today.

Now, with reference to the secret ballot on a strike: I can see, under some circumstances, where we might have to resort to that some day, but I think in the light of present circumstances it would be unwise for this body to adopt this amendment including that provision. Certainly we do not compel the employers to have a secret ballot. The National Association of Manufacturers is meeting now. They passed a resolution yesterday, a resolution in relation to labor. Certainly there is no provision of law compelling those attending that meeting to have a secret ballot under Government supervision. There is no justification for it now. There is no justification for it today so far as labor is concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, as far as the Smith substitute is concerned, there are two provisions that go far beyond what is necessary at the present time. As I see it, the one important thing at the present time is to have a reasonable waiting period, so-called, a period of reason, during which emotionalism will have an opportunity of passing over and during which reason and rational action will be able to assert itself.

The Smith amendment goes far beyond what we should legislate on today and I hope the Smith substitute will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the hour for the vote has arrived, and I ask for a vote on the Smith substitute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I desire to know if the first vote is on the Smith substitute as amended, to the Ramspeck amendment to the Vinson bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Now I want to know if the Smith substitute is adopted, if the vote then comes on the Ramspeck amendment as amended by the Smith substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct again.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I would like to know if I am correct in saying if that action prevails the Committee will rise?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to make one further parliamentary inquiry. If the Smith substitute is voted down, we then remain in Committee of the Whole and consider the Ramspeck bill, open to amendment under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is correct throughout.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. Suppose the Smith amendment is adopted in Committee of the Whole and is reported back to the House and the House fails to pass the Smith amendment, then does the question recur on the Vinson bill which applies only to naval defense contracts, or where are we?

The CHAIRMAN. In case the Smith bill fails in the House or is defeated in the House, the question then before the House would be the original Vinson bill.

Mr. WORLEY. Without offering any amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Without any amendments being in order.

The question is upon the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 176, noes 135.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers, Mr. RAMSPECK and Mr. SMITH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 182, noes 143.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining sections of the bill (H. R. 4139) be stricken from the bill.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 2 of the bill H. R. 4139.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, we have just witnessed something that I thought could never happen in the House of Representatives in the year 1941. Amid applause and cheers, the so-called Smith amendment was adopted. This amendment, if enacted into law, will place many unfortunate restrictions on the rights of the workers of this country in the proper conduct of their union activities. The effect of the Smith amendment will put back the cause of the American worker more than 50 years. Many of the Members who applauded the adoption of the Smith amendment have, persistently and actively, opposed all legislation designed to improve the working conditions of the workers of America. Unfortunately, here in the House of Representatives, we have reached a point where some of the Members are determined that something must be done against organized labor. These Members, many of whom are fine, able, and conscientious Representatives, have the mistaken notion that the pending bill must be passed regardless of its result upon the future and the morale of labor.

During the time this bill has been under debate, much has been said about the work of the racketeer in labor, excessive initiation fees, illegal calling of strikes, gangster-controlled unions, and many other abuses detrimental to good government.

Ulysses S. Grant said:

Labor disgraces no man; unfortunately you occasionally find men disgrace labor.

I admit that in certain unions, bad practices have existed and that some delegates and officers of unions are corrupt. For the sake of argument, I am willing to concede that some unions are dominated by gangsters; but I am sure that, if you add up all of the bad practices and if you catalog all of the disloyal and corrupt officials, you will find that they do not represent more than a small fraction of the decent, fine men and women connected with labor.

Thomas Middleton said:

Honest labor bears a lovely face.

Regardless of how you may try to smear labor, you will find that, through it all, there will appear the clear eye, the ready hand, and the loyal heart of the American workingman. All of my life I have lived in the city of New York. The majority of the people in my district are compelled to work for a living. Most of them are skilled mechanics and are most competent citizens as well as most intensely loyal and patriotic Americans. In the majority of cases, these men are union members, American born who have contributed much to improve the efficiency and usefulness of labor unions. I expect they will be among the first to stamp out any unwholesome influence in their unions. For my people, this legislation is unnecessary and harmful, because it casts a reflection upon the finest type of manhood and womanhood in our land, the producers.

Personally, I know much about organized labor. As a boy, I grew up in a neighborhood where everyone had to earn his living by the sweat of his brow. My father was a member of a trade-union and for that reason I have been able to appreciate what organized labor has done for the working man. My father worked 12 hours a day, 6 days a week for a salary that barely paid the actual household expenses. Later, as a result of the work of his union, the hours of his labor were reduced to the 10-hour day and a 5½-day week and later to the 8-hour day, 5 days a week. These new working conditions made it possible for a man to spend some time with his family and afforded him an opportunity for much needed relaxation and rest. In the light of this knowledge, I cannot permit the many accusations that have been made, here, about organized labor to go unchallenged because, without labor organization, the men and women of this country would still be working the same number of hours my father had to work and would be receiving only the same inadequate salary that was paid at the beginning of the century.

Daniel Webster had this to say:

Labor in this country is independent and proud. It has not to ask the patronage of capital, but capital solicits the aid of labor.

That statement is just as pertinent today as the day it was uttered by Daniel Webster.

There are abuses that creep into every organization because of the frailty of

human nature. But there is no abuse so great that it cannot be corrected from within the organization. We cannot legislate brains, honesty, and good judgment but we can hope and reasonably expect that the proper union officials will see that abuses which do exist will be corrected and be corrected at once. Now, that we have stated our objections, let us give labor, itself, a fair chance to remedy and correct these violations that exist before we legislate against labor.

This problem is not a one-sided affair. I am sure a careful examination will reveal there are many corrupt employers who, to outdo their competitors, subsidize dishonest labor leaders so as to gain advantage in obtaining contracts for and in securing the services of a sufficient number of mechanics. These contractors should be punished because they corrupt the representatives of labor and are an unwholesome element in the business world.

As my speech will be the last one before this vote is taken, I earnestly hope that you will listen attentively to my appeal. I have never been a demagog and I do not intend to be one today. I sincerely believe that industry and labor are composed of America's best men and women and they cooperate and work together on their problems, but I also believe there are employers and workers who, regardless of anything we may do, will resort to unfair labor practices. They avoid the labor laws and do everything possible to destroy each other. I recognize that there are some sinister influences on both sides and I am anxious that they should be weeded out and punished. However, the sins of the unfaithful ones should not, cannot, and must not be charged against that vast army of noble people who represent the best traditions of American labor and support the strong arm of good government.

Only this week we had the best example of what can be accomplished when clear-minded, right-thinking representatives sit down around the conference table. The railroad executives' committee and the representatives of railway labor settled their differences of working conditions and salary increases without even the lapse of a minute in the operation of the railroads. To me the labor representatives of this conference are typical of the true American workingman and the generous spirit of the railroad executives symbolizes the ideal American businessman.

At this point, I wish to compliment all of the men who accepted the invitation and followed the suggestion of the President to settle by agreement their differences, in spite of the decision of the Railway Mediation Board. I congratulate them for their fine display of good sportsmanship and true Americanism.

I hope the debate on this bill is serving a purpose. All the ills and grievances that are supposed to exist in labor organizations have been thoroughly discussed and exposed to public view and, certainly, the proponents of this legislation have presented them in their worst light. If these abuses exist, and I do not concede that they do, the intelligent leadership in labor circles are now on notice and should clean house. Let the chips fall where they may, the labor unions should eliminate all those who fail to meet a high standard and who are unworthy of trust and of the respect of American people.

When I have finished speaking, the roll will be called. At that time, you will have an opportunity to display your interest and understanding of our working people and their problems. By a vote of "no" you will indicate your confidence in the rank and file of labor and you will show your confidence in the integrity and consummate patriotism of the American working man and woman.

Let us properly criticize labor organizations—suggest remedies to labor organizations—but do not destroy labor organizations and what they represent.

I plead with you to join with me and my fellow democrats from New York in voting "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4139), to further expedite the national-defense program in respect of naval construction and procurement by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 198, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Smith substitute amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the other amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Smith substitute amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 229, nays 158, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—229

Allen, Ill.	Beckworth	Buck
Allen, La.	Bell	Bulwinkle
Andersen, H. Carl	Bender	Burch
	Bland	Burgin
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs	Camp
Andresen, August H.	Bolton	Cannon, Mo.
	Bonner	Carlson
Andrews	Boren	Carter
Angell	Boykin	Cartwright
Arends	Bradley, Mich.	Case, S. Dak.
Barden	Brooks	Chapman
Barnes	Brown, Ga.	Chiperfield
Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio	Clark
Baumhart	Bryson	Clason
Clevenger	Hobbs	Plauché
Cluett	Hoffman	Ploeser
Coffee, Nebr.	Holmes	Poage
Cole, Md.	Hope	Priest
Collins	Jarman	Randolph
Colmer	Jarrett	Rankin, Miss.
Cooley	Jenks, N. H.	Reece, Tenn.
Cooper	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Copeland	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Courtney	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Cox	Johnson, Ill.	Richards
Cravens	Johnson Luther A.	Rivers
Crawford		Rizley
Creal	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cunningham		
Curtis	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, W. Va.	Rockefeller
Dies	Jones	Rodgers, Pa.
Dirksen	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Disney	Keefe	Russell
Ditter	Kerr	Sanders
Domengeaux	Kilburn	Scott
Dondero	Kilday	Shafer, Mich.
Doughton	Kinzer	Sheppard
Drewry	Kleberg	Short
Duncan	Knutson	Sikes
Durham	Kocialkowski	Simpson
Dworshak	Kramer	Smith, Maine
Eaton	Lambertson	Smith, Ohio
Elliott, Calif.	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Ellis	Lea	South
Elston	LeCompte	Starnes, Ala.
Englebright	McGehee	Steagall
Faddis	McGregor	Stefan
Fellows	McLaughlin	Sumner, Ill.
Fish	McLean	Sumners, Tex.
Ford, Miss.	McMillan	Taber
Fulmer	Mahon	Talle
Gamble	Mansfield	Tarver
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Terry
Gearhart	Martin, Mass.	Thomas, N. J.
Gibson	Mason	Thomason
Gifford	May	Tinkham
Gilchrist	Michener	Treadway
Gore	Mills, Ark.	Vincent, Ky.
Gossett	Mitchell	Vinson, Ga.
Graham	Monroney	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ala.	Moser	Wadsworth
Gregory	Mott	Ward
Guyer	Mundt	Wasielewski
Gwynne	Nelson	Weaver
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norrell	West
	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wheat
Hall, Leonard W.	O'Hara	Whitten
	Oliver	Whittington
Halleck	O'Neal	Wickersham
Hancock	Osmers	Wigglesworth
Hare	Pace	Winter
Harness	Paddock	Wolcott
Harrington	Patman	Wolfenden, Pa.
Harris, Ark.	Pearson	Woodruff, Mich.
Hébert	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Heidinger	Pheiffer, William T.	Worley
Hess		Youngdahl
Hinshaw	Pierce	Zimmerman

NAYS—158

Arnold	Fitzgerald	Kefauver
Barry	Fitzpatrick	Kelley, Pa.
Bates, Ky.	Flaherty	Kelly, Ill.
Beam	Flannagan	Kennedy, Martin J.
Belter	Fogarty	
Bishop	Folger	Kennedy, Michael J.
Blackney	Forand	
Bloom	Ford, Thomas F.	Keogh
Boland	Gavagan	Kirwan
Bradley, Pa.	Gehrmann	Klein
Buckley, N. Y.	Gerlach	Kopplemann
Burdick	Gillie	Kunkel
Butler	Granger	Landis
Byrne	Grant, Ind.	Larrabee
Byron	Green	Leavy
Canfield	Haines	Ludlow
Cannon, Fla.	Harris, Va.	Lynch
Capozzoli	Hart	McCormack
Celler	Harter	McGranery
Claypool	Hartley	McIntyre
Cochran	Healey	McKeough
Coffee, Wash.	Heffernan	Maciejewski
Crosser	Hendricks	Maciora
Crowther	Hill, Wash.	Manasco
Culkin	Holbrook	Marcantonio
Cullen	Hook	Merritt
D'Alesandro	Houston	Meyer, Md.
Davis, Ohio	Howell	Mills, La.
Day	Hull	Murray
Delaney	Hunter	Myers, Pa.
Dewey	Imhoff	Nichols
Dickstein	Isac	O'Brien, Mich.
Dingell	Jackson	O'Connor
Downs	Jacobsen	O'Toole
Eberharter	Jenkins, Ohio	Patrick
Edmiston	Johns	Peterson, Fla.
Eliot, Mass	Kean	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Engel	Kee	

Pittenger	Shanley	Thom
Powers	Shannon	Thomas, Tex.
Rabaut	Sheridan	Traynor
Ramsay	Smith, Pa.	Van Zandt
Ramspeck	Smith, Wash.	Voorhis, Calif.
Rankin, Mont.	Smith, W. Va.	Vreeland
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Wis.	Walter
Robsion, Ky.	Somers, N. Y.	Weiss
Rolph	Spence	Welch
Sabath	Springer	Wene
Sachs	Stratton	Williams
Sauthoff	Sullivan	Wilson
Scanlon	Sutphin	Wolverton, N. J.
Schuetz	Sweeney	Wright
Schulte	Tenerowicz	Young
Secrest	Thill	

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hill, Colo.	Romjue
Baldwin	Johnson, Ind.	Sasscer
Bennett	Lesinski	Satterfield
Boehne	Lewis	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	McArdle	Scrugham
Casey, Mass.	Maas	Snyder
Chenoweth	Magnuson	Sparkman
Cole, N. Y.	Murdock	Stearns, N. H.
Costello	Norton	Stevenson
Douglas	O'Day	Tibbott
Fenton	O'Leary	Tolan
Flannery	Patton	Whelchel
Ford, Leland M.	Plumley	White
Gale	Robinson, Utah	
	Rogers, Okla.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bennett for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Whelchel for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Leland M. Ford for with Mr. Flannery against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

General pairs:

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Maas

Mr. Lewis with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. White with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Tibbett.

Mrs O'Day with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Romjue with Mr. Hill of Colorado.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Sasscer.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Snyder.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions that it report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: "Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the bill known as the Ramspeck bill."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is the amendment which has just been voted on by the House, and therefore is not in order on a motion to recommit. This motion strikes out the very amendment we have just adopted and inserts language that has just been voted upon by the House; therefore it is virtually the same amendment, and is not in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit cannot contain instructions to amend an amendment which has just been adopted by the House. Therefore the point of order is sustained.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. McKEOUGH demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 252, nays 136, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—252

Allen, Ill.	Duncan	Kilday
Allen, La.	Durham	Kinzer
Andersen, H. Carl	Dworshak	Kleberg
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Knutson
Andresen, August H.	Elliott, Calif.	Kocialkowski
Andrews	Ellis	Kramer
Angell	Elston	Lambertson
Arends	Engel	Landis
Barden	Englebright	Lanham
Barnes	Faddis	Lea
Bates, Mass.	Fellows	LeCompte
Baumhart	Fish	McGehee
Beckworth	Ford, Miss.	McGregor
Bell	Fulmer	McLaughlin
Bender	Gamble	McLean
Blackney	Gathings	McMillan
Bland	Gearhart	Mahon
Boggs	Gerlach	Manasco
Bolton	Gibson	Mansfield
Bonner	Gifford	Martin, Iowa
Boren	Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.
Boykin	Gillie	Mason
Bradley, Mich.	Gore	May
Brooks	Gossett	Michener
Brown, Ga.	Graham	Mills, Ark.
Brown, Ohio	Grant, Ala.	Mills, La.
Bryson	Green	Mitchell
Buck	Gregory	Monroney
Bulwinkle	Guyer	Moser
Burch	Gwynne	Mott
Burgin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mundt
Camp	Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson
Cannon, Fla.	Halleck	Nichols
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Norrell
Carlson	Hare	O'Brien, N. Y.
Carter	Harness	O'Hara
Cartwright	Harrington	Oliver
Case, S. Dak.	Harris, Ark.	O'Neal
Chapman	Harris, Va.	Osmers
Chiperfield	Hartley	Pace
Clark	Hébert	Paddock
Clason	Heidinger	Patman
Clevenger	Hendricks	Patrick
Cluett	Hess	Pearson
Coffee, Nebr.	Hinshaw	Peterson, Fla.
Cole, Md.	Hobbs	Peterson, Ga.
Collins	Hoffman	Pfeiffer, William T.
Colmer	Holmes	Pierce
Cooley	Hope	Plauché
Cooper	Jarman	Ploeser
Copeland	Jarrett	Poage
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Priest
Cox	Jenks, N. H.	Randolph
Cravens	Jennings	Rankin, Miss.
Crawford	Jensen	Reece, Tenn.
Creal	Johnson, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Culkin	Johnson, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Johnson, Luther A.	Rich
Curtis	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Richards
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Dies	Johnson, W. Va.	Rizley
Dirksen	Jones	Robertson, N. Dak.
Disney	Jonkman	Robertson, Va.
Ditter	Keefe	Rockefeller
Domengeaux	Kerr	Rodgers, Pa.
Dondero	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Doughton		Russell
Drewry		Sanders
Scott	Talle	West
Shafer, Mich.	Tarver	Wheat
Sheppard	Terry	Whitten
Short	Thill	Whittington
Sikes	Thomas, N. J.	Wickersham
Simpson	Thomason	Wigglesworth
Smith, Maine	Tinkham	Wilson
Smith, Ohio	Treadway	Winter
Smith, Va.	Van Zandt	Wolcott
South	Vincent, Ky.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sparkman	Vinson, Ga.	Woodruff, Mich
Starnes, Ala.	Vorys, Ohio	Woodrum, Va.
Steagall	Vreeland	Worley
Stefan	Wadsworth	Young
Sumner, Ill.	Ward	Youngdahl
Sumners, Tex.	Wasielewski	Zimmerman
Taber	Weaver	

NAYS—136

Arnold	Hart	O'Toole
Barry	Harter	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bates, Ky.	Healey	Pittenger
Beam	Heffernan	Powers
Beiter	Hill, Wash.	Rabaut
Bishop	Holbrook	Ramsay
Bloom	Hook	Ramspeck
Boland	Houston	Rankin, Mont.
Bradley, Pa.	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Burdick	Hunter	Rolph
Butler	Imhoff	Sabath
Byrne	Izac	Sacks
Byron	Jackson	Sauthoff
Canfield	Jacobsen	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Johns	Schuetz
Celler	Kean	Schulte
Claypool	Kee	Secrest
Cochran	Kefauver	Shanley
Coffee, Wash.	Kelley, Pa.	Shannon
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Crowther	Kennedy, Martin J.	Smith, Pa.
Cullen	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Wash.
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Smith, W. Va.
Davis, Ohio	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Day	Klein	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Kopplemann	Spence
Dewey	Kunkel	Springer
Dickstein	Lanham	Stratton
Dingell	Larrabee	Sullivan
Downs	Leavy	Sutphin
Eberharter	Ludlow	Sweeney
Edmiston	Lynch	Tenerowicz
Eliot, Mass.	McCormack	Thom
Fitzgerald	McGranery	Thomas, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Traynor
Flaherty	McKeough	Voorhis, Calif.
Flannagan	Maciejewski	Walter
Fogarty	Maciora	Weiss
Folger	Marcantonio	Welch
Forand	Merritt	Wene
Ford, Thomas F.	Meyer, Md.	Williams
Gavagan	Murray	Wolverton, N. J.
Gehrmann	Myers, Pa.	Wright
Granger	O'Brien, Mich.	
Grant, Ind.	O'Connor	
Haines		

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gale	Robinson, Utah
Baldwin	Hill, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.
Bennett	Johnson, Ind.	Romjue
Boehne	Lesinski	Sasscer
Buckler, Minn.	Lewis	Satterfield
Casey, Mass.	McArdle	Schaefer, Ill.
Chenoweth	Maas	Scrugham
Cole, N. Y.	Magnuson	Snyder
Costello	Murdock	Stearns, N. H.
Douglas	Norton	Stevenson
Fenton	O'Day	Tibbott
Flannery	O'Leary	Tolan
Ford, Leland M.	Patton	Whelchel
	Plumley	White

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. Bennett for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Whelchel for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Leland M. Ford for, with Mr. Flannnery against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

General pairs:

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Patton with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. White with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Tibbott.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Sasscer.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Snyder.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Amend the title to read: "A bill to further expedite the national defense by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, diminish the cause of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon some extracts from a letter to which I referred to at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, foregoing a request for time, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point my remarks bearing upon the proposed trip of Mr. Bullitt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, recently it was announced by the President that Mr. William Bullitt would be sent to the Near East as his personal representative. Mr. Roosevelt made the statement that Mr. Bullitt would make his headquarters in a plane.

The plan as announced would have Mr. Bullitt tour the entire sector and act as the eyes and ears of our President, surveying the entire Near East. Much of this war will be decided on the plains of Libya and the mountains of the Caucasus. As usual, Mr. Roosevelt is seeking first-hand information on the subject and is not relying on second-hand facts.

Recently Mr. Churchill declared that by 1942 there will be a shortage of manpower. We here in Congress must be concerned with that statement. We here must also be concerned with another factor.

Tomorrow the Committee for a Jewish Army will convene here in Washington, and I desire to bring before the House certain aspects to be considered.

The Committee for a Jewish Army is a nonpartisan, nonsectarian group calling upon all of humanity now engaged or supporting those engaged in a great struggle to recognize that the pioneer Jews of Palestine and the stateless Jews of Europe constitute a nation and hence must be allowed to fight as a nation. My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] has introduced a bill for the purpose of allowing lend-lease equipment to be utilized for the Jewish army. I trust we shall pass that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call upon this House to request the President to instruct Mr. Bullitt to go to Palestine to find out and tell us why 100,000 fighting Jews are immobilized and prevented from fighting Hitler. We who have been supporting this movement know full well how anxious these people are to fight. We want the personal representative of our President to tell him that we are supporting something real, powerful, and vital.

Mr. Speaker, there are today in Europe many millions of Jews who have been completely disenfranchised. They have been deprived of the elementary right to eat, to sleep, and to live as normal human beings. It is our bounden duty to see that these people be given a place in the sun.

Mr. Speaker, these people today are wearing a yellow badge, a badge which is supposed to be the symbol of shame, of disgrace, of pariahs. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that badge is a badge of courage and a badge of honor. Mr. Speaker, when the Jewish army is fighting alongside of the Free French, the Australians, and the Empire troops in the Near East, on the Russian front—invading Europe—that yellow badge will be a symbol. Just as the Victoria Cross, the Pilsudski medal, the Congressional Medal, so will the yellow badge be the symbol of a free Jewish people.

We shall see the day when the yellow badge worn by a Jew will be a badge of a hero.

Mr. Speaker, I should suggest that Congress say to Mr. Churchill, "A shortage of men?" Mr. Churchill, the Jews of Palestine and the Jews of the world are ready to give their right arms and their bodies. Take them, allow them to fight, to die, and to live as a free people in a free world.

Two hundred thousand of them and more will follow. General Wavell had 30,000 men under his command when he swept the Near East of the Axis forces. But all his gains were dissipated and all his brave men fought in vain. A larger, better-equipped force came back and swept the Nazis and Fascists back until once again the land lost to the brave Anzacs and Aussies was regained.

Today we face a threat in the Far East. Today the brave fighting men from down under have to be sent to Singapore and other threatened points in the Far East. Whence will come additional men, asks Mr. Churchill. From the Jews of the world, who seek the privilege to fight not only against Hitler but also for self-respect, for decency, for democracy, for the four freedoms, the Atlantic charter, humanity, for their own national redemption.

Mr. Speaker, the last war allowed the Jews to fight, and they were given Palestine. It is only moral and right that the Jews should be allowed to fight in this war. Their homes and their families are in mortal danger. To not permit them to have a Jewish army is a disgrace to our democratic civilization.

The United States has an interest in Palestine. We have a stake in this war. Our interests must be protected.

I call upon Mr. Churchill to give to the Jews their army and take strong, brave fighting men into the allied nations. There is additional manpower; it is yours for the asking.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some quotations from hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by James R. Young and on another topic to include two newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE VOTE TODAY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for America. The vote just stated, thank God, shows that, so far as this House is concerned, Pegler was wrong.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] may have indefinite leave of absence on account of the serious illness of his brother.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein four telegrams I have received on the legislation just considered by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I desire to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the Bath County Enterprise.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech given by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent Mr. JENSEN and Mr. SABATH were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars and to include therein two short statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, is it the ruling of the Chair that in all 1-minute speeches excerpts may not be contained in the body of the RECORD but have to go in the Appendix?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two letters and one extract.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to be advised what the program is for the balance of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the appropriation bill will be ready for consideration tomorrow. Thereafter the bill extending the Soil Conservation Act and a resolution establishing a special committee in relation to the small businessmen of the country. That legislation will be considered on Thursday and Friday. It is expected the appropriation bill will be ready for consideration tomorrow. I understand from the chairman of that committee that the committee is ready to take up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect the committee to be ready to commence general debate tomorrow. We will probably consume tomorrow in general debate and begin to read the bill on Friday morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is hoped the Soil Conservation Act will be taken up this week and also the resolution establishing a special committee with reference to small business men.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the Patman bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the Patman bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it contemplated that the House will be in session on Saturday?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the appropriation bill takes up Thursday and Friday, I would prefer not to answer that question just now.

Mr. MICHENER. Can the gentleman give us any information about next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Next week, on Tuesday, is the Private Calendar. If a rule is reported from the Rules Committee, the National Defense Housing Act will be taken up on Wednesday.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the Lanham bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the Lanham bill. Of course, if the Appropriations Committee takes up Thursday and Friday and the other two matters I have spoken of do not come up on Saturday, assuming that we adjourn over Saturday, those two pieces of legislation would be next in order. The probabilities are they will be brought up on Monday. In other words, I do not want to make a definite statement because if we should go over from Friday until Monday—and, personally, unless it is necessary, I would just as soon we would go over from Friday until Monday—but if the Appropriations Committee takes up both Thursday and Friday and these other matters are not taken up this week, they will be in order on Monday and taken up on Monday. They will, however, be the next order of business after the appropriation bill is disposed of.

Mr. MICHENER. And I take it the gentleman hopes that during the following week some kind of recess may be arranged until after Christmas.

Mr. McCORMACK. If an outright adjournment cannot be obtained, we hope at least to arrange for a recess.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL-DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1470) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 4, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, December 4, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, December 3, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1113. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 7, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Snake River (main stem), Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, with the view to control of its floods, authorized by act of Congress approved March 4, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 452); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1114. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the rank and title of the Commandant of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 294. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business; with amendment (Rept. No. 1461). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KRAMER: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6109. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, to provide for the clarification of the dual nationality of certain persons, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6159. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Joint Resolution 251. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand; without amendment (Rept. No. 1471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 501. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4626. A bill for the relief of Jane Hawk; with amendment (Rept. No. 1464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FENTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5331. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Mankin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5573. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Noel Wright and Bunny Wright; with amendment (Rept. No. 1466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5984. A bill for the relief of Solomon Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2419. A bill for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying; with amendment (Rept. No. 1468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 6160. A bill to amend title 111 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, so as to reduce the number of reexaminations of persons receiving insurance benefits on account of permanent and total disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6161. A bill to restore World War service-connection granted by special review boards under Public Law No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, June 16, 1933; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R 6162. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the act of June 28, 1934, Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6163. A bill to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr PAGÁN:

H. R. 6164. A bill to protect democracy in Puerto Rico; and to amend, to that effect, section 37 of the organic act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6165. A bill preserving the nationality of persons born in Puerto Rico who reside continuously for 5 years in a foreign state in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6166. A bill to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 6167. A bill to provide a higher rank on the retired list for certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. Res. 370. Resolution to investigate the administration of old-age assistance laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Act 69 and Act 96, dated October 18, 1941, and November 10, 1941, relative to the construction of an irrigation and water utilization system on the island of Molokai; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 6168. A bill for the relief of Bernard Halpern; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 6169. A bill for the relief of Yone T. Park; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2110. By Mr. BEITER: Resolution adopted at a meeting of the United Irish-American societies of New York, held at Eighty-sixth Street Garden, New York, on Wednesday evening, November 26, 1941, opposing the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2111. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the California State advisory committee for the National Youth Administration, requesting that the National Youth Administration continue as a recognized national youth agency independent of the United States Office of Education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2112. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Carpenters' Local Union, No. 33, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means

2113. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to memorializing Congress to increase the pay of soldiers and to grant them a free-mailing privilege; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2114. Also, petition of the Texas State Teachers Association (visual instruction section), Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to audio-visual education and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Education.

2115. Also, petition of the General Welfare Center, No. 58, Hutchinson, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2116. Also, petition of Asa L. Carter, of Pittsburgh, Pa., attorney for petitioners, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to open grade and improve an Erie to Chester hydroelectric canal (straight line and two wings angling at Pittsburgh and Scranton); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1941

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, who in times past didst behold the wickedness of men whose violence and corruption filled the whole earth so that Thou didst repent Thy creation, yet in loving kindness didst think upon mercy, setting the rainbow in the cloud for a token of Thy covenant with every living creature of all flesh, that there should no more be a flood to destroy the earth: Look upon Thy creation, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with the tender eyes of Thy mercy. Call anew Thy wayward children from the worship of false gods, to find in Thee the consummation of all desires.

Subdue the unhallowed thirst for conquest and vainglory among the nations. Remove all bitterness and hatred from the hearts of men. Set Thy rainbow in the clouds anew, and quench the flames of war that encompass the earth, lest mankind, whom Thou hast spared in mercy, be destroyed by his own devices. And hasten the coming of Thy Kingdom, O Lord, when all mankind may know not our peace only, but Thy peace which passeth all understanding. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Him who is the Prince of Peace, Thy Son our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 1, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 1, 1941, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1884) to make provision for the construction activities of the Army.

NOMINATION OF WALTER G. RIDDICK—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Walter G. Riddick, of Arkansas, to be a judge of the eighth circuit court of appeals. For the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], chair-

man of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that on December 12, 1941, at 10 o'clock a. m., a hearing on the nomination will be held in the Senate Judiciary Committee room.

NOMINATIONS OF ARTHUR D. HEALEY AND CHARLES EDWARD WYZANSKI—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Arthur D. Healey and Charles Edward Wyzanski, of Massachusetts, to be district judges for the district of Massachusetts.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider these nominations, and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that on Friday, December 12, 1941, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., a hearing on the nominations will be held in the Senate Judiciary Committee room.

PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the proclamation issued by the President of the United States designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a joint resolution of the Congress, approved August 21, 1941, authorizes and requests the President of the United States "to issue a proclamation designating December 15, 1941, as Bill of Rights Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and prayer":

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate December 15, 1941, as Bill of Rights Day. And I call upon the officials of the Government and upon the people of the United States to observe the day by displaying the flag of the United States on public buildings and by meeting together for such prayers and such ceremonies as may seem to them appropriate.

The first 10 amendments, the great American charter of personal liberty and human dignity, became a part of the Constitution of the United States on the 15th day of December, 1791.

It is fitting that the anniversary of its adoption should be remembered by the Nation which, for 150 years, has enjoyed the immeasurable privileges which that charter guaranteed: the privileges of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and the free right to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

It is especially fitting that this anniversary should be remembered and observed by those institutions of a democratic people which owe their very existence to the guaranties of the Bill of Rights: The free schools, the free churches, the labor unions, the religious and educational and civic organizations of all kinds which, without the guaranty of the Bill of Rights, could never have existed; which sicken and disappear whenever, in any country, these rights are curtailed or withdrawn.

The 15th of December 1941 is therefore set apart as a day of mobilization for freedom and for human rights, a day of remembrance of the democratic and peaceful action by which these rights were gained, a day of reassessment of their present meaning and their living worth.

Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them. They come in time to take these rights for granted and to assume their protection is assured. We, however, who have seen these privileges lost in other continents and other countries can now appreciate their meaning to those people who enjoyed them once and now no longer can. We understand in some measure what their loss can mean. And by that realization we have come to a clearer conception of their worth to us and to a stronger and more unalterable determination that here in our land they shall not be lost or weakened or curtailed.

It is to give public expression and outward form to that understanding and that determination that we are about to commemorate the adoption of the Bill of Rights and rededicate its principles and its practice.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of American to be affixed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Alva Blanchard Adams, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization; and

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States and

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2232. An act to provide a differential in pay for night work to custodial-service employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 3487. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 3539. An act to provide for the deposit and expenditure of various revenues collected at schools and hospitals operated by the Indian Service in Alaska;

H. R. 3542. An act to authorize the purchase from appropriations made for the Indian Service of supplies and materials for resale to natives, native cooperative associations, and Indian Service employees stationed in Alaska;

H. R. 4139. An act to further expedite the national defense by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, to diminish the causes of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4871. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5168. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., certain lands of the United States in Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., for highway purposes and for ornamental park purposes;

H. R. 5249. An act to amend section 7 of the Natural Gas Act;

H. R. 5359. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use;

H. R. 5392. An act to convey certain property to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Door Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 5837. An act to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone;

H. R. 5880. An act to abolish certain fees charged by clerks of the district courts, and to exempt defendants in condemnation proceedings from the payment of filing fees in certain instances;

H. R. 5945. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5990. An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the Maritime Commission to sell two merchant vessels to the Government of Ireland.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The mesage also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as follows:

PROVISION AFFECTING EXISTING APPROPRIATIONS OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 128)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed general provision affecting existing appropriations of the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 129)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department and naval service, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $50,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 130)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Power Commission, fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $135,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

STUDY OF INVESTMENT TRUSTS AND INVESTMENT COMPANIES

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final portions of the Commission's report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies, consisting of chapter II of part 4, dealing with the economic significance of investment companies, and part 5, dealing with the Commission's conclusions and recommendations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, submitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission showing its activities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LAWS OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the secretary of Hawaii (through the Department of the Interior), transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of acts 69 and 96 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in its special session of 1941 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Gary, Ind., favoring the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

The petition of Asa L. Carter, of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the construction of a seaway from the Great Lakes to Chesapeake Bay through Pittsburgh, Pa. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Gary, Ind., protesting against all proposals to federalize the unemployment compensation program or any feature thereof; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of F. Edward O'Neil, of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase pension payments to veterans or their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram from the Modern Forum of New York City, N. Y., and copy of a telegram from the recording secretary of the Central Labor Union of Minneapolis and Hennepin County, Minn., in the nature of memorials, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation impairing or abolishing the right to strike; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from Frank W. Clarke, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to freeze wages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the mayor of St. Paul, Minn., praying that the petition of the Moore Motor Freight, St. Paul, Minn., to operate pending the decision on application of convenience and necessity be granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A resolution of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the pay of soldiers and granting them free mailing privilege; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Plain and vicinity, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CONTROL OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES— LETTER FROM PETER TRACY

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have received from Peter Tracy, of Hartford, a letter under date of November 24 which is of such general interest that I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
CAPITOL CITY LODGE, No. 354,
Hartford, Conn., November 24, 1941.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On Thursday November 13, Members of the House of Representatives and some administration spokesmen, to gain votes for the repeal of vital sections of the Neutrality Act, promised early consideration and support of laws to control strikes in defense industries.

When the Congress gets around to the control of strikes it will be found that this is but a minor part of what the exploiters of labor want.

They will be asking for a semiannual public audit of union funds; a list of officers and their salaries; a list of the union members, and other business details. They will be asking that the closed shop be outlawed, and that the strike breaker and the antisocial individual, who refuses to take citizenship in a labor union, be guaranteed the right to work.

They will be asking for all of this and much more in the name of national unity and productivity for the defeat of the totalitarian enemies of democracy.

About 28 years ago the superintendent of a local shop told me that if he found that I was a member of a labor union I need not waste time trying to figure out why I was being paid off. That is the type of shop that prevailed locally up to the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act and the National Labor Relations Act, and it is the kind of shop the present industrialist champions of democracy hope to revive when they have killed the National Labor Relations Act.

We make no pretense of being perfect, of never having made a mistake on a working day, or an election day, but we do try not to make the same mistake twice.

However, should the Congress decide to enact rules for the governing of labor organizations, just as we have unobjectionable rules for baseball, football, etc., we shall not object providing they apply to all organizations, political, business, and fraternal.

In the political field all citizens should be directed to become members of a political party and exercise their membership to the end that party dictators shall no longer control nominations and eventual election to public office.

In the business field let us have a semiannual public audit of their associations, and of each individual business engaged in interstate commerce, and on each article manufactured let us have the direct labor cost, the material cost, the overhead charge, the jobbers' mark-up, and the retailers' mark-up, each separately and distinctly marked.

In the field of fraternal labor organizations let us give the public a semiannual report of union funds, officers' salaries, money used for death benefits and sick benefits, and money used for spreading the gospel of the brotherhood of man, and money used for strike relief, etc. To eliminate the closed-shop strikes let us say that where 51 percent of the employees are members of a labor union and make the request that all of their fellow workers take citizenship in their union it shall be so ordered.

If our way of life means a government by the people then the Congress should encourage or even direct the people in each station of life to get into whatever organization affects their way of life and take an active part in the running of that organization. This will be democracy in action and it will do more to preserve and improve our way of life than all of the billions of dollars we are now spending.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PETER TRACY, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 1st instant,

The following reports of committees were submitted:

On December 1, 1941:

By Mr. HATCH (for Mr. CONNALLY), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2054. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain

plants in the interests of the national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 846);

On December 3, 1941:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 683. A bill to expedite the national-defense program by providing a method for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries without resort to hasty strikes and lock-outs; with amendments (Rept. No. 847).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

S. 1986. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, and so forth, in areas of the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 848);

S. 2014. A bill to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 849);

H. R. 527. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 850);

H. R. 528. A bill to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone; without amendment (Rept. No. 851);

H. R. 529. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 852); and

H. R. 4495. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 853).

RELIEF OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS IN STRICKEN AREAS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2076) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes, and I submit a report (No. 854) thereon. I shall ask that the bill be considered today. It is a matter of such tragic importance I will call it up later.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH. I have reported a bill which was drafted by the farmers of the Nation, and I want to ask for its consideration today. If they do not get relief immediately, they will probably have to drift away from the farms. It is important that the bill be passed promptly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it my duty at this time to state specifically what my objection is to the consideration of legislation today. My heart goes out to the farmers of the southwestern section of the country. The bill reported embodies important legislation and probably invokes a precedent which has rarely been employed by the Congress. However, today is no time for the consideration of such legislation. There was an understanding had when a large number of Senators paid their tribute of respect to the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, by journeying to that State in order to attend his funeral, that no business of importance would be transacted in their absence. They will be away until at least Saturday or Monday. Under those circumstances, I would object at this time to the consideration of any measure which might be attempted to be brought up by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this is a matter of such vital importance to many farmers who have been afflicted that I think, regardless of some other considerations, we ought to express ourselves. We all deplore the death of one of our colleagues, but that does not help those that are suffering from the horrible tragedy which has overtaken them. I could bring from my office a huge stack of affidavits depicting the pitiful situation in which numerous farmers find themselves; they have been wiped out; they have nothing; and, unless relief is afforded, they must either go on W. P. A. or some other project in order to obtain bread and meat. I shall insist that the bill be brought up, and then objection can be made if that course is desired.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall make at this time formal objection, if that is what the Senator invites.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have not quite concluded. I know the distress of the farmers in the particular section of the country. There has been distress in other sections of the country as well. Most of them have had the courage to endure it.

I have not read the bill. No Member of the Senate has read the bill save those who are members of the committee. A very small number were present when the bill was heard and hearings were had. I attended one day only.

Out of respect to those who are away on a sentimental mission, and a proper one, I think no one should ask for the consideration today of a measure so important as the Senator from South Carolina claims this one to be; and I shall sternly and absolutely object to its consideration today.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I resent the implication that this is a bill pertaining to my section alone. Several States are included in the bill. One of them, New York, has suffered as severely as my State has suffered; and other States are involved in which agricultural production has been totally and completely wiped out. I have never attempted on the floor of the Senate to obtain for my State what was not legitimately due to other States as well.

In behalf of those who have designated me, as chairman of the committee, to report this bill, I shall make an attempt to bring the bill before the Senate.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to say a word in support of the contention just uttered by the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Committee. The farmers of New York are suffering equally as much as are the farmers of the State so ably represented by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and we plead for the early consideration of this bill.

I appreciate the understanding which was arranged before the departure of many of our colleagues to attend the funeral of the late Senator Adams; but, owing to the importance of this measure, it occurs to me that an understanding may be arranged between the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the consideration of the bill on Monday. It may be taken up and made the unfinished business on Monday, when the understanding will have expired. So I hope some arrangement will be made during the day for the early consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was distracted for a moment. To what bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. MEAD. I merely pointed out the importance of the bill reported by the Senator from South Carolina and added that I appreciated the integrity of the understanding which was had with the Senators who have left to attend the funeral of the late Senator Adams. I expressed the hope that arrangements might be made for the consideration of the bill immediately after the end of that understanding. For instance, it might be made the unfinished business on Monday. I merely expressed the hope that at some time during the day suitable arrangements could be made for the early consideration of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also should like to express the hope, as the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has done, that as soon as possible some time next week the Senate will consider the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. The United States Department of Agriculture has called the estimates of the production of South Carolina the worst in 70 years.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2077. A bill amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program; with an amendment (Rept. No. 855).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 5095. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 856).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1963. A bill authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 857);

S. 2047. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; no amendment (Rept. No. 859);

H. R. 2297. A bill to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions; no amendment (Rept. No. 860);

H. R. 4365. A bill to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 858);

H. R. 5377. A bill to amend section 111, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 861);

H. R. 5476. A bill to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 862); and

H. R. 5694. A bill to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 863).

INVESTIGATION OF WATER SYSTEM AND RATES IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on September 22, 1941, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] submitted a resolution (S. Res. 169) to investigate the administration of the water system of the District of Columbia and the proposed increase in water rates. The resolution was appropriately referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. From that committee I now report the resolution back favorably without amendment and ask that, under the rule, it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as it calls for an expenditure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 27, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1884) to make provision for the construction activities of the Army.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2079. A bill to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; and

S. 2080. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 2081. A bill to transfer from the Farm Credit Administration and certain agencies thereof to the Secretary of Agriculture certain notes and other evidences of indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2082. A bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service; and

S. 2083. A bill to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 2084. A bill to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; and

S. 2085. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; to provide for regulation and control within the District of Columbia of such solicitations; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this act; to authorize appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2086. A bill to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 2087. A bill to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps;

S. 2088. A bill to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2089. A bill to authorize the transfer of the custody of a portion of the Croatan National Forest, N. C., from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Navy; and

S. 2090. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to such other persons as may be specifically authorized by the Secretary of Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself and Mr. TRUMAN):

S. 2091. A bill for the relief of Michael J Bates; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. KILGORE introduced Senate bill 2092, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COORDINATION AND CONTROL

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to establish a department of defense coordination and control. It is designed to create a department of coordinated control of defense matters. It is not intended as any criticism, but I believe the time has arrived when we must have coordinated control of our defense effort. That is the purpose of the bill; and for that reason I request that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from West Virginia will be referred as requested by him.

The bill (S. 2092) to establish a Department of Defense Coordination and Control, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2232. An act to provide a differential in pay for night work to custodial-service employees in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 3487. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 3539. An act to provide for the deposit and expenditure of various revenues collected at schools and hospitals operated by the Indian Service in Alaska;

H. R. 3542. An act to authorize the purchase from appropriations made for the Indian Service of supplies and materials for resale to natives, native cooperative associations, and Indian Service employees stationed in Alaska; and

H. R. 5359. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4139. An act to further expedite the national defense by providing for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes in connection therewith, to diminish the causes of labor disputes affecting the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4871. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone; and

H. R. 5945. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin; to the calendar.

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 5168. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., certain lands of the United States in Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., for highway purposes and for ornamental park purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 5249. An act to amend section 7 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Door Fields, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 5880. An act to abolish certain fees charged by clerks of the district courts, and to exempt defendants in condemnation proceedings from the payment of filing fees in certain instances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5990. An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5392. An act to convey certain property to the Southwest Texas State Teachers College;

H. R. 5837. An act to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to authorize the Maritime Commission to sell two merchant vessels to the Government of Ireland; to the Committee on Commerce.

CONTROL OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—AMENDMENT FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 1st instant,

On December 1, 1941, Mr. AUSTIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTROL OF PRICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5990) to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

MEDICAL CARE AND HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a short time ago there was passed by both Houses Senate bill 165, to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization.

It appears that an error was made in the printing of the bill, whereby, on page 2, line 12, the word "therein" was used, whereas the word "herein" should have been used. Therefore I now submit a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 165) to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization, to make the following correction, namely: On page 2, line 12, of the engrossed bill, strike out the word "therein" and in lieu thereof insert the word "herein."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, for the reasons heretofore stated, which it is not necessary for me to repeat, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the resolution will lie over, under the rule.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 199), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the special committee authorized and directed by Senate Resolution 277, agreed to July 11, 1940, to investigate the conservation of wild animal life, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, in furtherance of such purposes, $7,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purposes; and the said committee is hereby directed to file with the Senate as soon as practicable its report and recommendations.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR ADAMS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, because at some more appropriate time in the future I shall pay tribute to the character and services of the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, and due to the fact that the Senate will set aside a day for such tributes, I shall do no more at this time than ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Times of December 2 extolling our late colleague, as well as an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of December 2, entitled "Senator Adams."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times of December 2, 1941]

A GOOD SENATOR

Alva Adams was not a big man physically, but his standing as a citizen of Colorado and a Senator of the United States was all out of proportion to his physical size. No Member of the Upper House of Congress had higher repute for integrity of character and conscientious zeal to render faithful service.

Known as "Little Alva" to distinguish him from his father who bore the same name, Senator Adams was from his majority active in Colorado public affairs and Democratic politics. In the Senate he served on important committees—public lands and surveys of which he was chairman; appropriations, banking and currency, irrigation, and reclamation, and rules. These appointments somewhat measure the Senate's estimate of him. He was not on the right side of every public question, but he served intelligently and honestly and with complete courage.

Such men as he raise the intellectual as well as the moral level of the Senate.

[From the Evening Star of December 2, 1941]

SENATOR ADAMS

The mind of Alva Blanchard Adams was honorably conservative. For him to have pretended to what are known as advanced views would have been a fruitless folly. Born to wealth and high position, trained to the responsibilities of business, a distinguished member of the Colorado bar, consistently a man of large and important affairs, he had no reason to be critical of a system of free enterprise which from abundant personal experience he believed to be good.

Yet Senator Adams never was uncharitable. When his rivals pointed out that he had described himself as a progressive while serving an appointment to the Senate in 1923 and 1924, he called their attention to the fact that the word he had used had no proper connotations of radicalism. But he was not unjust in his attitude toward New Deal reforms. His protest against extravagance arose from his confidence in sound money and a balanced budget. Certainly he sympathized with the poor and the distressed as much as any of his contemporaries, however much he might differ with some of them about proposed measures of relief.

To what extent the prevailing national emergency shortened Senator Adams' career is a matter of speculation which even his most intimate friends could not discuss with perfect assurance. That he felt the impact of the crisis very deeply cannot be denied. He was an isolationist and voted against the revision of the Neutrality Act, yet he favored appropriations to implement the lease-lend program on the ground that "the Nation's policy * * * must be carried out." His patriotism remained unquestioned during the hottest debate. In problems of Government finance he maintained his authority until the end. His colleagues attribute his death to overwork, and their diagnosis probably is correct. Few individuals of his generation have been more devoted to duty or more bravely faithful to the demands of an accepted task.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, today the remains of one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, will be laid to rest. We are all shocked at the loss the Nation has sustained by the sudden death of Senator Adams. Our minds are filled with a thousand memories of his constant activity. No man in public life ever took his responsibilities more seriously. He thought only of the good of his country and was without thought for himself. He had an understanding of fiscal matters and economic principles which made him unusually able in debate, and he brought a great wealth of wisdom to his senatorial duties which has made the entire Nation debtor to him. We, his associates, will miss him more than words can tell. We miss him now, and our hearts are filled with a feeling of loss we cannot express. In this time of defense need the services of Senator Adams were of special value, and this, indeed, made added call upon his time and energies. He truly died in the service of his country, doing a work for which he was admirably fitted, and leaving a place among us which no one else can fill as he did, with his many years of experience and a devotion to duty not excelled by any of the men I have known and worked with in Washingon.

MORALE OF CITIZENS AND SOLDIERS—ADDRESS BY MAJ. C. A. NEWCOMB

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address by Maj. C. A. Newcomb, Staff Judge Advocate of the Ordnance Training Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. The title of the address is "People's Morale Vital to Soldiers' Strength of Mind." Major Newcomb points out in this article—very effectively, I believe—the fact that there is not anything wrong with the morale of the boys in the camps; but he directs some criticism, and justifiably so, at businessmen, hotel keepers, proprietors of restaurants, and other places, who deny men in uniform admission to their places of business.

Mr. President, it has come to my attention that there are some places here in the District of Columbia where men wearing the uniform of their country are not welcome. If that be true, it will be difficult for us to approach the question

of morale or of national unity by beginning at the camp site when we ought to be beginning here in our own community. The uniform of the selective-service man—the uniform of anyone in the Army or the Navy—ought to be and is, in my judgment, a badge of honor; and it ought to make the man who wears it welcome in the very best as well as in the average public places of the Nation. Particularly here in the District of Columbia a very shining example should be set for the rest of the Nation to copy; and there should not be any public place in Washington where admission is refused to a man in uniform.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address delivered by Major Newcomb printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I rise to reinforce the remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] about respect for the uniform. I rise also to remind him of the fact that some time ago I introduced a bill dealing with the very evil to which he refers; and I hope that some day the bill may be favorably reported from the committee to which it has been referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the address presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The address is as follows:

PEOPLE'S MORALE VITAL TO SOLDIERS' STRENGTH OF MIND

(By Maj. C. A. Newcomb)

Daniel was a learned judge advocate many years ago. I only hope I can do as well in a lion's den. Tonight I should like to discuss an old topic from a slightly different angle. It seems to be the style nowadays for any officer addressing any organization to talk about morale, and we know it needs discussion, but tonight I would like to talk about civilian morale.

When a young fellow is inducted into the service he has an extra problem which he does not realize he is about to undertake. Not only does he have to get used to Army life, but he has to get the folks at home used to it. It starts out to be pretty nice thing to have the folks at home send long tear-jerking letters about how they miss Johnny, because it fends off the homesick feeling; but, after all, the homesickness does not last forever. The selectee sets about to adjust himself to his life, and, having done that, he starts out on job No. 2, the hard one, to persuade the folks at home that not only are things pretty good at camp, but he is actually getting along fine. He thinks that ought to do the trick until he finds that the folks refuse to believe him. Now, of course, a lot of the folks believe their boys, but there are just enough who don't, who cause trouble. Why is this? Well, there are some people who just believe what they want to believe, whether it is correct or not, some merely allow themselves to be misled, some do not understand the news they receive from their sons, and still others after what they have heard get stubborn—it's not possible that Johnny is doing fine. Why, he's never been away before, he can't peel potatoes, he has two left feet, he can't take orders. Why, they send him out in all kinds of weather, they don't feed him well, and so on into the night.

CIVILIANS SADLY CONFUSED

All this happens when civilians get confused, sadly confused from too much news and views. I imagine it's hard for them to understand many of the things they read about life in the service—both official and personal. For example, we in the service sometimes use highball as a slang term for salute. One mother, on hearing her son gave an officer a highball and he returned one was rather difficult to dissuade from the belief that the officers and enlisted men spent their time drinking together. The folks read letters, misinterpret them, pass on the misinformation, and in its repetition from ear to ear just like gossip it becomes completely different from what the soldier at camp has written. They commence to write letters to their boys and tell the world in general about what goes on in Army camps. Oh, those letters.

TAKE IT IN STRIDE

The young men of America didn't ask for this period of service, but they are men enough to take it in their stride. True, they undergo certain hardships in adjusting themselves to Army life. They were not used to getting up early in the morning. They were not subject to discipline which the Army has found necessary to keep it from being a disorganized mob. But they learn to get used to it and finally to enjoy it. Sure, they complain about things, but that's a healthy sign. Men let off steam that way and our experience shows that grousing about their hard lot shows a high state of morale. The silent brooding ones are those we must watch.

The men are doing their jobs. They are entitled to cooperation from home. They enjoy hearing from home. They want to know what is going on, who is married, who's had a child, who is born and who is dead, who's had a break in business, who's been a failure, and matters like that. But God knows they do not want to hear corny gags about the routine they operate under or to be kidded about them. They don't want to hear what they are missing because they are in the Army, certainly they don't want to be teased about it. They do not want to hear how they could have avoided service by one subterfuge or another. They are in, and what happened to them before they were inducted is water under the bridge. Probably if they had it to do over they would do exactly what they did before. In other words, they only want to know what the news is at home and they don't resent any affection lavished on them, but they require a little intelligent forethought when things might be written to them that might either tend to tease them or to make them unhappy with their lot and for no good reason.

ENTITLED TO COOPERATION

The men are entitled to cooperation from home and this is only a small thing they ask; that is, it seems small but it really has far-reaching significance.

When one of the selectees goes into town he is surrounded by people with whom he has associated before being inducted into the service. At first he feels right at home. He is back in civilian life and is surrounded by the ordinary people in life, some dressed sportily to go to the movies, night clubs, and church meetings; others attired in evening clothes going to a formal dinner dance or some important meeting; and others just out for the evening in their regular everyday business clothing. My, what a feeling! I'm back in my own if only for a few hours. That is the thought running through the mind of the soldier as he walks along the street. Now, the soldier may do one of several things. He may go into one of the local bars and get a glass of beer, he may go into a movie, he may go into a restaurant to get a big steak to satisfy a craving that has been gnawing at his innards for some days, or he may just want to walk around and do a little window shopping. After a short while he becomes conscious of a certain feeling that he can't quite account for. Then it dawns upon him that most of the people are either staring at him as though he were an outcast or acting toward him as though he didn't belong to the society which they think they belong to. What a feeling! He goes into a restaurant and the man behind the counter takes his money as though he were a leper and the food is served in rather a begrudging manner.

This feeling makes the soldier feel like an outcast in the world to which he had belonged before. It doesn't help the morale of the soldiers, and it makes them feel that they have been and are being dealt with unjustly. After all, all of the boys have sacrificed quite a bit to g. into the Army. They didn't go into it voluntarily but have accepted it as a duty they owe to their country. They are wearing the uniform of the United States to protect our shores from invasion from a man who is seeking to conquer the world, a madman, maniac, or whatever one wishes to call him.

BENEFIT OF PEOPLE

All of this protection is for the benefit of people in the street, to protect them from this man and the great war machine he has built up for the past 10 years. The people fail to realize this. They think that because they pay a few taxes and go to church on Sundays (those who do even that much) that they are entitled to protection. They fail to realize that these young fellows are sacrificing a great deal more than they are. Many men in uniform have given up a great deal more than the average man walking along the street and will have a great deal of difficulty getting back into the swing of things when they are discharged from the service.

Just to impress upon you the type of man you see in uniform, let's look over a typical barracks. Here in one bunk sleeps a man who had a good position on Wall Street with an income of $10,000 per year. In another is a carpenter who averaged his $250 per month. In another is an attorney who was also making a good living. Most of the boys are persons who have been accustomed to a good income. Of course, there are several who can't even read or write and haven't a good income, but they are all fine boys. The fellows with an education help them and are now starting a school, teaching them their A B C's, etc. All in all, the typical barracks is composed of a fine group of fellows who cooperate with each other and live a very clean, wholesome life. Men from all walks of life sleep side by side, wear the same type clothes, eat the same food, and do the same work.

GUARD DUTY

One of the duties of the soldier is guard duty, and indeed it is a stiff task. First, there is a rigid inspection, then the boys are marched to an area where they sleep in tents while the others are out on guard duty. There are usually four squads who alternate relief, i. e., take a 12-hour guard duty with four reliefs. One relief from 6 to 9, next 9 to 12, etc. They each have a certain designated post to walk and are to know certain orders both general and special to give verbatim when the officer of the day approaches.

GUARD DUTY EXPLAINED

During challenging hours, they halt everyone 30 paces away and tell them to advance then to be recognized. Everyone, including the officers, have some kind of pass to identify themselves. If it is the officer of the day, who incidentally is the man in charge of the whole guard, etc., the guard will salute him as soon as he recognizes him. One night the man on guard halted the officer of the day and told him to advance to be recognized. The officer of the day approached and was halted six paces away and some means of identification was demanded. The officer of the day turned over his wallet and the guard got down on the ground, examined all the

contents of the wallet and finally, after quite some thought, handed it back. The officer of the day then said, "I want to ask just one thing. What is my name?" The soldier on guard replied, "How in hell would I know? I can't read."

EASILY HURT

That is just one example of a boy who is uneducated and the type many people think are below their social level. Remember this, he is just as fine a boy as the one who has had an education. He has feelings, emotions, and is willing, but he, too, can be easily hurt by the attitude of the people.

What can the civilians do to aid the morale of the soldier? Adopt a friendly attitude. Remember that the man in uniform is sacrificing much more for you than you are sacrificing for him. Remember that all men are created equal and try to understand that these men are giving a little more. Tell your friends and then have them tell their friends to trust the soldier at least as their equal. If, as you are driving along the street, and your wife stares at a soldier and gets a look of disgust on her face, explain the situation to her. Tell her that might be her son. Tell her that when the soldier is stared at in this manner that he is sure the people think he is revolting and disgusting to them. Right away he starts to become conscious of the uniform he is wearing.

IGNORE SOLDIERS

Instead of having the people proud of the soldier, they ignore him and seem to be ashamed to associate with them. Let's develop a new attitude. It will do wonders for our morale and will make the soldier feel like a different person. Instead of continually griping about civilians, he will develop a different attitude of his own. If he feels the civilians are proud of him and admire him instead of gazing at him reproachfully, he will be more willing to learn, to do his duty, and will make our Army a much better, more enjoyable place to be. It will relieve tensions and make our men much more efficient and cheerful soldiers, proud of the uniform they are wearing and proud of the people for whom they are making this sacrifice.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH AT DINNER IN HONOR OF VICTOR FEDIUSHINE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at a dinner tendered to Hon. Victor Fediushine, Consul General of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, New York City, on December 3, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR PLACE IN THE WORLD TODAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Place in the World Today," delivered by Senator AIKEN before the People's Forum, at Johnson, Vt., November 12, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY SENATOR WAGNER AND HARRY SLATTERY ON PUBLIC POWER LINES FOR ALUMINUM PRODUCTION

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator WAGNER concerning a public power transmission line serving expanded aluminum production plants at Massena, N. Y., as well as a statement on the same subject by Administrator Harry Slattery, of the Rural Electrification Administration, which appear in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH CAPTAIN RICKENBACKER ON SEPARATE AIR FORCE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Captain Rickenbacker on the question of a separate air force, published in the Florida Times Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., of November 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTRACT FROM THE LONDON EVENING STANDARD EDITORIAL ON SEPARATE AIR FORCE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an extract from an editorial in the London Evening Standard of November 17, 1941, relative to a separate air force, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE OF POST-WAR ADJUSTMENTS—ADDRESS BY DR. R. E. DOHERTY

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a address entitled "The Challenge of Post-War Adjustments," delivered by Dr. R. E. Doherty, president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa., before the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, in Chicago, November 12, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES G. PATTON AND RESPONSE BY JAMES B. CAREY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by James G. Patton, president of the Farmers' Educational Cooperative Union of America at Topeka, Kans., November 18, 1941, and the response of Mr. James B. Carey of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN AID TO RUSSIA—EDITORIAL IN THE FLORIDA CATHOLIC

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix an editorial printed in the Florida Catholic of September 26, 1941, entitled "American Aid to Russia," which appears in the Appendix.]

PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY BISHOP JOSEPH P. HURLEY

[Mr PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address by Most Rev. Joseph P Hurley, bishop of St Augustine, July 6, 1941, on the subject Papal Pronouncements and American Foreign Policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PLEA FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN RIGHTS—LETTER TO THE LATE SENATOR BORAH

[Mr PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to the late Senator William E. Borah, from Chauncey J. Hamlin and Elizabeth W. Hamlin, dated September 21, 1939, and headed "A plea for the preservation of American rights," which appears in the Appendix.]

PARTICIPATION IN WAR—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald entitled "Must We Fight Germany and Japan?" and a statement by Abraham Lincoln, which appear in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE SPENDING—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of November 28, 1941, entitled "Defense Scandal," which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF PRICES—ARTICLE BY HENRY N. DORRIS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "House Price Curbs Are Compromise," written by Henry N. Dorris, from and published in the Detroit Free Press, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE CONTRACT AWARDS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of defense-contract awards of all Federal agencies through September 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

STARVATION IN CONQUERED EUROPE—EDITORIAL FROM THE COMMONWEAL

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Commonweal of November 28, 1941, entitled "Starvation in Conquered Europe," which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GREEN ON LABOR LEGISLATION

[Mr. BUNKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a letter dealing with proposed labor legislation, written to him on November 28, 1941, by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEATH AND GRATUITY BENEFITS TO DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1060) to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States, which was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and "effective as of August 27, 1940."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this bill merely provides for those called into the service of the United States the same benefits provided for dependents of men of the Regular Army; in other words, the 6 months' benefits are to be extended to widows of National Guard men, and others in that category, as they are extended to dependents of men of the regular service.

On December 1 last the House of Representatives passed the bill with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "effective as of August 27, 1940." The bill really supplements congressional policy established finally by section 5 of Public, No. 18, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved April 3, 1939, which was designed to extend to all personnel of the Army of the United States on extended active duty all the benefits enjoyed by personnel of the Regular Army. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BEGINNING OF SENATOR McKELLAR'S CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the Senate might well pause to take note of the fact that one of the most distinguished members of the Senate entered

Congress 30 years ago today. I refer to the long service of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Those of us who have been in the Senate for any appreciable length of time will recall with regret that most of those who served here even 20 years ago have ceased, for one reason or another, to be Members of the body.

When I entered the Senate in 1922 the senior Senator from Tennessee was then in active participation in the daily routine and business of the Senate. Through all these years his record has been marked by a deep sense of fidelity to duty and devotion to his own people and to what he conceived to be the best interest of the people of the United States.

The senior Senator from Tennessee is a man of very great industry, and those of us who through the years have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with him not only on the floor but in committee know with what extraordinary diligence he has devoted himself to his public duties and responsibilities. As a Member of the Senate he has shown rare courage and independence of mind and thought.

Those of us who live in neighboring States in the Southeast know with what deep affection he has been regarded by his constituents throughout his long public service. Long before I entered this body Senator McKELLAR was well known to the people of my State and to the people of all the States of the Southeast. His record as a public official had endeared him to the people of his own State and of his section of the Nation. He has been faithful to the interest of his State, to the agricultural interest, and to the interest of general business and commercial enterprises, and likewise he has been faithful to the larger interest of the United States as a whole.

So, Mr. President, I am highly pleased to note that Senator McKELLAR is still with us, is still an active Member of this body, and is still enjoying the confidence, respect, and esteem of his colleagues, as he will continue to do so long as he shall remain a Member of this body.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to embrace this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the occasion of completing 30 years of exemplary service in the Congress. His record of a quarter of a century of service in the Senate and 6 years of service in the House of Representatives is one which has seldom been attained in the history of the Republic, and when we reflect on the character and the nature of the service we realize that it is of a kind which has less seldom been equaled by any man.

Mr. President, I have had the especial privilege of being closely associated with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, because throughout my 20 years of service in the House I was a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of that body, and for 8 years I was its chairman. With the senior Senator from Tennessee holding a similar position here in the Senate, it was necessary for us on frequent occasions to come together in order that we might expedite the legislative calendar of the Post Office Committees of both Houses. When my distinguished predecessor, the late Senator Copeland, died it became my proud privilege to come to the Senate as his successor, and immediately upon my taking my seat in this body I asked that I might be assigned to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, where I became more closely associated with the man we honor today. I found him to be an aggreeable, cooperative, courteous, kindly gentleman, a leader of his committee, who knew better than any other man the history, the expansion, the development, and the needs of the Postal Service. As I became still more closely associated with him I became more fond of his gentlemanly personality. I found him also to be an incessant worker, one constantly busy with the affairs of his State and the work of his committee.

Mr. President, if I were privileged to say a word of admonition to him on this enjoyable occasion, I should say that these are gruelling times, when the burdens upon legislators are more difficult to endure than perhaps they have ever been in all the history of the Congress; I should caution him, out of consideration for himself and his people, who are fond of him, to be very careful of his health; I should remind him, too, that nature has admonished him and others that they cannot keep up the tempo that has characterized their activity here in the past; and, in order that we may have him with us for many years to come, in order that we may enjoy his counsel, his advice, and his direction, I should ask him to ease off on his many labors, and to pass them over to those of us who are associated with him in his committee work.

I grasp this opportunity, Mr. President, to express my felicitations to my distinguished colleague on this occasion and to say to him and to his associates that, so long as the history of the Senate shall be familiar to the people of America, the name of McKELLAR, of Tennessee, along with the names of the great men who have served in the Senate in the past, and the great men who will serve in the Senate in the future, will be written high on the scroll.

My congratulations, therefore, to my colleague.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am happy to be here today on the thirtieth anniversary of the beginning of the congressional service of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. Since I have been in this body I have noted on many occasions the intense patriotism of this distinguished Senator, and his fidelity and love not only for his Nation as a whole but for his State. I have seen his great industry exhibited on many committees and in support of many measures. I have had the good fortune to enjoy a friendship with him which has been very rare and which has been a great privilege to me. I have traveled the length of the earth in his company and have enjoyed his good nature. Always I have seen in him the great American that he really is.

As the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has said, when the history of this Nation shall be written and the great and distinguished men who have served in this body shall be listed, the name of KENNETH McKELLAR, senior Senator from Tennessee, will have no peer in that galaxy of stars.

I am happy to be present on this occasion to congratulate Tennessee upon its representation in Congress over a period of 30 years by Senator McKELLAR and to extend to him my personal wishes for many, many more years of good health and contentment in the service of the Nation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to express my full and wholehearted approval of all the beautiful tributes which have been paid to my good friend, KENNETH McKELLAR.

As boys, KENNETH McKELLAR and I entered the University of Alabama as fellow students in the freshman class. We continued in the same institution for 4 years and graduated together. At that time the University of Alabama was a military school, under strict West Point discipline. The boys all lived in barracks, which gave us a closer contact and more intimate relationship than exists where the students of an educational institution are not confined as we were at that time.

I have enjoyed my friendship with KENNETH McKELLAR. He was an outstanding student at the University of Alabama. He was a hard worker. He earned and was given the degrees of bachelor of arts, master of arts, bachelor of laws, and later the honorary degree of doctor of laws by that great institution. This recital of the honors conferred upon him by the University of Alabama is sufficient in itself to indicate the quality of work he did as a student in his boyhood days. He was made a captain of one of the military companies and was on the honor roll each year. He was given all the honors that could be accorded a student at the University of Alabama.

When KENNETH McKELLAR came from the House to the Senate my father was a Member of this body. He was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which Senator McKELLAR later became the chairman. He has performed the duties of that position with great distinction and ability. My father and Senator McKELLAR were thrown together and, notwithstanding the disparity in ages, there developed the warmest sort of friendship between them.

After all the years of personal contact—and we have continued our relations throughout the years—we are even warmer friends today than we were when we were students at the University of Alabama, for the reason that our friendship for each other has been a little closer, if possible. Our respect for and confidence in each other have increased throughout the years.

I shall not undertake to go into the details of the great work this man has done, the character he has developed, or the respect and confidence accorded him, not only by the people of Tennessee, but by the people of all that section of the country. We all know him to be a man of fairness and justice, a man of decision and determination, and a hard fighter in any cause in which he enlists.

I never did know exactly why KEN MCKELLAR left the great State of Alabama and moved to Memphis, Tenn. However, in later years, I reached the conclusion that possibly it was a good thing for me that he did so, because I am sure that if he had stayed in Alabama there would have been one less Alabama seat in the Senate for me to try to secure. At any rate, he is here and I am here.

Alabama has an unusual delegation in the United States Senate, in numbers, at least. Five native-born Alabamans are Members of this body—the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and myself. Of course, Senator MCKELLAR is the dean of the Alabama delegation in the United States Senate. We all love him. We all respect him.

Mr. President, the only personal wish I desire to express on this happy occasion of the celebration of 30 years of splendid service by our friend is that when my day comes to leave this great body KENNETH MCKELLAR will still be here in vigor and strength. He can now walk farther and faster than most other Members of the Senate. I hope that throughout the remainder of my experience and service in the Senate I shall have the pleasure, the privilege, the honor, and the satisfaction of serving with him to the very end of my experience here. I have for him a sincere and abiding affection.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, the Republican Members of the Senate, constituting the minority, desire to participate briefly in the tributes paid to the able Senator from Tennessee on completing 30 years' service in the Congress. The record indicates—and my memory also supports the record—that Senator MCKELLAR was inducted into this body on the 4th day of March 1917. Therefore he has served 24½ years as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not need the RECORD to support my statement. I recall most pleasantly that 24½ years ago, when I came to the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was a Member of this body. I have followed his career closely since that time, and I am sure that every minority Member of the Senate shares my view when I say that his record has been conspicuous for honor, industry, and integrity. Above all, his word is good. When that is said of a Senator or a citizen, in my opinion, it indicates the finest quality of character. He has the courage of his convictions, and the integrity of his conduct is exemplary. As the minority leader it becomes my very great pleasure to wish for him many more years of useful service to his State and to the Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the other Members of the Senate who have paid such beautiful tributes to our colleague, Senator MCKELLAR. I often speak with pride of the fact that I was born within less than 50 miles of the place in Alabama where the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was born. When I was a student at the University of Alabama Senator MCKELLAR was held up to us as an inspiration and an outstanding example of what one distinguished son of Alabama had accomplished. All Alabama is proud that we gave KENNETH MCKELLAR to the Nation. We are proud of his brilliant record in Congress. We are proud of him as a splendid gentleman, as a devoted public servant, as an outstanding leader in the affairs of the Nation.

We rejoice that he has had a long and distinguished career here in the service of our country; and on this day we can but hope that the Nation will be blessed by his being spared to serve in this body for many a year to come.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not want to let such an occasion as this pass without joining in the words of tribute which have already been spoken by Senator MCKELLAR's colleagues and my colleagues in this body.

I am not informed as to the number of men who have served for as many as 30 years in the National Congress. As has been said, Senator MCKELLAR's service began 30 years ago today, when he was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives at what was then called the "lame duck" session. He served there for about 6 years, and then came to the Senate.

He has been here ever since. His service in the National Congress up to today, therefore, has been continuous for the full period of 30 years. He has entered the charmed circle, the circle very few men have been privileged to enter, of 30 years' continuous service in the National Congress.

To me the beautiful thing about this occasion is that we are not eulogizing a man who is approaching the end of his career, but we are honoring a man who, after 30 years of service, is still in fine fettle and in full vigor, who is able to throw himself into the midst of every contest that arises on this floor, and to exhibit all the fervor and all the activity which have characterized him during his long and distinguished congressional career.

In Senator MCKELLAR's career the people of Tennessee take great pride. No State has ever been privileged to be represented by a man who rendered finer service. He has had the opportunity, as many of his friends know, to serve his State as a public servant in other capacities. It is not generally known that on more than one occasion in the past he could have been Governor of his State. But he loved the work here and he chose to remain here. He could have been on the supreme bench of the State of Tennessee, but he continued to choose the work in the Halls of the National Congress.

The people of Tennessee have for Senator MCKELLAR an affection which it is difficult to measure in words. It is known in Tennessee that when Senator MCKELLAR becomes interested in anything which he thinks should be done, the chances are about 10 to 1 that it will be accomplished. In my mind, I have been able to compare him to only one public servant from our State who, from the standpoint of achievement, ability and absolute determination of purpose, could even equal him, and that is our own Andrew Jackson. All of us remember the story that we in Tennessee like so much to tell about Andrew Jackson. Someone asked his old Negro servant whether "Marse Andy" had gone to heaven when he died. The old servant said it depended a good deal on whether "Marse Andy" wanted to go to heaven; that he "spected" if he wanted to, he did.

It is a great thing for a State to have a public servant who has the ability, the power, the influence, and the determination that Senator MCKELLAR has had. No State, I repeat, has ever had a public servant who has excelled him.

I should like to read the short statement that Senator MCKELLAR issued to the press on yesterday as sort of a note of thanks to the people of Tennessee for their kindness in keeping him here as their servant throughout these many years. I want to read it not only because it expresses a beautiful sentiment but because it expresses the real character of the man.

This is the statement:

Thirty years ago today I was sworn in as United States Representative from the State of Tennessee. I served 6 years in that House before coming to the Senate.

When I entered Tennessee's historic borders I was a youthful stranger, a wanderer in search of a home, an unknown and penniless seeker after a living and a fuller, richer, nobler life. I had nothing to promise Tennessee and apparently nothing to offer her. As a Good Samaritan she took me in, gave me at first of her 1893 scarcity, and later of her abundance. She blessed me by her confidence in me, built up and broadened my life, and, I hope, my character. She nurtured my ambition; and whatever of good there may be in me is due in large measure to her generous, wholehearted, and unstinted goodness to me.

For 30 years I have been her Representative and servant in Washington. For 30 years I have tried, without the degree of success I have wished, to do for her and her people as much as they have done for me; but, in any event, they have had my most earnest efforts and endeavors.

For 30 years I have tried to help build up Tennessee's material welfare; to help construct and improve her roads and bridges; to help provide the dams on her rivers, thereby obtaining the priceless electric power which aids her every citizen; have tried to help secure for her and her youth greater opportunities for education and learning; have tried to help secure for her ex-soldiers, who served their country so well, their just portion of national benefits; have tried to secure for her farmers the aid they were justly entitled to from a progressive National Government, including better prices for their products; have tried to help secure for men and women who live by their hands better working conditions, shorter hours, better pay, and higher standards of living, including more comfortable homes; have tried to help obtain for our people, especially those in the cities, better housing conditions, and for the people of our rural communities better electric lighting, as exemplified in the Rural Electrification Administration program; have tried to help, and did help, secure for the women of our State the right to vote and to take part in government. I have tried to do all these things in collaboration with the performance of my duties to our beloved National Government. I have tried sincerely, especially in periods of depression, to obtain employment for every honest and upright Tennessean who desired employment.

In putting my hand to these tasks I have not succeeded as well as I had hoped; I have not carried out all my aspirations as I should have liked to do; but at this time, celebrating my thirtieth anniversary as a public servant, I can only say to Tennessee and Tennesseans that I have tried with all my heart to serve them faithfully and as effectively as my physical and mental powers enabled me to do. Through my life I have tried to measure my conduct by a self-imposed golden rule, "Do for my friends and constituents more than they have done for me." I have not succeeded entirely, but that has been the polestar of my efforts, and it will be until I cross the river.

As I have said, that statement was given to the press by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] as a sort of note of thanks to the people of Tennessee. It expresses a beautiful sentiment, and it seems to me to reflect the character of the man.

The Senator from Tennessee is known far and wide as an able man and as a great fighter. He has two attributes which I think on all occasions mark the real strength of a man. One is that he is an excellent judge of human nature and the other is that he makes strong friends.

It was during his recent illness, if I may be pardoned a reference which is, perhaps, a little more personal than the others, that, to my mind, the people of Tennessee demonstrated the real affection in which they hold him. During that period when he was extremely sick, thousands upon thousands of people in Tennessee and other sections of the country inquired about him daily and showed their tremendous interest in and concern about his condition. They, I know, along with me and all my colleagues here, are profoundly grateful that he has so fully and completely recovered and has been able to resume his place so vigorously in this body.

I could say, perhaps, a great many other things, in my humble way, in tribute to my distinguished colleague, but I close by expressing the sincere hope that many beautiful and golden years lie ahead of him, during which he may continue to serve the people of the great State of Tennessee and the people of the Nation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, 11 years ago today I took the oath prescribed for Members of this body. That was the first day of the last "lame duck" session of the Congress of the United States. Where today our present great Vice President sits, then, the Honorable Charles Curtis, of Kansas, sat, and the President of our country at that time was Mr. Hoover.

During the course of those 11 years, of the hundreds of sessions of this body which I have attended, I believe, Mr. President, that I can state without the slightest hesitation, that I am now being afforded greater inspiration than I have derived from any previous session of the Senate of the United States.

I have often wondered why we in the Senate of the United States have neglected paying deserved tribute and have deferred singing the praises of our colleagues until after, unfortunately, they have passed to the great beyond. I believe in speaking words of praise of those whom we love and respect while they are here amongst us, and in our midst, in order that they may know the warmth of our admiration and affection and that their ears may hear the words intended truly and genuinely for them. I can recall no other occasion during my connection with this body when such fitting tribute has been paid to a colleague of ours in his presence, and while he still remains with us. I refer to the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, senior United States Senator from Tennessee, the sister Commonwealth of North Carolina, a man whom we all love and admire. All of us at this hour lift our faces to heaven and thank the Almighty Creator that he has spared KENNETH MCKELLAR so that he may continue to carry on as he has carried on for more than 30 long years in the interest not only of the people of Tennessee but in the interest of all the people of America.

Mr. President, I am fortunate in living in a State which is a neighbor of the State of Tennessee. I am reminded of the fact that once upon a time Tennessee was a part of the greatest State in the Union, the State of North Carolina. We disliked then to lose Tennessee, but if, many years ago, when the great Commonwealth of Tennessee was carved from the body politic of North Carolina, those in North Carolina who consented to or witnessed the severance had known that Tennessee would be so ably represented in the United States Senate as she has been by such men as KENNETH MCKELLAR, they could have had no fear that the interests of that former portion of North Carolina would not be well safeguarded and its people properly cared for.

A moment ago I sat with open and eager ears and listened to the eloquent words that fell from the lips of our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from the State of Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] when he said that had KENNETH MCKELLAR not left Alabama and gone to Tennessee, there would have been one less seat in the Senate of the United States for which he might have contested. Let me add to that by saying that had Tennessee not been carved from North Carolina, there would have been one less seat in the United States Senate for which I might have contested.

We are double neighbors. In the first instance, we come from sister States. A second and a more delightful one is that our offices adjoin one another on the same corridor of the Senate Office Building.

Years before I was honored by a seat in the United States Senate in Washington I had heard of KENNETH MCKELLAR. I knew that he was held in high esteem by all those whom he represented. During the 11 years I have been here, a day has hardly passed, the sun has hardly set upon the evening hour, when it has not been my pleasure to be in intimate association with him. I consider myself fortunate to have been provided with inspiration such as we of this body have been afforded during our respective tenures of office in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I hope Senator MCKELLAR may serve for many more years as a Member of the Senate; and, in so doing, in every one of those years he will nobly and studiously serve his constituents, as for 30 years he has so well and sincerely represented them.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator from Tennessee about to take the floor?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator be good enough to defer to me while I make a deserved statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I did not want the distinguished and modest Senator from Tennessee to begin to say anything on this floor before I had an opportunity to add a testimonial to those that have been uttered in appreciation of him and his illustrious service.

I am one of the five Members of this body who have the distinction of sharing the good State of Alabama with Senator MCKELLAR as the State of their birth. I also have the distinction of having been, like him, a student and graduate of the University of Alabama. Not so long ago, when I was privileged to attend that institution, one of the old professors told me how warmly he had followed the career of his distinguished student and pupil and friend, Senator MCKELLAR.

So, as one of his friends, as one of his colleagues and a fellow alumnus, as a native of the same State, as one of his admirers, as one who appreciates the distinguished character of his illustrious public service, I did not want the occasion to pass without bearing that humble testimony. If those who shall come hereafter shall be privileged to serve even a part of his length of service, if they shall be able to gain even a few of the laurels which have deservedly come to him, if their names can be associated with even a few of the illustrious pieces of legislation which he has championed and brought to enactment in this body, they will be fortunate indeed. A kind friend, a hard fighter, with a fighting heart within his bosom with a lofty concept of public service, a distinguished citizen, and a great Senator, today Senator MCKELLAR is justly appreciated.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a great many things have been said in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Most of these very well-deserved and glowing tributes have come from men who represent the South. I want the Senator from Tennessee to know that, while I have been here only a short while as a Member of this legislative body, we who represent, in the Senate, the north central part of the United States feel toward him as do his colleagues who have known him for all these years. It must warm the cockles of his heart to hear these marvelous tributes paid to his loyalty, his industry, his patriotism, and his determination after these many long years of service in this body.

What the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] said about the Senator from Tennessee is the finest thing that can be said about any man; that is, his word is good. His word is as good as his bond.

Senator MCKELLAR, I have enjoyed my brief association with you, because you are one of the old school, the type of an individual I have always admired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, Senator McKELLAR is a friendly man, and his neighbors in the South regard him as a friend. Coming from the North, I say that although he is a strong party man, I have always found him fair and considerate. Since I came to the Senate I have been a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and as the ranking minority member of the committee I have been given every necessary opportunity to express a dissenting or minority point of view.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I can truthfully say I have never been more surprised, never more embarrassed, never more touched, never more honored, never more pleased in my life than I am to hear these unexpected statements on the floor of the Senate about my services in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. I am so overwhelmed and so excited, Mr. President, that I cannot express what I should like to say after all these speeches. I can truthfully say that these 30 years have been the happiest years of my life; that these associations here in the Senate with my brother Senators have been the happiest associations of my life; that these evidences of their esteem and good will afford more pleasure to me than all the gold in the Government vaults of Kentucky could ever afford.

I think the United States Senate is the grandest body of men assembled anywhere on earth today. It is as honest a body of men as ever assembled in any place in the world. The friendship and esteem of its Members are a priceless possession. I am deeply indebted; I am grateful beyond the power of words to express, for the associations and friendships I have made in my service here. God knows I do not deserve the many beautiful things that have been said about me; but, all the same, I want to say to you, my friends who have so generously spoken of me and of my services, that I thank you from the bottom of my heart. You have given to me on this anniversary of the beginning of my service in the Congress the greatest pleasure, the greatest satisfaction, the greatest honor that life has ever brought to me. I esteem you, I respect you, I admire you all without regard to any section, without regard to any political party, without regard to any factionalism or creed.

I believe the Members of the United States Senate are the most delightful associates any man ever had, and I am proud of my association with each and every one of you. My service with you has always been of tremendous worth to me, for I believe that this body contains the ablest, the greatest, the finest lot of men ever congregated anywhere under one roof.

With all the gratitude of my heart I thank you who have delivered such wonderful tributes, undeserved as they are, and all those who have grasped my hand this day. It is the greatest day of my life.

CONTROL OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—REFERENCE OF BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces that he has given most careful consideration to the reference of House bill 4139. He has referred the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, rather than to the Committee on the Judiciary. Senate bill 2054 was referred to the Judiciary Committee, as requested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], because of the property seizure aspects of the proposed legislation. House bill 4139, as passed by the other body, does not contain such aspects, and, therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for its reference to the Committee on the Judiciary. Even if it did contain the property seizure aspects, there would be real question as to the propriety of the reference of such a bill as House bill 4139 to the Committee on the Judiciary, because of the fact that even in such case the bill would still be in its very nature predominantly a measure affecting labor.

WORK STOPPAGES AND PRODUCTION

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an important editorial in the Evening Bulletin, of Philadelphia, for December 3, 1941, entitled "Discipline Not Enough," which is based upon a statement of the Honorable William L. Batt.

At this time we are considering the problem of work stoppages and ways of increasing production. I am convinced that the way forward can be found primarily by an appeal to the patriotism and fairness of the average worker. I will not for a moment believe that the loyalty and devotion of American workers is any less than that of Britain's workers. Maximum production is now necessary both here and there. Indeed, the preponderant burden of this production rests upon us.

The talk we hear of compulsion, of compulsory arbitration, of stringent measures of enforcement, needs to be balanced with consideration of voluntary measures worked out openly and patriotically by the workers themselves.

There is much talk about work stoppages caused by strikes. I will not in any way seek to minimize the difficulties that arise in this way. However, it is a fact that time lost through strikes this last year was less than 1 day in the working year. It was only one-fourth the loss in time occasioned by industrial accidents. It would not begin to match the great loss in time wasted in unemployment before this country became aware of our defense needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the editorial in the Evening Bulletin, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCIPLINE NOT ENOUGH

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of December 3, 1941]

William L. Batt, Philadelphia manufacturer now with the Office of Production Management, believes the Nation needs more than discipline to solve its labor troubles. In his speech at the Franklin Institute he appealed for the "spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

The Philadelphia industrialist does not gloss over the delay which strikes have caused in the defense program. But even if legal action could prevent labor disputes, production difficulties would not be overcome if workmen remained inert and apathetic to the needs of the crisis.

There is no question that the United States possesses the largest and most effective industrial plant in existence. Our power is counted on by Britain and the other nations resisting aggression. It is feared by their enemies, who are also our foes. But wars are not won by balancing one set of statistics against another. The spirit which animates the men who forge the tools and operate the machinery is the vital factor in obtaining top production and victory.

In a democratic country labor discipline must come from within the ranks of the workingmen. It cannot be imposed from without. Laws and penalties could not force the British workmen to make the sacrifices they are making today. When American workmen size up the realities of the situation in the same temper as their British colleagues maximum effort will be assured.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND POST-WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the national income for this year is expected to total $92,000,000,000. That is a full $10,000,000,000 above the national income during the former banner year of 1929 and $17,000,000,000 above the figure for last year. These are Department of Commerce estimates.

All this means that we must prepare for a bigger country than ever before. It is a bigger country in every way. Our 133,000,000 people are more numerous by 10,000,000 than they were in 1929. We have developed new techniques and skills. Production ought to be greater and the national income ought to be greater. These increases were on the way without regard to the defense boom. They should be permanent. Some such level as has been attained this year should be tomorrow's normal.

It is a time to think in a big way of growth and expansion. Any other course is decline and death. Instead of feeling a little dizzy at our present pace of production, we must become accustomed to think of it as normal and be prepared to make emergency efforts far in advance of anything yet achieved. And with all this we must not lose our mental balance or sense of personal values or our faith in fair dealing.

Mr. President, during the time I was Secretary of Labor I served as chairman of the National Board for Vocational Education and came to observe the practical values of this splendid governmental agency. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a valuable contribution to post-war thinking by Dr. J. C. Wright, Assistant United States Commissioner for Vocational Education of the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, entitled "Vocational Education for Post-War Problems."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Although vocational education is today occupied with the task of training nearly 4,000,000 persons for defense industries, it is not too early to look beyond the current crisis. Two points in the National Resources Board recent post-war objectives program pose problems for vocational education:

"(a) We must plan for full employment for maintaining the national income at $100,000,000,000 a year, at least, a point we shall

reach by 1944, rather than to let it slip back to eighty or seventy or sixty billion dollars again. In other words, we shall plan to balance our national production-consumption budget at a high level, with full employment, not a low level with mass employment.

"(b) We must do this without requiring work from youth who should be in school, the aged who should be relieved if they wish it, and women who choose to make their contribution in the home, and without asking anyone to work for more than 40 hours a week 50 weeks a year, or to sacrifice the wage standards which have been set."

There is much food for thought in these statements. In order to be ready to do its part, vocational education, on a Federal, State, and local level, must be ready to provide the necessary expansion for a post-war readjustment program which will provide preemployment, refresher courses, and supplementary courses of a short and intensive training character for: (a) Men returning to civil life from the military service; and (b) men returning to nondefense industries who have by necessity, by choice, or by the inducement of higher wages entered into defense industries to an extent which cannot be maintained in times of peace.

Other trends and forces are also shaping the future of vocational education:

(1) During the 14 months in which we have been engaged in providing intensive training for employment in defense industries, the value of the short and intensive school schedule has been demonstrated. Experience shows that there is no better way to meet the needs of the unemployed.

(2) At the present, we are rapidly crystallizing our philosophy and views among educators with respect to the desirability of larger units of administration for public schools of less than college grade. The little one-room schoolhouse has long since been outmoded, and even the consolidated county high school is now beginning to feed its pupils into regional schools where more and better opportunities for occupational training can be provided. The State of Indiana is considering the establishment of a regional school in the Bedford limestone region, a school intended to serve a number of counties and to be operated by the State board for vocational education. From Puerto Rico comes an inquiry with respect to establishing three or four regional or district vocational high schools in that little island.

Similar inquiries have come to our office from Louisiana, which already has eight State trade schools located in various parts of the State; from Kentucky with two State trade schools, and from other States. Some contemplate reorganization of junior colleges so as to provide terminal courses largely of a vocational character. Others propose a new type of institution on a State-wide or regional basis, to be known as a technical institute, which would be of less than so-called college grade, but probably would include 2 years beyond the usual high school age limit.

(3) There is a growing tendency for industrial training for rural youth. This demand has been emphasized and brought to the surface by the out-of-school rural and nonrural youth program carried on in connection with the national-defense vocational training program. It is to be expected that during the post-war readjustment period the young people in these rural communities and their parents will not be satisfied with the limited type of training heretofore offered. Wider units of administration will need to be built up in order to handle the problem.

(4) Under the national-defense vocational training program as much as $38,000,000 will have been expended for equipment for vocational schools by the end of the present fiscal year. This equipment will provide at least 50,000 training stations in addition to the 75,000 previously existing in the trade and industrial program. These training stations will not be idle.

(5) Another development coming out of the defense-training program is the habit which the public is now coming to accept as entirely reasonable of using school facilities on a double or triple shift rather than letting an expensive building and equipment lie idle for two-thirds or three-fourths of the 24-hour period. We may expect in the future to see schools operated on what is called the "graveyard shift" if the facilities in the daytime and the early evening are insufficient to provide accommodations for persons who are out of work and who need specific training in their vocational readjustment.

(6) Out of the present emergency we are also seeing industry being decentralized. Plants are being built away from large centers. Many small plants are being erected in small industrial areas, and it is doubtful whether the employers and public will be satisfied to have industry return to the congested centers after this emergency. This trend establishes a new combination of wage earning and productive employment in agriculture, such as has not heretofore existed for those in rural communities. It may well be expected that more people will own a few acres of land near an industrial community and divide their time between growing crops and working in industry.

Twenty-three years ago, at the close of the first World War, the public schools were not in a position to provide a type of readjustment training for those who were returning from military service to make possible employment, nor for those who had left peacetime occupations to work in factories engaged in the national defense. There was a scarcity of vocational schools. There was little appreciation on the part of school administrators of the need for vocational schools, since most of the young people in secondary schools were given a type of training which prepared them for college work. In addition, the evening schools, which now have been developed to provide related instruction for men and women at work in industry, were not available in many of the cities.

Most of the foregoing difficulties have disappeared in the last 23 years. Today, school administrators and most of the teaching faculty have come to appreciate the need for a balanced educational program, a program which takes into account the need for college training for those who seek to enter the professions and a type of education and training which will serve as a terminal course at some point in the school life of the individual. This may come at the end of the secondary-school period or at the end of what is commonly known as the junior-college period. It will enable the youth to enter into wage earning with a preparatory training that will help him to advance more rapidly than might otherwise be possible. In addition, evening schools are generally recognized as an accepted service.

After having gone through a period when wage-earning opportunities sank to a low level and the army of the unemployed rose to an all-time peak of ten or eleven million, it goes without saying that we should take steps to prevent a reoccurrence of the same conditions. While vocational education and training cannot of itself create work opportunities, it can make people employable by providing them with the skills and technical information necessary to do the work of industry and business, the work of the farm, and the work in the home. Where people are willing to work and are equipped to work, it would seem as though there need be little unemployment in our country.

Already boards of education and superintendents of schools in cities, counties, and States are beginning to think of the problems they will face when the emergency now before us has ended. It is not too early to estimate the conditions we will face and the methods by which our educational resources may be used to create the kind of post-war progress our people want.

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, for the past several months, on the sidelines of the national emergency, negotiations have been in process for the satisfactory settlement of a very delicate question. That question involves the controversy which has arisen between the operative agencies of the railroad management and railroad labor, in the form of adjusting a wage dispute. It is safe to say that many Americans have watched with a great deal of eagerness for the final settlement of this important question. Now, since the Senate last met, a satisfactory solution has been found and announcement of it has been made.

Mr. President, I think it entirely fitting and proper that we, who as members of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor are assigned to deal with such matters, should today express our gratitude and appreciation to those who negotiated the settlement of this controversy. They are to be commended for the enlightened procedure which they have followed in this instance. Over a period of years these American workmen have adopted and developed a loyalty to their jobs, and a patriotism for which they should rightfully be lauded. The railroad transportation system of America has become the envy of the world, and its high standard has been established and maintained by the loyal, efficient services of its workers.

It is not unreasonable to believe that America is facing a changing scene in its economic system. There is even today in America a more even distribution of this world's goods due to the efforts of various organizations in the country. There was no doubt from the beginning that the railroad workers were entitled to a raise in pay, but it can be said to the credit of railroad labor that they have lighted the way and set a noble example in the negotiation of disputes.

I feel I must call attention to the astute and diplomatic manner in which this very delicate question was settled, and I must pay my respects to those who took part in the negotiations for the patience they have shown, to the men for their devotion to their jobs, and to American railroad labor generally for its devotion to the Nation.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to know whether it is possible to have Senate committees authorized to submit reports during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session. It is possible that the Committee on Education and Labor may submit a report on the labor bill which the House passed yesterday and which was referred to that committee today. If such a report should be made, it ought to be printed and be available to Senators on Monday before the other labor bills are taken up. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate committees be authorized to submit reports

during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1431, ACCOMPANYING RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. PEPPER. From the Committee on Printing I report an original resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 200), as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1431 submitted to the House to accompany the bill (H. R. 5993) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am constrained to object to the consideration of the resolution at this time in view of the agreement I had with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who specifically requested that if any new business came up this afternoon I should, on his behalf, object to its consideration. I know nothing about the contents or the purport of the resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a number of Senators have noticed that there is a shortage of copies of the report of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee which accompanied the regular river and harbor bill which is now on the calendar in the other House. I would not consider this to be such a matter of business that there would be any possible controversy about it, but, of course, I should want to defer to the judgment of the able Senator from Illinois. The request came from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator whether there would be any serious objection if the resolution went over until Monday?

Mr. PEPPER. Many requests for the report are being made, and the purpose of the resolution is to supply additional copies of the report.

Mr. LUCAS. May we have this understanding, if it is possible to take action based on such an understanding, that if there is any objection made later, the action of the Senate in agreeing to the resolution at this time shall be reconsidered on Monday?

Mr PEPPER. Gladly, Mr. President.

Mr LUCAS. With that understanding, I have no objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 1st instant,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

On December 1, 1941:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. REYNOLDS), from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, and for appointment to temporary rank in the Air Corps, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion in the Navy and in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George S. Messersmith, of Delaware, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Mexico.

On December 3, 1941:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Carl Riggs, of West Virginia, to be Work Projects administrator for West Virginia, effective December 10, 1941.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable committee report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

John O'Keefe, of Pembina, N. Dak., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak. (reappointment).

FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I submit a favorable report from the Committee on Appropriations on the nomination of Philip B. Fleming, of Iowa, to be Federal Works Administrator, vice John M. Carmody, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip B. Fleming, of Iowa, to be Federal Works Administrator, vice John M. Carmody.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George S. Messersmith, of Delaware, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl Riggs to be Work Projects Administrator, effective December 10, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. On behalf of the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 8, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4, 1941:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George S. Messersmith to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

Philip B. Fleming to be Federal Works Administrator, Federal Works Agency.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Carl Riggs to be Work Projects Administrator for West Virginia.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Raleigh Howard Lackay, first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

LeRoy Otten Travis, first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment.

APPOINTMENTS, TO TEMPORARY RANK, IN THE AIR CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Walter Hay Reid, colonel.
John Bellinger Patrick, colonel.
Earl Hamlin DeFord, colonel.
Raymond Edward Culbertson, lieutenant colonel.
Ralph Adel Snavely, lieutenant colonel.
Robert Boyd Williams, lieutenant colonel.
John Kimball Brown, Jr., major.

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS, TO TEMPORARY RANK, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Ralph Bamford Walker et al., which appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 27, 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 9429.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Buford D. Abernathy et al., to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 19th day of December 1941, and the nominations of William S. Farber et al., for sundry promotions in the Navy, which appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 24, 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 9290.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Robert C. Armstead et al., to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 19th day of December 1941, which appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 24th day of November 1941, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 9290.

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Lacel G. Moss, Atlanta.
Henry Burden, Cawker City.
Thomas W. Sloan, Garfield.
Robert L. Harris, Udall.

LOUISIANA

Sidney J. Davis, Angola.
Nellie M. Austen, Baker.
Phyne Ull, Independence.
James C. Howell, Jackson.
James H. Broyles, Kentwood.
Juliet H. Scheppf, Madisonville.
Frank Godfrey Rieger, Scotlandville.
Allan F. Hebert, White Castle.

MARYLAND

Earla V. Newman, Beltsville.
Samuel Gilbert Townshend, Jr., Brandywine.
Grover C. Kirn, Jessups.
James Albert Roney, North East.
George R. Bromley, Stockton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Elise L. Dunham, Bass River.
Edward H. Leary, Middleton.

MINNESOTA

Keith S. Crawley, Alpha.
James A. Boyle, De Graff.
Ruth I. Underdahl, Medford.
Mary L. O'Boyle, St. Paul Park.
Philip A. Weis, Sartell.

MISSOURI

Georgia Sue Manning, Herculaneum.
George W. Wood, Linneus.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Leon H. Watt, Goffstown.

VIRGINIA

Henry H. Dickenson, Lebanon.
Elizabeth S. Davies, Manassas.

WEST VIRGINIA

William F. Gravely, Jenkinjones.
F. Alvin Webb, Keystone.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. Charles S. Dayton, Ph. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Royal Oak, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of hosts be with us yet, lest we forget; lest we make justice our aim and forget mercy; lest we rely wholly upon our machines and forget the human spirit; lest we trust in our own strength and forget Thy strength divine. We seek Thy will that we may follow it to the health of our Nation and the lasting happiness of our people. For Jesus' sake, and in His name, we ask. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On November 28, 1941:

H. R. 2567. An act confirming the claim of Patrick Morgan and Daniel Clark to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. 97 in Report of Commissioners dated May 1, 1815; and

H. R. 2963. An act for the relief of the estate of James C. Harris.

On December 2, 1941:

H. R. 466. An act for the relief of J. T. Colter; and

H. R. 5690. An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On December 3, 1941:

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Louise Hsien Djen Lee Lum;

H. R. 1852. An act for the relief of Fred Weybret, Jr., and others; and

H. R. 3121. An act for the relief of the Automatic Temperature Control Co., Inc.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina, who is detained from the Chamber for the moment, I offer two privileged resolutions (H. Res. 374 and 375), and ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM J. FITZGERALD, of Connecticut, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Military Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The resolution was agreed to.

CERTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF HON. WILSON D. GILLETTE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 4, 1941.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. WILSON D. GILLETTE as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress, from the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect [Mr. GILLETTE] will present himself at the bar so that the oath may be administered.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. GILLETTE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a speech made by Wayne Coy on September 25, 1941, before the Society for the Advancement of Management.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address delivered by Mr. Frank Buttram at the annual meeting of the Independent Petroleum Association at Tulsa, Okla., on October 21, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Danbury Times-Tribune of December 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Father La Farge, which appeared in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by Rev. C. M. Barnes, made over radio station KFSD, San Diego, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an address he made with reference to Canadian-American relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very important dispatch in the Times-Herald of this morning. An estimate of the cost is on its way here now, and I ask to include this address regardless of the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

HOW LONG CAN THE GOVERNMENT CONTINUE AT ITS PRESENT RATE OF SPENDING?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is the same old song in the same old way, but it is one that is going to cause the Members of Congress and the people of this country great concern. I refer to the Treasury statement for December 1. When I look at that statement I find that in 5 months of this year we have gone in the red $6,125,235,775.04. If we keep on the way we are appropriating money, by this time next year the deficit will be double what it is now. Then where are we? The people of this country will have their backs bowed on account of carrying this tremendous burden, which will go on for generation after generation. It will wreck the Nation. You who have voted for the spending are responsible.

Where are you going to get the money? That is the thing that will worry the Congress soon and the American people, yet we sit here spinelessly, with a wishbone where our backbone ought to be, letting every appropriation go through that comes from the White House and from every bureaucratic head.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop; it is time to look; it is time to listen. Will you get some courage to say no to the President, say no to the Department heads, say no to the ones who want to steal the Treasury. We need men of the hour, and they are men who think of country, of Constitution, of liberty; men who vote like they think. Men who can say no.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative program for today and any other special orders heretofore entered I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr Speaker, is there anyone in the House who will rise and tell me when, during the last thousand years, the Turks have advocated and practiced liberty, freedom of worship, freedom of speech, of the press; have maintained in their own land or elsewhere freedom from fear?

They have had what some call free love, or, more accurately, the practice of polygamy.

This brings me to the item in the morning press, which tells us that the President has decided to use some billions of the lend-lease funds to arm Turkey; no doubt, to build or rebuild harbors and ports in Turkey and eventually to aid in feeding the people of Turkey—all this to enable the Turks to assist the Russians in fighting the Finns.

Perhaps the President thinks that Turkey is a great democracy; that the Finns are existing under a dictatorship. It may be he thinks the Finns are aggressors against Russia; are picking on Russia; and therefore we should aid in giving the Finns a trimming.

Giving the Turks money and munitions of war to fight the Finns, the only nation which is making any effort to pay its last war debt to us is a queer, queer way to spread the "four freedoms" throughout the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution which would authorize the President and the State Department to negotiate with the Dominion of Canada and the British Empire for the acquisition of all that territory in the Dominion of Canada lying east and south of the line comprising the center of the channel of the St. Lawrence River.

The resolution calls for the acquisition of this territory as a condition precedent to any further negotiations by the President and the State Department for the development of the St. Lawrence River-Great Lakes navigation and power project, and it further provides that such an agreement for acquisition of this land will contain a provision whereby the debts and obligations due the United States from the Dominion of Canada and the British Empire be credited in whatever amount is finally agreed upon as our payment of the purchase price of the territory so acquired.

I introduce this resolution for two reasons: First, to emphasize the ridiculousness of the persistency with which our President pursues the St. Lawrence Seaway project; and, second, to provide a means for the British Empire to liquidate a portion of their ever-mounting debt to us.

If this resolution should not be reported out of committee and passed before the House considers the pending omnibus river and harbor bill, and if by some stretch of the imagination this House should allow the St. Lawrence project in the omnibus river and harbor bill. I proposes to offer this resolution as an amendment to the St. Lawrence section of that bill.

EXCESS DEFENSE PROFITS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, our membership yesterday evening on roll call spoke its sentiment in connection with unwarranted strikes in the defense industries of America. This vote should be followed, if possible very quickly, by action in this House against "profit patriots" and "defense brokers" who are using the defense effort to further selfish gains. I compliment the Subcommittee on Military Affairs on attempting to focus attention on those individuals who would attempt to make unwarranted profits out of the preparedness program of America.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I believe the gentleman will agree that the Committee on Ways and Means of this House, under the leadership of that very able chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], can be depended upon to see to it that unusual and exorbitant profits are not earned and kept by those who would do that sort of thing.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman. I do have confidence in that committee and its chairman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article having reference to the Aleutian Islands and their strategic position.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with some amazement but with

no surprise to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from St. Louis [Mr. PLOESER], who stated that he is introducing a resolution to have this country acquire some territory in Canada in reference to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I know, of course, that the gentleman is very strongly opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project. I simply want the country to know what all the Members here present know—that such a step is dragging a "red herring" across the trail of this waterway-development proposition. The opposition, the eastern railroads, the eastern utilities, some of the eastern seaports, and other sectional interests, put up the best case they could before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, and they were licked.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans on veteran migration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Maj. Paul Griffith, of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have always tried to entertain a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. I take no exception to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, but I would remind the gentleman and this House that, as far as the St. Lawrence seaway is concerned, the entire proposed navigation canals, locks, and dams are in American territory, also one-half of the power dams. Whatever improvements have heretofore been made on the St. Lawrence seaway have been made by the Canadian Government. They have spent $160,000,000 on that project, while we have spent only $17,000,000.

Canada is our friendly neighbor. For a century and a quarter we have maintained a boundary line between Canada and the United States, 3,000 miles in length, without a soldier, without a gun, and without a fort.

Some day, in the light of modern warfare, this Nation may consider itself a very fortunate country indeed to have placed by a benevolent providence in the interior of this North American Continent our mighty fresh-water seas—the Great Lakes—where in the near future perhaps the navies of this Nation will have to be built.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is not the St. Lawrence River mostly in Canada?

Mr. DONDERO. I would not say so, but nearly the entire improvement to be made is in American territory—the dams and also the new canals to be built.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that legislation of the character announced here this morning is intended to defeat the project?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct. It has nothing to do with the merits of the project whatever.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the proceedings today, after the legislative business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore made, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION FOR SELECTEES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, at this season of the year in the financial pages of the metropolitan papers we frequently see notices of extra dividends that have been declared, of melons that are about to be cut, and of wage bonuses being given to employees, all of which is very fine; but I rise to call attention to the fact that for the selectees of this country, who really are the most entitled to extra considerations, no such bonuses or melons are available.

In this connection I urge the support of Members for H. R. 5922, introduced by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], which would provide furlough transportation for the boys from Army camps back to their homes whenever such furloughs are made available, but not more than twice a year. It seems to me that this is a legitimate provision for our selectees, who serve America so well for so little, and that these boys are entitled to that. This bill should be passed so that the boys coming from communities not being favored with nearby Army camps have the same opportunity to visit the home folks at Christmas, or at such other times that they receive a furlough, as boys who are favored by being at camps close to home. I think the Military Affairs Committee should report this bill out immediately and that it merits the unanimous support of the Members of the House. I hope that we may have action on this legislation before the Christmas recess of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from the City Council of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Paul F. Douglass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF THE TREASURY

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which I received this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

TRANSPORTATION FOR SELECTEES

Mr EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for his very kind support of H. R. 5922, otherwise known as the Hall bill. Also I take this opportunity to thank the scores upon scores of Members who have written me or who have approached me personally assuring me of their support of this bill. This measure, as the House knows, provides for transportation home during furloughs of all those noncommissioned officers and men of the armed forces of the United States, and for each time they are granted furloughs, if not oftener than once every 6 months. This Christmas several hundred thousand men will have to pay their way home unless the Hall bill is passed. I ask for a report from the Military Affairs Committee on this bill, and urge that speedy action be taken to favorably act upon it. Let us send the boys who have furloughs home for Christmas.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

SECRET WAR PLANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is a most startling statement in the Times-Herald of today headed "F. D.'s secret war plan revealed," and the first paragraph reads as follows:

A confidential report prepared by the joint Army and Navy high command by direction of President Roosevelt calls for American expeditionary forces aggregating 5,000,000 men for a final land offensive against Ger-

many and her satellites. It contemplates total armed forces of 10,045,658 men.

One of the few existing copies of this astounding document, which represents decisions and commitments affecting the destinies of peoples throughout the civilized world, became available to the Washington Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune yesterday.

It is a blueprint for total war on a scale unprecedented in at least two oceans and three continents—Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Here is my comment: This program is supposed to start in 1943. I recall that after the World War we did not have the hospital facilities to take care of our sick, crippled, blind, and insane veterans. The time to act is now, to make a survey and start plans for the hospitalization of thousands of men who will need hospitalization if the Roosevelt war plan is carried out. We should begin at once to prepare if this is all that Congress shall be permitted to do other than grant power and appropriate money for an undeclared war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

REPORT FROM SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to report to the House that today the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, according to the rules of the Appropriations Committee, is filing with the chairman of the committee a report on the official trip of examination of the Federal activities in South and Central America.

This report constitutes some 40 pages, and I am mailing a copy of the report to each Member of the House today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FRANKED MAIL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today information regarding franked mail which I think every Member of the House will find interesting. I am putting in the RECORD the total number of pieces of congressional franked mail, the weight, and the lost revenue from 1930 on; also similar information regarding executive departmental franking.

The record shows that while executive department franking has increased in the 10-year period from 1930 to 1940 by 350 percent, the congressional franking has only increased 30 percent. The record shows that less than 3 percent of the total free mail carried by the Government is congressional; Post Office records show that in 1940, 2.78 percent of the total free mail carried was congressional mail. These figures are all taken from the Post Office Department records.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Has the gentleman's inquiry shown how much of this mail has been paid for and disseminated by various organizations which are seeking to propagandize the United States?

Mr. ENGEL. No. The information was taken from the Post Office Department records and of course those records do not give that sort of information.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON] was seriously ill yesterday and unable to attend the session and vote. Had he been present he would have voted in favor of the Smith bill.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Mr. PATTON'S statement on the matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of next week, after all special orders and any other business of the day, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN C. KETCHAM

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret and sorrow that I announce to the House the death of a former Member, Hon. John C. Ketcham, who for 12 years represented the Fourth Michigan Congressional District.

Throughout his life, not only in this House but at home in the community in which he was born and in which he lived, he had the respect of all who knew him. He served in this House over a long period of years, always as a friend of the farmer, always conscientiously and with ability. It has been my ambition to follow in his footsteps; to serve as intelligently, as courageously, and with as great ability as did he. If I attain that goal, the district may well be considered fortunate.

I know there is no Member of the House who was acquainted with my friend, John Ketcham, who did not admire and respect him.

He has gone to receive the heavenly reward he so richly deserves.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Hon. John C. Ketcham, whose passing has just been announced by our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was a man well known throughout my district, and a man who stood high in the estimation of my constituents. He had a warm spot in the hearts of thousands of people who permit me to represent them. I knew him personally and admired him greatly and had the privilege of being with him at a great many meetings in different parts of Michigan.

I had not heard of his passing. I regret the news very, very much. In this manner I express my sympathy to his people and his friends throughout Michigan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the death of John C. Ketcham casts a shadow of gloom over the House. Many of us here present served with John Ketcham, knew him well, admired him much, and the memory of him will linger with us long.

He was a man of broad experience. Born on a farm, he became a successful school teacher, successful county school commissioner, a successful farmer, a successful businessman, a leader in things pertaining to agriculture, master of the Michigan State Grange, lecturer of the National Grange, a Member of Congress, Michigan State commissioner of insurance, and an all-round public-spirited citizen.

He will be greatly missed in his local community, in his county, in his State, and in his Nation.

While in Congress he took a very active part. He was a splendid debater, a logical thinker, and a forceful speaker. His reputation as a public speaker extended to every State in the Union, and during the time he was lecturer of the National Grange he addressed agricultural audiences throughout the country. Few men in his home State were as well and favorably known to the general public.

John Ketcham was a clean Christian gentleman. His word was his bond. His life was an example worthy of emulation. He has left a splendid heritage to a sorrowing family.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of serving in this House for 12 years with Hon. John C. Ketcham, who at that time represented the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. I had known him for years before he came here. I have seen much of him since he left the House.

I wish to assure those who did not have the privilege of serving with him here and who have not met him in life that in his passing not only the State of Michigan but the country at large has lost one of its most faithful servants and one of its outstanding citizens.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life of John C. Ketcham.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the passing of John C. Ketcham, of Hastings, Mich., former Member of this House for 12 years, has brought a feeling of deep and sincere regret to me.

He was my personal friend. I knew him well for many years. Upon coming to Washington, nearly 9 years ago, he opened his office to me that I might share it with him until my own was ready for occupancy.

John Ketcham was a man who was known to his fellow men as one who was the noblest work of God—an honest man. He had the respect and utmost confidence of all who knew him. He lived up to the highest ideals of life. His course was charted, not by the desire for personal success, but with a devotion to public duty and service to his fellow men. His great ability was devoted to maintaining basic American principles. As a man he was an example to other men. Youth might well accept him as their hero and a guiding influence.

He has finished his course. He will be seen no more, but he has left behind the heritage of a good name, a splendid record of public service, and a nobility of character which will leave the world a little better because he lived in it.

He was a faithful and steadfast husband. His family has lost an honored and upright father, our State a devoted and able public servant, and the Nation a great American.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY RELATIONSHIP OF DEFENSE PROGRAM TO SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up a priviledged resolution, House Resolution 294, authorizing an investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business in the United States wiht a view to determining (1) whether or not the potentialities of small business in the national-defense program have been adequately developed, and if not, what factors have hindered such development; and (2) whether or not adequate consideration has been given to the needs of small business engaged in nondefense activity, or engaged in the transition from nondefense to defense activity.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "seven."

Page 2, after the word "activity", in line 4, add the following:

"and, (3) whether or not small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials, in which there is a shortage, or in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and yield myself 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the resolution, and it is not necessary to explain it. As you know, for many months now complaints have been made that small business is being discriminated against and unfairly treated; that defense contracts are being given to the larger corporations, with whom the small manufacturer cannot compete, and that certain sections of the country are getting a disproportionate share of defense work while other sections are neglected.

I have devoted a great deal of time and study to this matter, and I can say to you that the accusations are not entirely borne out by the facts. That there is some discrimination, that the small business man has not received a proper share of defense work, there is no question. However, there have been many instances, and I am personally aware of some of them, where the departments tried to give work to smaller concerns, but they were unable to accept the work due to lack of tools, machinery, supplies, or money, or inability to get dies. Still it is unfair to business generally, and certainly tragic for the country, that about 50 large corporations should have the bulk of defense work.

Some Members point out that we have already given the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs the power to investigate these matters. That is true, but they do not have the jurisdiction to go into the matter of priorities, and that is something that just must be done. There is a lot of justification to the claim that many small firms will be obliged to go out of business because they cannot get materials. The proposed committee will have the authority to get to the bottom of this situation, and find out why many of these small concerns are not receiving the consideration to which they are entitled.

I am told that many large firms have great inventories of essential metals stored away, supplies far in excess of their normal needs, and that some brokers and commission men have also succeeded in tying up huge quantities of materials. Hoarding and profiteering must be stopped. Just such actions as these are one of the reasons why small business is now threatened.

Charges of hoarding and profittering are continually made, as we all know, and I am inclined to believe that there must be some truth to the charge. This committee can and should investigate hoarders, profiteers, and big concerns that are taking adavntage of the Government, and operating to the detriment of small business.

I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the Priorities Board, and I know that he is doing the very best he can. I hope this committee that is to be appointed will cooperate with him, and bring to his attention the many abuses that I know exist. While on the subject of the O. P. M. I will say that I am not at all satisfied with some of the men working under Mr. Nelson, and I do not think they are carrying out his wishes. When this committee is formed I intend to submit to it the names of some of these gentlemen. They are not helping Mr. Nelson in the splendid efforts he is personally making, and the prejudices they have introduced into their work certainly does not help their organization or small business generally.

Many complaints have reached me, incidentally, about these dollar-a-year men. It is claimed that most of them are large stockholders in corporations with which they were until recently associated; that

many of them still receive some form of compensation from these corporations directly or indirectly; and that while all of them are presumed to be patriotic and conscientious, it is but natural that they should favor the corporations with which they were associated, or other large corporations. Certainly it can be truly said that they are more familiar with dealings with large corporations than with the problems of small business.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] called attention to the fact that at least two billion of war contracts up to the first week in June had gone to concerns with controlling officers in the Government making the contracts. He found that specific contracts amounted to $1,126,020,978 exclusive of contracts for fuel, supplies, construction, and expansion, and of contracts to subsidiaries, subcontracting, and corporations to cover up, controlled by these corporations. These include:

American Brass Corporation: James H. Madden and James T. Kemp, both in Office of Production Management, $6,857,101.

Bethlehem Steel Co.: George F. Hocker, Office of Production Management, $71,449,442.

Chrysler Corporation: Edmund S. Chapman, Chief, Light Ordnance Unit, Office of Production Management, $34,179,529.

Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation: George M. Kirk, Office of Production Management, $4,587,200.

Crucible Steel Co.: Frank E. Spencer, Office of Production Management, $14,184,446.

Dravo Co.: Alex W. Dann, Office Transportation, $10,830,481.

General Electric Co.: F. B. Cliffe, Carl M. Lynge, Office of Production Management, $106,754,743.

General Motors Corporation: William Knudsen, Office of Production Management; Frederick C. Horner, Office of Transportation; and E. F. Johnson, Benson A. Waderlow, Bayard B. Kunkle, and John L. Pratt, all Office of Production Management, $324,403,069.

International Harvester Co.: Richard E. Evans, $9,368,738.

Lukens Steel Co.: A. J. O'Leary, Office of Production Management, $8,000,719.

Murray Corporation of America: Clarence W. Avery, Office of Production Management, $3,079,680.

Procter & Gamble: Rich R. Deupree, Office of Production Management, $24,720,000.

United Aircraft & Transportation: George J. Mead, Office of Production Management, $186,439,438.

United States Steel Corporation: E. R. Stettinius, Office of Production Management, $5,548,143.

Western Electric Co.: J. F. McKermann, Office of Production Management, $22,017,520.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.: E. C. Brandt, Office of Production Management, $37,747,430.

Available records do not reveal whether contracts were open bidding or cost plus.

And since that time many hundreds of millions of dollars in additional contracts have gone to these gigantic corporations. Many of the contracts could easily have been divided and allocated to small manufacturers.

There is also justifiable criticism of certain retired Army and Navy officers who have capitalized upon their rank and familiarity with department heads and routine, and now act as Washington representatives for large corporations. This should be stopped, and I hope the committee will see that it is stopped. Equally to be criticized is the Government worker who resigns his job to accept positions with these corporations as their representatives, or to lobby for contracts before Government agencies in which they were formerly employed.

Much criticism is also directed against many Government officials who permit their acquaintance with representatives of corporations to sway them in the awarding of contracts. Some of these men, grown used to dealing with the same corporation representatives and agents over a period of years, continue to give all contracts to the corporations, without even a thought for the small business man.

I should like to say right here that the Quartermaster General's office does not come in for the criticism generally directed at other agencies. It is a pleasure to realize that the very able Gen. E. B. Gregory has exercised wonderful judgment in surrounding himself with an outstanding staff. And it is refreshing to see that he is doing everything he possibly can to divide contracts among as many small firms as is feasible. I know of a number of occasions where he has divided 1 contract among 10 or 20 small firms. He is performing a difficult job in an admirable way, and his methods might well be emulated by others. The only suggestion I might possibly make to his office is that some way be found to guard against small manufacturers, who are over eager to get Government contracts, from submitting bids at figures which they cannot fulfill without loss or bankruptcy.

I am glad to see that the Quartermaster General's office has not done as other agencies are doing, that is, letting contracts on a negotiated-fee basis. Of course, it is done in some cases on construction work.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Rules Committee, feel that this resolution being broad in its terms and probably couched in the same language as the usual resolution setting up a congressional investigating committee, and the mere fact that the language of the resolution states:

> The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business in the United States with a view to determining—

four or five different things—that it may result possibly in a duplication of what is being done by the House Military Affairs Committee under a similar resolution that authorizes it to investigate the whole rearmament program?

Mr. SABATH. I may say to my friend from Kentucky, that if I felt this committee would in any way interfere with the splendid work of the gentleman's committee, this resolution would not have been reported; but I have not heard that the gentleman's committee or the Committee on Naval Affairs have been able to deal with the abuses relative to priorities.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. For the information of my good friend from Illinois, I would like to say that the special committee of the Military Affairs Committee which deals with contracts was sitting all day yesterday and will sit all day today. We have found where small subcontractors throughout the country have been discriminated against and where there is a lot of crookedness. We will be able to disclose a great deal of information in the next week or 10 days touching the very thing this resolution deals with.

Mr. SABATH. That is only as to contract assignments and contract discrimination, the awarding and allocating of contracts. I am sure that the proponent of this resolution, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], will be very careful to guard against any duplication of work or conflict between the committee and the Military Affairs Committee and the Committee on Naval Affairs. This is something I have already talked to him about, and you may be sure he will not go beyond the authority of the resolution or its intent. It will be the purpose of the committee to aid small business in obtaining priorities, by pointing out where they are being discriminated against, and to make a broad study of the reasons why some sections of the country are being neglected in the awarding of defense contracts.

The larger corporations are said to have realized long ago that a shortage of raw materials might exist and many of them are guilty of hoarding much more material than they need. They are primarily responsible in depriving the small manufacturers of needed materials.

Mr. MAY. Of course, there are some 150,000 or $200,000 small business men who have hardly appeared in this picture.

Mr. SABATH. That is right.

Mr. MAY. Somewhere between 150,000 and 200,000 who have hardly appeared in the construction picture in this program. Mr. Odlum, of course, is the man appointed by the President to look into all that. I have had quite a bit of experience, as the gentleman knows, with these very questions. I am in entire sympathy with the small business man. I am not questioning the good faith of this resolution or the purpose of it, but I do feel it would constitute an actual duplication of what we are doing.

Mr. SABATH. I do not think it will. Mr. Odlum was appointed head of the Division of Contract Distribution in the Office of Production Management and given the task of trying to save small industry. I understand that he is now speaking of resigning. I know that he was very conscientious in trying to perform a difficult assignment, and I hope that the work he started will be carried on. Mr. Odlum pointed out that approximately 133,000, or about 72 percent, of the plants in the country employed 20

workers or less, and that this group of small manufacturers required roughly between 5 and 6 percent of the materials used by these industries in a year. If 5 or 6 percent of the essential material used by industry will keep 72 percent of our plants working, then some system of distribution should be secured, and I hope that when this committee is constituted it will do something along these lines.

Mr. Speaker, some 6 months ago I conferred with Under Secretary of War Patterson, and emphasized that something had to be done to protect the small business man. He assured me that he was determined to do everything he could, and I know that he is sincere in his desire to do what he can.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG. This is a matter of transcendent importance, and I feel that the gentleman, as chairman of the Rules Committee, is to be congratulated, and his committee is to be congratulated for bringing this resolution before us. I disagree entirely with the view of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. It seems to me that it is extremely important that the House of Representatives adopt the pending resolution at this time.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. Only a few days ago the Governor of my State, Dwight H. Green, and Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, with many other mayors and representatives of various organizations, came down here to urge and plead for action on this resolution, demanding aid for small business.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The resolution is in the usual form and by the terms of the resolution the proposed committee is "to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places" as it may deem proper. What does "places" mean? Does that mean if this committee is set up it is authorized to go to Europe or to South America or to start international studies or activities? Or does it mean that "places" confine the activities of the committee to within the jurisdiction of the United States? What is the gentleman's interpretation of that?

Mr. SABATH. That is understood.

Mr. MICHENER. What is understood?

Mr. SABATH. That they cannot go outside the United States. It is only intended to do that.

Mr. MICHENER. What can we do about it if the committee does go outside? When they get the money and go, what will we do about it?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Michigan was present in the Rules Committee when this resolution was considered and, if I am not mistaken, he even favored some action being taken in the interest of small business men.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. SABATH. I firmly believe, from what I have been told, that it will be absolutely necessary that the committee or a subcommittee thereof go to some of these various places around the country where hoarding and profiteering are taking place. They must find out who is doing it and where, and do everything within their power to release raw materials to the small business man.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask the gentleman if he, in his judgment, believes the committee will be able to do something for the relief of the small business which has to lock its doors today because it cannot get certain materials?

Mr. SABATH. I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Let me give a specific instance.

Mr. SABATH. I will answer that.

Mr. STEFAN. I just had word from my home town that a dry-cleaning establishment that cleans clothes had to quit business because it could not get a certain kind of ingredient to wash or to clean these clothes. Would this committee be able to go in there and make an investigation as to why these places are being locked up?

Mr. SABATH. Frankly, I must say that many of the complaints from small business men are not justified. It is true that there are a few that have been closed, such as the one you mention. We are trying to see to it that none of them is closed.

Mr. STEFAN. This one is closed.

Mr. SABATH. Today there is more work being done and more plants operating than ever before in the history of our Nation. There is greater activity, more jobs, more overtime than ever before in our history. Of course, it has required a great deal of time to reopen many plants that closed down in 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, and 1934, but the administration is trying to put them all to work now. I believe this committee might be able to see that proper distribution of raw materials, safeguarding the requirements of small business, results in keeping them all working. Not a one should be closed. Neither should all the big corporations absorb all the work.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that that should be done.

Mr. SABATH. The little fellow is just as patriotic, and he is just as willing to serve the Nation as the big fellow. Furthermore, they can do the work just as efficiently, and just as economically as the big fellow.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman feel it might be worth while for Congress to deliberately require the allocation of a certain small percentage of materials for the deliberate purpose of keeping little business alive? I consider it worth doing that in order that we may keep this structure of competitive business.

Mr. SABATH. That is my aim and has been for years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. A short time ago I introduced a bill to provide that very thing. I wonder if the gentleman feels that if this committee is set up it will be willing to consider such a proposition.

Mr. SABATH. I know that this committee, when it is appointed by the Speaker, will be one that will do its work to the best of its ability, and one that will have the interests of the Nation, and the welfare of small business, at heart.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sure they will, too. I may say to the gentleman that I am in favor of the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The resolution authorizes the committee to investigate the national-defense program and its relationship to small business. There is no definition of small business in the resolution. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules give us some definition of small business, so that we may have some idea as to the scope of the activity of this committee?

Mr. SABATH. I will give the gentleman my viewpoint of what I consider to be small business. I am of the opinion that all of those companies outside of the 56 great corporations now enjoying a monopoly of defense work should be considered as small business. This includes firms that employ anywhere from half a dozen to 2,000 men. Those corporations employing from five to twenty thousand workers or over I would class as big business.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. While I cannot serve on this committee, I do pledge myself to cooperate in every way and to give the committee whatever aid I can.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, part of which I may be obliged to use in the closing of the debate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY RELATIONSHIP OF DEFENSE PROGRAM TO SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute because of the change in the program. It was announced on the floor last evening the last thing before we adjourned that the first thing up today would be the appropriation bill, that we would have general debate on it today,

and that the measure which is now before the House would not be up for consideration until later in the week.

In view of the statement appearing in the Washington Times-Herald this morning, I think it well that the Committee on Appropriations give further consideration to the appropriation bill which is to be before us. There is an item in that bill of at least $1,300,000,000 which is a blank check to the President. If the statement carried in the press this morning is correct, which purports to give information to the effect that this money is to be used for an A. E. F., then I think the Committee on Appropriations should call General Marshall before that committee and ascertain the facts before it submits this blank check bill to the Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my support of the pending resolution to appoint a congressional committee to study the problems of the small businessman which have arisen in connection with the existing emergency and our national-defense program. Since this is the third time I have taken the floor to plead for action to protect the interests of the small business men of America, I shall not take much of your time today, but I do want to take this opportunity to urge support for this resolution and to ask for its passage by the House.

On October 10, and again on November 18, I addressed the House at some length on this subject, and I have discussed the increasingly serious problems of our small business men with a large number of you individually. I believe the time has now come for action. The interests of our own national-defense production as well as the vital interests of protecting the economic structure of America both demand that defense contracts be spread in such a manner as to "bring the small business man back into the Union" at this serious juncture of our national history.

It has been demonstrated by the findings of experts that the allocation of slightly over 2 percent of the strategic materials of this country to the producer employing less than 20 men will not only speed up our defense production, which is important, but will also keep open and busy the shops and factories of our smaller producers who today are in many instances actually threatened with being driven out of business entirely.

Yesterday this House very wisely took action to protect defense production by eliminating needless strikes in defense industry. That is a step in the right direction. Gearing the small producer into the defense picture will be another big step in the right direction. This step which we are today considering will not only help keep alive and busy the small producer actually using strategic materials but it will keep men employed in the more sparsely settled sections of this country, thus maintaining customers in buying power whose purchases keep open the many small businesses along Main Street which, in turn, pay the taxes which keep our small towns and little cities functioning. By protecting the interests of the small producer, we help curb the growing dislocation of our national population which tends to make the big cities bigger and the small towns smaller, with the inevitable follow-up of new demands for Federal housing and Federal spending in the large centers of population.

Mr. Speaker, after the excesses in labor have been corrected, after the small businessman is safeguarded in his rights of existence, we will then have two more problems to correct before we can look at the defense program of America and pronounce it to be well done. I refer to the fact that this Congress must take action to eliminate from the Federal pay roll the Communists and subversive individuals whose names and positions of authority Congressman MARTIN DIES, of Texas, has repeatedly called to the attention of the administration, the Congress, and the country. If the President continues to fail or refuse to act in this connection, this Congress must, since we build our house on treacherous sands when we permit Communists, bundists, and other political saboteurs to hold positions of responsibility on the Federal pay roll.

Finally, action must be taken, and that soon, to curb the growing evil of economic privateering which is taking place right here in Washington as commission agents, favor peddlers, purveyors of influence, and downright grafters continue to chisel private fortunes out of the public business of perfecting our national defenses.

With our selectees serving at $21 per month, with labor restricted in the exercise of privileges which it has in normal times, and with taxpayers forced to pay the highest levies in our national history, it is with ill grace that the Congress or the President has failed to act to eliminate the abnormal profits and the get-rich-quick schemes which are developing in this emergency. It is bad enough to have apparently forgotten the pious pledges of former years to the effect that "never again would millionaires be carved out of the savings of America during a defense emergency," but it is worse to read newspaper accounts of ex-Government officials and prominent political favorites reaping huge rewards—in some cases passing the million-dollar mark already—for using their connections to get juicy and profitable contracts for huge corporations who employ their favor-peddling on a commission basis Just this week we read of a prominent New Deal official, formerly a Member of Congress, Mr. West, of Ohio, suing a corporation for more than $700,000 of unpaid commissions of this type. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the time has come to call a halt to such disgraceful perversions of public money and private influence. We all know that in the final analysis these huge commissions are paid out of the sweat of the man who works and out of the sacrifices of the taxpayer, and increasing care should be taken to see that we get a dollar's worth of defense for America for every American dollar spent for defense purposes.

The resolution—House Resolution 294—now before us, and for which I ask your support, Members of Congress, provides for setting up a congressional committee to, first, determine whether the potentialities of small business in the national-defense program have been adequately developed; and if not, to learn what factors have hindered such development; second, to determine whether adequate consideration has been given the needs of small business engaged in nondefense activity, and, third, to determine whether small business is being treated fairly and whether the public welfare is properly and justly being served through the allotments of valuable materials, in which there is a shortage, or in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials.

Mr. Speaker, America is entitled to know the facts on these three important points, and I have long been working to bring about just such a congressional investigation and study. I hope this resolution is passed today and that the committee will begin at once on the important business of defining a course of action which will provide justice and equity to the small business men, who, after all, are the backbone of our American way of life.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this rule and propose to support it. I know that many of our Members are beginning to think that possibly we about have all the investigating committees we need, but it does seem to me that the purpose to which this resolution is pointed is most worthy and that the work sought to be brought about by the resolution should be undertaken.

When our extraordinary defense effort began to get under way we began with an emergency program of about $3,000,000,000. That was back in June of 1940. At that time it was said over the country and in Congress that we could go on with business as usual. It was believed by many that we could superimpose our defense effort upon our general economy. It was said by many and believed by many that the productive capacity of America is great enough to do the job of building a great defense machine and at the same time carry on business as usual.

In the meantime, what has happened? Since the program was launched, it has been stepped up repeatedly, almost from month to month. Beginning with the first program of $3,000,000,000, we find that within a year of that initial appropriation the total of appropriations and authorizations for national defense has leaped to roundly $45,000,000,000. Then with the two lease-lend bills this year the total has been expanded further to about $60,000,000,000.

Mr. Knudsen has given us some figures on defense expenditures that also indicate

the extent of the dislocation in our general economy that is presently taking place. For the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1941, our defense expenditures were $7,600,000,000. The estimate for the next year is $17,000,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, $26,000,000,000.

When you translate those fabulous sums into the part of our productive capacity that will thereby be consumed, it begins to become apparent why business as usual is out the window and it begins to tell why the businessmen and the employers all over the country are beginning to feel the pinch of our defense efforts.

Along in June and July of this year complaints began to flood into Washington that civilian supply industries could not get their essential materials. The tide of these complaints swelled gradually until they reached tremendous proportions. Every mail brought a new batch of complaints. We were all getting them. Our constituents were coming to Washington demanding help to get materials in order to avoid factory shutdowns.

We all know that most of these rules and regulations are administrative in character. They are not the result of direct or specific action by Congress. Many of us felt at that time that the Congress, as the legislative, policy-making branch of the Government, answerable to the people as their elected representatives, had a responsibility about the whole matter that could not be shirked.

And so our respected colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who is the Republican leader in the House, appointed a committee, made up of 20 Republicans in the House, to investigate the impact of our defense effort on small business and to determine what might be done for the protection of small business. I think in view of the situation today, it might be well for us to take a few minutes to review what our colleague from Massachusetts said at the time he appointed that committee, and I quote from his statement.

In appointing the committee, Republican Leader MARTIN said:

> Thousands of small businesses in the United States may be in grave danger of destruction. Our committee will investigate the dangers now confronting the small businesses of America. The committee will also make a comprehensive study of the perils which will beset all American business when the wars end, and the national preparedness program is completed. It will seek means of protecting the small businesses of America against the confusion which will attend the readjustment of a war-exhausted and bankrupted world to some kind of a peace basis.

In further commenting on the danger to the backbone of American business—the small businesses—our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said:

> In these chaotic days there is grave danger unless Government policies are reversed that small business will be wiped out. That would be a deadly blow for America.
>
> Small businesses employing less than 200 workers each comprise 99 percent of all business and handle 65 percent of the Nation's commerce. The loss of the major portion of these would be a great calamity and would be especially deadly in the period which will follow the close of the wars. In England after 2 months of war 20,000 small businesses were forced to close, and about 20,000 more were about to do so, it was reported.
>
> Deprived of a fair share in the war contracts, almost strangled by priorities, stifled by regulations and taxes, America's small enterprises which have provided a livelihood for millions, and made possible the prosperity of the Nation, are hanging on the ropes.
>
> The committee proposes to do a wholly constructive job to the end that the efficiency and volume of the national preparedness work can be increased with a minimum damage to small business.
>
> Everything necessary must be done to prevent the destruction of our time-tried system of private enterprise.

In this morning's press there is report of an address made by Mr. Floyd Odlum, who is the director of contract distribution in the O. P. M., in New York yesterday, in which he echoes the sentiments of our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. Mr. Odlum, speaking of subcontracts and small business in general, said that there were 133,300 plants in the country each employing 20 persons or less:

> While in the midst of the greatest production job in history, the Nation cannot afford the loss of these small plants. It cannot afford the loss of their output of needed civilian goods. It cannot afford the loss of facilities that may be needed badly by the time we can reach them and make a proper decision to produce bits and pieces for defense.
>
> It cannot afford, either now or in the years after this emergency, to see the economic death of thousands of small business men who are the pillars of their home towns, the supporters of churches and schools, and the employers of careful craftsmen who have worked years for their jobs and homes.

He also stated that—

> Two percent of the scarce material supply would keep them all alive for 6 months, 4 percent for a year.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman's argument is excellent, and we all want to help small business. The question now is what can we do for them at this time, when they need it. Will this investigation give them the things they need to exist, because they are going out of business gradually?

Mr. HALLECK. I expect to get to that shortly. He stated that about 2 percent of the scarce-materials supply would keep them all alive for 6 months, and 4 percent for a year. Now, then, that is significant to me, and interesting, because on November 11, referring to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has just asked me and to a suggestion made by the gentleman from California a few moments ago, I made a talk in Rochester, N. Y., in which I said:

> It has been pointed out that much of the priorities unemployment can be absorbed in the many new plants the Government is building or financing, and that much of it can be absorbed in expanding defense work in existing plants. But no hope has been held out anywhere, so far as I am able to learn, that all priorities unemployment can be so absorbed. As a recent statement by the National Association of Manufacturers points out: "Scores of manufacturers unable to convert their machinery and facilities face the possibility of collapse for themselves—and perhaps sections of their communities with them—unless materials are made available in reasonable quantities to keep a skeleton of the Nation's peacetime productive power at work."
>
> Now, that, as I have seen the picture throug our committee hearings and my discussions with business people, is the very nub of the problem—that we must, if at all possible, set aside every month certain minima of these basic materials for rationing among the nondefense lines, first, for repair and maintenance inventories, and, secondly, to enable business managers to hold their organizations intact, sustain their basic pay rolls, and prevent a greater degree of disemployment than may be absorbed promptly in defense work.

I think that is one proposition that our committee has developed and that many of us have been talking about, and that the O. P. M. ought to begin to pay some attention to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the statement the gentleman has just made, why not narrow the scope of the inquiry to the allocation by the O. P. M.? That is the thing that we are driving at—to see that the O. P. M. is looking after small business interests, as well as large, not the other phases provided for in Nos. 1 and 2 in the resolution. I am satisfied that if you will confine it to that strictly, to ascertain whether or not small business is properly being given its proportionate part from the O. P. M., there will not be any objection, but if you are going to go out into the whole phase of it to see whether or not the national defense or defense activities are getting the proper amount of business, then you will duplicate the work of the Military Affairs Committee and also the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate what the gentleman has suggested. In the first place, I did not draft this resolution, but I am for the resolution and I have so stated. I appreciate also that the committee of which the gentleman is chairman and other committees in the House do not want duplication of effort. They do not want somebody to get over into their field. But we have not contemplated that the extent to which this resolution would go would involve the thing the gentleman is talking about.

Now, if I may proceed, I referred to the minority committee of 20 Republicans that was created on August 11 of this year. While the committee was made up of Republicans, we undertook to avoid politics in everything we did. We felt and knew that there is before the country a tremendously difficult problem, and we wanted to make whatever contribution to the solution of that problem we could. We did not have any money from the Federal Treasury on which to operate. We did not have the power of subpena. But we have discovered that these small business men do not have to be subpenaed to come to a meeting and to Members of Congress and tell what their problems are and to give real con-

structive suggestions as to what ought to be done about their problem.

We debated about how we would proceed. We decided that probably we could do the best job by affording to the small business men of the country a sounding board over which their voices could be carried to the country and to the Congress, and through which their voices could be heard.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making. I also want to mention the fact of one of the small business men's meetings held by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana at Indianapolis last fall, at which more than 500 small businessmen voluntarily appeared and expressed their views respecting the problems which are confronting them. I want to compliment the gentleman on the statement he is making.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I want to concur in what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] has just said. In addition to that, one of these meetings was held at Minneapolis, Minn., where some 500 businessmen attended. Is it not true that in all the meetings the gentleman from Indiana has participated in there has been a sincere desire upon the part of every businessman present to aid in the national-defense program?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is true. Every one of them is extremely patriotic and will make any sacrifices necessary for national defense.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I will yield briefly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have no objection to the object of the resolution, but I am at a loss to understand how you are going to classify small business. I am asking that seriously, because I want to know what is running through the gentleman's mind as to what constitutes small business.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been asked before to identify small business. As far as the minimum requirement is concerned, I do not think there is any minimum requirement. A fellow cannot be too small to be small. When you go to the maximum limits I would not undertake to say as to the number of employees or the capitalized value of the corporation or business, but I think it has a general meaning in the minds of all of us that for the purpose of an inquiry like this is thoroughly sufficient.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia briefly.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will you set up a sounding board in Washington, or does this select committee plan to set it up in Florida, California, and other pleasant places?

Mr. HALLECK. Now, I am not for a lot of traveling around, but I doubt whether these meetings should all be held in Washington. Our committee held meetings at our own expense in Minneapolis; Indianapolis; Columbus, Ohio; and several other places. I think it is a little better to go and hear what these people have to say than expect them to trek clear down here to Washington to say it. A lot of them already are just about bankrupt. There are too many people who have to come to Washington, anyway.

Now, let me continue for a moment. These meetings have been referred to. They were marvelously well attended. I think they have done some good. The press has reported whole columns of what these small business men have said. Representatives of O. P. M. have been in attendance at those meetings, and I think some of the relaxation, some of the changes that have been made to pay a little more attention to the needs of small business have followed in part, at least, from some of the work our committee has done. That may seem a little immodest, but I think possibly we might be excused for claiming a little credit for it.

There was much testimony that the Government itself in many cases has been one of the worst hoarders of materials. As one paint manufacturer said in our Indianapolis meeting:

> I don't understand why the Government demands a 3-year supply of a given material when I cannot get a 30 days' supply.

We have heard also of manufacturing operations using only a small amount of critical material being shut down because of lack of that very small amount. One businessman at our Columbus, Ohio, meeting suggested that the Government should institute what he would call "existence priorities," under which a large operation would not be sacrificed for a particularly small amount of critical material. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who asked me a moment ago as to what might be done, would pay attention to some of these suggestions.

Uncertainty in business operations has been one of the chief causes of complaint. As one man put it, I just wish the Government would tell me what they want me to do. If I am to get out of business, I would like to know it, and if I am to get some materials to carry on with, I would like to know how much and when.

I am frank to say that I had no idea of the extent and ramifications of the problem. One can hardly realize until he hears these distressed factory managers tell their personal stories, how completely a business can be tied up by a small shortage of material.

Nor do we realize how a tie-up in one plant extends out and out by ever-increasing circles to leave an effect upon the whole community. Some of the smaller communities, those which have only one or two pay rolls in the town, have suffered severely, for the priorities unemployment soon kicks back upon the baker, the grocer, the filling-station operator, and the moving-picture owner.

The meetings we have held have all been characterized by calm and dispassionate presentations of individual problems and solutions. I have yet to hear a small business man whose statements indicated any lack of patriotism. But it is no secret that there is some suspicion over the country as to the necessity for certain of the restrictions and limitations now imposed. That some dislocations are inevitable must be admitted by everyone when the tremendous extent of our defense effort is considered. But certainly no fair-minded person should complain if it be insisted that only those dislocations which are necessary to the national defense shall be permitted to continue.

In spite of the work our committee has done and will continue to do, we claim no monopoly in this field. I think personally this job should have been started long ago. I think maybe it is not out of order for me to suggest that the gentleman from Texas introduced his resolution for the appointment of this congressional committee the day after the announcement was made of the appointment of our Republican committee. I know that a joint congressional committee with power of subpena, with finances, a committee the make-up of which would eliminate any possible suggestion of political operation as distinguished from patriotic operation could do something to solve these many great problems that are before us.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but I became curious because of the metal furniture business—and I am not going into it very far except to say we had a meeting—we called up the Department of Justice to find out how much of the material that went into metal furniture was being used by Federal prisons in our country in competition with loyal law-abiding citizens, and found out it amounts to 800 tons a month—800 tons a month. And our industry is closing down because they cannot get it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 17 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

From the study our committee has made we have reached the conclusion that to some extent all of these difficulties flow from a poorly conceived administrative plan at the outset. We all recall that in 1939 these problems of industrial mobilization were first placed in the hands of the National Defense Advisory Committee. In 1940 that Committee was consolidated with the O. P. M. At the same time the problem of civilian supply was turned over to O. P. A. C. S. Another 5 months passed, priorities difficulties began to develop in many important industries, and the next reorganization brought the S. P. A. B. into existence, together with the establishment of the Odlum bureau to study the

particular problems of those smaller industries not equipped to handle defense work on any considerable scale. Now, we know that even this fourth revision of the administrative plan has not worked well; and we face today a fifth reorganization of the industrial mobilization arrangements—all within a period of less than 2 years.

Yet even today we have have no overall picture of the job at hand. Congress does not know today whether we are planning on an eventual Army of 2,000,000 or 5,000,000 men.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Did the committee have Mr. Odlum before it to tell the committee what he had succeeded in accomplishing?

Mr. HALLECK. No; we did not have Mr. Odlum before us. He has never been before our committee. We have not held any meetings in Washington.

Mr. MAY. I want the gentleman to know that I am thoroughly in accord and in sympathy with the small business men of this country, and I can see from my investigation how he is being drastically destroyed, and there are, of course, many reasons why it cannot be avoided in many instances. But our committee is making a very thorough investigation of that thing as we go along and the only thing I am interested in is not to have the Congress criticized for duplicating its efforts. I do not want the Congress to be charged with the very thing the gentleman says is going on downtown, the setting up of one committee on top of another committee.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman stated that he did not know whether we were to have an Army of 2,000,000 or 5,000,000 men. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has read the Washington Times-Herald of this date.

Mr. HALLECK. I prepared this statement before I came over here and before reading the article to which the gentleman refers. So, from what I am saying and have said, the article has a particular interest for me.

It seems to me that these considerations, that is, the question as to how big an army we are going to have, when we are going to fight, and what we are going to fight, reach down to the very heart of the problem before us today. It must be obvious that the industrial production available for civilian consumption depends, in the last analysis, upon how much we are going to command for military use.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Absolutely.

Mr. HALLECK. Until we know the answer on this point, any system of administration, whether it be priorities, allocations, or what not, will be in real difficulty.

When I came over here this morning I read the article in the Times-Herald that has caused so much interest and concern. I read the letter that was addressed by the President to this board of strategy, or possibly to the Secretary of War. In it he apparently was seeking some of the information that I say now, and have been saying for literally months, ought to be definitely determined; and the American people should not be kept in the dark as to the program. The Congress should not be kept in the dark as to the program. We cannot plan, the businessman cannot plan his operations unless he is told the extent of the demands to be made upon him. Did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] want me to yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. I wanted to point out to the gentleman that there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the scope of Mr. Odlum's duties. It appears to me that Mr. Odlum's duties, by his own remarks, and by a letter I happen to have in my possession, do not relate so much to the matter of solving the problem for the small business of the country as it is to help in the distribution of war contracts.

There is a lot more to the saving of the small business man than giving him a war contract.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman's committee had a perfectly splendid meeting at Columbus. I hope this new committee will follow the pattern this Republican committee started and hold their deliberations not here in Washington, but will get out, as the gentleman's committee did, to points where the small business men can meet them.

What I very much fear is that we will have a lot of bureaucrats sitting around in Washington hearing each other as to what should happen to small business men instead of continuing the thing that the gentleman and his committee started of finding out the real needs of individual small business men and letting them know that they may have opportunity somewhere to tell their story to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that suggestion is well taken, and I might add there that while we sometimes refer to bureaucrats in a rather slighting way, it has been my observation that some of these people downtown who are in charge of administering the different programs instituted by the Congress do not pay much attention to anything until the folks out in the country begin to get up on their hind legs and squawk a little. I do not mean by that that our committee or the committee that will be set up under this resolution ought to go out and try to fan up a lot of disunity and lack of interest in the defense program, not at all. The things that can be done to protect small business and at the same time not weaken, but strengthen, our defense effort should be done, not only in the Congress but by the people downtown charged with administering these different programs.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. This resolution was introduced on August 12, about 4 months ago. Does not the gentleman feel that the resolution should be amended to limit the life of this committee to, say, 60 days, as thousands of men and women are losing their jobs because of this priorities question. Some of these concerns have as much as 98 percent of their materials at hand, but because they cannot get the additional 2 percent they go out of business. Some of these firms are in towns where there is only one industry in the town. This committee's activities, in my opinion, ought to be limited to, say, 60 days.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion with reference to amending the resolution. I think the job ought to be done right away, and it should be done expeditiously. It should be gotten after quickly, to the end that the greatest benefit may flow from it that is possible.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman that I am not finding fault with his position about this matter at all. From what I have learned in our investigation the thing seems to be merely a question of allocation of materials essential to keeping the small business men going in many instances, or, if necessary, a reallocation where they have already been allocated somewhere else.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed for a moment and complete my statement. I was referring to changes in the administrative plan.

Now all these changes in the administrative plan have, of themselves, made new problems for the businessman. Industry can make adjustments to almost any situation. But it cannot make new adjustments on a Nation-wide basis every 2 or 3 months. Today we see in many industries a situation in which the priorities system is at a standstill—and yet the allocations system has not yet been substituted. Here we find vital industries literally stranded between the two administrative plans. Scores of factory managers have priorities, but still cannot get their materials. It is a matter of official record that during the month of October S. P. A. B. issued defense priorities for 6,000 tons more of copper than they were able to deliver. In some cases, defense priorities on steel are piled up for 3 or 4 months on the producers' books. The net result of this situation is that for the moment we have neither a priorities system nor an allocation system. This makes for confusion and hardships far beyond what is actually justified by the supply and demand picture in the basic materials.

These are some of the major reasons why, to my mind, Congress must take a hand in the defense of small business. A matter of national policy is before us.

In shaping policy, Congress must have the over-all picture as to our defense needs; our civilian requirements; our needs for maintenance and repair of all existing plant and equipment. The only way to get at these fundamental facts, and to weave them into a strong and constructive national policy is to create a committee to investigate and report. The destruction of small business, and the disemployment of millions of workers in civilian industries, does not appear to me to be the right road to strong national defense. Rather should we utilize, so far as possible, all of our production capacity, both large and small, if we are to win this battle of production.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am supporting the pending resolution. I hope it passes. I hope this committee will get right to work. I also want to express the hope that when the committee goes to work it will not start out on a witch hunt for a few dollar-a-year men down in the O. P. M. with the idea of trying to make them the goats; does not start out on a witch hunt against just a few big business fellows who really are not essentially to blame and who have no essential power in making up the policy of the country. I think, rather, that the committee should go to work to get at the real fundamental facts and if it is found that there has been failure and error in governmental administration, point that out, too; find out where the trouble has been and the reasons, if any, for these difficulties. If the committee does that, in my opinion, it will have done a great job for the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the Fourth Congressional District there is the Sturgis Posture Chair Company, a small business, because it only employs 54 men. It has orders for 8 weeks. It has the material, or, at least, it has the source of supply which will give them the material. Fifty-five percent of their steel chairs have been ordered either by the War Department or the Navy Department—I forget which—yet they are prevented, by order of the O. P. M., from filling the orders of either the War or Navy Department. They cannot even supply the Government. What are you going to do with that kind of a situation?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I want to express my appreciation of the zeal with which my colleague from Indiana is serving the business interests of this country. He is doing a very remarkable job, and I think the gratitude of the entire country is due him.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My frank, cold-blooded opinion on this is that the committee should go to work and report back to the Congress within 60 days. I think the answer is here in Washington and between the administration program, what we appropriate and authorize here, and the burdens we have imposed on O. P. M. and other agencies. I think the answer is right here in Washington.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has expressed a hope as to the action of this committee. I have heard only two objections to the setting up of this committee. One is that it is just another investigating committee. The other is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will undoubtedly be its chairman, and there is some fear that, in view of the gentleman's fight down through the years against chain stores, this is to be a chain-store investigation.

I call attention to the fact that the bill confines the fight to the national-defense program. It has nothing to do with chain stores and big and little business in peacetime.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this select committee will be appointed by the Speaker of the House. The Speaker of the House is not going to appoint any committee that will duplicate the efforts of any other committee, because it will be under the jurisdiction of the Speaker of the House. It is not contemplated by the author of this resolution that this committee shall duplicate or interfere in any way with the very fine and excellent work that is being done by the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, the committee that is under the leadership of my friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE], or any other standing committee.

This resolution was drawn by the legislative counsel, having in mind what is desired, and that is, if you will notice, to study and investigate whether or not the potentialities of small business in the national-defense program have been adequately developed, and if not, why not, whether or not adequate consideration has been given to the needs of small business engaged in nondefense activities or engaged in the transition from nondefense to defense activity, and whether or not small business is being treated fairly in regard to allocations and allotments.

This does not duplicate the work of any committee. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] was correct in stating that this does not involve the question of chain stores or independent merchants. It is the question of protecting small business in our defense program, with special reference to allocations and priorities.

The greatest power that has ever been lodged in any bureau in the history of this Nation has been lodged in the organization to make priorities and allocations. It is contemplated that this committee will be a legally constituted body to which any Member can refer any complaint regarding the treatment of small business. Such complaints can be investigated and a report made to the Members submitting them.

If you have a complaint now, you must rely upon the mercy of those who are administering this law, with no power on earth to compel them to come up and be sworn and tell the truth on the witness stand about your complaints. This resolution will give this body, the House of Representatives, a legally constituted body before which you may appear and before which the committee may compel witnesses to appear and answer complaints of your constituents which have been lodged with you.

We had Mr. Donald Nelson, who has charge of priorities in O. P. M., before our Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. Nelson, as you know, was formerly the manager of Sears-Roebuck. He impressed me as a very fine man, honest and conscientious, and willing to do the right thing in every way. He said that 20 percent of the small business institutions would be able to take on national-defense work; in other words, they could convert their plants into defense plants; but 80 percent of the small business concerns of this country would not be able to do that. Therefore, there must be a wise allocation of these materials, or more than 100,000 small businessmen in the United States will be forced to the wall in a short time.

I do not believe in long-lived select committees. I may state to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that to show you my own record on special committees—and I believe the same kind of record should be made by any select committee—I was chairman of a special committee at one time to investigate the veteran-guardianship "racket," when I was on the Veterans' Committee under the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. We made an investigation of less than a year. We made recommendations to this House to stop it. Every one of them were enacted into law, and we spent less than $10,000.

I was appointed by Speaker Bankhead chairman of another committee. We went about our work and we worked fast. We completed our work in less than a year. We spent less than $10,000, and every recommendation we made was enacted into law. This gives my record on special committees.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the creation of a House of Representatives committee to investigate the plight of little industries, both as to the question of their participation in Government contracts,

and of the effects of priority orders on raw materials, is a needed step to reinforce the efforts of those friendly Government officials who are struggling to help this type of business in our economy.

Last August I spoke to the Members of the House on the monopolization of war contracts by big business. I took occasion to condemn the attitude of one of the officers of the old Defense Contract Service who had written me that the small industrial proprietor must show a real competitive spirit, and figuratively speaking, by "ringing door bells" of the prime contractors, procure for himself subcontracts. Since then the new Contracts Distribution Division has discarded this passive attitude, and has really gone to the aid of struggling business. It has discovered that without the power of Government, there is no way to force the spreading of Government contracts.

A notable accomplishment of the Contract Distribution Division, as presently constituted, is the relief given to the washing-machine industry. A $12,000,000 contract for gun mounts has been awarded to this industry, and more than 30 manufacturers in this field are sharing in this defense work. Help has been extended to manufacturers of aluminum products for civil use, whose supplies of raw material are cut off, but in this field there are still some of the smaller industries that are facing a shut-down unless Government orders are speedily forthcoming. This type of industry needs more effective attention.

In its present situation there is applicable to small industry, a rule of the sea that incorporates real and exact justice. When a ship is fighting a great storm, and the skipper finds it in the interest of safety to dump overboard part of his cargo, he has no hesitancy in doing so, no matter what the cost or whose goods it may be. However, the owner who suffers by the dumping of his cargo is not forgotten. He is compensated in part or in whole by recoupment from those shippers whose goods were saved at his expense. Right now all industry is "at sea," threatened by outside forces, and it will be the rankest of injustice if the small concerns that cannot manufacture war material, must go down in order that others may live.

I am greatly disturbed at the moment by the reports of large commissions being paid to brokers and others who are on the scene in Washington assisting clients in procuring contracts. Certainly these commissions would not be recklessly paid if the bidder thought he could obtain a contract through representation by a member of his own firm. It must therefore be concluded that the brokers have some special standing and can exert commanding influence. Struggling little industry cannot afford to hire these brokers, and perhaps their presence in Washington keeps orders from flowing to the little, unrepresented industry. It is an intensely disquieting situation that this committee, if created by the Patman resolution, should immediately investigate.

I believe Mr. Floyd Odlum, the present head of the Contract Distribution Service, has the will and earnest hope that he can break up the concentration of contracts. It is reported unofficially that he meets obstacles in his path. I should like this congressional committee established so that the power of this great body can be hitched to his efforts. If he finds influences that are retarding his program, he should bring his story to the Congress and let us put our weight with his in clearing out the obstructors. We hold the purse strings and we can effectually check any department that fails to heed the call for a reasonable spread of business.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the small business men of Illinois, together with certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the importance of this resolution cannot be stressed enough.

The national-defense program is setting the stage for a hoped-for victory over Hitler and his philosophy.

But in its eagerness to acquire needed materials for warfare the defense program is also beginning to wipe out the small business man in the United States, and up to now it is hard to see how the process can be stopped or even slowed down enough to determine just how much of all materials are needed for armament requirements.

We all understand that defense demands get priority over demands for material for nondefense goods. Many a small manufacturer, for all the optimistic talk on the subject, physically cannot shift over or rearrange his plant into making defense goods.

From this situation all manner of consequences are already flowing.

There are bad bottlenecks in aluminum, brass, copper, certain chemicals and plastics, chromium, nickle, zinc, and, above all, steel.

These shortages produce shortages in various and innumerable other articles needed by small manufacturers to make consumer goods.

The paralysis spread from these manufacturers to dealers, who find themselves with less and less to sell, consequently have to cut down their sales force. Unemployment and dicontent result all the way along this spiral. The harvest is unpredictable just now, except that you can safely predict that if it is not stopped now, it will be a sour harvest. This is of national interest to us all. So serious is this situation that on September 26, when the attention was called to Priorities Director Donald M. Nelson, that he issued this statement that appeared in all the newspapers in the country:

Under the priorities system companies that are given equal priority ratings still are not assured of materials, but must scramble among themselves to obtain them. So many priorities have been issued that the system is breaking down.

We are going to have to allocate from the top as well as the bottom. Up to now we have infringed too strongly on small business.

We are beginning to solve the problem now, but up to the present the little business man has been hurt more than he should have been. We are now giving his deep problems very serious attention.

I have explicit faith in Mr. Nelson's ability, but the small business man is still getting the worst of it.

It has been called to my attention that our Canadian neighbors are receiving all the nonferrous materials they desire, with no limitation whatever upon the exportation from this country. And in a newspaper article appearing in the Boston Sunday Post of November 23, 1941, by Robert L. Norton, in which I quote:

It is my understanding that the gentleman in Canada who holds a position corresponding to that of Mr. Nelson in this country recently spoke before the New England Council, and told the council that there was no unemployment in Canada, and that he and other Canadians were very grateful that our administration of this program had made it possible for Canadian plants to continue in operation.

Yet the backbone of American industry, the small manufacturer, because he cannot get materials must close his doors and go out of business.

Ghost towns are already in abundance in America, towns that relied upon these little factories for their subsistence and existence. Towns that had a pride they enjoyed for generations are either gone or going, people are living like gypsies in trailer cars, migrating from place to place, wherever they can get work. Think of the effect this is going to have on our social and economic life, think of what is going to happen in America if this is not checked.

Remember the American people are going to blame the men they elected to public office; we are going to be charged with this responsibility. The people do not know who is in charge of this program or who has the right to tell them what they can have, or what they cannot have, but they do know they elected you and me to protect them, and while we are charged with this responsibility we should take the initiative and at least do all we can to show those in charge of this program that Congress is determined to keep its eye on this matter, for if we do not, I fear for the future of America.

I have here a report on materials shortage effects on small industries in the State of Illinois that prevails in every State of the Union:

REPORT ON MATERIALS SHORTAGES EFFECTS ON SMALL INDUSTRIES IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

When business first began to feel the pinch of materials shortage, even before it became acute and became a national issue, our associations began to hear from members, and many who were not members, asking what to do. It was obviously impossible to answer quertions without first learning the conditions which caused the materials shortages.

Therefore the Illinois Division of the National Small Business Men's Association undertook to make a survey among those industries most seriously affected and found the following facts, which we believe that you, our representatives in the Congress, would wish to have. The percentages given are based on the answers to questions given in

the questionnaires employed in this survey. Attached hereto is a copy of the questionnaire:

The question: "Could any part of your plant produce defense orders of any kind; and if so, what percent of your plant?" was answered as follows:

	Percent
Entirely adaptable	26
Three-fourths adaptable	13
One-half adaptable	22
One-quarter adaptable	19
One-tenth adaptable	8
Total	88
Not adaptable	12
Grand total	100

The question: "Have you tried to secure defense orders?" was answered:

Have applied for subcontracts:	Percent
At Washington	20
Office of Production Management, Chicago	37
Ordnance Bureau	16
Total	73
Have not applied	15
Plants not adaptable	12
Grand total	100

The question: "With what results?" was answered:

	Percent
Have received subcontracts or indirect orders	22
Have received no contracts or indirect orders	51

The question: "How many employees have you laid off?" was answered by 27 percent of those reporting, and these stated they have already reduced their number of employees from 1 to 75 percent each.

In this connection it is impossible to give the total number of employees discharged, because a number of concerns failed to give the total number of employees on their pay roll. However, judging from what is known about the concerns reporting, it can be deduced that the larger concerns have discharged a larger percentage than the smaller ones. It is known that the over-all average number of employees of these industrial concerns is 112 per plant and that the unemployment situation is becoming serious.

The answers to the last question are:

Unless defense contracts can be secured by small industrial plants, or unless they can get materials for normal production, 64 percent state, go out of business; 17 percent state, curtail production; 12 percent state, do not know; 5 percent state, no comment; 2 percent state, use substitutes; total, 100 percent.

As to the materials shortage, the survey disclosed that:

Forty-five percent require steel as their prime material.

Twenty percent require aluminum.
Nineteen percent require brass.
Thirteen percent require copper.
Twelve percent require zinc.
Ten percent require wire.
Ten percent require iron.
Eight percent require chemicals.
Seven percent require fiber board.

Other materials are 5 percent or less requirements. These statistics led to our investigation in the effort to discover the facts about the production, armament requirements, export allocations, and surpluses, if any, for civilian requirements, of these materials. We regret to state that our inquiries to the Department of Commerce and the Office of Production Management failed to give us any information whatever. The best report we were able to get on strategic and critical materials is Union Calendar No. 340, H. Report No. 982, July 21, 1941, which, however, does not give all the facts desired. However, we ware fortunate in securing the facts on the most widely used material of all—steel—and we submit herewith as a part of this report the facts given to us by the president of the American Iron & Steel Institute, and we quote:

"Replying to your recent letter of inquiry with respect to figures relating to the steel industry, the production of steel ingots in the first half of 1941 was at the rate of approximately 82,000,000 tons for the year.

"For this calendar year, according to current official estimates and reports, the requirements for our defense program and for export to Great Britain and Canada represent an ingot equivalent of about 18,000,000 tons. For 1942 the present estimates are somewhat higher.

"Meanwhile, the industry's ingot-producing capacity is increasing steadily. At the end of 1941 the rated capacity of the industry will approximate 88,000,000 tons of ingots, an increase of 6,000,000 tons in 2 years.

"The facts now available, therefore, indicate that both in 1941 and in 1942 there will be fully 67,000,000 tons of steel-making capacity which can be used for domestic civilian uses and for exports to countries other than Great Britain and Canada. Since such exports are unlikely to exceed an ingot equivalent of 3,000,000 tons, the capacity available for nonmilitary uses would seem to be close to 64,000,000 tons.

"Such a total is higher than has ever been used in this country, and even in 1940 the aggregate of domestic consumption, including defense and civilian uses, was only 55,000,000 tons of ingots.

"Admittedly, of course, full future requirements of the defense program are not predictable with any finality of exactness, and estimates are constantly changing. But nothing has happened to date to disturb the fact that the steel industry has a capacity to supply the needs of defense several times over."

The statement that 64,000,000 ingot tons of steel are available for civilian consumption led us to inquire why the small manufacturer cannot get steel for his needs. We are reliably informed by steel producers that the reason is that priority orders are placed in such a way that efficient and steady flow of steel is impossible because of frequent change from one kind of production to another kind. We are informed that if one or a group of steel mills were permitted to produce sheet steel, as an example, without interruption, another mill to run on armor plate, another on structural, another on rods or bars, and so on, they could flood the market with all varieties of steel required for defense, export, and civilian needs as well.

We have reports that similar conditions apply to copper, zinc, and other materials, but we cannot get the facts. We have found that some trade associations which should have the facts pertaining to their particular lines of business are reluctant to disclose information for reasons of their own. Apparently only an official inquiry can elicit the facts.

It is our considered opinion that if the facts were known, the shortage of materials would be found to be greatly exaggerated. We base our belief on the credible reports that the mines and mills of the country are not as yet producing the raw materials at full capacity. When this is done, and this is obviously the first essential for defense as well as for civilian needs, we firmly believe that there will be sufficient of all but perhaps the imported materials.

Since the essential facts evidently cannot be ascertained by an individual, group, or organization, we respectfully request the cooperation of our Senators and Representatives in Congress to take the steps we believe to be necessary to secure these facts in behalf of the preservation of the Nation's business enterprises. To this end we present herewith a petition, as follows:

"To the Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States:

"Whereas it has become apparent by the actual closing of a number of industrial plants, and it is acknowledged by Government spokesmen that a large proportion of the smaller industrial plants throughout this country are doomed to extinction because of the so-called shortage of materials for civilian uses due to the armament program; and

"Whereas there are about 470,000 small corporations throughout the land, of which number approximately 145,000 are now vitally affected by metals and other shortages due to the armament program to such an extent that a majority of these will be compelled to close their plants within a few months at the most if they cannot obtain armament orders or materials for production for civilian uses; and

"Whereas this particular group of metal-using plants average 112 employees per plant, or 16 240,000 workers it is apparent that the extinction of a majority of this group of industries alone woud inevitably affect adversely every other line of trade, industry, commerce, finance, transportation, and the professional services throughout the land, and threaten the destruction of the entire econom'c structure of this country; and

"Whereas there is ample reason to believe, if the true condition were known, that the so-called shortage of materials is greatly exaggerated and would be found to be so if all the facts pertaining to production, armament requirements, exportation, and essential civilian needs are disclosed; and

"Whereas, it is of common report, and set forth in Union Calendar No. 340, House Report No. 982, of July 21, 1941, on Strategic and Critical Materials, on page 26, as follows:

" 'It was painfully apparent throughout the testimony given before this committee that a lack of coordination and absence of a responsible head with authority and power to fix responsibility in this as well as in other matters, has been largely responsible for the deficiencies we now are experiencing all along the line. The administration has been too prone, when difficult problems arose, to easily dispose of them by creating another board, only to add to the confusion of the assortment of agencies we now have. We are now plagued with and will continue, evidently, to be harassed because of the absence of a coherent organization. We are overblessed with boards and committees and with a legion of liaison officers feeling the necessity of consulting first with this or that agency. All of this has resulted in a deadly consuming of time and in the end we still have a divided authority: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives be, and hereby are petitioned to designate a Joint Legislative Committee to:

"1. Ascertain the facts about production, imports and exports, armament priorities, and surplus, if any, for civilian needs of the strategic and critical materials.

"2. Ascertain the quantities of strategic and critical materials heretofore exported, and earmarked for export in the future under the Lend-Lease Act, to England, Canada, China, Russia, and other countries.

"3. Ascertain what becomes of these materials. What proportions are used for the purpose intended (production of armament), and what proportions are manufactured into consumers goods and offered for sale at home or abroad.

"4. Ascertain the extent of hoarding and bootlegging of materials.

"5. Ascertain the extent of the issuing of priorities for materials for armament orders

and shipbuilding which are scheduled to begin production or construction months ahead, thus tying up materials long before they are required and thereby depriving industry of the materials in the meantime.

"6. Ascertain to what extent steel manufacturers, as an example, are required to operate their plants in a manner to prevent the greatest efficiency in production and economy in operation, by too frequently changing their production from one form of finished or semifinished product to another.

"7. And in accordance with the above-mentioned report in Calendar No. 340, to take the absolutely necessary steps to bring order out of the confusion and chaos now prevalent in the administration of the armament program by:

"(a) insisting upon the designation of a single individual, in whom the people of the United States as a whole have confidence, as the head of the program, with full authority and responsibility; and

"(b) eliminating overlapping bureaus, commissions, committees, and red tape.

"8. To render a full, complete, and accurate report as promptly as possible to the people of the United States as to the matters set forth in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 hereof.

"In behalf of the 157,000 small business men and the 46,000 professional and personal service men and women in the State of Illinois, the National Small Business Men's Association, and the Illinois Chamber of Commerce respectfully request that the State's Senators and Representatives in the Congress jointly sponsor a resolution for the appointment of a legislative fact-finding committee for the above-named purposes.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
"FRED A. VIRKUS, *President,*
Illinois Division,
"THE ILLINOIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
"ROY C. INGERSOLL, *President.*"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only for the purpose of answering my colleague from Indiana with regard to what he claims has been done by the Republican committee appointed long after I hammered away on the floor of the House and in the departments for aid to small business and a broader distribution of defense work.

President Roosevelt long ago realized the gravity of our present situation, and rising above politics appointed many prominent Republicans to key Government positions. I have only to refer to Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Messrs. Knudsen, Stettinius, and Nelson, and many others, as examples. I must admit that at the time I thought that there were plenty of good Democrats who could just as well have been appointed to the positions, but I must in all honesty admit that these gentlemen are giving their utmost in the interest of national defense. However, it is a fact that Democrats appointed to the same positions could have done at least as well. Certainly I believe a small business man would have better understood the problems of small business than a large corporation official.

As long ago as July 10, 1940, I spoke on this floor against the danger of giving all the defense work to large corporations, and emphasized that unless we did something for small business we would have a very bad situation on our hands. Again, on July 23, 1941, and on July 30, 1941, I pleaded for a broader distribution of work, all in the interest of small business.

In passing, I might refer to the many remarks I have made to the effect that the Midwest is not getting its share of defense work. If you will stop to consider that Chicago, which should be second or third in the handling of defense work, is tenth on the list of cities in the award of armament contracts, you will realize how strong an argument the Midwest has. If you were as familiar as I am with conditions in Chicago and the surrounding territory you would see how serious a situation has been created. Skilled laborers and mechanics have left the city by the thousands, destined to Detroit, New England, and the eastern seaboard. Not only are families broken up, but the economic existence of a city is threatened, with 40,000 living quarters reported vacant.

Let me insert here a tabulation showing the allotment of armament contracts to various cities, as compiled from Government reports. You will notice that Chicago is at the bottom of the list.

Total contracts

[In thousands of dollars]

Area	Total contracts	Per worker	Percent comparison
Seattle	715,462	19,413	1,693
Los Angeles	1,403,312	11,103	968
Baltimore	627,048	5,930	517
Buffalo	520,208	5,696	497
San Francisco	410,035	5,369	468
Indianapolis	163,999	4,223	368
Detroit	963,052	3,158	275
St. Louis	392,153	3,092	270
Boston	724,416	3,050	266
Cleveland	328,198	2,333	204
Philadelphia	611,944	1,902	166
Milwaukee	137,716	1,399	122
Chicago	544,401	1,146	100

It is just such things as this that the committee should inestigate, and they certainly have plenty of work awaiting them. I hope and expect that the work of this committee will be beneficial, and in the interest not only of the small business man but to the entire program of national defense and to the country as a whole. For that reason I urge the adoption of the resolution and I now move its passage.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes allocated to me to discuss House Resolution 294 which is designed to authorize an investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business, I want to enthusiastically endorse this movement to aid small business.

Somewhere I read that next year 53 percent of American industry will be engaged in defense work. If this is true, approximately half of the 184,000 manufacturers in this country are headed for bankruptcy.

While many industries may be converted to the manufacture of defense materials, it is freely predicted that there is no salvation for nearly 25,000 manufacturing concerns.

It is difficult to understand how the American people can spend $68,000,000,000 on a national-defense program, and aid countries such as Canada, Great Britain, China, and Russia, while at the same time thousands of our own American taxpaying citizens find themselves denied employment because their employer has been forced to close his doors.

This resolution should be adopted and a speedy investigation launched, not 6 months from now but immediately, if we are to avert a national calamity that will follow the execution of the death sentence now hanging over the heads of thousands of small business men.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I should like to reach some understanding with the gentleman from New York as to the amount of time to be allowed for general debate. If it is agreeable to the gentleman from New York, I suggest that general debate proceed throughout the day and that we read the first paragraph before the Committee rises tonight.

Mr. TABER. But the Committee will rise before any amendments are acted on?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All amendments to be deferred until tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. And we shall run just as late as the demand for time makes necessary?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Until general debate is exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue through the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill has been delayed almost 2 hours from the time it was scheduled to come up. It is my understanding that it was delayed because of some publicity in the Times-Herald and other papers this morning.

I feel that when this appropriation bill is brought to the floor, that the com-

mittee at least ought to have the statement of General Marshall or somebody who speaks with authority, concerning the correctness of the article. The country is entitled to know, and if we are going to appropriate $8,000,000,000 more today and tomorrow, we should at least know whether the article is a fraud or tells the truth. I hope the committee will investigate to such an extent that it can give the House the facts.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's suggestion as to loss of time, the committee, I am certain, will be glad to run until as late this evening as the gentleman may wish. Full opportunity will be given for the discussion of every phase of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do not think the gentleman heard me. I think this is the first time that I have ever raised a question of this kind on the floor, and I only do it because of its importance. I do it only because of the article referred to in the Times-Herald of this morning. That article makes it clear that our country is to furnish an American expeditionary force in the present World War. It purports to quote a letter from the President of the United States with reference to a program for an American expeditionary force, and I think the committee owes an obligation to the House and to the country to be able to advise directly as to whether or not that is a proper quotation or is only a newspaper story.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, both the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I have consulted at length with a representative of the War Department, and we are prepared to discuss fully and in detail any phase of the bill which the gentleman wishes to consider.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6159.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of bill.

By unanimous consent, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to myself.

The bill which the committee reports appropriates $7,649,839,031. In addition to this amount of direct appropriations authority is granted to enter into contracts in addition to appropriations for certain specific purposes in the aggregate amount of $594,000,000. The combined total of direct appropriation and contract authorization provided by the bill is $8,243,839,031.

This amount of direct appropriation and contract authority may be classified according to relation to national defense as follows:

Direct application to national defense	$8,109,945,898
Indirect application to national defense	87,179,000
Nondefense but due solely to the war abroad	37,500,000
Nondefense due to the enactment of new law since regular appropriations were made	8,711,333
Nondefense miscellaneous due to emergent and unforeseen conditions	502,800

The amount in the bill for direct application to national defense is $8,109,945,898. This sum added to the previous appropriations and contract authorizations for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, including the amount necessary to complete the naval expansion program in the future, raises the total outlay to date for national defense to approximately $69,000,000,000.

This bill provides nothing new in policies or objectives. It merely carries out a continuation of the plans heretofore adopted and heretofore provided for in the previous acts, providing funds for national defense. Our expenditures in October ran at the rate of approximately 19 percent of our national income. That compares with an expenditure by England of something in excess of 50 percent of her national income—between 51 percent and 52 percent; with Germany, whose war expenditures, insofar as we are able to judge, approximately three-fifths of her national income, which, with confiscations and involuntary contributions, supplemented by loot from subjugated nations, probably totals something in excess of 100 percent of her national income; and with Canada's expenditures approximating 45 percent of her national income. But we, too, are moving forward.

It is expected that during the next fiscal year the amount which we will expend for national defense will approximate 30 percent of our national income. It presents a situation unparalleled in American history. Never before have we faced a situation which touches so directly and so intimately every citizen of the Republic; which provides for the expenditure of so vast a sum in so short a time; and which devotes so completely to one purpose the entire resources of the Nation. But it is a matter in which we have neither option nor choice. There is before us now but one question. It is the question of winning or losing the war. It is a question of conquering or of being conquered. It is a question of self-defense or submission.

There is no middle ground. There is no intermediate stage. Either we prevail or we yield. As between these alternatives there can be no hesitation on the part of any American citizen. How absurd is the suggestion that we should "just forget all about it and go back and sit down." Sit down in a fool's paradise and await the rude awakening which every nation which followed that seductive course has experienced. That question was definitely settled once and for all when Congress passed the lend-lease bill, and this bill carries out the commitments made at that time. The issue resolves itself into a question of production and transportation. That nation will win which puts the most machinery on the front in the least time.

It is a war of production. The nonaggressor nations must outproduce the Axis Powers. There is no other way to preserve either their freedom or their form of government. And that is our task. England is producing magnificently. But she is subject to great handicaps. Daily, bombers have searched out every possible location where factories might be operating; where plants might be hidden; where production might be camouflaged. Every industrial center which could be located has been bombed. Every productive activity visible from the air has been strafed. And inevitably damage and dislocation of operations and attendant loss of momentum has followed. Russia, which produced at the peak of operations so vast a stream of equipment as to stagger the comprehension of the world, has, in consolidating her position on her present front, been forced to abandon 70 percent of her industrial area. China, forced back into the interior and relinquishing her coastal centers of industry, is limited to the production of small arms only. It devolves upon America to produce and arm the nonaggressor nations; to produce and provide the munitions and equipment of defense; to outproduce the Hitler nations and their enslaved satellites. That is our job, and that is the assignment which we propose to carry out with the funds to be appropriated in this bill. This is the next consecutive step in the defense program.

Let me emphasize here that we are providing matériel only. We are supplying no personnel. We are contributing neither armies nor men. We are merely supplying the tools which are to be used and operated by the manpower of the nations to whom they are consigned.

And I would like to forestall at this time any questions which anyone may have in mind to ask during the consideration of the bill by saying most emphatically that at no time during the long and exhaustive hearings on this bill or any other bill in this session of Congress has there been any testimony or information that any plans were being made or considered or any time, money, or material being devoted to any project with a view to action upon the part of American armies or participation by American forces outside the Western Hemisphere. Let there be no mistake on that point. In the consideration of this bill and supplementary legislation by this large committee, including some of the most experienced men in the Congress, there has been no suggestion or intimation that the United States provide anything more than materials of the character inventoried in the report now before the House.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just one moment, if the gentleman will permit.

The bill before us falls into five general purposes. In the five divisions of the bill we make provision for the Army, the Navy, for the lend-lease administration, for general appropriations, and for salary advancements under the Classification Act.

Under the first title, the bill provides for expansion of the Army, involving an increase of 309,886 men and officers, which brings it up to 1,840,000 enlisted men and about 200,000 officers—in round numbers, an army of about 2,000,000 men by next June.

We propose to activate 2 more armored divisions, going from 6 to 8. We propose to increase our combat groups in the air force from 54 to 84. We propose to install additional air bases and additional airfields.

Under the second title we propose for the Navy additional airplanes, the installation of arms on American merchantmen; acquisition of additional craft, including mine and control craft, and additional funds for maintenance and upkeep of naval vessels.

Under the third title of the bill, we provide for lend-lease in round numbers one and a half billion dollars, $1,556,496,246, with authority in addition to the War Department to use not to exceed $500,000,000 in addition for the transfer of defense articles procured from War Department appropriations since March 11, 1941, to such nations as come within the classification permitting the transfer of such materials.

To summarize:

Lend-lease bill provides	$1,556,000,000
Previously provided:	
Act Mar. 27, 1941	7,000,000,000
Act Oct. 28, 1941	5,985,000,000
Total	14,541,000,000

All of the $7,000,000,000 was allocated as of November 13, 1941. Allocation includes placing of requisitions by countries to be aided, examination and approval by Lend-lease Administrator, and procuring agencies—War, Navy, and so forth—and all ready for making of contracts and placing of orders.

Of the $5,985,000,000 provided in the act of October 28, 1941, $2,220,412,520 had been so allocated as of December 1, 1941, or approximately 40 percent, in about 1 month. All is expected to be under contract by March.

Of the total of $12,985,000,000, there had been placed under contract as of November 23, 1941, $5,149,000,000, and all is expected to be under contract by March.

Disbursements have risen rapidly. From March 27, 1941, to June 30, 1941, $21,000,000 was actually paid out. From July 1 to November 29, a total of $633,000,000 had been paid out, making a total since March 27 of $654,000,000. Disbursements are now running at the rate of better than $200,000,000 a month and will rise rapidly from now on.

The question may arise as to why with $12,985,000,000 already provided it is necessary to appropriate additional sums now. When General Marshall was before the committee in connection with the $5,985,000,000 he frankly stated to the committee that the amount thereof which was to be handled by the War Department was $2,255,000,000 and that this sum represented in money value only about half of the outstanding requirements then reported by the countries to be aided. He regarded the $2,255,000,000 as inadequate. The amount allowed in this bill under lend-lease ($1,556,000,000) plus the authority in the bill to use not to exceed $500,000,000 in equipment of the War Department procured from regular funds to be used for lend-lease, makes, $2,056,000,000, or about $200,000,000 short of what General Marshall stated last October as representing the outstanding requirements of the nations to be aided by equipment to be procured by the War Department.

The House should have clearly in mind in connection with the appropriations in this bill for our own needs and lend-lease that these appropriations are necessarily a prelude to the battle of production. There will be more appropriations in large amounts both for the Army and Navy and lend-lease until the Axis runs up the white flag.

The battle is world-wide and the fronts are many and shifting. It is in its first analysis a struggle of economic, financial, and productive capacity. To recapitulate—the nations which outproduce in quantity and quality of arms will win. At the present time the United States is devoting about 25 percent of its manufacturing capacity to defense articles. By the middle of 1943 it will be devoting about 54 percent. That means that factories have been converted from peace to war needs, special machinery and tooling for national defense have superseded the peace equipment of the plants. New factories have been built, designed and equipped for manufacture of war goods. New operating personnel has been trained for these plants. They must be kept geared to the production for military needs and must produce for the military needs an ever-increasing quantity of tanks, guns, planes, and so forth, for military purposes. These articles take a long time to manufacture, and gearing production up to the requisite basis takes a long time, but once it is there and the stuff begins to roll off in the stupendous quantities projected, the doom of Axis domination is sealed.

Defense industry must be kept running. Design is changing in weapons. Improvements are constantly being made in types and performance following battle experience. We cannot rest once we have placed a number of given orders for equipment and say, "When we get this we will have the best in the world and the most." We must improve, continue to increase production, and keep the industries turning it out until the emergency is over. We must not only produce the most but we must produce the best and constantly improved types to win. We could speculate that some of this is not necessary, that it will never be used, that we are overproducing. Who wants to gamble in national defense? Rather be safe with too much and too soon than sorry with too little and too late.

It should be recalled that not a step can be taken under lend-lease or under any other of our procurement programs until the money is appropriated. Nobody can obligate the Government to any kind of a contract until the money is available with which to pay that contract or specific authority is given in money terms to make a contract. If articles take 12, 15, or 18 months to produce, the money to pay for those goods must be appropriated that far in advance.

A word about the $68,000,000,000 that has been laid on the line for national defense since we started this program about July 1940. This sum includes 2 years' appropriations. It includes cash and contract authorization for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. It also includes contract authority for the expanded two-ocean navy for which appropriations will have to be made in the future, running into the fiscal year 1946. It also includes funds to cover contract commitments some of which money will not be used until the fiscal year 1944. There should not be any confusion that this sum is all to be expended in this or the next fiscal year. It is a part of the projected program covering the present and future. Included in this vast sum are large amounts for pay, transportation, allowances, and other expenses of our large military and naval forces that do not enter into production. Included also are all sums for the Army and Navy for these 2 fiscal years, and, of course, we had a smaller Army and Navy in previous years, and some part is due to Regular Army and Navy maintenance and improvement. It is possible, and everyone hopes, that a large part of this sum will never need to be paid out, but the test of the impact of this $68,000,000,000 on the taxpayer and on future generations will not be the total of the appropriation but the amount of that total that is actually disbursed.

The future is clouded in uncertainty. Europe is a maelstrom of conflict. The Pacific is a tinder box. We have these responsibilities which we have assumed under lease-lend and for our own defense. There is no turning back. We have our military and naval advisers and experts, General Staff and Naval Operations, whom we have educated, trained, and equipped to defend this country. They come to us with these requirements. They say they are necessary. If they do not know, to whom should we turn? National defense is their life study and responsibility. We have to trust them on quantities and types and time. Their judgment may go amiss at times. They may play too safe. We will not criticize them too much for that. But woe to them if they do not ask us for enough and in time. The grandstand generals and admirals in civil life—those who at baseball and football games know better than the umpires and referees—never let up in wanting to umpire now and will not let up after the emergency is over. We

have but one course. We must follow responsible military and naval counsel and advice. We can help to keep down contracting costs and petty larceny by constant scrutiny and criticism by our investigating committees set up for that purpose, but when it comes to determining what we should have, when we should have it, and how much we should have, practically we are in duty bound to follow the advice of responsible military and naval leaders.

I recall that in World War No. 1 a large military appropriation bill was approved on November 4, 1918, 1 week before the armistice was signed. The authorities of the War Department and the members of the Committee on Appropriations had a well-founded feeling that the money would never be used. But they did not dare to take that chance as near as victory was.

The sums in this bill have been examined as carefully as possible. They are large but the cause for which they provide is larger still. It may be necessary for us to come to you for more and more funds. I hope more will not be required, but if the struggle continues there is no alternative. If this world conflict continues until we reach the point where 50 percent of our industrial capacity is devoted to national defense, the bill of expenditures must necessarily be correspondingly larger. If we reach the point where 50 percent of our national income goes for national defense, expenditures will involve staggering figures. Our national income now is about at the rate of $94,500,000,000. It is rising. It is entirely possible that we may have to devote one-half of $100,000,000,000 to national defense. We hope not. But whatever the cost, it is inconsequential in comparison with the consequences of defeat.

Mr. JOHNS. I was interested in the percentage by which Russian production has been cut down by the war, to 30 percent. Is it correct, that it has been cut down that much from bombing and other causes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman realizes, Germany controls today all industrial centers and practically all the workshops on the continent of Europe outside of Russia. Russia, in taking the position which she is today so admirably sustaining, has relinquished outlying districts in which she was producing at the beginning of the war approximately 70 percent of her munitions.

Mr. JOHNS. Do we know anything about how much the production of Germany and her allies has been cut down by the war? Have we any figures on that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I regret to say that on the basis of the information we have been able to secure, Germany, far from decreasing her production, is accelerating production and is today throwing into the conflict an ever-increasing stream of equipment and munitions.

Mr. JOHNS. Just one more question if the gentleman will permit. This appropriation contains an additional amount for lease-lend. Can the gentleman inform the House just how much money of the original $13,000,000,000 has already been spent? I do not mean how much has been allocated under contract but what has been actually spent? The Treasury reports show something over $600,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are expanding as we go ahead. It is proceeding at an accelerated tempo. Expenditure is now at the rate of $200,000,000 a month. It takes some time to get underway. In many cases we have to build facilities in order to get production started. As of the 13th day of November we had allocated the entire $7,000,000,000. As of December 1 about 40 percent of the $5,985,000,000 made available on October 28 had been allocated.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On the question of personnel I note in the report what the gentleman has said that you provided for raising the total to 1,840,000 men in round figures.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And in addition the officer strength to 200,000. This will bring the total up to approximately 2,000,000 men by next June.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But the report on page 10 contains the statement:

> Provision heretofore has been made for critical items in kind for an army of 3,200,000 men * * * and for a considerable reservoir besides.

The General Staff now strongly advocates further augmentation, not only for potential demands of our own forces but to permit of larger transfers of defense articles.

The potential demands for our own forces are shown as about $2,500,000,000. I am unable to understand just how that works. You provide pay for a personnel of 2,000,000 but you are providing critical items and arms for a vastly larger number of men. Was there any discussion as to how many more than 3,200,000 men we were to provide for?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. The personnel—about that now provided—will be inducted only when and as Congress gives the money. Matériel, however, has to be prepared long in advance. For example, we were told that it takes 18 months from the time a pencil is put to paper in the drafting room until a plane can be turned out. It takes time—anywhere from 6 months to a year or a year and a half or 2 years, depending on its character, to turn out the finished product. We must have the matériel ready as the men are provided, as they will be inducted into the service. When they are called up for training we will have matériel for them, or if the need should arise we will have the matériel for transfer to our allies in Europe.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But here is the point, as I understand, it takes longer to make a plane than it does a pilot, for instance. But it does not take longer to make a rifle than it does to make an infantryman. If you are not making plans for arms for an American force of far greater number, what are you making plans for?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, we are not limiting ourselves to the needs of the American Army. We must aid in arming Europe, we must aid every anti-Hitler force in the world. That is what we are doing.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Somewhere I read where this bill authorizes or permits our Army to assign to those nations that are friendly to us equipment that we have on hand available for our own armed forces up to a half-billion dollars?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Up to a half-billion dollars from funds appropriated to the War Department since March 11, 1941.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman feel that the removal of the equipment we have in the Army at the present time is going to help the morale of the boys who are now training with brooms and clubs?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I submit the testimony of a man in whom all of us have the utmost confidence, General Marshall, Chief of Staff, unquestionably one of the great military authorities of the world. He said that it was important to provide this material. If the material at this time was not needed by our forces, it was much better used by sending it over to Russia and keeping the Russian Army on its feet.

So, if at any time it becomes necessary to send this material abroad where it may happen to be needed in order to maintain our Allies' defense, it will be sent. We would rather stop Hitler in Europe than stop him in America, and we would rather have European soldiers use this material over there than have our own soldiers use it over here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman straighten me out on one thing? What in our terminology constitutes an army division, how many men or how many troops?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It varies from peacetime to wartime. Twelve to eighteen thousand men I should say, for peacetime.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Twelve to eighteen thousand men. The Army is to be raised to a million two hundred thousand, including the officers. What are the Navy personnel and the Marine Corps to be increased to? At the present time we have a fraction less than 2,000,000 in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. This will carry the Army up to 2,000,000 men, including officers. What is to be the approximate number of the Marine Corps and the Navy under this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no especial provision for increase here in the personnel of the Navy or Marine Corps except as we are gradually increasing the establishments. We have as our objective a two-ocean navy, and as the facilities are provided and ships are launched,

it will then be necessary to increase personnel accordingly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us what information his committee has as to the number of divisions now in the active German Army? Are there any figures on that?

Mr. STEFAN. Three hundred divisions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Potentially 300. I do not think it is quite 300. It has been stated as approximating two hundred and something.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Two hundred and sixty.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the estimate as I recall it. Two hundred and sixty and potentially three hundred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Should we have in mind approximately 15,000 men in measuring the number of men in those divisions?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The issue of war is not determined by the number of men.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The issue of the war is determined by the equipment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For example, we are told that the column which broke the famous Maginot line consisted of only 150,000 men as opposing millions, but they had the equipment, so we are not concerned with the number of men Germany has or can produce. What we are concerned with is the munitions which Germany is producing, and we cannot expect to stabilize the front until we have out-produced and out-machined the Axis factories.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that little business has been suffering, and in view of the fact that it has had to undergo these priority orders, does not the gentleman feel that the Army and Navy officials should be more careful in making selection of their sites and in going forward with their work, especially in view of the fact that 2 weeks ago they built 276 houses too many in the wrong place? Does not the gentleman think we ought to cut down on these nondefense expenditures and spending? The Oklahomans, especially in my district, have been doing their best, and I have been voting for all defense items, but they and I are beginning to draw back each time these additional appropriations come; they are wanting to know when it is going to stop, and I refer to this nondefense spending.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman thinks he should stop the program, that is his privilege.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not want to stop the defense program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the result of delaying the activities provided for in titles 1, 2, and 3 of the bill. There is nothing for nondefense in titles 1, 2, and 3, and there is nothing in the rest of it that is not indirectly connected with defense. The Army officers in determining the site of their plants, of their cantonments, and manufacturing facilities consider only the military importance of the location; what is the most strategic position with reference to proximity of material, labor, and transportation?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Then when I tell my folks back home I voted for this bill, the gentleman can assure me I am voting for essentially defense items?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is nothing in this bill which the gentleman can support that will not forward the defense program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts I have been very much alarmed by the shortage of small arms and ammunition. It seems to me it amounts to a scandal that existing facilities have not been used where there is trained labor and where you could have had immediate production of small arms and ammunition. Does this bill provide any further appropriation for small arms and ammunition? I do not feel that it is the lack of money that is at fault, I believe it is the lack of proper thinking in regard to the production of small arms and ammunition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 15 additional minutes.

I am glad to say to the gentlewoman that the production of small arms is one of the numerous items of which we are producing 100 percent on schedule.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But there is a great shortage.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are some items, of course, on which we do not reach the high schedule set, but we are now producing and we have available 100 percent of the small arms—shoulder rifles—for our own forces, who are equipped 100 percent with their quota of such items. I am glad to be able to reassure the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested, because this information does not tally with the figures I get from different departments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was the information given to the committee by the statistical department at our monthly hearing last Monday. I shall be glad to cooperate with the gentlewoman in a suggestion she may have to make in this connection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Montana.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Will the gentleman tell us whether the 2,000,000 young men that you plan to have in the Army by next June will be sufficient to defend the United States at all times, or are they just a part of the number that you plan to equip to defend the United States, or are part of these men to go to other countries?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As has been indicated, we are preparing to equip an Army of 3,200,000 men. We are proceeding in a regular and orderly way. There are no funds now asked to raise the Army up to that point, but we are getting the material that takes a long time to produce.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Did the witnesses say that 3,200,000 men would be sufficient to defend America at all times and under all circumstances?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the program outlined by the military authorities upon whom we rely. They recommended that we provide equipment for an Army of that strength, and we are proceeding to get the strategic and critical material.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Is the policy to use these men in foreign countries or to use them all in this country?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no intimation that we expect to take any of these men outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. Are any funds allocated in this appropriation bill for the expansion of housing facilities to take care of the increase in our personnel?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are providing in this bill for the enlargement of cantonments to accommodate the increase in personnel. There is no provision for new cantonments, but we are enlarging existing facilities to take care of the additional men provided for in the bill, as they gradually enter the service. In addition, we are providing temporary housing, that is, trailers, portables, and demountable buildings, which can be moved from point to point, as the occasion requires.

Mr. HARNESS. Does the gentleman mean they can be used by the troops of the Army?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The enlargement of existing cantonments is for the troops, and the temporary housing is for the men who are supplying the labor in the production of matériel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman just said that we are arranging for the housing of about 2,000,000 men. Is the gentleman in a position to give us any information on the suggestion that was made in today's papers about increasing our armed forces to somewhere between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 men, and are any plans under way to work out that proposition? Can the gentleman tell us anything about that problem at this time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say there is no credence to be placed in the deductions drawn in the article to which the gentleman refers. The information upon which it is based does not deal with American troops for whom we are making provision in the bill before us. This bill neither contemplates nor provides for any expeditionary force. The conclusions adduced in the newspaper article referred to are the highly colored

and highly partisan opinions of a paper which has been notably and notoriously opposed to the foreign policy of the United States from the beginning.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman tell the House that that story is unfounded? Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Inasmuch as the gentleman has raised that question, I must say that speaking moderately and conservatively the article is obviously a tissue of misrepresentation and misinterpretation. It is a matter of common knowledge that this story has been peddled about newspaper row for the last 4 weeks. It is apparent, therefore, that its publication has been very carefully timed to reach the House simultaneously with the report on this bill. Both the bill and the newspaper reached the floor here this morning within 25 minutes of each other.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My own opinion is that if there was any timing of the article, it was timed more to coincide with the starting of a new daily newspaper in Chicago than with the introduction of this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is, on the face of it, too efficient a piece of synchronization to be a mere coincidence. But it is a matter of no significance. Even a casual reading shows that its conclusions are not based on the document which it professes to quote. Some time last summer the President, or an administrative agency through the President, in order to appraise the extent and nature of the task of supplying lend-lease material, requested an estimate of the kind and amount of material required. There was no inquiry as to men or personnel. It was purely a study of material—material to be supplied abroad. The number of men referred to are not men in American armies, but men in European armies. In order to estimate the amount of equipment required it was necessary to translate it in terms of men—the men who would use it—the men in the armies of the nations to whom the lend-lease material is to be consigned. The commentator would have you believe that these are American forces to be sent as an expeditionary force to Europe or elsewhere. But a glance at the excerpts which it prints shows that by no stretch of the imagination is there any foundation for any such conclusion. It is a deliberate misrepresentation.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the two leading military authorities, General Wavell and General Auchinleck, both admitted that if we were to conquer Hitler the United States had to send men in addition to matériel?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, there have been irresponsible people in every nation and in every station in life who are always ready to tell us how this question or that question can or ought to be solved, but we are considering here only the testimony of responsible authorities, upon whom we rely for official information and advice. There has never been at any time any article prepared or any document submitted by those in authority which had in contemplation an expeditionary force of American soldiers to Europe, or any part of Europe. The article is a canard, pure and simple.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to my esteemed colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Of course, we know that there is not one single dollar or one red cent in this bill for an American expeditionary force.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Positively not. That matter was inquired into minutely by members of our committee, and we were assured repeatedly, and it was reiterated time and again, that there is nothing in contemplation in any way relating to an expeditionary force of American soldiers to Europe.

But the brazen misinterpretation attempted to be read into this routine document, obvious as it is, constitutes only one proof of the venality of the article. The bill itself is a convincing refutation of any idea that the study quoted is of importance today. Military studies must necessarily take into consideration every possible contingency. And this particular study happens to be a study of contingencies which were never realized and which today do not apply in any respect. For example, the writer says the program alleged to be in contemplation requires an "additional appropriation by Congress of $40,000,000,000 in the next 6 months." That was early in September. The 6 months referred to are the 6 months covered by the bill pending before the House today. The perspiring sensationalist says the administration plans an appropriation of $40,000,000,000, but in this bill the administration actually asks for an appropriation of $8,000,000,000.

Again, the article would have you believe that the general staff is preparing to send an army of five or ten million men abroad. Under the Selective Service Act of 1940 you cannot have in the American Army more than 900,000 selectees in any one year. Here is the language of the statute:

> There shall not be in active training or service more than 900,000 men annually.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In a moment. It would take legislation by this Congress to repeal that law, to permit the dispatch of such expeditionary force as the newspaper insists is now under way.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. HARNESS. Is it not a fact that, so far as the Regular Army is concerned, there is no limit to the number they can enlist?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Regular Army is wholly inadequate for use as an expeditionary force. It would require the enlistment of millions of men. Under the law you cannot draft more than 900,000 annually.

But that is not all. There is another law on the statute books providing explicitly that our soldiers shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere.

Again it would take an act of Congress to make possible the expedition which this penman tells you is already in the making. The article is viciously erroneous and irresponsible. Even the excerpts from the document which it proposes to quote are garbled. Note that the article states flatly that it is the opinion of the Army and the Navy that the powers fighting Germany could not defeat Germany. There is not a word of truth in that. There is no such statement in the document or anything that could be remotely interpreted as justifying that conclusion. It is fabrication out of whole cloth.

And here is a startling instance of direct and deliberate misrepresentation.

The article affects to quote the authorities as stating that while the exact date for active participation of the United States in the war has not been definitely fixed, "it will be soon." There is no such statement and no statement in the document cited from which such inference could be drawn.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me to complete this statement, I shall be glad to yield.

Now, observe that this document was prepared 3 months ago. If it was pertinent then it has long since become obsolete. Events move swiftly in modern warfare. At the time the document was issued, our committee had been told by representatives of both the Army and the Navy that Russian resistance to the German armies could not last 3 weeks. And it is to be noted that the whole document is predicated on the elimination of Russia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for 5 minutes more.

In the meantime, the situation has been completely changed. Russia has not been eliminated. On the contrary the Russian armies are not only holding their own gallantly but are driving back the invader ignominiously.

So if every statement relative to the document could be substantiated, there is no significance attached to it because it does not apply to present-day conditions. Not only is Russia eliminated as a factor but it is assumed that Spain, Portugal, and France would be in as active Axis allies. It also is assumed that Italy is a continuing potential participant, when it is evident that Italy has practically ceased to be a potential factor.

In brief, the study is predicated upon conditions which do not obtain—which have not materialized and which will not materialize.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I have listened while the gentleman has denied the accuracy and correctness of the inferences drawn from this newspaper. Would the gentleman insert the document referred to in that article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The report referred to is a confidential military document. The ridiculous feature of it is this: Someone even suggested that in view of this newspaper article this bill ought to be recommitted. Well, there is still need for the $8,000,000,000 notwithstanding the report. If the report called for $40,000,000,000 it would not be logical to refuse $8,000,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. If this newspaper story is not true, will you insert the true document in the RECORD?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not have it. If the General Staff thinks it should be made public, it will do so, but its publication was unfortunate from a military standpoint.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has only been a short time ago since Mr. Neilson and Nelson, who is an important officer in connection with the national defense, stated that by 1942 we would have to begin spending at the rate of three and one-half billion dollars a month, or $42,000,000,000 a year. What this article says, as I understand it, is that they are to begin to spend $5,000,000,000 a month by June 1943.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, what the article says is that we were going to spend $40,000,000,000 in the next 6 months. That means beginning last September. That means that by the end of February we are going to spend $40,000,000,000, and here is a bill introduced today upon the recommendation of the Budget Bureau and upon information submitted by the Army and Navy, and sponsored by the responsible officials of the United States Government, which says we only need $8,000,000,000 for that period.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What about the statement of Mr. Neilson or Mr. Nelson that you are going to spend three and one-half billion dollars a month?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No such statements have been submitted to the committee.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As a matter of fact, this will mean $67,000,000,000 in 18 months.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We will not be in full production for another year. We must build factories. We must equip and tool them. We must assemble personnel. We cannot reach the peak of production until the fall of 1942 or the spring of 1943, and only when we reach that time will we have continuous production at the peak of capacity.

Of course, as we step up production, we will be spending more money. According to the testimony before us, national defense consumed 7 percent of our manufacturing capacity in 1940, 25 percent in 1941, this year, and will consume 54 percent by 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifty minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will take 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman, to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, Judge WOODRUM.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is not this true regarding the newspaper article which has created a good deal of comment today: There are no funds whatsoever in any form or description or in any manner in this bill which contemplate any such program as is contemplated in this newspaper article?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, that is the testimony in the hearings, that is the testimony in the report, that is the statement that has been made on this floor repeatedly this afternoon, and that is the attitude and opinion of the highest-ranking officials of the Army, the Navy, and the State Department.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Did not the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, also state specifically in the hearings and in answer to a direct question that no expeditionary force was presently contemplated by the United States Army?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; and all the testimony which was adduced on the subject corroborated the statement by the gentleman.

I yield to my colleague from Kansas, a member of the committee.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And did not the Army tell us just last week that they would be back here in February for billions more? Billions more in February for another deficiency? This, I think, fits in pretty well with this newspaper story.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I explained in opening debate, this is a continuous program. We passed the first supplemental national-defense bill, the second supplemental national-defense bill; this is the third, and, as I said at the time, we would be called upon to pass another in March. We cannot discontinue production. We must accelerate it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman possessed of sufficient information so that he can state with certainty now that the President did, in fact, address to this general board, or as reported, to the Secretary of War, the communication which is published in the paper, asking this general board to outline a program to the President as to future objectives? Does the gentleman know whether such a letter was written? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What the President did was to inquire in a routine way what materials would be necessary to carry out our commitments to supply materials.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not asking that. I am asking the gentleman, does he know whether or not the letter printed in this newspaper article this morning purporting to be published in full, the President's letter—has the gentleman sufficient information on the subject to indicate whether in fact that letter was sent by the President to the Secretary of War?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly it was sent by the President.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, may I ask the gentleman this further question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And what does the letter request? The letter does not mention personnel. It asks what we would have to produce and what materials it would take to defeat Hitler? How much matériel must be put in the hands of our allies abroad in order to defeat Hitler?

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman this further question?

There is further reported in this article what appeared to be exact quotations from the report of this Board to the President, and those quotations appear in italics with comment from the writer of this article. I ask the gentleman's attention to this fact and ask whether or not from his examination of this article he is prepared to tell the House whether or not the italicized portions of this article are, in fact, exact productions from the report furnished by this joint board to the President at his request?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have no information on that, but it is wholly immaterial whether they are or not. If the gentleman will read the excerpts and will then read the comment by the editorial writer he will see that the opinions which the editorial writer adduces are without foundation as based on the citations. He would see, as has been said, that it is claimed there that it is the opinion of the Army and Navy that Lindbergh was correct. No such opinion has ever been given, and the excerpts do not support such a statement. It is said that it is the opinion of the board that the date of active participation will be in the near future, and there is nothing in the report sustaining any such conclusion.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 2 additional minutes to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. First of all I want to say to the gentleman that the Army of the United States is made up of components of the Regular Army and the National Guard, intermingled with other units of selectees. The National Guard Act contains a provision which prohibits their use in a foreign country.

On the question of this report in the newspaper as to a war plan, let me state that in the very beginning of our hearings on the investigation of the War Department program there was widespread criticism because there had not been the

proper plan in connection with the house-building program. This is merely a study that is maintained constantly by the War Department in an effort to be prepared with complete plans if an emergency arises when we have to do these things. It is not any plan for an expeditionary force now and never has been. That is what I want to say.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In conclusion let me say——

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. It is true, is it not, that this report that the joint board gave to the President is in effect a projection of the Army and Navy plan for future operations when and as those operations may become necessary?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. There is nothing in it except information to the President as to what matériel will be needed from the United States in order for a European army to defeat Hitler.

Mr. HARNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Missouri made the statement, reading from an existing law purportedly, that the limitation of the men that we could draft under the Selective Service Act was 900,000. I call the gentleman's attention to Public, No. 213, extension of the selective draft, where that provision in the act was suspended. There is no limitation on the number of men that can be drafted, nor is there any limitation on the number of men that can be enlisted in the Regular Army.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The original statute still obtains, although modified somewhat by the extension of selectee service from 12 to 18 months.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that the United States is under heavy obligations. We must maintain and develop our own Army and equipment. We must support the anti-Hitler forces. We must build and maintain a two-ocean navy. It is the greatest requirement ever made of any nation in history. We must have greater unity, greater coordination, and greater sacrifice than has ever been required of America before. In the words of General Marshall, the quicker we finish the job, the cheaper we will do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman and I, collaborating, requested information of the War Department about the newspaper article to which some reference has just been made. Time is short and the information had not arrived at the time I took the floor. May I ask the gentleman if he has received this information?

Mr. TABER. I have received some information that came in after the gentleman from Missouri took the floor, and I intend to make a statement, because the gentleman from Missouri had no means of obtaining the information while he was on the floor.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Did the gentleman receive any information as to the authenticity of the statement carried in the Times-Herald this morning?

Mr. TABER. I may say I cannot give all the details. We did not have time to go over the whole article. I can say this, that the verbatim quotations in the main probably are correct. There are some mistakes, but in the main the quotations are correct. The statements that are made as conclusions are summaries by the writer. Some of the things do not appear at all in the statements, I am advised, and other things do not appear in the language or with the effect that they are represented to have. I am going to call attention to one or two of the things that are not correct with reference to the statement.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In view of the fact that so much interest has been shown in this matter that has been brought to the attention of the House, why does not the gentleman, if he will permit me to make the suggestion, give us a full, detailed statement? Let us have all the facts he can give us right now.

Mr. TABER. That is what I am going to do. The gentleman must realize and the Members of the House must realize that this matter only came to my attention and, as I understand it, to the attention of the gentleman from Missouri at approximately 12 o'clock, just as the House was coming into session, and in the hour that was consumed while the small-business resolution was under consideration, we have not been able to cover the thing in any thorough or satisfactory way. Any statement I might make would be subject to very thorough and complete clearing up.

Before I make any statement in that regard, may I say that I have been on a committee that has had to do with appropriations for the War or Navy Departments 19 years, and I am somewhat familiar with the problems that they are confronted with from day to day. There is maintained by the Navy a war college at Newport, with a complete staff of both civilian, naval, and Army instructors, whose duty it is to plan and work out the probable situations that this country might have to confront in the event of hostilities, and those situations are gone into from day to day, from month to month, without any disturbing of the routine. Here in Washington opposite Hains Point the Army maintains a war college and there it has a like complete staff. No man is permitted to obtain a high-ranking position in the Army or the Navy who has not attended one of those schools.

Those problems were under way and under discussion in the twenties; they were under discussion in the early thirties and long before Mr. Hitler was ever heard of from the world standpoint. The only particular thing about this particular set-up that is different from the set-ups that have been described to those Army and Navy committees for 19 years, to my knowledge, is the letter of the President of the United States requesting the particular study. That is something that I do not know of having taken place before. It might have; I will not say.

There is one thing that I regard as important that I have not covered. These two questions I have covered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Would the gentleman fix the date of that letter of the President? I think it was July.

Mr. TABER. The letter of the President is dated July 9. The war prospectus issued by the joint Army-Navy Board was dated September 11. These were the two high points that I see in the article.

On page 6–A of the edition I have of the Washington Times-Herald, the sixth edition that came out on December 4, in the second column, about a quarter or a third of the way down, appears this statement:

> Lindbergh has insisted that the powers now fighting Germany cannot defeat Germany. This is the opinion of the Army and the Navy.

After consultation, we were advised that it is not the opinion of the Army and the Navy, as stated in the report, that Germany cannot be defeated by the forces now opposing her. It is stated that under certain assumptions those forces may not be able to defeat her. The report does not take into account wastage produced by Germany's Russian effort, internal disturbance, and other factors. The effectiveness of Russian resistance had not been made clear by the date of the report, and the report was based upon the most adverse assumptions in order to outline the full extent of possible matériel requirements.

The other statement that seemed to me important was this. It is the sentence that first begins in the fourth column:

> The report of the Joint Board does not fix a definite date for the beginning of active participation in the war but indicates that it will be soon.

I am advised that there is no indication whatever in the report of an early entry or participation in the war.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is that the gentleman is reading from?

Mr. TABER. It is the information I was furnished by the War Department.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman cannot give us anything more than that it is furnished him by the War Department?

Mr. TABER. I will not at this time.

We are considering an enormous appropriation bill covering in contract authorizations and direct appropriations upward of $8,000,000,000. As the gentleman from Missouri told us, it will bring the total that is available for expenditure up to approximately $68,000,000,000 since, as I understand, this Congress began. The expenditures up to date, of course, have been nothing like that, perhaps $8,000,000,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This Congress began on January 3, 1941. Does the gentleman mean to say that this will bring up to $68,000,000,000 the sum the Congress has appropriated and authorized since January 3, 1941?

Mr. TABER. Is not that right? Is it 2 years?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard that it is from the date of July 1, 1940.

Mr. TABER. It is since July 1, 1940; all right—since the fall of France.

The items in here call for an increase in the personnel of about 300,000 men, and for everything connected with that increase. They call for additional items for completion of airplanes, due partly to increased cost and partly to changes in design because of developments across the waters, and they amount to a large sum of money. They call for approximately $3,600,000,000 for ordnance. They call for other items involving approximately $2,000,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 additional minutes.

Of those items, $1,556,000,000 is asked for the purposes of the Lease-Lend Administration. I leave out the odd figures; there are a few odd dollars in there. This appears in title III of the bill, and has been segregated by the committee so that it will be entirely separate from our own requirements for defense.

There is, in addition, $1,346,000,000 for tanks, guns, Signal Corps work, ammunition, and other things that are a part of the objective of the Army but are not specifically in the requirements for the units that are now set up. In other words, the maneuvers in the South in the last 3 months have demonstrated certain things, that is, that we must have more powerful guns, we must have more tanks, we must have more ammunition, and we must have the most modern aircraft guns and the most modern antiaircraft guns. It is absolutely impossible to say what we absolutely must have early enough so that the set-up can be planned to be put into production.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has stated that $1,556,000,000 is for lease-lend. Does that go to the same fund that we already have as a lease-lend fund? In other words, we just add that to the fund already allocated for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. It goes directly to the Army for the purchase of the ordnance and the other equipment that is detailed in title III of the bill, and it must be used specifically for that purpose. There is no interchange with reference to it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have here appropriations for a lot of other matériel. Is there any reason why the administration could not transfer them for lease-lend purposes? I assume it could be done, could it not?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not saying that it should or should not be done.

Mr. TABER. No; there is the Byrd amendment which was adopted to the lease-lend bill, and that amendment states that no articles hereafter manufactured for the Army or the Navy shall be transferred unless the specific authority is contained in the appropriation bill providing the funds for that purpose. That is with reference to funds that are appropriated after March 11, 1941.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In view of the circumstance that we have this $1,500,000,000 that goes to this lease-lend fund, and in view of the statement of the chairman a while ago to the effect that all lease-lend funds have been allocated, can the gentleman tell us or suggest to us that in all probability we shall need to provide further lease-lend funds in the quite near future if we are going to continue our program?

Mr. TABER. These are things that have been requested of the War Department for lease-lend by the powers that are at war. The War Department believes and told us that they are needed for the prosecution of the war that is now on.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, from our side?

Mr. TABER. From the standpoint of those who are engaged in it; and, in my own opinion, we are engaged in it. I do not know what you would call it, having ships at sea and shooting at the other fellow unless you called it war.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In view of the statements made on the floor of the House and the program that appears before us, is it not the gentleman's judgment that we will have to have more lend-lease funds in the near future?

Mr. TABER. We have been told, and told frankly, that they would be before us approximately the 1st of March for more. On the other hand, I doubt if the request for funds is as large as the item that was last before the House for that purpose.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the Appropriations Committee given any consideration as to how we are going to pay these enormous sums?

Mr. TABER. We have given consideration only to the question of whether these things are needed in the prosecution of the war. For my own part, I have given consideration to this matter which I do not think has been properly considered by a number of those who have spoken on the subject. By the change in the Neutrality Act, and by the passage of the lease-lend bill, in my opinion, we entered the war, and the problem is how we are going to get out of it. I have not heard anyone answer that question amongst those who have opposed appropriations for the lend-lease program. For my own part, I do not want to be a party trying to get out of this in any way except by winning it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that part of the appropriations for ordnance is for additional facilities of arms and ammunition.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman an appalling lack of foresight in view of the huge program on which we are embarking that they did not for instance use existing facilities such as the United States Cartridge Shop at Lowell, Mass., with its fine buildings, power, heat, lights, railroad sidings, and the most expert labor in the country available. During the last war their output was greater than that of any other cartridge manufacturing concern. They were awarded a medal at the end of the war. There is a great shortage of small arms and ammunition, particularly cartridges of various caliber, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. TABER. I think that certainly should be gone into very carefully by the War Department before they attempt to expend money on facilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was it the War Department, or some other authority?

Mr. TABER. The War Department entirely.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then I think it is extreme negligence to go into the war without cartridges and ammunition, as every hour counts.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman knows that I did not oppose the provisions for the lend-lease provision, and I think the record should be clear in response to the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] as to what this bill does for lend-lease. By separate title it provides a billion and a half, and then, under the terms of the Byrd amendment the bill provides that another $500,000,000 more be transferred so that there is approximately $2,000,000,000 in this for lend-lease.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. I intended to get to that other $500,000,000 proposition.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think it would be illuminating on that point to inform the House that the powers that were before us in the committee wanted all of the $7,000,000,000 available for lend-lease, and that is the tendency of the administration in this war. It is to mix it all up together.

Mr. TABER. The administration sent down a proposed bill, and that proposed bill contained authority to the Executive to transfer under the Lend-Lease Act anything that was produced with funds that had been appropriated since March

11, 1941, but that language was not carried by the committee in its report, and there is a limitation on it to the effect that the transfer should be limited to $500,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And is it not a fact that the War Department, as reported by General Marshall and General Brown, specifically stated that the over-all $2,000,000,000 limitation was satisfactory to them?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman's opinion on this: Would we not be using sound judgment and a sound assumption if we take this position, that the only limit that is to be placed on the lease-lend needs as they flow to us from other parts of the world is the limit that this Congress places on the appropriations and authorizations from time to time?

Mr. TABER. There is no question about that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, we have opened the door. We have extended the invitation. We send commissions to urge them to justify what they want. The justification comes in and there is to be no limit except what this Congress places from time to time as the propositions are submitted to us?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand it, the appropriations made in this measure become available immediately upon the bill being signed by the President?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think the House should be informed as to just how much money the President already has had at his disposal. I am not interested in allocated sums, but where the money has actually been contracted to be spent or where it has already been spent, how much of the lease-lend has already been spent of the $13,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Of the $13,000,000,000, the expenditures are to date not very far from $1,000,000,000. The contracts outstanding in addition to that, as I understand it, are perhaps $8,000,000,000. Out of the $13,000,000,000 there is probably $4,000,000,000 that has not been contracted for.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am informed that it is $5,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Well, that might be. I would not say positively.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The figure given me was $5,149,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I imagine that is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. That means there are about $7,000,000,000 that have not been spent of the $13,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Oh, there is a lot more that has not been spent. There is about $12,000,000,000 of the $13,000,000,000 that has not been spent, but $5,000,000,000 that has not yet been contracted for.

Mr. KNUTSON. What has been spent and obligated?

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, spent and obligated would amount to about eight or eight and a half billion dollars.

Mr. KNUTSON. That leaves $4,500,000,000 or $5,000,000,000, then, that has not been either spent or obligated?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is there any excuse for bringing in a bill that carries $1,556,000,000 at this time when we have five and a half billion that has not been spent?

Mr. TABER. Most of the money that is carried in that set-up could not be used because of the allocations for which it was appropriated, for the purposes for which this money is asked.

Mr. KNUTSON. They have had ways down in the department of transferring money heretofore. Why could they not transfer it now?

Mr. TABER. There are limitations upon the amount that can be transferred under that bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why do you not bring in a bill to allow them to transfer moneys to where it is needed?

Mr. TABER. It would simply result in another request for more funds in another way.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, as long as we give them all they ask for, they will continually ask and ask and ask. I am going to suggest that the Ways and Means Committee turn over the next tax bill to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. That will be delightful.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I may incorporate in the gentleman's remarks a reply to a question that was asked. Because of the huge amounts of these bills I want to insert right here a few words by Governor Eccles, the chief adviser to the President:

> No nation can be bankrupt as long as it has all the manpower, all the productive facilities, and the raw materials that it had before. If you stop to think about the debts of the Government you'll discover that the debt of the Government is a debt of the economy as a whole. It is not the Government—it is all of us. In effect, all of us owe to all of us whatever the public debt is.
>
> The idea of thinking that we are leaving a great burden on our children and our children's children is wrong. The mortgage, which is the Government's bonds, we are bequeathing to posterity as well as the debt.

Heavens, how comforting.

Mr. TABER. Well, I wonder. That seems to imply that the Government is dependent upon its people, whereas the philosophy we have been used to for some time implies that the people should be dependent upon the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me there are three very serious logical reasons why these figures should come in here in this manner at this time. One, to help those who are responsible for production to get the blueprints on the boards and the production lined up. Two, to put the Ways and Means Committee on notice as to the taxes that must be imposed upon our people. And, three, to start the Treasury of the United States to raise these funds which have not yet been brought into hand, although appropriated, not yet spent, so that when production comes off the line the money will be there with which to pay the invoices.

Mr. TABER. I expect that is correct. A lot of this production will not be able to go into the works until after the 1st of next July. It will roll in then. In the fiscal year 1943 there should be tremendous production in ammunition, in munitions, in airplanes, in tanks, armored vehicles, and other necessities of war.

Frankly, this makes an enormous sum of money for national defense. I do not think any of us would consider it for a moment if it were not for the fact that we are committed to a program and that we are under a menace in this war. It is absolutely necessary if the United States of America is going to survive that we provide those in authority in this Government with the things with which to fight. If we do not do that it is going to be disastrous from all of our standpoints.

I have yet to hear anyone suggest how we could possibly get out of this war except to go through. I do not like the prospect. It is ruinous as far as dollars are concerned. It is a tremendous burden upon us and those that are to come after us, but we have got this to face: If we do not go through the burden is going to be twice as heavy and twice as bad. That is the worst part of the situation. We are not going into something that we want to go into but the situation is such now that we have got to.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. As to spending for war, what is it really going to cost? We were told that Germany had probably invested in her army what in American dollars would amount to $100,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I think that is right.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. And that ours was maybe one-tenth of that. We were told by those who are concerned that our spending had only started.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What if the Congress given the opportunity to vote on a declaration of war voted it down, would that put us in?

Mr. TABER. It would not get us out. That is the trouble. There is no use kidding ourselves, there is no way out except to submit or to win; and I believe that the United States of America when it faces the situation will go in to win, and I believe it will win.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. No; not now.

Here is the situation: We had a chance when we first started in to adopt a policy that would insure our staying out unless the other fellow came over and attacked us. We did not choose that policy. Now we are in and we have got to get out on top or else we are going to be in a terrible position. I cannot see any other thing to this picture, and I do not propose for my part to be a party in any way to doing anything except to move toward winning.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not want to take the floor today, and this is the only question: Does not the gentleman suppose some smart guy will be able to get from the files of the Army and the Navy what they should have reported to the President at least on what we need to fight Japan? Because that is right on the horizon.

Mr. TABER. I am not going to be surprised if Japan takes a course that will force us to defend our western coast, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines. On the other hand, the best thing we can do at this time to stop and prevent Japan's taking that action is to tell her that we mean business; and we tell her we mean business if we pass this bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. What I am getting at is: Is it possible that the report is available to the President with the idea that it probably will happen and possibly will happen? There must be a report of that character. I do not see why the gentleman is so docile about it.

Mr. TABER. As far as I am concerned, I do not know anything about a report with reference to Japan.

Mr. GIFFORD. There must be one.

Mr. TABER. I expect the military staff have made one, but I do not want to be a party to asking the War Department to disclose its hand and its plans, because I do not think that is good tactics. I think the tactics for the Congress of the United States of America is to support the operations that are necessary to win and not to interfere with the creation of plans or to disclose the plans that are required to win.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts I may say as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I am quite sure it is true, that War Department plans are continuously being made and perfected and brought up to date to meet any possible contingency that may arise.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why do not some of these smart guys publish it so we can read it?

Mr. TABER. That would be a very, very bad thing.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; it would; but why this information today about the other plans?

Mr. KNUTSON. May I suggest to the gentleman that he may be able to get that information in London?

Mr. TABER. I have just read the article in the Times-Herald. The report of the Board of the Army and Navy was simply an answer to the President's question as to what would be required in a certain contingency; and the Board properly answered.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is right.

Mr. MOTT. We hope that the situation described in that report may never come about and that we will never have to use the establishment that is described in that report, but if that contingency does come about I think we ought to take some satisfaction in knowing that the Navy Department and the War Department knows what will be required and knows what to do and what will be expected of us if that time should ever come.

Mr. TABER. And they should know if they are going to ask the Congress for the money.

Mr. MOTT. That is right.

Mr. TABER. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman realizes that we are all preparing for the worst, but hoping for the best. We have a right to expect that our money will be spent properly and carefully and we ought to cut out these finagling folk like "Tommy-the-Cork" here in Washington.

Mr. TABER. There is not any question but what we ought to quit supporting those leeches.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman give the committee information showing what funds will be used in this bill for the development of bases in this country and elsewhere throughout the world?

Mr. TABER. There are no funds in this bill for major bases. Of course, there might be incidental items, but we have not gone into that very extensively in this bill. The Air Corps stuff, or the ordnance, or the appropriation for pay of the Army and that sort of thing might be incidental for that purpose, but we did not have a large item for additional bases. We did have some items for small improvements to air fields and that sort of thing.

Mr. DWORSHAK. This bill contains no funds for the construction of a base in Ireland or elsewhere?

Mr. TABER. No; nothing in this bill would be used for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. I understood the gentleman to say that we are in the war. Are we in the war?

Mr. TABER. That is my opinion.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it the gentleman's opinion that we got in through constitutional processes?

Mr. TABER. No; on the other hand, the Congress did things that constituted or could have been construed by the other fellow very readily as acts of war.

Mr. MURRAY. And, as a matter of fact, we started these things out as peace measures, then as defense measures, and now we bring them out openly as war measures; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. I have not heard the President say that, but here, to my mind, is the worst part of the situation and the worst part of this article. I think that the amendment of the Neutrality Act, the first one, and the passage of the lease-lend bill unquestionably immediately involved us, and from that date on I think we were involved. The Congress voted on it. The Congress is the authority that has the right to declare war. In my opinion, those things were acts which resulted in our being in the war, whether or not we have declared war or not. I do not see how we can possibly escape that viewpoint in view of the fact that we now have our ships at sea shooting at the other fellow and the other fellow shooting at them.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. For all practical purposes, what difference does it make if we are in the war, whether we got in constitutionally or unconstitutionally? We have to find a way out.

Mr. TABER. The only way we are going to get out is to fight or quit and I do not know whether anybody wants to quit or not, but I do not.

Mr. MAY. I do not either.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, there are two things in here I have not discussed. One is the power proposition and the other is the road proposition. I am frankly satisfied that we are going too far in this power business, further than we have any license to in order to provide what is necessary.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the minority report mention that?

Mr. TABER. There is no minority report. I make that statement on my own.

I do not think there is any justification for it. Another thing, there are $125,000,000 in cash and in contract authorizations for so-called military roads. For my own part, I do not believe that a great deal of that is for military roads, and it was all supposed to be. I do not think anything ought to be used under that appropriation except for what is strictly military. I expect to have something to say on that tomorrow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I have recently returned from a month's tour of duty with our armored forces. I visited their home station at Fort Knox and for 3 weeks participated in the recent maneuvers. As a result of that tour of duty and upon this occasion I would like to tell the Members of the House something about the progress our armored forces are making in order to give the members of this committee some idea of what we are getting for the money which we are spending on this component of our forces.

When the Germans, in their efficient manner, began to plan their present operations, they realized beyond possibility of a doubt that in order to win it would be necessary for them to gear their military machine to the spirit of the age—mechanization. Therefore, if we are to properly provide for the security of this Nation, it is absolutely necessary that we look at Germany in order to determine what is the best equipment for the purpose of modern warfare.

In the first part of my trip I spent a week at Fort Knox, Ky., and there I visited the most wonderful school that it has ever been my pleasure to see. It is the most practical institution I have ever heard of, either within or without the Army. The personnel in that school, commissioned and enlisted, student and permanent, has the highest average of

any that I have ever seen in all of my experience with military institutions. May I tell the members of the committee somewhat briefly about this school? It is something that I would urge that each and every one of you see, if you can possibly find the time to do so. It would be well worth your while not only as Members of Congress, but also as American citizens in general, because the principles that are practiced in this school, if applied to education throughout this Nation in other walks of life, would be just as much if not more worthwhile than they would be in the Army.

In this school, realizing, of course, that time is the principal factor and that it is important, they have taken every precaution to see that they do not waste time training men who do not have an aptitude for that which they are to be trained.

In other words, if they are going to train a man as a motorcycle rider, before they put him on a motorcycle, before they use up a lot of energy and time and expense in training him to ride a motorcycle, they first determine whether or not that man has an aptitude for motorcycle riding. They do that in a very simple manner, by putting him on a bicycle on a certain course, in order to determine whether or not he has a sense of balance and the other factors necessary to make him a motorcycle rider.

In order to determine whether or not a man will make a proper gunner, they put him on a platform that has all the motions of a tank crossing country and there, with one of these electric guns such as you see in penny arcades, they have him shoot at a moving target. In that way they test out whether or not that man can properly synchronize his hands and his eyes and make a proper marksman.

They follow a similar plan in connection with communications, mechanics, and various other lines in order to determine whether or not these men can be easily and efficiently trained in these fields. If they find they cannot train him easily and efficiently along one line, they train him for something for which he is adapted. In that way they avoid the difficulty of fitting square pegs into round holes. This is a wonderful thing in the training of men because, after all, the equipment these men are to handle, whether it be tanks, half-tracks, scout cars, jeeps, motorcycles, or expensive Signal Corps equipment, gunsights, guns, or what not, is public property, it is expensive, and it is highly technical in its character. It is neither wise nor efficient to put men in charge of this property who will break it up in trying to learn how to operate it or in operating it. So, I say to you that any Member who can possibly find the time will find it worth his while to visit this wonderful school. I am sure the commandant of that school, General Henry, will be glad to take you around at any time and show you how practical, thorough, and efficient this school is.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I am interested in knowing, and I believe the other Members are, whether after visiting these schools and training areas the gentleman has found that we have sufficient equipment to give the men proper training, or whether we still lack the necessary equipment.

Mr. FADDIS. I believe that we have sufficient equipment to train those troops we are trying to train at the present time. It is true that you find some wooden guns here and there in the maneuvers on tanks and on half tracks and on various other pieces of equipment. It is true that around various establishments, such as headquarters, you may find wooden guns representing guns which should be bona fide lethal weapons, but I do believe that we have plenty of equipment in the hands of the troops that we have at the present time to give them efficient training.

Mr. MOTT. In large maneuvers such as that which is going on now, in which they actually use war equipment like tanks, jeeps, field artillery, and so forth, about what proportion of the mechanized equipment in use in those maneuvers is real equipment and what is substitute?

Mr. FADDIS. As far as the mechanical equipment—tanks, trucks, half-tracks, reconnaissance cars, scout cars, jeeps, and so forth—are concerned, it is practically 100 percent. As far as the Signal Corps equipment is concerned we are seriously deficient in the communications equipment which permits airplanes to communicate with tanks and so forth. The reason is that in the past we have not been securing the proper strategic materials from the countries abroad to construct some particular Signal Corps equipment. However, because of action taken by the Committee on Military Affairs sometime in the late part of the summer, this deficiency is now being corrected, and we hope to soon see such equipment 100 percent.

I may say to the gentleman that I believe the most serious lack at the maneuvers in the way of equipment was in blank ammunition, which robbed the maneuvers of some of the realism and some of the interest that might have been there if we had had more blank ammunition.

Mr. MOTT. Is the situation with regard to ammunition being remedied with reasonable rapidity?

Mr. FADDIS. I may as well say here, because it is no great state secret, that our scarcity of blank ammunition is due to the fact that we are accumulating ball ammunition, which we may need a great deal worse than we will blank ammunition.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman believes that is the principal reason for the shortage of blank ammunition?

Mr. FADDIS. That is one of the reasons. Strikes and other conditions have interfered with our production of ammunition in the past to the extent that we are not as well provided with ammunition as we should be.

Mr. MOTT. We are not going to have any more strikes after the Senate gets through with the measure we passed yesterday.

Mr. FADDIS. I hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. While I was on maneuvers in South Carolina last week I happened to discover one wooden pistol. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was using it. He was the only trooper I saw with one.

The gentleman mentioned the fact that there were a few wooden guns being used in the practice operation at Fort Knox and perhaps in the maneuvers. I have been a little bit at a loss to understand—perhaps the gentleman can explain it to me—why it is, since there was proof before our committee over a year ago that the Army has more than 2,500,000 rifles of the new Garand, the Springfield, and the World War types, they do not use these rifles in maneuvers instead of using these other things.

Mr. FADDIS. I may say to the gentleman that as far as rifles are concerned, I believe every man who by the table of organization should be armed with a rifle has a rifle. The only scarcity in guns that I discovered was the scarcity of machine guns, 37-millimeter guns, and other equipment of that kind. I am satisfied there is plenty of that equipment on hand in storage. However, they are reluctant to bring that equipment out in great quantities and unnecessarily expose it to the action of dust, of wear, of the weather, and similar factors, when the equipment is not being used in actual combat. I heard no officer in the Army complain that the use of wooden guns was in any way hampering the training of our troops. I ask many of them the question, which was answered in the negative. The only criticism I have ever heard about wooden guns came from those in civil life.

In the maneuvers, for all practical purposes, with the scarcity of blank ammunition, a wooden gun is just as valuable as any other gun and saves the real one for more serious business where the wooden gun would not serve the purpose. It is certainly more economical.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman made the statement a few minutes ago that we were accumulating ball ammunition. I talked to a couple of soldiers the other day, who have been in the anti-tank corps some 11 months, and they told me that they had not yet seen a shell and had not yet fired a shell. Will the gentleman explain to the Committee what steps are being taken to teach those boys properly to shoot, whether they have any simulated target practice?

Mr. FADDIS. I know nothing of the organization to which these men may belong, but I have found in my experience, in listening to tales of that kind from men both in the Army and out of it, that, so to speak, such tales have to be taken with a grain of salt. I firmly believe that there is not an organization in the Army but that has had some target

practice. I will, however, say this, that because of the scarcity of ball ammunition, due to conditions over which this House might have controlled if they had had the courage to do so, we really have not had the ammunition to give the men of our Army the target practice that we should have given them. That is chargeable to a reluctance on the part of the House and another body to exercise the duties they should exercise, and see that the production is forthcoming.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Let me yield first to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. These men to whom I talked, four different boys, a few weeks ago, took part in the demonstration at Fort Belvoir, that was especially set up by orders of the Secretary of War for Members of Congress, and were stationed in the antitank group at Fort Meade, and they told me they had been there for 11 months, and had not yet fired a shell at a target.

Mr. FADDIS. I say that I cannot speak for the training of any individual in any organization.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I would like to have the gentleman elaborate his answer when the gentleman makes the charge that the Congress has been derelict in its duty.

Mr. FADDIS. It certainly should not be necessary to explain that, when the Congress has sat here for months and months and has not had the courage to take the strike situation in hand until yesterday. That is the answer to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. Gladly.

Mr. DITTER. I know my colleague wants to be fair. I am wondering whether he could tell us when any Budget estimate came from the executive branch of the Government providing for this ammunition, the lack of which he has just presently deplored and admitted—any Budget estimate which was rejected by the Congress or which was refused by the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. FADDIS. I am not charging the gentleman's committee with any dereliction at this time.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman will please pardon me. I will try to answer his question. I am not charging the gentleman's committee with any dereliction of this kind but I do know this, that with the existing facilities in connection with the production of ammunition, if the House of Representatives and the other body connected with the Congress had done their full duty some time ago, we would have received a great deal more efficiency than we have received.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FADDIS. I cannot yield any further. I hope my colleague will pardon me. I have a great deal more to say on the matter.

Mr. DITTER. I will arrange to have the gentleman yielded 2 minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with these maneuvers, I hope it is well understood in the Congress, as well as it is in the Army, that, after all, maneuvers do not prove anything to the point of establishing a fact, and that any statement which may be made on either side, based on information learned in these maneuvers, should not be taken too seriously.

After all, there are no actual casualties in maneuvers and umpires make the decisions, and umpires differ in maneuvers as umpires will in other pursuits. But I want to say that the officers in charge of our armed troops are of the very highest type, that the enlisted personnel is of the very highest type, and that throughout these maneuvers I observed especially that there was no attitude upon the part of the officers of the Army to fight the last war. As a matter of fact, I purposely, many, many times, endeavored to steer conversations to conditions in 1917 and 1918. Every time, without a single exception, they ignored every opportunity to enter into a discussion of 1918. The officers in connection with our armed forces are looking to the lessons of the battlefields of Europe today and any statements made that they are fighting the last war or are attempting to form an army based upon calculations of the last war, are erroneous, because these officers are absolutely up to date. They are openminded in every respect. They are endeavoring in every way within their power to discover whatever weaknesses may exist within these forces in regard to strategy or tactics, to training, to discipline, or to the mechanical defects of the equipment involved. They are working hard to eradicate those differences and to prevent any mistakes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. While the Selective Service Act was being considered many of our "sob" Members of the House, you will remember, pictured the boys that they did not want to serve their country; that there would be a weakening of morale, particularly when the Extension Act was being considered; the old "sob" going out, bringing these young men into disrepute, or attempting to bring them into disrepute. I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, who has just returned from his period of service in the Army, if he will express what he found with reference to the morale of the young men in the Army at the present time; if they are the type of young men that our "sob" brothers spoke about so eloquently, and if they are deserving of the erroneous characterization or the erroneous picture that they developed in the minds of the American people, that they would quit our country in time of crisis?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. I am glad to answer that question. I want to say to the distinguished majority leader that I made a careful attempt to find out just what the attitude of the men in the ranks was. I talked to hundreds of them. I found that their morale was of the very highest; that they are full of enthusiasm; that they are pepped up about their jobs; that they are making every effort to be as efficient as possible in the care and in the use of the equipment they have in their charge; that they have a full realization of the responsibility that is theirs, and that while they are looking forward, of course, to a settlement of the present difficulties which are keeping them in the service, they have every intention of giving whatever is necessary to protect this Nation under any condition and at any time at any cost. I want to say this, that I believe they are much better than a cross section of the youth of the United States and that they will measure up just as well in courage, character, integrity, morale, physique, training, and all the other necessary qualities as any soldiers that ever wore the uniform of the United States Army.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. There have been a lot of things said here about this newspaper article with respect to war plans for an expeditionary force. I would like to have the gentleman comment on the question of how long the War Department has been considering war plans and whether or not this is just an extension of the beginning away back in the time of the World War.

Mr. FADDIS. Why, of course. The War Department has at all times plans to meet any eventuality which may occur any place on the globe. Everyone knows that who is at all acquainted with the War Department and its way of doing business.

I want to say to the Members of the House that I believe today in order to meet the military needs facing this Nation we should have at least 40 armored and mechanized divisions, and that back of each of those armored and mechanized divisions should be another division, the old squad-type infantry division. I think that is the least that under present conditions we should take into consideration as to what we should provide to insure the security of the United States. I do not believe we should discard any of the components of our Army but should superimpose that mechanized force upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] has again expired.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am today introducing a resolution providing for the creation of a select committee to be composed of nine members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, five of whom shall be members of the Committee on Agriculture and four of whom shall be members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, and re-

questing that the committee be authorized and directed to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration with a view to determining whether or not such activities are being carried on in accordance with the policies of Congress, expressed in the laws administered by such administration.

Information to the effect that the Farm Security Administration has leased for a period of 99 years a large tract of land in Halifax County, N. C., to the heads of nine families and that these families have a community of interest in all of the work-stock and equipment and in all of the crops cultivated and harvested upon the plantation, leads me to believe that the Farm Security Administration is not administering the laws which have been enacted by Congress in accordance with their true intent and meaning.

I have received information which further indicates that the Farm Security Administration has in many different ways violated the letter and the spirit of the laws which we have enacted.

Funds made available for loans to worthy tenant farmers under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act have been used to acquire large sugar plantations in Puerto Rico, upon which sugar factories are located. Rehabilitation funds have been used by the Farm Security Administration to purchase a 42,000 acre tract of land in Bates County, Mo., from Lord Scully, of England. Associations and "straw men" have been used by the administration as devices in such transactions. Other information I have received indicates that the "sky is the limit" with the Farm Security Administration. They are apparently spending money as if no limitation whatever had been placed upon its use.

The Jones-Bankhead Tenant Purchase Act does not authorize the acquisition of large tracts of land for the purpose of subdivision and Congress intended that the funds made available under this act should be only for the purpose of making loans to worthy tenant farmers, in the hope that they might become home owners.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee today on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IS VITAL BOTH TO PEACETIME AND WARTIME ECONOMIES

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, everyone who has kept abreast of the progress of America knows what the Rural Electrification Administration has accomplished since 1935. In the many years prior to that time private utilities had succeeded in electrifying only 10 percent of the Nation's 6,000,000 farms. Since the R. E. A. was established that percentage has risen to 34 percent, the Nation's farms are being lighted up rapidly, small rural industries are now being powered by low-cost electricity, and almost 2,000,000 farmers now have modernized their farm activities to keep pace with new conditions in a changing world.

As in other areas, Kansas farms have pulled themselves up by their bootstraps since 1935. At that time only 7.6 percent of the 174,589 farms in the State had central station electric service, but today 20.5 percent of the farms are electrified. Kansas now has 25 R. E. A. systems which are serving or will serve as soon as lines now contracted for have been completed, almost 27,000 consumers.

But the program still has far to go. Four-fifths of Kansas' farms still are plodding along in the technological economy of another era; two-thirds of the farms of the Nation as a whole still are in that condition.

The Federal rural electrification program is one of loans, not grants. Contrary to the predictions of pessimists, it is giving every evidence of paying out. It does not constitute a drain on the National Treasury. On that score the figures as of September 1 of this year are eloquent. For the entire country, which now has some 800 R. E. A. systems in 2,300 counties of 45 States, the total interest and principal which had become due under contracts covering all R. E. A. loans was $12,156,137. Repayments on schedule totaled $12,017,181. That left delinquencies totaling only $138,956 for the whole country. But to balance this delinquency, $3,446,669 had been paid ahead of schedule. Thus a total of $15,463,850 had been repaid by R. E. A. farmers as against a total of $12,156,137 which they owed the Government.

In my own State of Kansas the repayment and prepayment record is notable. There, at the end of September, a total of $123,287 had been paid back on R. E. A. loans for transmission and distribution lines, although at that time a total of only $104,951 had become due.

The farmers of Kansas know what it means to be emerging from the oil-lamp days, and they are making the most of the low-cost power which is now reaching them. Besides the regular household conveniences, R. E. A. consumers in Kansas have installed equipment which is facilitating their output of farm products, particularly the needed protein foods. More than 11 percent have electric water pumps; almost 16 percent have electric chick brooders; they have cream separators, dairy water heaters, feed grinders, milk machines and coolers, stock tank heaters, poultry water warmers, all electrically powered.

As in other States, electricity in Kansas is conserving farm manpower. The Ninnescah Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., writes in its news letter:

> Five cents worth of electricity can shovel more grain, pump more water, hoist more silage, separate more milk, grind more feed, etc., than a man can by working a day.

In the same news letter a farmer, Mr. J. F. Stratford, makes a report which is typical. In addition to his household equipment, which includes a meat grinder and water pump, Mr. Stratford reports use of an electric milking machine, separator, soldering iron, silage hoist, and three yard lights.

The farmers of Kansas are streamlining their farm technology to fit the needs of the times. An R. E. A. co-op manager in Kansas sums up the situation:

> Today we farmers of America have a major job. Food supply is the job ahead. * * * The British people, cut off from normal food supplies, as well as our own boys in camps, need everincreasing quantities of eggs, milk, meat, and vegetables. With electricity each man's work goes further.

Is America jumping ahead of the times in insisting that the farms of Kansas, of Oklahoma, of Georgia, of Texas, of Wisconsin, and of the other States in the Union continue their progress in rural electrification? In pushing this program even during the defense emergency are we putting on fancy furbelows? I say no. Let America and its lawmakers take a look at the rest of the world. Take a page, for instance, from the technological chapter of Mr. Hitler's experience as he works to solidify his war economy at the present time. All evidence indicates that the Reich looks upon practically 100 percent electrification of rural areas as basic to the support of her war machine, and that she is extending this program to territories that are being annexed to form the greater Germany. Or take a look at other European countries, as they were before the war, and it will be seen that they had from 80 to 99 percent rural electrification.

It is generally recognized that rural electrification is vital both to peacetime and wartime economies, but it will take a watchful eye if this program is not to be sabotaged in our country. There are powerful interests that have been watching patiently for just this sort of opportunity. But I say that if electrification of our farms was important before the emergency, then it is doubly so now when we are pushing our food production to feed vast areas of the world. Now, more than ever, it is necessary that our farms operate efficiently. They are attempting to supply today more protein foods than they ever produced before, and according to food inspection standards which in the first World War were unheard of. Today's standards have been stepped up, and rightly so, to meet modern health requirements. Bacteria and mold conditions in food, which were accepted as inherent and unavoidable during the last war, today are ruled out by health authorities, by the Army purchasing officers, and by the civilian population. America is producing today with the best and most modern equipment which she has on hand.

My own district abounds in specific examples of this. Mr. J. L. Fowler, a member of the Butler Rural Electric Cooperative Association of El Dorado, used an electric brooder for a fall brood this year. He checked his brooder very carefully, and found that it cost less than 5 cents a day to operate. He reports that this fall brood are the finest and liveliest chickens he has ever had. Mr. J. C. Heyman installed electricity in his elevator and elevated 2,800 bushels of grain using only 14 kilowatt-hours. G. W.

Locke, of DeGraffe, reports that his bill for electric power is about half what he paid for ice before he had electric service.

Power on the Kansas farm is making Kansas a better State and a stronger State. As the record shows, power is coming to Kansas farms because the Federal Government launched a rural electrification program. That program, administered within the Department of Agriculture by the Rural Electrification Administration, is not completed by any means, but its progress has merited sympathetic attention and support.

In the present national emergency the R. E. A. program is especially valuable to the country. Europe is starving, and will continue to starve until hostilities are ended. Even then, the Continent will be much further from self-sufficiency in foods than before the war largely because the dairy cows of Norway, Denmark, and Holland have been slaughtered as ruthlessly as human beings in these days of air raids on open cities. American farmers are now feeding Britain; soon we must feed most of the world. With electricity, wisely used, the American farmer can get more milk from the same number of cows and get more of it to market in good condition; he can raise more and better chicks from the same number of hatching eggs—and get more money for the eggs they lay; he can raise more pigs with the same number of brood sows. This is not textbook theory; Kansas farmers are doing it every day.

We need that extra food now, and in the future. Electricity is a great help.

The Federal Rural Electrification Administration was among the firs' to be recognized as a defense agency. It has thrown all of its energies since June of 1940 back of the defense program. It has made electricity available to Army and marine camps, to munitions dumps, to airplane factories, to airway beacons, and to many other new facilities springing up in previously remote sections of the country. It has willingly slowed down and postponed construction operations of a nonessential character when such construction involved materials needed for the production of munitions. In the Rural Electrification News for October, Administrator Harry Slattery said:

> In this crisis we need munitions of war, food, and a national determination to work, to sacrifice, and to endure despite the cost. Every rural-electrification system has work to do. I call upon every system to roll up its sleeves and pitch in.
>
> Many systems already provide electric service for Army camps, for factories producing essential materials. More opportunities for such service will come. Applications for direct defense uses must receive absolute priority.
>
> Shortages have developed and will develop. Our line-construction program will be curtailed. If any copper is available after munitions needs are met, Rural Electrification Administration will get it. But we can have no hesitancy in deciding when we must choose between farm electric lines and shell cases.

Last month, in a letter to a newspaper publisher who had complained because his local cooperative could not get copper to string on the bare poles it had erected throughout the countryside, the Administrator wrote:

> Rural power lines take steel, zinc, and either aluminum or copper. All these metals are scarce, and aluminum is not available at all. They are scarce because they are needed in making tanks and airplanes and destroyers and shell cases. We need these munitions because everything we gained in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution and its Bill of Rights is threatened. Cooperatives will not exist in this country if the Nazi philosophy prevails in the rest of the world.
>
> That means sacrifices for many of us. The problem becomes one of the extent of the sacrifices necessary, and the willingness of the people to make them.
>
> Let us look at the second point first. The Federal Rural Electrification Administration has taken the position that it will not support any move to use, for rural power lines, copper which is needed for shell cases and airplane radiators. We will not compete with munitions production. In this attitude we have received very heartening backing from Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives throughout the country.
>
> That brings us to the other question, Just how serious is the copper situation? What are the facts? What civilian uses should be first after military needs are met? We do not know the answers. People responsible for the continuity of supplies of critical materials apparently do not yet know, either. But we are trying to find out, and we hope for an early ruling.
>
> Knowledge of the facts will help those in charge of copper supplies to understand the essentialness of farm electrification, and the importance of finishing the rural power lines whose construction is so nearly completed. The men who have the difficult and onerous task of establishing and enforcing priorities have given us, implicitly, assurances that the hunt for copper will be continued assiduously and that when copper becomes available Rural Electrification Administration will get it.

This is the spirit in which R. E. A. is rising to emergency national needs. Fair-minded citizens have a clear obligation to protect the R. E. A. program from those who are using the national emergency to hamstring and sabotage it.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bonneville Power Administration item given on page 24 of the committee bill.

The committee is to be congratulated on the full and comprehensive report accompanying its supplemental appropriation bill applying to the Bonneville Power Administration. This committee report answers all the questions that can be consistently raised, and in this connection I want to call attention to the paragraphs of this report covering the natural deposits of raw materials in the Bonneville-Coulee area and how these materials can be put to work to relieve the shortage in our defense program.

These natural resources can only be economically processed by modern electrolytic methods. We all realize that the power requirements for defense industries in the country generally exceed the available supply. The Columbia River plants, due to the foresight of the House Appropriations Committee, can furnish the largest supply of the cheapest power on the North American continent. This bill provides the means to put this power to work at fullest available capacity.

The transmission lines provided in this bill have been stepped up to the installation of generators, so that we will not have a condition similar to that we encountered 5 years ago when the two generators at Bonneville were completed and no lines provided. I wish to bring out one point, and that is the economic necessity for locating the new defense plants just as close to the bus bar as is economically feasible. This is largely a matter of administrative coordination. but I feel so strongly on this subject that I cannot let any opportunity pass without voicing an opinion.

The entire welfare of the region I represent is bound up in Bonneville power rates, and this rate is in turn dependent upon investment. Locating such plants close to the bus bars reduces investment, and in addition presents a saving to the Federal Government not only in first cost but in the cost of operation, as lower charges are permissible under the Bonneville Act in zones close to the power plant.

The items in the pending bill are flexible enough to allow this administrative procedure to be accomplished. I again wish to thank the committee for its past and present foresight in providing for development of the power facilities on the Columbia River. Over one-half of the light metals required for aircraft production will come from the frozen kilowatts of the Columbia River. These light metals are nothing more than solidified electrical process through the medium of raw materials.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman from Massachusetts was present when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] who immediately preceded him made the general charge that the lack of ammunition and ordnance that the gentleman deplored and admitted ex'sted, should be laid at the door of the Congress of the United States. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe probably as well if not better versed on the details of matters of that kind than any man in the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania unfortunately refused to amplify the glib generality he indulged in earlier. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts now whether he knows of any estimate sent up by the Budget Bureau since the rearmament program was started in which the House reduced any item for ordnance or ammunition.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to my colleague that I cannot recall any instance in which any reduction in those items has been made by the Congress. I might add that I have in mind very vividly a statement made as of about July 1, 1940, 10 months after the second

World War started, a statement by the President of the United States to the effect that unless Congress desired to make speeches it could go home because there was nothing more for it to do at that time.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, may I remind my distinguished friend from Massachusetts—and I think he will recall it—that in one particular instance another body reduced to some extent an ordnance and ammunition item and that because of the insistence of the House a substantial amount was returned after the cut had been made.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; I recall the incident, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am wondering how the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who visited in the camps and talked to hundreds of these boys was able to do that when the boys are not allowed to write even to their Congressmen. How did he get them to talk to him?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania can answer that better than I can.

Mr. DITTER. Lest there be no misunderstanding, the distinguished gentleman is not referring to me when he refers to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is he?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No.

Mr. DITTER. I wanted the record to be clear on that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, we have before us another enormous appropriation bill carrying the sum all told, including contract authorizations, of about $8,244,000,000. Of this sum $5,127,000,000 goes to the Army and $1,130,000,000 to the Navy; $1,556,000,000 goes to lend-lease, and $430,000,000 to general items.

As has been pointed out, if this bill is approved it will bring the total of appropriations for defense and lend-lease purposes since July 1, 1940, to $67,900,000,000. Of this total the Army will have received $29,700,000,000, the Navy $19,300,000,000, other agencies $4,400,000,000, and lend-lease $14,500,000,000.

It is a tremendous figure and I think it is worth noting in passing that the testimony in connection with this bill indicates an increase in cost in certain instances of from 10 to 25 percent. A 10 to 25 percent increase already in respect of $67,900,000,000 of appropriations shows what may be in store for us in the future in connection with appropriations for defense purposes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The committee of which I am a member has been studying price control and they went to some degree into the question of costs. For this reason I would like to know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts analyzed the increase in cost so as to show whether it was due to increase in cost of materials, increase in profits, or increase in wages? Can he tell us what causes the increase?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that the analysis was not very detailed, but that such testimony as was given indicated that it was partly due to increase in wages and partly due to increase in material costs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And if the gentleman will permit, I think some emphasis was put on the fact that a great deal of ordnance was readapted to changes that were brought out by experiences during the war.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is true; but I think there is an actual increase in costs to the extent I have indicated.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In cases where it was due to increased cost of materials, did the Office of Price Administration, under Mr. Leon Henderson, make some attempt to control or regulate those costs?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot answer that specifically. My impression is that certain of the ceilings established by Mr. Henderson have their application in this field. There is a very serious problem indicated here, I think, by the evidence referred to.

This is an enormous bill, but personally I shall support its main features. I shall support it because the evidence indicates that we are still lamentably unprepared even for purposes of our own defense in respect to vital items today. The tragedy of the present situation, Mr. Chairman, to my mind, is that fact, a fact brought about in large measure by our delay in starting our defense effort and by the failure of the administration to bring about coordination of that effort here in Washington. I shall support the main items of this bill, including the request for lend-lease purposes, because practically all of the items requested for lend-lease purposes can be taken over and utilized for our own purposes at any time up to their actual delivery to some one of the anti-Axis Powers.

I support the main items also in the light of testimony furnished to your committee by both Mr. Knudsen and General Ayres.

Mr. Knudsen has told us that, with certain exceptions, everything to be manufactured out of all the appropriations to date, including the appropriation before us today, both for defense purposes and for lend-lease purposes, can, in his judgment, be turned into arms, ammunition, and other materials by September 1, 1943. I insert at this point a brief table which he has given us showing our total manufacturing capacity on a national basis in billions of dollars, and the amount expended or to be expended in billions of dollars for defense purposes, as well as the percentage of total capacity which that expenditure represents for the 4 calendar years 1940 to 1943, inclusive.

The defense program, including the appropriations asked for in this bill (H. Doc. No. 441), will require about 49 percent of the manufacturing capacity of the country in 1942 and about 54 percent in 1943. The following table shows estimates of manufacturing production for defense in relation to total net manufacturing production for the years 1940 through 1943:

Estimates of net manufacturing output in 1941 values

Calendar year	Annual rate of production (billions of dollars)		Percentage ratio defense to total
	Total	Defense [1]	
1940	22	1.6	7
1941	28	7	25
1942	36	17.5	49
1943	39	21	54

[1] Includes proposed supplemental appropriations under H. Docs. 428, 441, 442, and 443. The figures for defense production given here are based upon presently scheduled and pending program. They are not intended to indicate that, for 1942 and 1943, this is the maximum production possible.

I think it is interesting to note in this connection that while the percentage devoted to national defense rises over the period from 7 to 54 percent, it is also true that our manufacturing facilities increase to such an extent that we shall have available for purposes other than defense purposes in the calendar year 1943 a capacity of $18,000,000,000 as compared with a capacity in 1940 of $20,400,000,000. In other words, we are only losing in dollar capacity for nondefense purposes about $2,400,000,000 in spite of the fact that we are going to utilize 54 percent for defense purposes in 1943.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would that mean there would only be a 10-percent cut in our nondefense capacity at that time? Can the gentleman make a comparison that will show what cut in our nondefense production as of, say, 1941, that figure would represent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In 1940 we had a capacity of $20,400,000,000. In 1943 we shall have a capacity of $18,000,000,000 for nondefense purposes, a 10-percent cut.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Am I correct in saying that is a cut of 10 percent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Then as to steel and other defense materials, will there be sufficient to carry on a nondefense capacity out of that, roughly, $18,000,000,000?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is an over-all table. I cannot break it down into specific commodities.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In general, will there be material to carry on the nondefense capacity reduced by about 10 percent from the 1940 capacity?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think, generally speaking, the O. P. M. is satisfied with the prospect as to essential materials.

I mentioned General Ayre's testimony. I think that has already been referred to. The General, as we know, is one of the outstanding economists in the country when not in the service. He gave us figures indicating that in 1940 we spent

about 3 percent of our national income for defense purposes. In 1941 the percentage rose to 19, and in the next calendar year we shall expend about 30 percent of our estimated national income as compared with 42 percent expended in Canada and 50 percent in England.

I realize fully the dangers inherent in the enormous appropriations which we are being called upon to make at this time. In the light of the general picture confronting us, however, it seems to me it is imperative that this appropriation be approved, both in respect to the items for our own defense and in respect to those for lend-lease purposes.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman earlier in his statement told us that we had appropriated almost $68,000,000,000 since July 1940, $29,000,000,000 for the Army, $19,000,000,000 for the Navy, $4,400,000,000 for other purposes, and $14,500,000,000 for lend-lease purposes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct, including the bill now under consideration.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman tell us what part of this money has actually been spent?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have the figures for lend-lease expenditure, which indicate as of November 23, $5,149,000,000 obligated, and as of November 15, just under $1,000,000,000 expended. I am sorry I do not have similar figures at the moment in respect to our own expenditure but, as I have already stated, the evidence does indicate that the entire $68,000,000,000, with certain exceptions like shipping, is expected to be expended and actually turned into finished goods for delivery by September 1, 1943.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. Some newspapers and individuals in various parts of the country are demanding that we declare war immediately. Are we ready for war?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In my opinion, we are very far from being ready for an all-out war with Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. In speaking about preparedness, I notice on page 145 of the hearings, part II, that provision is made for 400,000 additional Springfield rifles at an average cost of $60. Why is it necessary to buy Springfield rifles at this time if, as I understand, there are 700,000 Springfields on hand, as well as enough Garands, according to Colonel Faddis, who spoke before, to supply all the men now under arms?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I believe that most of the Springfield rifles are requested for lend-lease purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think there was also some testimony to indicate there were certain missions or certain troops where that type of rifle was desirable, that there were production facilities for that rifle, and that they could not get all the Garands just as rapidly as they wanted them.

Mr. CLASON. At the present time there are 700,000 Springfield rifles on hand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A great many of them have been transferred.

Mr. CLASON. Then explain why there is the difference in cost as between the World War rifle, in view of the fact the Remington-Rand Co. is going to use the machinery belonging to the United States Government, formerly used at the Springfield and Rock Island armories, and the present cost? In other words, the difference between $34 for the World War No. 1 rifles and $60 per rifle today.

Mr. WILLGLESWORTH. I am afraid I cannot give a complete answer to the gentleman's question. I believe this is one of the items where there has been a very material increase in price, for the reasons already indicated.

Mr. CLASON. Because of the increase in wages and other costs?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any appropriation in this bill for the little jeep car that has been so successful in going where larger automobiles and ambulances cannot go? I know that in Conway, where little Pamela Hollingsworth was lost on the mountain for 8 days, there was a jeep car that was able to go over the rocky, mountainous ground that it was almost impossible for the larger cars to cross and bring her down. The few hours that were saved by the use of the jeep car probably prevented the amputation of one of her feet. These cars are invaluable in bringing in wounded men, I believe, and in serving other purposes. I wonder if there is any appropriation in this bill for more of them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is a very large appropriation for motor vehicles in this bill. There is an even larger appropriation for items of special equipment, of confidential character, in large measure. I am sure that jeep cars are provided for but to what extent I cannot tell the gentlewoman.

This bill, as the Members know, is enormous in scope. The committee has five very large volumes of justifications for the various items that are included. It is set up in four titles. We could discuss these items almost indefinitely.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know enough about it to know what ought to be regarded as a military secret, but it seems to me the gentleman would be fully justified in withholding from a public statement any information that ought not to be given publicity, an individual Member of the House wants to get some information that the public ought not to have. I think we are talking too much in America. I do not mean this speech; I have no reference to the gentleman at all; but whenever we get hold of some information about what we are doing we give it to the world right away. It seems to me there is not much use of anybody's doing any secret-service work who wants to find out just what we are doing because we are hollering it everywhere. We are pretty close to this thing and we ought to exercise a pretty high degree of caution as to what we give out. The gentleman certainly understands I am making this observation not at all in connection with anything he has said.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman. The members of this committee are always in a difficult position in handling bills in the defense field, because much of the testimony that is presented is necessarily given to us off the record.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would not put it in the record. I would take the responsibility for not doing it; and if anybody wanted to know something about it, I would tell him to come around and I would whisper it in his ear.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. My reaction to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman is that this is the first time we have ever been dragged into a war without a declaration of war. It is all brand new to America and to a democracy to accept the things we were told not to expect, and be told not to ask questions and talk out in meeting, and so on. This is the first time we have been dragged across the seas, both seas, and without any declaration of war. There has been direct and purposeful subterfuge in the whole proposition. We ought not to blame the American people or the Congress, either, for talking a little bit because of this brand-new circumstance.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I suggest to my friend, with the permission of the gentleman who has the floor, that we must not forget that even if we are being dragged, we are the dragees in this drag, and we have to look at it from that standpoint.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. We have not become used to our dictatorship yet; that is all.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Still, I insist—and although I hesitate to say it, I think everybody will agree with me—that we ought to be pretty careful about giving out too much publicity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, title I providing for the Army carries a total of $5,100,000,000. I insert at this point a break-down by the Chief

of Staff showing eight items, including those for lend-lease purposes, aggregating $6,687,000,000:

The estimates now presented for consideration provide $6,687,369,046 for the following general purposes:

1. To maintain the National Guard in Federal service throughout fiscal year 1942.

2. To increase the strength of the ground forces by 150,000 enlisted men (87,500 man-years).

3. To activate the mobile Aircraft Warning Service in continental United States and overseas (increase of approximately 16,570 men, 6,592 man-years).

4. To initiate the expansion from the 54-group air program (the first aviation objective) to the second aviation objective (84-group program) (an increase of 49,090 enlisted men, Air Corps, 9,091 man-years; and 61,366 enlisted men, 29,256 man-years, service troops with the Air Corps).

5. To provide for the mobilization, operation, and training of the Philippine Commonwealth Army, including a reimbursement of $10,000,000 borrowed for this purpose from the emergency fund of the President.

6. To provide for an increase of certain special ordnance weapons and equipment which are possessed by Axis Powers in large quantities and for which increased necessity is constantly being developed.

7. To provide additional funds required to meet known deficiencies of urgent and immediate priority.

8. To provide funds for a few new urgent requirements which should not be postponed.

FUNCTIONAL BREAK-DOWN OF THE ESTIMATES

I have discussed briefly under appropriate headings the purpose to be accomplished with the funds requested. The following functional break-down shows a division of the funds to the purposes stated and a further break-down of the miscellaneous items:

Total amount requested		$6,687,369,046
Required to—		
1. Maintain the National Guard in Federal service throughout fiscal year 1942		130,000,000
2. Increase the strength of the ground forces by 150,000 enlisted men		148,900,000
3. Activate the Aircraft Warning Service		55,500,000
4. Initiate the second aviation objective		363,000,000
5. Mobilize and maintain the Philippine Commonwealth Army		269,000,000
(a) For operation	$66,738,377	
(b) For equipment, including transportation charges	192,261,623	
(c) To reimburse the "Emergency fund of the President" for funds advanced	10,000,000	
6. Provide special items of equipment		4,210,577,646
(a) Ordnance equipment	$3,688,510,246	
(b) Signal equipment	134,067,400	
(c) Facilities	388,000,000	
7. Miscellaneous items:		

	New items	Deficiency items
Military Intelligence activities	$239,000	
Welfare of enlisted men	1,210,000	
Pay of the Army:		
(a) 20 percent overstength, National Guard	7,400,000	
(b) Uniform allowance for 21,119 aviation cadets to be commissioned as second lieutenants Air Reserve	3,167,000	
(c) Increase of $10 a month to all enlisted men completing 1 year's service	60,354,000	
Pay of the Army—Continued.		
(d) Premium on $10,000 Government life insurance for Air Corps flying cadets	$2,920,000	
(e) Deficiency, 5,477 officers		$18,700,000
Travel of the personnel listed above	2,999,000	
Claims for damages	12,000	
Subsistence:		
(a) Increase in working capital	7,675,000	
(b) Additional working capital	48,000,000	
Army transportation, water: Purchase of boats for Iceland		800,000
Procurement of 100,719 multi-wheel-drive motor vehicles	197,635,000	
Unit parts, tires, repair materials for stockage	25,527,000	
Construction, etc., at military posts:		
(a) Urgent miscellaneous facilities, ground forces	10,407,000	
(b) Miscellaneous construction for the Air Corps	92,000,000	
(c) Acquisition of land	12,364,000	
Signal Corps:		
(a) Increase of contract price, signal equipment		27,800,000
(b) To replace funds diverted for procurement of radio equipment		29,112,000
(c) Improvement in radio sets SCR 268	6,000,000	
Air Corps, Army:		
(a) Additional funds for procurement of airplanes		331,763,000
(b) Increase of 7½ percent for spare parts	408,488,000	
Construction, Sitka, Alaska		1,305,000
Chorrera and Rio Hato Road, Panama		500,000
Seacoast defenses:		
(a) Deficiency for construction of installations, Panama		5,645,000
(b) Deficiency for construction of installations, United States		2,390,000
Total	886,397,000	418,015,000
	$1,304,412,000	
8. Miscellaneous operating expenses		$205,979,150

The members of the committee will note that the estimates call for an increase in enlisted personnel of about 277,000 and for an increase in facilities to the extent of $388,000,000.

The bill before us breaks down the Army request into 25 items, aggregating $5,100,000,000 exclusive of items for lend-lease purposes. I shall refer briefly to a few of these items.

There is an item for expediting production in the sum of $383,000,000, $125,000,000 of which is for lend-lease purposes. This sum is requested largely for machine tools, for the construction of tanks, antitanks, antiaircraft, guns, and explosives, the facilities to be in production within a year's time.

There is an item for military posts in the sum of $434,320,000. This item includes 9 projects for housing additional forces at $31,743,000, 22 projects for urgent miscellaneous facilities at $10,407,000, 3 projects for Air Corps technical facilities at $2,937,000, 36 projects for Air Corps facilities, including 11 completed air fields and 14 skeletonized fields at $376,866,000 and 22 projects for the acquisition of land at $15,864,000.

There is an item for the Signal Corps in the sum of $256,709,000, $17,600,000 of which is for lend-lease purposes. This request results from the increase in the Army, from increased signal services within the Army, and for essential radio equipment.

There is an item for the Air Corps in the sum of $779,000,000. This item includes $331,700,000 for increase in the cost of planes, $405,900,000 for spare parts, $34,900,000 for research, $6,300,000 for other purposes.

There is an item of $3,719,883,000 for ordnance which may be broken down as follows: $390,000,000 for antiaircraft, $226,000,000 for antitanks, $1,899,000,000 for tanks, the balance for ammunition and small arms.

Including items for Army transportation, the committee will find the sum of about $4,440,000,000 requested for special equipment items. These items include ordnance, Signal Corps equipment, facilities, motor vehicles, cost of transportation, the ordnance, largely for tanks, antitanks, antiaircraft guns, explosives, and small arms. The articles requested require a long time for production and are needed in large quantities. The sum requested will assure maximum production of the items in question during the fiscal years 1942 and 1943.

Of the total, $1,536,000,000, or thereabouts including ordnance, Signal Corps equipment, facilities and motor vehicles is for United States Army requirements; $1,346,000,000, or thereabouts, including ordnance and Signal Corps equipment, is for reserve requirements; $1,556,000,000, or thereabouts, including ordnance, Signal Corps equipment, facilities, motor vehicles and cost of transportation is for lend-lease purposes. I include at this point a table showing the division of these items.

DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATE OF AMOUNTS REQUIRED UNDER LEASE-LEND

Mr. TABER. General, will you submit for the record at this point, by appropriation titles, as the bill is submitted by the Budget, the amounts that you figure might be desired under the lease-lend?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir. The total amount in the estimates for special items of equipment—namely, $4,439,574,646—is divided between the procuring services as follows:

Ordnance Service	$3,688,510,246
Signal Service	134,067,400
Expediting production (for facilities)	388,000,000
Army transportation:	
Motor (for purchase of motor vehicles)	223,162,000
Rail (for shipment of motor vehicles)	5,835,000

These amounts can be further subdivided as follows:

Presently known defense-aid requirements:	
Ordnance Service	$1,354,899,246
Signal Service	17,600,000
Army transportation:	
Motor	153,162,000
Rail	5,835,000
Total (less expediting production)	1,431,496,246
Expediting production (for facilities)	125,000,000
Grand total	1,556,496,246

Presently known requirements, U. S Army:	
Ordnance Service	$1,144,176,250
Signal Service	59,315,400
Army transportation: Motor	70,000,000
Total	1,273,491,650
Expediting production (for facilities)	263,000,000
Grand total	1,536,491,650
Presently known requirements, the ultimate destination not now known: [1]	
Ordnance Service	1,289,434,750
Signal Service	57,152,000
Total	1,346,586,750

[1] This requirement is for the production of tanks and their related equipment.

The original request from the War Department merged those items required for lend-lease purposes with other items desired by the Department. It also urged authority to transfer any and all equipment procured from appropriations since March 11, 1941, the date of the lend-lease bill, to lend-lease purposes. These appropriations have amounted to over $14,000,000,000. Your committee has segregated the items required for lend-lease purposes in a separate paragraph and has placed a limitation on the transfer of items procured from funds appropriated since March 11, 1941, in the amount of $500,000,000.

Title II, providing for the Navy, carries a total of $1,130,000,000. The bill before you breaks this total down into seven items. The more important items follow:

There is an item of $10,000,000 for the naval emergency fund to care for harbor and shore work. There is an item of $250,000,000 for the Bureau of Ships. This covers improvements for existing ships, additional small craft, work on Army transports, and other matters. There is an item of $120,000,000 for arming our merchant ships. There is an item of $449,720,000 for the Bureau of Aeronautics. This contemplates the speeding up of our program, the acquisition of over 2,100 planes, spare parts, and other matters. There is an item of $300,000,000 for the increase and replacement of naval vessels. This contemplates the acquisition, conversion, and construction of special types of small vessels.

Title III, as already indicated, carries with it a total of $1,556,000,000 for lend-lease purpsoes. The request includes $1,254,000,000 for ordnance, $17,600,000 for Signal Corps equipment, $125,000,000 for facilities, $153,000,000 for motor vehicles, and about $6,000,000 for costs of transportation.

Title IV carries with it a total of $430,000,000 for a large number of varied items of general character.

There is an item of $35,000,000 for the Red Cross for the benefit of those who are rendered sick or destitute as a result of hostilities. There is an item of $10,000,000 for temporary defense housing, including trailers, dormitories, and portable houses. There is an item of $3,776,000 for the Federal Housing Administration to cover additional work under recent legislation and title I claims. There is an item of $129,600,000 for public roads, including $5,000,000 for the purpose of aviation flight strips. There is an item of $50,000,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Authority for 104 new defense flying fields. There is an item of $25,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, primarily for the Fontana Dam, and 11 additional units. There is an item of $30,000,000 for the construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission system in connection with the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. There is an item of $3,000,000 for the Central Valley set-up for a transmission line. There is an item of $2,500,000 for the Treasury Department to carry the foreign-owned property control to March 31. There is an item of $4,335,000 for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to cover additional work under recent legislation. There are items of $17,600,000 for six flood-control projects; of $2,700,000 for river and harbor improvement in the Delaware River; of $111,569,000 for construction, maintenance, and operation in the Panama Canal Zone; and of $3,236,000 for within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck bill.

The items referred to indicate the enormous scope of this bill. Time for detailed discussion is not available. The Members must rely on the admirable committee report compiled by our efficient clerks, Marc Sheild and John Pugh, and on the discussion under the 5-minute rule.

I shall support without reservation the items embodied in titles I, II, and III of the bill.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, with 26 of my colleagues I have the honor of representing some 7,000,000 people of the State of Illinois. For a number of years the people of our great State have paid about 10 percent of all the Federal internal revenue taxes and about 10 percent of all the Federal corporation income taxes. Illinois is the second largest tax-paying State in the Union.

Since I have been in Congress I have consistently voted for every national-defense or lease-lend appropriation which, according to the report on the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, amounts to about $68,000,000,000.

Yesterday afternoon, late, I received from the clerk of the Appropriations Committee a copy of the committee report, the bill, consisting of 51 pages, and two volumes of hearings, consisting of 260 pages. I could not get these documents until yesterday. I remained up until 3 o'clock this morning studying this appropriation bill. Despite my own desire and the disposition of the people I represent to support every appropriation for national defense, I am inclined to believe I should cast my vote against this appropriation as a protest of the rush and steam-roller methods used in passing important legislation that seemingly has become the habit.

How can I possibly know that there are not a lot of unnecessary items in this bill? You may say I should rely on the committee's recommendation. But I have my own responsibility. It was only a few months ago that the chairman of one of the important committees of the House virtually demanded the appropriation of $30,000,000 as an immediate national-defense necessity, for the construction of a War Department building. Within a week after the passage of this appropriation, the President himself stated that the amount was too great, and he did not approve the location of the building.

On page 38 of the report, the committee asks reconsideration of the case of David Lasser who, under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act approved July 1, 1941, was singled out for removal from office. This man was stigmatized as a Communist. Now, on December 4, 5 months later, the pending bill reinstated him, admitting that a mistake had been made. The error may have ruined a man's life and certainly has injured his reputation.

Another example of the high pressure and steam-roller tactics in passing legislation was demonstrated yesterday on this floor when a harsh and undemocratic labor bill was passed. I voted against that bill in part as a matter of protest of this extraordinary procedure.

One of the provisions of that labor bill denies the benefits of social security to any individual who may be a Communist or have other disqualifications of similar types. Who, may I ask, would be the competent judge of these situations? To how many more David Lassers will we be called upon to apologize?

If this type of legislation and rush procedure continues, it will stimulate furious men to go to furious lengths. And who can tell whether their fury will be directed against what religious, racial, or economic group?

Gentlemen, the hurried appropriation of the taxpayers' money can result only in error and criticism, and harsh legislation has the distinct odor of future persecutions and is un-American.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

COLUMBIA RIVER POWER FULFILLING UNCLE SAM'S DEFENSE NEEDS FOR ALUMINUM

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this $30,000,000 appropriation for construction of projects in the Bonneville Power Administration will make possible further defense, economic, and industrial developments in the State of Oregon and will supply the State with sufficient power to make substantial contributions of new defense materials which are so badly needed throughout the Nation in order to meet the Nation's great defense program. It will make possible the development of new basic industries which have heretofore been denied the Pacific Northwest.

A new defense plant for the production of aluminum is now under construction on the south bank of the Columbia River at Troutdale, Oreg., and will require a total of approximately 100,000 kilowatts when it is in full operation. In addition to this large reduction plant, a rolling mill is to be established adjacent to the plant, which will demand an additional 30,000 kilowatts, and when in full operation will provide employment for approxi-

mately 4,000 men. With the additional power that will be made available by this appropriation, it will be possible to bring into reality other basic industries besides aluminum, which although on a smaller scale will require more employment per kilowatt of load than for the aluminum reduction plant.

The Northwest is blessed with many natural resources which could be made immediately available to supply ores for zinc, magnesium, and pig-iron reduction mills. When these Northwest industries which are sorely needed in our national defense are established, they will allow the Northwest to make a greater defense contribution than it is now making. The flow of the Columbia River is such that with the installation of the Grand Coulee Dam on the upstream, for wh'ch funds have already been appropriated for nine generating units, and the Bonneville Dam downstream, there will be available at all times sufficient generated power to adequately utilize all of the transmission facilities requested in this appropriation. This statement of the river flow is based on exhaustive studies made by the United States Army engineers, the National Resources Planning Board, and the Bonneville Power Administration. There can be no question but that every dollar requested in this appropriation will be used for sound defense load.

This appropriation bill is divided into two parts:

First. A deficiency appropriation; and

Second. A supplementary appropriation.

The deficiency appropriation is to provide for increased costs in labor and substitution of high-cost materials in order to complete the portion of the construction program already authorized by Congress. The supplementary appropriation more generally covers the immediate purchase of material for the 1943 program, in order that construction can get under way at the earliest possible time, and in order to make power available to vital national-defense loads it is necessary to purchase now while material costs are lower and can be obtained.

The deficiency appropriation also provides for additional costs of copper conductor for a 230,000-volt line from Bonneville Dam to Vancouver, Wash., and from Bonneville Dam to Grand Coulee Dam, additional tools and equipment necessary to complete the present program, and additional defense guards to provide adequate protection to an electric system vital to national defense.

Although the Bonneville-Vancouver line No. 3, and the Bonneville-Coulee No. 2 transmission lines lie wholly within the State of Washington, they have a direct bearing on the power supply to Oregon and the entire Northwest. The tie between the two great dams is essential for making an abundant and uninterrupted supply of power available at all times for Oregon, as well as Washington, and the Bonneville-Vancouver line No. 3 will make possible the transmission of additional large blocks of power to the J. D. Ross substation at Vancouver, Wash., much of the power of which is transformed to a lower voltage and delivered to the St. John substation just outside of the city limits of Portland, Oreg. In turn, the St. John substation forms the main distribution point for the transmission of power to the defense plants in the Portland area, including the Oregon Ship Building Co., Willamette Iron & Steel Co., and the Electro Metallurgical Corporation.

The supplementary part of this appropriation will provide for the construction of the second 230-kilo-volt transmission line between Covington, Wash., and Grand Coulee Dam, the Covington-Coulee line Nos. 3 and 4, which is a double-circuit line, the 230-kilo-volt Kelso-Longview loop, the 230-kilo-volt North Vancouver-Covington line No. 2, and the 230-kilo-volt Covington-Seattle line No. 2.

In addition to these transmission lines it will provide for the construction and additions of the following 230-kilo-volt substations, Covington additions, North Vancouver additions, Longview additions, Trafton substation, North Bonneville additions, and Chehalis additions.

In addition to the main 230-kilo-volt system, the following 115-kilo-volt transmission lines and substations will be under construction. The second line from Salem to Eugene, a line from Trafton to Bellingham, a line from Covington to Renton of double-circuit construction, and a second line from Covington to Tacoma, Wash. The following substations are included: Pasco substation, St. John's additions, Bellingham substation, Eugene additions, Salem additions, Tacoma additions, and Walla Walla additions.

There is also an item of $5,000,000 to cover the cost of feeder lines for service connection to industrial customers which will be used entirely for the supplying of power to industries necessary to the national defense. Also the appropriation will provide the necessary tools, equipment, and stock inventory to carry out the 1943 construction program, and will provide for the building of a warehouse necessary to properly protect and handle the quantity of additional material that will be required for the program.

The construction covered by the supplementary appropriation will strengthen the power supply for all of western Oregon. In general it may be said the proposed construction program makes immediately available to the State of Oregon an additional 80,000 kilowatts of transformer capacity, and will provide transmission line capacity for much greater loads. In addition to the large power load required by the aluminum plant at Troutdale, the following defense loads are located in the State of Oregon as a result of the abundant power which has been made available by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The Tongue Point Naval Air Base and Coast Guard Station, the Pendleton Army Air Base, the Corvallis Army Cantonment, the Oregon Shipbuilding Co., the Pacific Carbide Alloys, the Pennsylvania Salt Co., and the Electro Metallurgical Corporation, all of which are located in the Portland area. In addition, the Bonneville Power Administration is supplying a load to the Portland General Electric Co., and the Pacific Power & Light Co., a portion of which load is used for national defense.

The fulfillment of this submitted construction plan will make available not only to the State of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, but to the entire Nation a large distributed supply of the country's cheapest power. This is a substantial base for the defense program. Modern defense depends on power. Without an ample power supply our defense efforts would be curtailed. The wisdom and vision of the appropriation committee during the past 4 years in providing advance power capacity has been a lifesaver. Columbia Power will shortly provide around 50 percent of the light metals needed for the air arm of our defense. We still need to advance further in the production of other metals like zinc, tungsten, chrome, magnesium, manganese, and steel in order to keep our small manufacturers going and to eliminate priority unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, we have learned thus far in our defense efforts, as we learned to our sorrow in the last World War, that hydroelectric power is the key to the solution of our demands for aluminum for airplane construction, as well as for many other critical or strategic materials going into our defense production. Fortunately, we were well along on the program for the development of hydroelectric power on the Columbia River before we were brought face to face with our all-out national defense program. The 10 generators at Bonneville Dam will be installed and in operation before the close of 1943, if present plans materialize. Also, funds have now been provided for 9 generators at Grand Coulee, the last of which is due for completion by May 1944.

According to present plans and schedules the present generating capacity of 356,400 kilowatts will be stepped up to 1,166,400 kilowatts by December 1943, and to 1,490,400 kilowatts by May 1944. While it is true that thus far the emphasis has been placed on the production of aluminum, with this much needed power there is a wide-open field for the production of many more strategic and critical minerals in this area. I call attention to this statement, made by the Committee on Appropriations in reporting this bill, on page 29 of the report:

> The natural deposits of defense raw materials in this area and the accessibility to them of the power facilities of these two large dams make the area ideal for the development of national-defense industries, and advantage is being taken of these circumstances to a very extensive degree. Power demands for defense industries are now in excess of the supply. The defense load commitment has risen from 65,000 kilowatts in July 1940, to 525,000 kilowatts at present, and the prospective needs are rapidly accumulating. All power now being generated 24 hours a day is being used, and contracts in effect or substantially agreed upon are in excess of the supply.

That there may be no slackening of the program for the full development of these power facilities, including the transmission facilities to make the energy available at the various industrial centers where it is needed, I urge the

approval of the committee's recommendation of the allowance of this appropriation of $30,000,000 for providing these essential facilities in the Grand Coulee-Bonneville system. While it is true the major portion of the appropriation will be expended in the Grand Coulee area, the grid system is being developed so that this work will redound to the benefit of Bonneville territory as well as Grand Coulee, as the two projects are tied together and work as one coordinated whole.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I shall refer to the newspaper story that has been referred to so much this afternoon. I wonder if this is not so, or if it is so, why those who have spoken discreditingly of it this afternoon are concerned. Are they concerned that it is an eye opener to the American people, or are they concerned that if it is not the truth the American people shall not accept it as such. Evidently it embodies both theories; first, that it is an eye opener to the American people that there are plans for a 10,000,000-man Army. Certainly they know it would be very unpopular at this time to submit to a referendum whether we should have a 10,000,000-man Army to combat forces in Asia, Africa, and Europe. Yet it is perfectly reasonable, and I am not surprised, it has not startled me, because I have heard the President, without any legislative authority, pledge us from one subterfuge to another in the steps toward war. He has pledged us on a program to crush Hitler, and to crush Hitler, of course, means to crush him before he can leave there. Anybody who believes the President means what he says, knows it is going to take a lot of men to do that. It is going to take a lot of men to whip Japan over there in China, if it comes to a show-down.

The President has given an ultimatum to Japan with Mr. Hull's cooperation, yet nobody else in the Nation apparently knows what that ultimatum is. It is designed to lead us into war. Japan can have peace or war, the President says, on his submitted proposals, proposals about which we know nothing. I even challenged the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] on Monday afternoon as to whether he knew what they were, but he did not rise to answer me and say that he knew anything about them. Further, I heard a high-up general in the Army say that he had no idea what was in the proposals. So this great thing we call democracy is fading from us very fast.

My great leader, the distinguished minority leader on the Committee on Appropriations, my able friend the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, says we are in the war, but I do not accept that. I think the quicker we can get out of it and the easiest we can get out of the fix we are in, the better off we are, and we had better begin to get out now. Subterfuge by subterfuge we have been led into this situation.

This is old stuff, but I like to repeat it yet. How fervidly these men who are discrediting this newspaper article today promised us when we lifted the embargo that we would make England put the money on the barrelhead, and that would be all there would be to it. England would get our material. You recall that the barrelhead did not last 2 weeks, and then we were giving England credit. We have just gone from one subterfuge to another through all this thing, down through the lease-lend. We have a little of that in this bill, which is one of the reasons I am going to oppose this bill. We have had lease-lend up twice, and twice have given them $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000, and we have $1,500,000,000 in this bill for that purpose, and $500,000,000 more that can be put there.

Lease-lend is one of the last subterfuges to be adopted. Further, we have a distinguished Englishman telling what the United States is going to do to put England in financial bondage. This happened this last week. Anthony Eden took the floor to answer this Mr. MacGovern in the British Parliament and said, "That is not true. Under the lease-lend arrangement there is no accounting, no debt piling up."

England has been told that she does not have to pay a dollar of it back, yet in this country we labeled it lease-lend and told our people that we were just loaning it to them, but we knew when we were doing it that we did not intend to ask them for it and they never made an obligation; England never made a promise, even, to pay it back. It is just one subterfuge after another. Yet my friend, the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, says we are in the war and he is willing to accept it. I am not willing to accept it, and I do not think the bulk of the American people are willing to accept it that we are in this war. We have been told that it would not happen; how we were told.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. As one Member, I was astounded here this afternoon to hear a man great enough to be the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House say that if we were in the war, what difference did it make how we got in. I think that is right along the line the gentleman is talking about. We have got in there by subterfuge.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It never fooled me. I have been awfully stupid in a lot of things in life, but for 2 years I have guessed this thing exactly as it came out. Before this war even started over there in September of 1939, I thought the President of the United States was more anxious to get into war than anybody else, unless it was Hitler, before he had ever started over there, judging from the President's quarantine speech and the other things he said, talking so much, and being so far away from the thing himself.

Members will recall that Mr. BARKLEY, the leader in the other House, put into the RECORD on the 1st of February a speech by Josephus Daniels, made at the Mayflower Hotel to the electoral college delegates when they were here, in which he forgot himself and said that Franklin Roosevelt was more anxious to get into the other war as Under Secretary of the Navy than even Mr. Daniels himself or Woodrow Wilson. Josephus Daniels said that Franklin D. Roosevelt was the "rearingest" man to get into the other war the United States had. That gives us a little background to what, I say, that he is the "rearingest" man to get into this war in spite of all his promises about peace and saying that the boys would never go over there, promising that again and again and again. He is the first third-term President we ever had. He dominates the departments through his Cabinet officers, and he doesn't have anybody but stoolpigeons as Cabinet officers. He dominates all of the independent agencies by the appointments that he has made in the last 9 years, so that he has got the Government under his thumb, and he has propaganda agencies at this time building up an artificial sentiment for war. And now we have two theories of defense, and that is the subterfuge of it all. We are doing all this for defense purposes. Everybody comprehends an idea of what defense is, or did at least before this new idea of defense of going over there and whipping them before they could come over here. That is the new conception of defense. There are some of us who believe that defense is really defense and that getting ready for defense means getting ready to repel an invasion. That is what we understand to be defense in this country, but we have now a new idea of defense, as we use the word, and that is the thing that separates these two schools of patriots today—those that want to prepare for real, actual defense and those that want to go over there in all of the other continents of the world in order to preserve our democracy here. And he knows that we will not have any democracy here if we do these things. All these subterfuges were used to draw us into a state of war here, and we were never going to have this kind of war and send 10,000,000 soldiers everywhere else in the world without ever declaring any war. I am going to oppose this thing, and I am going to oppose these other appropriations which are not defense, until Congress declares a war or something more material happens than is happening today, and we will see how we come out on that score later.

Now, as to the sacrifices. Why, they have not even gotten into it yet. We had a million and a half men over there in the last war, and now we are going to fight in two oceans and on three continents at the same time, with not a friendly place to land, except in Africa. And we are doing things in Africa when I come to think about it. It is no secret. Judge SUMNERS is here, and I would say that this is no secret. I was wondering whether I should say anything about it the other day, and withheld it, but I read an editorial in the Washington Post that had everything in it, and it is this: The Appropriations Committee sitting here has approved contracts for mail planes from Miami to Capetown, in Africa, touching at several places on the western coast of Africa. You would wonder what power the Authority for Civil Aeronautics

had to issue a license to fly all over Africa. That is a new cockeyed thing, but we are doing it, and the first thing you know we will be flying into Cairo and to the Suez Canal, and every place where we fly we will leave the flag, and we are going to keep it there. My second theory is that the President of the United States is as ambitious as Napoleon and Hitler, and he intends to be remembered as the greatest man in the world by ruling the world, for when Hitler exhausts himself a little bit, before he gets through with Russia and England, then America can finish him up, and we will finish up Japan, we will subdue England, and really the old American flag will never come down from any place where we have sent an airplane or a warship on the five continents. That is just my prediction, and we will have wars in Africa and in China next year, and plenty of them. We have been flying planes now to the Suez Canal and other places. We have a great, big, new idea about our defense. Our hemisphere that we never dreamed of before.

I am opposing this bill because it is not defense. It goes clear beyond the pale of defense. I am for defense. I am opposing this bill because there is a billion and a half lease-lend in it. I opposed the other lease-lend bills. There is another half billion in here that can be used for lease-lend, and they wanted it so that it could all have been used for lease-lend. That is the tendency now—take our money and mix it all up with lease-lend. They came before us and proposed to take all of this $7,000,000,000 and make it available for lease-lend if they wanted to use it that way. That is the tendency. Give them everything they ask for. Give them everything that they ought to have and then mix our own Army, our own Navy, our own air force, and everything else up with them, and that is what the program is in America today. For one, I am against it.

I am going to oppose it because it is not our defense. There is not anybody worrying about Hitler coming over here and attacking us. Nobody is worrying about Japan coming over here and attacking us. But England has sold us her situation. She bit off so much that she cannot chew it now and we have to hold it for her. She has sold us her situation as she finds herself today. When it is all over I predict that if we win it will not be 30 days until Roosevelt and Churchill will fall out. They cannot agree for a minute when this war is over. Then we will either lose the benefits of it or we will be in another war with England to settle it. War never settles anything, and out of it we are disturbing every man's business. We are upsetting everything now. We have not really started to shoot. We have upset everything and are upsetting everything. We have spent more now than we spent in the other World War, and we were told by our experts that the spending had only started. That is expert testimony. We have only started to spend, they told us.

We are expecting another deficiency for the Army just like this in February—2 months—another three or four billion. We are expecting another lease-lend in March, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] told you.

This newspaper story of forty billion in the next year is not going to be very far wrong if we go hell-bent as we are headed right now. And we may be in the war any minute, because we have not been asked. We have given ultimatums and if Japan does not go back where Mr. Roosevelt tells her she shall, we have a shooting war on our hands without anybody else having anything to say about it.

This is beyond the pale of defense. It has got lease-lend in it, and if they can get by with this, they will make at least half of the bill in February lease-lend, with authority to use it all for lease-lend. We have evidence today from the men who visited the camps that they saw wooden guns in our own training camps. If we win, we have got to take care of the world. We have got to feed the world. Morgenthau told the National Grange we would be expected to feed the world if we win the war. We are going to take all the world over and feed it free. We are going to feed them. We are not going to sell it to them. It would not do any good to sell it to them. The same day that Mr. Morgenthau told that to the National Grange, Paul V. McNutt made a speech to a teachers' group, and he said undoubtedly the United States would be furnishing funds to the States very soon, 50–50, to run the elementary and secondary schools of the land. Yet that dream of an endless Treasury! supplying 50–50 with Federal funds for the elementary schools of the United States in addition to everything else.

Then there is no cut in nondefense items. Has not the Budget submitted the St. Lawrence waterway? Has not the President's budget submitted a proposition for this fool Florida Canal? Has not the President's budget approved of a river and harbor bill? The President's budget has approved them all. No consistency. No attempt to save anywhere, and in order to give any land all they ask for if we think it is in the interest of national defense, we appropriate the money. This billion and a half for Turkey; I cannot figure out Turkey very much, but it is not important anyway. We told Japan to stay off the Burma Road, to stay out of Singapore, to stay out of the Red Sea. We are the big world policeman. We are. The gentleman from Ohio the other day said that we ought to melt up all these statues, all these iron horses, and these iron men, heroes of 150 years ago, which decorate the parks and circles in Washington. That is the spirit of the administration that is here today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What does Washington mean? They would throw him out of the window. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and all that they stood for. Oh, yes; it would be perfectly natural. We could tear down the Washington Monument and build Harold Ickes a garage with it, and that would be all right. That would be in keeping with the things of today. Yet that is our America that is before us. The people in this administration today propose things like that.

Then we had this interesting thing before our committee this week, and I will close.

We asked a prominent general whether these were his plans, the Army's plans, or whether they came down from the President, and he refused to answer. We know that this Army of ours and these leaders are capable and there is no discredit to any boy in uniform in any Army camp, but we know because of the dominant spirit of the individual who is at the head of the Government, who is Commander in Chief of the Army, that the Army and Navy are his stool pigeons today. They do not dare say these are their opinions. They give them to us if he asks them to give them to us. If those 10,000,000 men were satisfactory to the President of the United States and he did not want to let it leak out he would not have asked them the question, he would not have written them that letter. They would not have dared to tell such a thing unless it had been acceptable to him, because they are doing nothing but what is acceptable to the President of the United States. They are loyal to their Commander in Chief. That is their elemental rule of loyalty. The President of the United States has assumed the position of being a dictator in this land and he is enjoying it. No man is getting more fun out of dictatorship than Franklin Roosevelt. He shows from way back that he likes war. He went into the other one before anyone else did. He likes his hero, Woodrow Wilson, who was the first interventionist. This interventionist group is a new breed of cats. We have had them only in the last 30 years. We never had them before, but now they are chasing us isolationists to the woods. We are the boys who ran this land for the first 125 years. The interventionists just came in in the last 25 years. They are a new breed, and yet they are running things and we are not allowed a chance to articulate, we cannot articulate our democracy today.

Why the President came down here on the floor when the Ludlow resolution was voted on, and a pretty close vote it was, the Speaker of the House read the President's statement against the Ludlow resolution and said: "Defeat it. Why, we have got a Congress of the United States and we believe in representative government. The Congress of the United States represents the people and under the Constitution we would be the ones to declare war." That is what he said in defeating the Ludlow resolution. But where are we today? Why, we are just as much ignored as that direct referendum referred to in the Ludlow resolution. He referred to us beautifully 3 years ago as having the function of declaring war, but we are perfectly ignored now.

I am amazed and astounded that men like the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, for whom I have the highest regard, have been sold on this proposition. Of course, JOHN was in the 22 who voted against repeal of the neutrality law while there were 137 of us

over here who voted the other way. I am not saying that JOHN is wrong or that we are right as yet, but we belong to the 137 on this side and JOHN belongs to the 22.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced H. R. 6175 for the purpose of clarifying the law as to the right of individuals to deduct expenses incurred in the protection of the property and the production of their taxable income.

Up to February 1941, this subject matter was handled by a Treasury regulation as follows:

> The ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year with respect to the management, protection, and conservation of properties producing taxable income are deductible from gross income.

On the date indicated, the so-called Higgins case upset this Treasury regulation and held substantially that the deduction of expenses could only be had as against the business in which the individual is engaged. A majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee, during the consideration of the 1941 Revenue Act, were in favor of some provision to correct the Higgins decision. This is also true of the Senate Finance Committee, but it was deemed unwise to add administrative provisions to the revenue bill, since at that time an administrative tax bill was contemplated to begin about November 1.

Since the year is nearly gone and we will not be able to get into an administrative tax bill before the first of the year, and since many tax returns are held up pending legislation, besides the possibility that a general bill might not be in force by March 15's return time, it seemed wise to me to introduce a separate resolution on the subject.

The late Senator Adams attempted to cover the measure by an amendment on the floor of the Senate, which was included in the Senate bill, but it was generally recognized that this amendment was not satisfactory.

Therefore, when the conferees met, this amendment (No. 41) was eliminated and the conference report to accompany H. R. 5417, dated September 15, 1941, included the following pertinent statement on page 12:

> The conferees have deferred action on the merits of this amendment with the understanding that it will be considered in a later bill dealing with administrative matters. They were advised by the Treasury Department that wherever possible, final decision by the Bureau of Internal Revenue on issues arising under the *Higgins* v. *Smith* decision would be deferred pending such later legislation. The Senate recedes.

The Treasury has lived up to its promise and in all parts of the country, tax returns, many of them covering four or five years, are being held open awaiting such legislation.

As I have said, it may be doubtful that the administrative tax bill may be ready by March 15; so taxpayers should have the benefit for the 1941 returns.

Senator Adams, on the floor of the Senate, repeated testimony which was given before the committee, namely: That even gambling houses in Nevada and some other States are permitted to deduct rent, stenographic expense, clerical hire, legal advice, auditing fees, safety vault rent, and special advisory expenses; whereas, a widow who may be forced to incur some such of these expenses, as for instance, hiring assistance, for the purpose of protecting her capital—her sole source of income—is not permitted to deduct any of them.

Thousands of cases in every section of the country are being held up because of the promise which the Treasury made to the conferees, as quoted above. It is important to the taxpayers that these cases be closed, it is important to the Treasury that they be closed and by keeping them open, large additional expenses are being incurred, by both the taxpayers and the Government.

In 1938, the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee recommended specific legislation for the clarification of this subject matter. This recommendation was not rejected. It was postponed for further study. If it had been enacted, the difficulty would not now present itself.

Many, I think all, of the States have similar provisions in their income tax laws and it has worked equitably.

I know of no other proposal which was a potential part of the administrative tax bill which has the recommendation of the Treasury, and the support of both of the tax committees in the Congress, as well as Mr. Stam's staff of the joint committee on internal revenue. Consequently, since the matter is substantially noncontroversial and is not intermingled with controversial legislation, I believe in the interest of the taxpayers, as well as orderly procedure in the Treasury with reference to tax returns, that this resolution should have no opposition and should be quickly adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I will not use one-fifth of that time. All I sought recognition for was to express my appreciation and that of the citizens of my State to the committee for having included in this appropriation bill the item for the construction of absolutely necessary transmission lines so that we may have the advantage of the power to be generated at the Shasta Dam in connection with the Central Valley water project. I also wanted to thank and compliment the Appropriations Committee on what I consider to be a matter of basic justice which they have done in this bill, and I refer to the inclusion in the bill of an item repealing action taken by the House on a previous occasion specifically denying David Lasser an opportunity to employment in the Government. It is today more than ever important that we join together with all men, whether our particular ideas agree with theirs or not, who are ready to play the game and who if they cannot have their way will still abide by the rules of democratic procedure and democratic government. To confuse men like that with those who are, indeed, agents of foreign governments and foreign dictatorships is a tremendous mistake. This man, as a matter of fact, has been represented in a report of the Dies committee as one who led the anti-Communist group out of the Workers' Alliance and who has been one of their most effective opponents through the years. I therefore compliment the Appropriations Committee on what they have done in this bill in rectifying what I am positive was an act of injustice on the part of the House before.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the realm of foreign policy and the national defense, the responsibility for initiative, under our constitutional system, is upon the President of the United States. The responsibility for evaluating such policies and measures rests, under our constitutional system of checks and balances, upon the Congress.

It is the function and the duty of the Congress, as an independent, coordinate branch of the Government, to discharge its responsibilities fully in the interest of the welfare of the whole Nation. Only in this way can we have responsible government. That this is the constructive task of the Congress was well recognized by our first World War President, Woodrow Wilson, who said:

> We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy.

The late Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, that great liberal, in clear agreement on the same point, once said:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress is confronted with another demand from the Chief Executive for enormous appropriations and contract authorizations.

It seems to me that the Congress, in exercising its constitutional function of checking, balancing, and scrutinizing the means and methods adopted for the national defense, and the expenditures of sums already appropriated, would be greatly aided by a factual review of the course of our foreign policy and the progress of our national defense.

In the factual presentation which I am about to make I am motivated by my concern for our future as a people, and by my regard for a responsibility which I believe rests heavily on the shoulders of the Congress.

In some quarters a determined effort has been made to lay at the door of the Congress the blame for our unpreparedness. I believe the time has arrived for the presentation of a clear record of events which have a bearing on the question which grips the attention of the American people today—our security and the best ways and means of assuring it.

I shall follow a question-and-answer method in presenting an array of facts which I believe is informative and illuminating.

Question. Under our system of government who is responsible for the formulation of our national-defense policy?

Answer. The President. He himself stated in a letter to Senator BARKLEY dated July 15, 1937:

> On the President falls the responsibility of recommending objectives. This is in accordance with the Constitution.

He is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Question. Whose responsibility is it to keep the Congress and the people advised of the changing requirements for national defense?

Answer. It is the President's responsibility. The Constitution directs the President to inform the Congress on the state of the Union.

Question. By what means can the President keep himself fully informed concerning naval, military, economic, and political changes throughout the world which may affect the welfare of the people of the United States?

Answer. First, through his diplomatic representatives—ambassadors, ministers, consuls—who are stationed in every country of the world; second, through his military and naval attachés located at the various diplomatic posts; third, through the world-wide intelligence service of the Army and Navy; fourth, through his commercial and agricultural attachés who are stationed at important observation points throughout the world; and fifth, through special envoys whom he can send on special missions wherever and whenever he pleases.

Question. Are these officials under the President's personal direction and supervision?

Answer. Yes. He appoints the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and all ambassadors. In fact, he refers to the Ambassadors of the United States Government, who are appointed by him with the advice and consent of the Senate, as "my ambassadors."

Question. Have these sources of information been at the disposal of the President during the last 9 years?

Answer. The President has had these sources of information at his disposal ever since he was inaugurated for his first term on March 4, 1933.

Question. Does Congress have access to the information gathered by these sources?

Answer. No; the Congress is given only as much of this information as the Chief Executive desires it to have. None of the information gathered by these governmental officers is immediately available to a Senator or a Representative.

Question. When it becomes evident the Nation's defenses should be improved, how does the President proceed to accomplish it?

Answer. He usually addresses a message to Congress asking for legislation or an appropriation of funds. The bill becomes a law when passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President. Of course, the Congress can initiate legislation. In the case of the Selective Service Act, the initiative was taken by a Senator and a Representative—not by the President.

Question. Once defense legislation is enacted who is responsible for its effective execution?

Answer. The President. He is the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. Once Congress has voted an appropriation or other defense legislation, it is the responsibility of the President to see that the money appropriated is wisely and economically spent as promptly as necessary; and that the legislation is efficiently and properly administered.

Question. By what factors is the adequacy of our national defense determined?

Answer. Whether or not our national defense is adequate at a given moment depends upon what troops, ships, and equipment are available to foreign countries and upon the foreign policy of those countries and upon our troops, ships, and equipment and upon our foreign policy. Therefore adequate defense is relative.

Question. Was our national defense adequate in 1932?

Answer. Yes. We were stronger than any potential enemy. As a matter of fact, in July of 1932 Mr. Roosevelt unqualifiedly endorsed the 1932 Democratic platform, which bitterly criticized the Republican administration for a national-defense expenditure fast approaching a billion dollars annually.

Question. When did our national defense begin to be inadequate?

Answer. The exact moment Hitler rose to power and other countries of the Axis chose the road to war rather than a peaceful and amicable solution of their problems.

Question. When did Hitler rise to power?

Answer. Hitler became Chancellor of the German Reich on January 30, 1933. On March 5, 1933, he got complete control of the Reichstag, one day after Mr. Roosevelt was first inaugurated President.

Question. When did Italy serve notice on the world she also was embarking on a role of aggression and conquest?

Answer. On the morning of October 3, 1935, Italian troops invaded Ethiopia.

Question. When did Hitler march into the Rhineland in violation of peace-treaty obligations?

Answer. On March 7, 1936.

Question. Upon assuming office what was President Roosevelt's attitude toward defense spending?

Answer. He was opposed to defense spending. In a message to Congress on May 16, 1933, he stated:

> Permanent defenses are a nonrecurring charge against governmental budgets while large armies, continually rearmed with improved offensive weapons, constitute a recurring charge. This more than any other factor today is responsible for governmental deficits and bankruptcy.

Question. Did this mean the President believed in rigid economy?

Answer. No; only that he didn't believe in spending for defense. During the 7 years, 1933–40, he spent approximately $22,000,000,000 for alleged recovery and relief. During this same period he spent only $6,553,681,000 for national defense. What is more, from March 4, 1933, to June 1940 Congress voted more than $18,000,000,000 to be expended solely at the President's discretion. Out of these funds President Roosevelt spent for defense purposes only $636,248,097.

Question. When was President Roosevelt first warned that he should start strengthening our national defense?

Answer. In his Annual Report for 1933, the President's Chief of Staff, General Douglas MacArthur, warned:

> In the obvious state of unrest prevailing throughout the world, evidences of which are plainly visible in our own country * * * the Army strength in personnel and matériel and its readiness for employment are below the danger line. I consider it of the most urgent importance to the United States that this condition be rectified without delay.

Question. Was this warning repeated?

Answer. Yes; time and again. For example, Gen. Malin Craig in his Annual Report for 1936 stated:

> We may describe—
>
> The armies of other countries—
>
> as a finished machine, ready for instant use. * * * In contrast, ours is an unfinished and unassembled machine. Some of its parts are not in existence, some exist as rough forgings, other in semifinished form. Only a few are in condition for immediate use.

And 1 year later, the Secretary of War in his Annual Report for 1937, observed that:

> The United States Army is relatively weaker compared with armies of other great countries, than it was a year ago.

Question. Did the President know that our potential enemies were building up their armies and their armaments?

Answer. Yes; for in an address at Buenos Aires on December 1, 1936, he said:

> We know * * * that vast armaments are rising on every side.

But he made no move to inaugurate a defense program. No effort was made even to keep us equal to other countries. In fact, on April 20, 1937, in a message to Congress requesting an appropriation of $1,500,000,000 for work relief he stated that:

> In proportion to national budgets the United States is spending a far smaller proportion of Government income for armaments than the nations to which I refer. That is, nations engaged in an armament race.

Question. When did the President first display any interest in the threats raised against America by the dictators abroad?

Answer. In the fall of 1937, just as the country was sliding into a depression, President Roosevelt started to take a little more interest in the foreign scene. In a speech at Chicago on October 5, 1937, he said concerning aggressions:

> When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of disease.

Question. Is there any evidence that he had thought through the implications of

his demand for the quarantine of aggressors?

Answer. No. Only one week before he made his "quarantine" speech he had pointed with pride to the fact that we weren't spending money for armaments. In a speech at Bonneville on September 28, 1937, he said:

As I look upon Bonneville Dam today, I cannot help the thought that instead of spending, as some nations do, half their national income in piling up armaments and more armaments for purposes of war, we in America are wiser in using our wealth on projects like this which will give us more wealth, better living, and greater happiness for our children.

Question. When, in the late summer of 1939, the present World War finally broke out, were our armed forces adequate and ready to meet any and all threats which might rise?

Answer. No. On December 28, 1939, the Chief of Staff, Gen. George Marshall, reported that:

The Army is probably less than 25 percent ready for immediate action.

In 1938 the President had recommended a 20-percent increase in naval tonnage to keep abreast—only to keep abreast, mind you—of increases in British, Japanese, and other navies. In January 1939, nearly a year after Hitler had taken Austria and several months after Munich, Mr. Roosevelt asked for about one half a billion dollars for an emergency defense program to be spread over 2 or more years. At that late date he opposed an air force even equal to the air forces of those foreign powers which he declared were our enemies. On January 12, 1939, Mr. Roosevelt told Congress:

No responsible officer advocates building our air forces up to the total either of planes on hand or of productive capacity equal to the forces of certain other nations.

Question. In what ways could we have been better prepared to meet emergencies when the present World War broke out in 1939?

Answer. This Nation would have been in a much stronger position if the New Deal had not vastly increased the national debt and retarded recovery by ill-timed reforms. As a matter of fact, the greatest contributions this country could have made to the discouragement of aggression during the pre-war years would have been to promote a genuine and lasting prosperity in the United States. Winston Churchill himself said in 1937:

There is one way above all others in which the United States can aid the European democracies. Let her regain and maintain her normal prosperity. A prosperous United States exerts, directly and indirectly, an immense beneficent force upon world affairs. A United States thrown into financial and economic collapse spreads evil far and wide and weakens France and England just at the time when they have most need to be strong. The quarrel in which President Roosevelt has become involved with wealth and business may produce results profoundly harmful to ideals which to him and his people are dear.

Question. When did the President finally present to Congress plans for a defense program?

Answer. May 16, 1940.

Question. What sinister and alarming events had taken place prior to this action?

Answer. The World War had been raging for 8 months; Poland had fallen; Russia was fighting on the side of the Axis Powers; Denmark and Norway had been subjugated; the Low Countries were about to fall; and the invasion of France by Germany was under way.

Question. Was Mr. Roosevelt's proposal to Congress a carefully considered, well-planned defense program?

Answer. No. It was conceived merely as a 5-year program to cost only $4,000,000,000. Since then the estimates of total defense costs have been raised to $100,000,000,000, or 25 times the original estimate. The President, however, was so positive he had provided for an adequate program that he advised Congress to go home. The New York Herald Tribune of June 5, 1940, stated:

President Roosevelt said he saw no good reason why Congress should continue in session for the duration of the emergency, as desired by the Republican Members. Sarcastically he said the situation does not require Congress to remain in session except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches.

Question. Did the defense program outlined by Mr. Roosevelt recognize the need for a draft system?

Answer. No. In a press conference on May 28, 1940, the President stated there was no thought in Government to revive the draft system. According to the New York Times of May 29, 1940:

Mr. Roosevelt underscored his observation that the present defense program was not to be compared with that of 1917. * * * There was no thought in Government today to revive the draft system, whether of men or money.

Three months later, however, he signed the Selective Service Act, initiated in the Congress providing for conscription.

Question. Did the program presented by Mr. Roosevelt on May 16, 1940, provide for a two-ocean navy?

Answer. No. Just 2 days before he laid his defense program before the Congress he said that anyone who believed in a two-ocean navy was just plain dumb. He made this statement in a press conference on May 14, 1940. According to the New York Times of May 15, 1940:

Mr. Roosevelt brushed aside as utterly stupid suggestions that developments in the European struggle and their implications in the Pacific strengthened the arguments for a two-ocean American Navy. If it ever had any merit, that theory became outmoded with the acquisition of California in 1847, he said. Such a conception of the Nation's floating defense was just plain dumb, he added.

But on July 19, 1940, or 2 months later, he signed a bill providing for a two-ocean Navy.

Question. Did the President give any indication at the time he presented his program to Congress on May 16, 1940, that he knew what an adequate defense would require in the way of personal sacrifice and productive effort?

Answer. No. In a press conference on May 28, 1940, to impress upon the Nation that it would not have to give up any luxuries for defense, he declared it was unnecessary for the women of this country to give up their cosmetics, lipsticks, and chocolate sodas as a consequence of the defense program. He also observed that there was no reason for the country to become "discomboomerated" in apprehension of what might come to pass.

Question. What goal did he outline on May 16, 1940, relative to the production and acquisition of military and naval aircraft?

Answer. He said:

I should like to see this Nation geared up to the ability to turn out at least 50,000 planes a year. Furthermore, I believe this Nation should plan at this time a program that would provide us with 50,000 military and naval planes.

Apparently he never understood what this really meant. A year and a half later we had about 12,000 airplanes in the Army and Navy combined, and a large part of these were merely training planes.

Question. What circumstances are preventing us from reaching the aircraft goal set by the President in his program of May 16, 1940?

Answer. Many circumstances have prevented us from reaching this goal. One of the most important of these is the New Deal failure to provide for an adequate aluminum supply. Over one-half the weight of an airplane is aluminum.

Question. At the time the President started talking about an air force of 50,000 planes and an annual productive capacity of 50,000 planes, had he made plans for procuring the necessary aluminum?

Answer. No. Despite the fact that the President was talking about the production of 50,000 airplanes a year by the spring of 1942, no one in the administration realized until the summer of 1941 how much aluminum would be required for that purpose. In the summer of 1940, or at about the time the President set up the 50,000-plane goal, we were producing about 360,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year. In the late fall of 1940 it was estimated we would need about 750,000,000 pounds a year. Early in 1941 it was estimated we would need about 840,000,000 pounds a year. After the passage of the Lend-Lease Act the estimate was raised another 200,000,000 pounds. By May of 1941 the estimate of aluminum needs for 1942 was raised to 1,400,000,000 pounds, and by the end of June 1941 the figure was somewhat over 1,700,000,000 pounds.

Question. Why had not steps been taken to assure an adequate supply of aluminum?

Answer. Administrative agencies were fighting among themselves, and the President did not appoint an armaments procurement administrator with sufficient authority to get the defense program moving. The Defense Commission and the Office of Production Management failed to take the necessary steps to bring about increased production by new producers. Quarrels between the Interior Department, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, and the Aluminum Co. of America retarded plant expansion. Each agency concerned wanted its own way and would not cooperate with other agencies. What is more, no one seemed to know exactly how much aluminum would be required.

Question. Has the Congress found conditions in this situation subject to stern criticism?

Answer. Yes. Late in June 1941 the Senate Committee Investigating National Defense and the House Committee on Military Affairs criticized the failure to increase aluminum production. At that time the planned aluminum production for 1942 was hardly over 800,000,000 pounds a year, about half of our then estimated requirements. Early in July 1941 the Office of Production Management announced plans for the expansion of aluminum production by more than 600,000,000 pounds in 1942; but on September 15, 1941, Mr. Jesse Jones, Administrator of the Federal Loan Agency, testified before the Senate Committee Investigating National Defense that even at that date no contracts had actually been let for the expansion of aluminum production facilities.

In a report of the Senate Committee Investigating National Defense dated November 17, 1941, it is observed:

> The committee is of the opinion that the Office of Production Management should be censured for failing to arrange for increased production of strategic materials and for failing to insist upon the utilization of existing facilities for defense production. Because of this failure we now face a much more stringent shortage of materials than was necessary.

Question. Is the country adequately prepared today to effectuate the President's foreign policy?

Answer. No! United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, stated in the November issue of Reader's Digest:

> Judged by any standard, our national-defense program to date is a failure. We are not producing sufficient war matériel to arm ourselves adequately. We are not supplying Great Britain with the armaments she needs. Worst of all, the American people are not being told the whole truth about our failure.

Furthermore, Mr. Donald Nelson, head of S. P. A. B., has testified that only 20 percent of our total production is defense production. Administration spokesmen say we must use from 50 to 60 percent of our productive capacity for defense.

Question. Are we unprepared because we have been sending our defense equipment abroad in compliance with the Lend-Lease Act?

Answer. No! On September 15, 1941, President Roosevelt gave Congress a progress report on lend-lease activities through August 31, 1941. This report shows that only $388,912,115 out of the $7,000,000,000 appropriation had been spent from March 11, 1941, when the Lend-Lease Act was passed, to August 31, 1941. This was only about 5 percent of the total.

Question. How much of the lend-lease money actually spent between March and August 1941 represented goods actually shipped abroad to lend-lease recipients?

Answer. The transfer of matériel to belligerent countries under the act amounted to $246,394,000. This was only about 3.5 percent of the money appropriated by Congress for this purpose.

Question. Does this figure represent the amount of military equipment we have sent abroad?

Answer. No. About $118,000,000 of the $246,000,000 represented agricultural products, not military equipment. Ordnance and ordnance stores amounted to $35,775,000; tanks, $28,163,000; aircraft, $6,016,145; and boats, $2,313,000. Thus the failure adequately to equip the American Army certainly cannot be blamed upon the lend-lease transfers of military equipment and munitions of only $73,000,000.

Question. Are we unprepared because Congress has refused to grant all of the President's requests for national-defense funds?

Answer. No. The record shows that in the first 7 years of the Roosevelt administration, fiscal years 1934–40, the regular and supplemental requests for the War Department and Navy Department totaled $6,528,136,486. Congress appropriated for those years a total of $6,391,174,658, which was only 2 percent less than the President requested. Thus the President cannot blame Congress for our present unpreparedness.

Question. Has the administration ever said how long it will take to reach our defense objectives?

Answer. We cannot have a two-ocean Navy until 1946 at the earliest. Beyond this it is difficult to be positive, but Donald Nelson, executive director of S. P. A. B., in an address at Chicago, October 25, 1941, has said:

> The sad fact is that we have hardly begun to realize how much more we must do than we have so far planned to do.

Question. What should the President do to speed our defense effort?

Answer. First. Take Congress and the people into his confidence and tell them the facts—which our enemies undoubtedly know—about what we have and what we need;

Second. Remove the unnecessary censorship imposed upon the American people under the guise of military secrecy;

Third. Stop the campaign of fear and get down to facts;

Fourth. Get rid of the incompetents.

Fifth. Appoint a single administrator with experienced, capable assistants to manage the defense program and delegate adequate authority to such administrator; and

Sixth. Formulate clear and consistent defense policies for labor, agriculture, and industry, together with a sound price control and fiscal policy.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, these are days when the questions before us are not simple issues of right or wrong. They are problems of policy, and completely reasonable men can—and do—differ tremendously in their views. The people of Ohio are deeply troubled by the gravity of these issues. In the last month I have received literally thousands of letters on both sides of the complex problems before Congress. I value these expressions of public opinion, even where they disagree with my own position.

I am not one of those who believe that our Nation is bitterly divided. Of course, we have sharp differences of viewpoint. Of course, we have people in our midst who are extremists in one or the other direction. Some folks cannot see anything good in England. Others are just as bitter in their attitude toward Japan, Germany, Italy, and Russia. But through all the disagreement on foreign countries the thousands of letters pouring into my office reveal one clear basis of solid agreement. All of us are for the United States first, last, and always.

When a new ship is launched the American people cheer unanimously. It does not matter whether they are Anglophiles or Anglophobes. It does not matter whether they are new dealers or stanch conservatives. We recognize that today there can be only one national policy for our Government to follow. I can express that policy simply: "It is better to be safe than sorry."

On this one issue, there is absolute unity in our country. We hope that our boys will never see the horrors of any battlefield. But we are determined to be ready if a battlefield becomes necessary. We hope that our two-ocean navy never fires a shell at a naval enemy. But we are preparing for the worst while we are praying for the best.

There can be no doubt that our American defense program is moving into a new phase of speed and production. But there is still too much money wasted. The funds our Government takes from the pockets of American taxpayers are already reaching new levels. Next March the people of our country will be paying out more money in taxes than we have ever paid before in the history of our Nation. I believe that we have the right to demand that every cent of this hard-earned money be spent intelligently and carefully. Not all of it is being spent that way.

Down at Milan, Tenn., Uncle Sam is building the Wolf Creek shell-loading plant. When it is done, if it ever does get done, we shall have a very substantial addition to our ammunition manufacturing facilities. Meanwhile, the job seems to be costing a pretty penny.

Original plans called for an expenditure of $20,000,000. To date, we have already paid out $51,000,000 and the work is still incomplete. Perhaps you wonder how the cost sheet got so far out of hand. No one has probed far enough into the facts and figures just yet to present the complete picture, but we have already discovered some of the sad truth.

The Truman investigating committee appointed by the Senate to check into defense spending is still taking testimony. Senator TRUMAN, a Missouri Democrat, has already delivered his opinion that the conditions revealed are shocking. Senator MEAD, a New York follower of the New Deal, calls it a "sordid story."

Among the interesting items brought out in the evidence are these. Before Maj. Paul Brewer, constructing quartermaster, was transferred from the job, he managed to do his family at least a bit of good. The major's father, 71 years old, was on the pay roll at $40 a week as "general foreman in charge of water barrels." The chief timekeeper had his own father on the pay roll at 65 cents per hour in the "rubber boot department,"

and on his own admission, all his father did "was kill flies." The chief auditor on the job told the committee that Major Brewer indulged in the pleasant pastime of placing his own appointees on the contractors' pay roll because "they were paid salaries the Government would not tolerate." Of course, the Government paid all these salaries right through the nose when all the bills were in.

These conditions are unfortunately far from isolated episodes in the tale of our defense. They parallel the situation uncovered by Republican Congressman ENGEL, of Michigan, early in 1941, in his personal investigation of Army camps. Wasteful expenditures in the form of unnecessary salaries, peak material prices, and extras have been the rule rather than the exception throughout our defense program. Patriotism and a willingness to sacrifice personal gain in the common interest of the entire Nation have been shockingly absent. It is high time to end these intolerable abuses.

One of the ways to end some of these abuses is to crack down on so-called influential people. There is a bill pending in Congress which would prevent men who were associated with the Government from appearing before Federal agencies for 2 years after they have left the Government pay roll. This is a pretty drastic proposal, but the evidence shows that drastic steps are necessary. You all remember Tommy Corcoran. A few months ago he was very much in the news as a No. 1 White House favorite. Mr. Corcoran is no longer with the Government. But he has been hiring himself out to private industry in the negotiation of contracts with Federal agencies. His success as special counsel in this business has been remarkable, to put it mildly. Now, there may be nothing whatever wrong with Tommy the Cork's activities. The American people just do not like it. We never have liked this kind of business, because we know that it lends itself to a good deal of old-fashioned behind-the-scenes phenagling. We know that high-priced lawyers on the scene mean that somebody is going to pay their fees; and when it comes to Government contracts, we have a shrewd suspicion that the somebody in question may prove to be ourselves, the taxpayers of America.

This is the time to tighten up on defense spending. We have started to produce in large quantities. We are getting into stride. The quicker we pump out the water and waste, the better our record is going to be.

Let me cite another illustration of the same general problem. We know that every organization must have a certain amount of delay and inefficiency. Our job is to reduce these things to their lowest possible point. Red tape is always easy to attack. But we recognize that sometimes the red tape manages to catch mistakes of fact and mistakes of judgment. What I have in mind is something much more vicious.

A few weeks ago a trade-association executive went to Washington with an idea for saving several million dollars. From his own intimate knowledge of the particular business with which he was associated and from his knowledge of our experience in the last war, he had developed a plan to supply Army materials without any sacrifice of speed or military efficiency. To present his arguments most effectively, he had spent a good deal of his time and energy on facts and figures.

When he arrived in Washington, our hero was full of ideals and enthusiasm. He was ready to offer a service to his country free of all selfish motives, absolutely unqualified by any suggestion of those private profits. After 8 days of futile effort, he finally received an audience with a colonel in the War Department. The colonel was forced to listen, because he could find no one to whom to transfer his visitor.

At the end of his interview, the colonel gave him the frankest answer he had received in his pilgrimage. Here was the gist of it: "What you have to say seems sound and sensible. But if you think that the folks here in Washington are interested in any idea to save money, you may just as well close up shop and go home. Nobody here is interested in saving money in defense expenditures or in nondefense expenditures."

At least the colonel was truthful. Higher-ups in Washington would undoubtedly deny that economy is a forgotten work in our National Capital. They would say that Congress must take the lead in initiating any economy legislation. It is a simple technique. Anything unpopular must be undertaken by Congress. Anything popular, anything involving the hiring of more people for the pay roll is the function of the Executive.

Meanwhile, it is no wonder that our defense program continues to be snarled in red tape and that our national debt mounts higher and higher with every passing minute. You may be interested in knowing just how high that debt really is.

Of course, we are spending at so tremendous a rate that the debt has gone up a few millions since I started talking to you. But a few minutes before I started our national debt was in the neighborhood of $55,000,000,000. We have grown so accustomed to these big numbers that nobody bats an eyelash when you hear them. It may help our understanding to recall that this figure is just twice as much as the highest national debt we ever reached in the days of the World War. We are not fighting on any large scale today. If we get into this war one of the first things Congress will be asked to do will be to lift the limit on Government borrowing. A few months ago we raised the ceiling to $65,000,000,000.

Let us not kid ourselves into believing what the new dealers are trying to tell us. They say that we owe this money to ourselves, so it does not make any difference. But it does make a difference, because the plain and simple truth is that the small taxpayers will find that they owe this debt to those who were able to buy Government securities. And it will give you very little comfort to remember that, after all, we are just one big family in the last analysis. Some day, sooner or later, we are going to pay off these debts, and when we do there will be no doubt as to who pays.

All these problems are in the background of congressional discussions these days. We are facing serious labor issues. We are dealing with difficult questions of price control. I am certain that these matters can be solved by men of good will, acting together reasonably and earnestly. The quicker they are solved the better will we be prepared for any possible emergency.

I am convinced that our basic national unity has not been impaired by recent events. This is still the greatest Nation on the face of the globe. We are determined to keep it free and powerful. Let us start now to emphasize our agreements rather than our disagreements. Let us show that here in America, no matter what may happen across the seas, we are ready to meet any problem, and any emergency, domestic or foreign.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, over 2½ years ago the Republican minority of the House of Representatives, through its Committee on National Debt Policy, had the foresight to point out:

> Also of vital importance is the question of financial preparedness, in event of emergency. The spending plan assumes that public indebtedness will be reduced during the period of prosperity that follows spending, but what happens if prosperity does not follow? In that event, or if a sufficient period of prosperity does not ensue during which the debt can be appreciably reduced, we will enter the next emergency, perhaps war, with the odds heavily against us. Wars are costly and should we enter a great war with an impaired credit there would be the threat of inflation to contend with from the very start. Thus a sound fiscal policy is necessary for an adequate national defense. (Report of the Special Committee on National Debt Policy, May 16, 1939, p. 10.)

And a year and a half ago through the Committee on National Defense, the minority declared:

> Let us remember, therefore, that should we be drawn into a war of first magnitude we should have to start with a debt of at least forty-four billions, probably more, and then finance the effort on top of that debt. It is a prospect which must concern every thoughtful person in the land.
>
> * * * * *
>
> No one at this time can foresee accurately the measures we might have to employ were we drawn into war but all of us can visualize the danger of our institutions were we forced to resort to inflation, to confiscation, and ultimate repudiation. Could our free institutions survive such a strain? Similar institutions have perished in other lands within our time. Driven to such expedients it might well be that we shall have failed actually in our defense.
>
> Such a possibility should convince us that the most serious weakness in the armor of our national defense today is the existence of a national debt of $44,000,000,000. There it stands, towering, ominous. Much as we should like to, we cannot consider our problem solely in terms of soldiers and sailors, of divisions and battleships. (The National Defense, February 14, 1939, and March 12, 1940, p. 6.)

The timeliness of our warnings should now be evident to all. We are now actually in the midst of a national-defense emergency with a budget badly out of

balance and with a tremendous public debt that has been increased more than 150 percent by the New Deal. The New deal has been following a policy of deficit financing that potentially is inflationary. What is worse, the New Deal is continuing to finance the defense program in the same inflationary way.

The New Deal has built up a tremendously high public debt that is really a mortgage on each and every one of us, and consequently a threat to our security. How much is this Federal-debt mortgage? On November 17, 1941, it was $54,460,335,707. This was $21,000,000,000 more than the total value of all farm land and buildings as reported in the farm census of 1940. If all of the property in all of the States west of the Mississippi River could be sold today for its assessed value, as last reported by the Census Bureau, the total amount realized would not pay off all of this debt mortgage.

The interest on the Federal-debt mortgage in 1941 will be about $1,275,000,000, or more than $475,000,000 in excess of the total ordinary expenditures of the Federal Government in any fiscal year prior to 1916. The interest charge in 1942 will be greater than the total public debt at the beginning of the last World War.

The Federal debt has increased rapidly in the last 7 years. On March 4, 1933, the total was approximately $20,200,000,000. This was a per capita Federal debt mortgage of about $163. On November 17, 1941, the per capita debt was about $415. In the first 8 years of the present administration the per capita debt has increased by 154 percent. This is the most rapid increase of debt in a like period during peacetime that has ever occurred in our own country or in any other country not afflicted by an uncontrolled inflation.

This is not all. In addition to the direct Federal debt of $54,460,335,707 the Government has guaranteed bonds and notes issued by its corporations and credit agencies to a total of $6,978,885,000. Under existing laws these corporations are authorized to issue a total of $14,900,000,000, which will carry this guarantee, thus leaving an unissued balance of $8,000,000,000. None of these obligations are included within the statutory debt limit of $65,000,000,000.

There is yet another chapter in the story of the public debt. To the debt must be added the State and local debt. On June 30, 1932, the State and local debt was $19,576,000,000, representing a per capita of $155.78. As of June 30, 1940—the last date for which a figure is available—the total was $19,891,000,000, equal to a per capita of $152. Thus, in 1932, the total public debt represented a burden on each man, woman, and child of $312.42, but in 1941 this burden was $543. The per capita increase has been caused entirely by the growth of the Federal debt.

This debt is a first mortgage against every citizen. All of us actually pay taxes, whether we realize it or not. Every baby born in the United States begins life with a public-debt charge of $543 against his future earnings. Every couple that marries starts housekeeping with a public debt of $1,086 in addition to what they may owe on the furniture. Every family with three children is carrying the equivalent of a mortgage of $2,715, or enough to pay for a modest home.

The great increase of the Federal debt, as against a stationary State and local debt, led to the following comment in the Budget message for the fiscal year 1941:

> Consequently, between June 1933 and June 1940 the Federal Government will have made available for local relief, work relief, and public works the sum of $17,000,000,000. In addition, during this same period the Federal Government increased its grants for public roads by $1,000,000,000 over the preceding 7 years.
>
> By reason of these Federal expenditures it became possible for the States and municipalities during this period to rehabilitate their credit, and even to reduce slightly their aggregate indebtedness. If they had continued to discharge the responsibilities that were formerly theirs to a degree commensurate with the Federal Government's effort, the aggregate indebtedness of our States and municipalities would have been increased by not less than $18,000,000,000 and their taxes would have been enormously increased. (Message transmitting the Budget, January 3, 1940, p. 16.)

What this passage says is that if the States and cities had spent as much as the Federal Government did they would have had to borrow as much to do it. This is a statement of the obvious. But there is no reason to suppose that the States would have spent that much. Later it will be shown that the Federal spending has been motivated by other considerations than the relief of need. Many States might have escaped these influences. They would not have engaged in foolish and costly experimentation. They would not have destroyed confidence by tinkering with the economic system, hence they would not have continued to create the problem they were seeking to solve. They would have handled the bona fide relief job for less than it has cost. It cannot be correctly said, therefore, that it was necessary for the Federal Government to borrow and spend $18,000,000,000, up to that time, in order to save the States and cities from having to borrow that much.

Obviously the reason for this rapid increase of the Federal debt has been expenditure far in excess of revenue. While tax levies have increased, the expenditures have increased still more. The record since March 1, 1933, has been as follows:

[In millions]

Period	Revenues	Expenditures	Deficit
Mar. 1–June 1933	$885.1	$1,307.0	$421.9
Fiscal year:			
1934	3,115.6	6,011.0	2,895.4
1935	3,800.5	7,009.9	3,209.4
1936	4,116.0	8,665.6	4,549.6
1937	5,293.8	8,442.4	3,148.6
1938	6,241.7	7,625.8	1,364.1
1939	5,667.8	9,210.1	3,542.3
1940	5,387.1	8,998.1	3,611.0
1941	7,607.0	12,711.0	5,104.0
Total deficit, Mar. 1, 1933–June 30, 1941			27,846.3
Increase of gross debt (same dates)			28,761.0

Source: Compiled from the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Daily Statements.

The public debt of the Federal Government is bound to increase very rapidly during the next few years because of the defense program. We have appropriated directly or made available through contract authorizations $63,000,000,000 during the past year and a half. In 1941 we spent $6,000,000,000 on national defense, and this year it is estimated we will spend $18,000,000,000 for defense. Some administration spokesmen estimate we will spend $27,000,000,000 for such purposes in 1943. Additional appropriation requests for national defense are already in process. It is safe to say that before the present defense emergency is over the direct public debt of the Federal Government will be in excess of $100,000,000,000. Obviously the present debt limit of $65,000,000,000 will have to be raised.

Why is it that a tremendous debt of over $54,000,000,000 was built up by the New Deal? In President Roosevelt's Budget message of January 3, 1941, he says:

> For more than 25 years the world have been in a state of political turmoil and its economies have been out of balance. Thisc world condition is reflected in unbalanced budgets in all countries. Here, the first World War, the war against the depression, the present defense program, all resulted in large additions in the Federal debt.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It should be borne in mind that our national debt results from war and the economic upheavals following war. These conditions are not of our own making. They have been forced upon us (p. 13).

Thus, he distinctly says that the increase in the debt that occurred in his administrations was a consequence of the depression. But let us look at several of his other recent Budget messages and it will be apparent that not all of the deficits were a consequence of alleviating the immediate consequences of the depression.

From these messages it will appear that these large deficits have not all been accumulated to discharge adequately the Government's obligation to provide for those in need. They have been made partly in response to a theory, accepted and approved by the administration, that it is a function of government to direct the course of the national economy by its spending. This theory was explained by the President in his Budget message for the fiscal year 1940, transmitted to Congress on January 3, 1939. After introducing a highly questionable distinction of his own invention between ordinary and extraordinary expenditures, he said of the latter:

> Beyond these questions of ordinary expenditures are those which relate to the nonoperating or unusual costs of Government and involve extraordinary expenditures that deal more particularly with the relationship between fiscal policy and the economic welfare of the country. These questions concern Government loans, capital outlays, and relief of need. Expenditures made under these heads are of such a flexible character as to provide, through their contraction or expansion, a partial offset for the rise or fall of national income (p. 9).

The spending policy which has produced an enormous expansion of the Federal bureaucracy and has added almost $35,000,000,000 to the debt in 7 years should be examined. The President's defense of the policy has been that

a large part of it has gone into investments, or into permanent additions to the national wealth.

Let us all fix that fact in our minds so that there shall be no doubt about it and so that we may have a clear and intelligent idea of what we have been doing. We have not been throwing the taxpayers' money out of the window or into the sea. We have been buying real values with it. Let me repeat, the greater part of the budgetary deficits that have been incurred have gone for permanent, tangible additions to our national wealth (p. 10).

The insidious aspect of this line of argument is its implication that the roads, buildings, and other improvements are permanent, and hence that there need be no concern about retiring the debt created to finance them. But experience tells us that while these improvements are durable they are not permanent. They will wear out or become obsolete. In order to justify the creation of debt to finance them, it is necessary to pay off that debt within the useful life of the improvements. If this is not done, the expenditures for replacement, insofar as they are financed by new loans, will lead to debt pyramiding. It will be a case of buying new horses before the dead horses are paid for. The farmer will go broke by such financing methods. How can the Nation prosper by engaging in a practice which everyone would admit to be unsound in his own case?

A different line of defense of the policy of deficit financing was attempted in the 1941 Budget message, delivered to Congress on January 3, 1940:

Those who state baldly that the Government's debt is $42,000,000,000—and stop there—are stating a half truth calculated to make our people apprehensive. For one thing, it would clarify the public mind if it were pointed out that of the $42,000,000,000 figure the amount incurred between June 30, 1933, and December 31, 1939, is just over $19,000,000,000. For another thing, it would be more honest and more honorable for them to say that while one line in the National Budget shows a national debt of $42,000,000,000, other lines indicate that the Government has $7,000,000,000 of cash, gold available for debt redemption, and proprietary interest in Government corporations, which reduces the net debt to $35,000,000,000

In addition, of course, there are the billions of dollars' worth of durable, tangible assets constructed or purchased by the Government that are a real offset to the debt, though never listed as such (p. 15).

In the budget message of January 3, 1941, there is a new attitude toward the debt that is very, very startling. President Roosevelt directly implies that the public debt will never be reduced, that it will always be with us. He said the only thing to be concerned about relative to the public debt is the ability of the national economy to pay the interest charges on the debt. His exact words are:

I understand the concern of those who are disturbed by the growth of the Federal debt. Yet the main fiscal problem is not the rise of the debt, but the rise of debt charges in relation to the development of our resources.

The fight for recovery raised national income by more than $30,000,000,000 above the depression depth. In the same period the total annual Federal interest charges increased by $400,000,000. Even if these interest charges increase, they can scarcely present a serious fiscal problem so long as a high level of national income can be maintained.

Investors are fully aware of this fact. The bonds of the United States Government are the safest securities in the world because they are backed by the best asset in the world—the productive capacity of the American people. Our tax burden is still moderate compared to that of most other countries (p. 13).

Thus, since he does not contemplate the repayment of the debt, but only the payment of interest charges, the debt will continue to increase and never decrease. Interest will be paid on it until that becomes a very sizable item, and then to relieve the Government of that charge there will come repudiation directly or through inflation.

The President does not seem to want to contemplate real steps of an adequate nature to meet the problem of the deficit. One of the best methods of reducing the deficit is through the reduction of nondefense expenditures.

In 1941 nondefense expenditures were $6,631,000,000 and in 1942 the estimate is $6,501,000,000. Outside of relief expenditures—$1,421,000,000 in 1941 and $965,000,000 in 1942—there was an actual increase in such expenditures. The President has not been willing to contemplate any reductions in nondefense spending. When the Senate Finance Committee asked the Bureau of the Budget how at least a billion dollars a year could be saved through reducing nondefense spending, the Bureau gave to the committee only excuses why it could not be done.

Another method of reducing the deficit is to increase taxes. Taxes have grown in the last few years, in fact they will have more than doubled from 1940 to 1942; but expenditures have increased even faster. Net receipts increased from $5,387,000,000 in 1940 to $11,998,000,000 estimated for 1942; but in this period expenditures are increasing from $8,998,000,000 to $24,501,000,000. The general theory of the administration up to early in 1941 has been that the defense program could be financed without any real increase in taxes. This, of course, was based on the premise we could have both more guns and more butter. This in turn was premised on the belief that there was no limit on our capacity to produce. On this theory our real national income would increase greatly, due to the defense program and existing tax rates applied thereto would pay for defense. But as is clearly evident there are definite limits to our ability to increase production because of scarce materials. Goods available for consumption will be less actually than the available purchasing power. Secretary Morgenthau has estimated that in the calendar year 1942 national income available for consumption in the hands of the people will be about $80,000,000,000, but the economy will only produce about $70,000,000,000 of goods and services at the present level of prices to be consumed by the holders of this income. This $10,000,000,000 of income will be used to bid up the price of all goods and services available. The Treasurer insists that this must be taxed away if we are not to have run-away inflation; that most of this additional purchasing power is not in the hands of those with large incomes. It is proposed to tax the weekly earnings of manufacturing and industrial workers, which earnings, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have increased 29 percent in a year and a half. The Treasury proposes to stop inflation by taxing away these earnings. This proposed new tax is not a surprise to the public, because already 14 tax bills have been enacted since 1933 and another is already prepared for submission to the Ways and Means Committee. The yield in revenue from these 14 tax bills and the fifteenth now on the way will be mere chicken feed in financing the Roosevelt war which contemplates an army of 10,000,000 men.

Mr. Chairman, I shall here at this point insert the estimated revenues and expenditures:

Estimated revenues and expenditures

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Revenues	Expenditures	Deficit	National increase
1941	0½	20	10½	90
1942	16	37	21	100

It is estimated that in the calendar year 1942 the people will have from seventy-five to eighty billions to spend, for which there will be but seventy billions of goods available. This, the Treasury said, will cause inflation. Something should be done, the Treasury adds, to "skim off" this excess purchasing power.

The method of doing this, according to one proposal of the Treasury, is:

First. Impose a tax of 15 percent on net income, to be collected at the source by deduction from pay rolls. The usual exemption of $750 for single persons, $1,500 for married persons, and $400 for each dependent, to be continued for purposes of this tax. Returns to be made by employers. Self-employed persons to make returns quarterly. The 15 percent tax to be allowed as a deduction from net income in computing the regular income tax, which would be collected as usual.

Yield, $2,800,000,000.

Second. Increase pay-roll tax for old-age insurance from 1 percent each on employers and employees, to 2 percent on each. This actually amounts only to moving up the effective date of this change, which would otherwise automatically occur under existing law on January 1, 1943.

Yield, $900,000,000.

Third. Impose new 1 percent pay-roll tax on employees for purposes of unemployment insurance. Present 3-percent tax on employers retained without change.

Yield, $450,000,000.

Also extend coverage to those not now covered.

Yield, $550,000,000.

Gross yield of the new proposals, $4,700,000,000.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to read into the RECORD two letters:

NOVEMBER 10, 1941

HON. CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: I have before me what purports to be a copy of a treaty of conciliation between Germany and the United States, signed at Washington May 5, 1928; ratifications exchanged February 25, 1929.

Article I of that treaty of conciliation is as follows:

"Any disputes arising between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Germany, of whatever nature they may be, shall, when ordinary diplomatic proceedings have failed and the high contracting parties do not have recourse to adjudication by a competent tribunal, be submitted for investigation and report to a permanent international commission constituted in the manner prescribed in the next succeeding article; *'the high contracting parties agree not to declare war or begin hostilities during such investigation and before the report is submitted.'*"

The last sentence, which I have italicized, is the sentence concerning which I would appreciate some information. My questions are as follows:

1. Have any disputes arising between the Government of the United States and the Government of Germany been submitted for investigation and report to a permanent international commission constituted in the manner herein provided?

2. Has such tribunal or commission made any adjudication?

3. Has any such tribunal or commission made an investigation and filed a report?

4. If such a report has been filed, where may it be found?

5. Has a year's written notice been given by either of the contracting parties to terminate this treaty as set forth in article 4?

In view of the discussion which will soon take place on the floor of the House of Representatives, an early reply will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HARRY SAUTHOFF.

And this is the answer to my letter:

DECEMBER 1, 1941.

The Honorable HARRY SAUTHOFF,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SAUTHOFF: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 10, 1941, relative to the Treaty of Conciliation between the United States and Germany signed at Washington on May 5, 1928.

In reply to the first question set forth in your letter, I may advise you that the records of this Department would indicate that no disputes arising between the Government of the United States and the Government of Germany have been submitted for investigation and report to a permanent international commission established in the manner provided in the treaty. I believe this information makes unnecessary any reply to questions 2, 3, and 4 of your letter.

With respect to question 5, no notice of termination of this treaty has been given by either of the contracting parties.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

The Clerk read the bill, down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOPER] having assumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, 1942 (H. R. 6159), had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon certain quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order to address the House at the conclusion of the legislative program today on the subject of small business, but due to the fact that I had an opportunity to make my remarks while we were considering House Resolution 294, I ask unanimous consent that my special order be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCINTYRE, indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 5, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, December 5, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, December 9, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1115. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the final portions of the Commission's report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 246); was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of C. M. Sherrod; with amendment (Rept. No. 1472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward; with amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4665. A bill for the relief of Harry Kahn; with amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4999. A bill for the relief of the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., successor to the Columbia Barge Co., organized January 12, 1933; with amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 6170. A bill to amend sections 3 and 15A of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCGEHEE:

H. R. 6171. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 6172. A bill to prevent suspension of the operation of Government-owned defense plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 6173. A bill to provide pensions at wartime rates for certain persons, and the dependents of certain persons, who serve in the armed forces of the United States during the present unlimited national emergency; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 6174. A bill providing for the issuance of special stamps for use during the present national emergency, free of charge, by persons on active duty in the

military services of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 6175. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as Good Neighbor Day, for the purposes of setting an example in neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow, leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 376. Resolution requesting the President and the Secretary of State to negotiate for the purchase of a part of the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. Res. 377. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6176. A bill for the relief of Shirley Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 6177. A bill for the relief of Owen Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6178. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 6179. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. VanNoy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 6180. A bill for the relief of George J. Cataldo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2117. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the office of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, Tuesday, November 25, 1941, wherein they record their opposition to legislation to exempt from State and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property for use in performing defense contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2118. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution adopted by Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., opposing tax exemption of property or transactions connected with national defense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2119. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Coordinating Committee for Women's Auxiliaries, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2120. By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Memorial of the City Council of the City of Chicago, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to increase the minimum rate of pay of those enrolled in the Army during this emergency to $42 per month and also to extend to them the privilege of free mail service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2121. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Silverlake Young Democrats of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting that Senate bill 1987 be not passed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2122. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Camp 79, O. O. of A., Barrington, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who art our peace, grant that we may find rest unto our souls. In a day with fightings within and fears without and of conflicts which no mortal can escape, come with spiritual power; at times Thou dost seem far away, deaf to our cryings and dumb to our needs. With ampler powers and for larger service do Thou fit us in a better world. We pray that we may be saved by our sufferings and sacrifices for those joys which our enfranchised spirits shall share. All that we crowd into our day's ambition, wealth, and purpose may they all be Thine for we are God's; they are but broken lights of Thee and Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

O Master, come with Thy blessed quietness and as we pray with our trembling faith, may we find the shifting sands beneath our feet as firm and as enduring as the Rock of Ages. With bated breath and whispering humbleness we ask for help and strength; grant that righteous conviction may ever struggle toward utterance as we attempt to realize in common everyday living the brotherhood of man; where cross the crowded ways of life. Praise be Thine, O Lord, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees: Education, Flood Control, Mines and Mining, and Pensions.

Sincerely yours,

WM. J. FITZGERALD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ADMITTING ANANTA KHITTASANGKA TO THE ACADEMY AT WEST POINT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 251, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 251, authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Ananta Khittasangka to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that Ananta Khittasangka shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction, and that said Ananta Khittasangka shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or in conduct and so recommended by the academic board: *Provided further*, That in the case of said Ananta Khittasangka, the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended, and the provisions of law relating to age limitations upon the admission of candidates to the academy shall not apply.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What are we doing with Thailand? What does this bill do? Will the gentleman please explain this?

Mr. MAY. We are not doing anything with Thailand in this resolution, but the resolution proposes to authorize the Secretary of War to admit Ananta Khittasangka into the West Point Military Academy. This young man is the son of the Prime Minister of Thailand. This is to be done without expense to the United States. He is already in this country and is a student at the Purdue University, at Lafayette, Ind. He is to be subject to all of the rules and regulations of the academy and to pass the necessary physical and mental examinations and all other requirements. If at any time he is disobedient to any rule or regulation, he shall be dismissed from the academy.

Mr. MICHENER. Will this proposed legislation establish a precedent?

Mr. MAY. No; it will not. The Secretary of War has approved this.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this create a new precedent or is this the custom? Is this appointment presumed to be a compliment, is it a good neighborly act, or merely an act of friendship? What is the motive prompting the proposal?

Mr. MAY. I had started to explain to the gentleman when he asked if it was a precedent, by saying that the Secretary of State points out here four or five different similar instances, and refers to the act and the date and the terms of it when others have been admitted. It is stated in a letter or report from the Thailand consul here in Washington, and by the Secretary of State, that it will help to bring about better relations with this country and the present situation in Thailand. It is more complimentary than anything else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman assure us, if this young man goes there, that he will not learn some of these vital military secrets that are a necessary part of the national defense and then go back and tell somebody over there?

Mr. MAY. Oh, the gentleman knows that the academy board at West Point is made up of Army officers and they will not permit military secrets to be given to military students.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman certain that the entrance of this young man into the academy will not cost us anything. That cannot be possible.

Mr. MAY. It is so provided in the resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Notwithstanding the resolution, does the gentleman really think that we are going to get out of it without paying for it?

Mr. MAY. I think the resolution is the law in the case, and that the Secretary of War will not violate the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, is not this the first instance that we have ever done anything for a foreigner without it costing us anything?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What amount will be paid to this Government for this education at West Point?

Mr. MAY. I do not know whether anything will be paid to the Government or not, but it is expressly provided in this resolution in the proviso on the first page that no expense will be caused to the United States thereby.

Mr. RICH. The point I want to make is, Will this come under the terms of the lease-lend bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to temporarily withdraw his request, because the Chair understood this was a unanimous report from the committee and there would be no contest about the matter.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I temporarily withdraw the request, but I wish to say it is a unanimous report of the House Military Affairs Committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of all business on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address made by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NO SEPARATE AIR CORPS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], who has just returned from England. I think the House would be interested in a statement he has made on "No separate Air Corps."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

As a result of my visit to the British Isles and my conversation with high commanders of the British Army and with our own military observers, who have seen first-hand the warfare in England, on the Continent, and in Russia, I am convinced that the idea of an Air Corps separate from our Army and our Navy is a mistake which should never be adopted by our country. It has been the lack of adequate air support for the ground army that has been primarily responsible for the tactical failures of the British to date. It is largely because of the very close support and cooperation between the air arm and the ground arms that the Russians have taken such a toll of German tanks and have been able to make such a valiant fight.

While it is realized that the fighter command of the independent Royal Air Force have done a superb job in preventing the Germans from gaining air superiority over the British Isles, we must remember that the problem of the British Isles, which, after all, is small in area, is not the same problem as in the United States or in Russia; and, furthermore, the Royal Air Force, in the defense of the British Isles had the support of the antiaircraft artillery, which is a part of the ground forces. Even so, I am informed that had England not started the war with a separate air force it would never have one now; and they cannot understand why anyone in our country is advocating such a basic change in our present Army organization when we are in the midst of a national emergency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by a young lady from Green Bay, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial and also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a news item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman from New York are granted.

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without any animosity at all, but in sorrow and with some regret, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the editorial writers in the great newspapers which have been clamoring for the last 5 or 6 weeks for labor legislation now in their editorials characterize the bill which was passed last week as being drastic antilabor legislation.

It would be a fine thing if some of those editorial writers who have been pounding us on the back for labor legislation would now display a little sincerity and knowledge of what we did and tell us wherein the Smith bill is drastic antilabor legislation. Let them point out to us what provision is un-American. Let them tell us now whether or not they favor violence in strikes, whether they favor jurisdictional and sympathetic strikes, whether they favor the collection of a fee for the sale of work permits to the men before they are permitted to work—evils which they have been writing about for the last 2 or 3 years. Let them be honest with the House and point out wherein they claim we have erred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to recapitulate on next week's work: On Monday there will be the extension of the Soil Conservation Act. I was hoping that it would be brought up today, but it will be brought up Monday.

I understand there are two noncontroversial bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

On Tuesday will be the Private Calendar; not the omnibus bills, but the call of the Private Calendar.

If a rule is reported out of the Rules Committee, on Wednesday we will take up the national-defense housing bill. I have nothing further to announce to the House for next week.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. FULMER. If we have time this afternoon, it would be satisfactory to bring up the extension of the Soil Conservation Act today.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows the statement I have just made was as a result of a conference I had with the gentleman yesterday. I wanted to bring it up today. It is agreeable to me, if the appropriation bill is finished in time, to take it up this afternoon; but if not, it will come up on Monday.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman contemplate any conference report before Monday of next week from the Senate?

Mr. McCORMACK. I doubt if anything would be here before probably the latter part of next week. That is the best answer I can give the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to state that, after talking to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] yesterday, the Chair told several Members the soil-conservation bill would not come up today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the position understood, that I was anxious to have it brought up today. I had made arrangements to ask that the House meet at 11 o'clock. I had conferred with the minority leader, and as a result of the talk I had with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on

Agriculture, I deferred making that unanimous-consent request and asked that we would go over until Monday. Certainly, if the Speaker has told Members definitely that the bill would not come up until Monday, there is only one thing to do. If I had told one Member it would not come up until Monday, I would feel obligated to keep that promise, and under the circumstances I think, in view of what the Speaker has said, the bill should not come up today.

The SPEAKER. Well, the bill will not come up today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Hon. William C. Bullitt, former Ambassador to France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein two business letters I have received from Detroit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the House Committee on Agriculture relative to aiding farmers whose crops have failed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Mountain States Association in their convention in Albuquerque.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6159, the supplemental appropriation bill for the national defense, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRAVEL OF THE ARMY

For travel of the Army, $10,000,000.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 3, line 10, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order to describe the meaning of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, in the appropriations called for in this bill we are taking some very drastic steps, steps the House will remember for many years to come. I have consulted with various officials of the War Department and have asked their opinion on different items in this bill and have examined various items under which I could include furlough travel pay for the 600,000 young men who are to be able to go home on furlough this Christmas. The committee will recall when I presented the Hall bill, H. R. 5922. Not enough time has elapsed since then to enable the bill to be brought before the House on a discharge petition and, as I have had no report from the Military Affairs Committee or the War Department, I take this opportunity to present my amendment to this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will yield a little later. I have 10 minutes. I will greatly appreciate it if I may proceed.

Mr. ANDREWS. I merely wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his amendment would not be in order, the Committee on Military Affairs not having authorized the expenditure.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If I may proceed, this amendment seeks to increase by $15,000,000 the item for Army travel of $10,000,000 on page 3, line 10. The purpose of the amendment is to provide transportation home during furlough for all those who will be granted furlough by the War Department this Christmas. According to the figures which have been procured, it will run about 600,000 men. I have talked with various officials trying to get an estimate of the cost of such transportation and find the consensus is that the amount charged the United States Government in case this amendment is passed, will not be in excess of the 1¼ cents a mile the boys are now charged. For this reason I am presenting this amendment at this time and asking the House, as the last opportunity it will have to give these boys their transportation home, to consider it on a sane and wholesome basis.

The members of the committee well know that I have attempted to present the proposition on various occasions. It will be recalled that during the consideration of the draft extension bill I offered an amendment providing for transportation during furlough, but, as the amendment had not had wide discussion, it was not accepted at that time and I did not press for a record vote in the House. Since that time, however, I submit to the committee that there has been sufficient and wide discussion throughout the entire country on this proposal of paying the boys' transportation home on furlough. I dare say that at this time there is not a Member of this House who has not heard from some of the folks back home urging each and every Member to consider the feasibility of paying these boys' transportation home.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Let me say to the gentleman that if I am properly informed, when he delivered his radio address he called on the country to write all of their Congressmen about it; and in view of the fact that he has never asked the House Committee on Military Affairs for a hearing, it has not come up. He has now filed a discharge petition on the desk.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is mistaken, because I have no discharge petition on the desk. I have purposely refrained from filing one because I felt that at this time it would be appropriate to ask the House for this action. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the bill now under consideration calls upon the House to appropriate great sums of money for the national defense and for the defense of other nations which the President deems necessary to designate. According to one of the minority leaders I talked with last night, this bill provides at least a billion dollars for the President to dispose of as he sees fit. That is, for the defense of other nations he deems necessary for our defense. I propose at this time to give a small amount of that $8,000,000,000 bill which we are now considering to the boys so that they may return to their homes and their families and see their loved ones during this Christmas holiday period. During recent days in the press we have seen a great many items describing the President's plan for a widespread, deliberate program of defense of a vigilant nature which will spread over the entire world, including an expeditionary force of some 10,000,000 men, to go to the continents of Asia, Africa, and every other place throughout the world that is deemed necessary to take care of the situation. As a mother wrote me not long ago, this may be the last chance that a great many of the boys have to come home. This may be the last opportunity the House may have to go on record as being willing to pay for the transportation of these boys to their places of residence.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that I am for the idea the gentleman expresses, but when this was brought up before the Military Affairs Committee we were of

the opinion that there should be some testimony taken as to the transportation facilities, and we looked for the gentleman so that we could get this information.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If I may proceed, I will answer the gentleman in this way: I have not had the opportunity, I have not had the chance, nor has the Military Affairs Committee had the opportunity to study this proposal because of the time element; but there is no question about the fact that the mandate has been given by the people throughout the United States, and they are more than anxious to see some action taken at this time so that the boys may have their way paid home during furlough for Christmas. I submit that this is the only opportunity that we will have between now and December 25 to carry out such proposal.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to point out two or three things to the gentleman, and I am sympathetic with his idea in connection with this amendment. I must say, however, I believe it unfair in the last analysis to the veterans and to the soldiers and to their families to associate the idea of a Christmas vacation with this. It is misleading because it is not assured that 600,000 men will be returned home. Christmas leaves must be given at the convenience of the War Department and the Army. The Military Committee has asked for a report on this bill. The Budget has not yet reported on the matter. As soon as this is reported the Military Affairs Committee will act upon it. It is a gross mistake to associate the idea with a Christmas holiday, however.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. In the meantime, however, there is little time left for consideration between now and Christmas outside of the pending amendment. I submit to the House this may be the last opportunity we will have to send these boys home for a furlough. I submit that according to the War Department about 600,000 men will be allowed to go home during this furlough period, and I am simply speaking from information which I have received. It has been estimated that it would cost $30 a head. It may, but I am inclined to disagree with that statement. It may not cost more than $25 per head to send these boys home. I submit that in the event it is not more expensive than that the $15,000,000 increase which I have provided for by this amendment will be sufficient to take care of the half-million boys who will go home.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to give every consideration to my amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this close in 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a little time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, as appealing as this motion is and as emotional as the general approach is, I seriously question the advisability of our proceeding to enact such proposal into law. If I was in a military camp today and one of my buddies had a furlough to go home and I could not go, if he had all of his expenses paid, and I had to remain on duty and at some future time happened to get a furlough and did go home and then had to pay all my expenses, I would have a first-class ground for complaint. If we are to establish a policy of paying transportation home for the boys who are given a furlough, let us make it a blanket proposition applying to all and not proceed with a lot of discriminatory tactics in the manner here presented.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No one is more anxious than I am to inaugurate such a policy, but unfortunately there is a limit to the time and for that reason this is probably the last chance we will have.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I see no limit to the time whatsoever. This could be granted 15 years after the man dies in service, as we often make grants to dependents of soldiers, if he lost his life in the service. If he is given a furlough and he goes home, at some future date when the Congress sees fit and a bill is enacted into law, he may be reimbursed at so much per mile for that trip.

I have traveled many miles on expense accounts, and I have had those expense accounts paid anywhere from 3 days to 3 months after I incurred the expense, so I see no time limitation whatever on this proposition.

If the boys want to go home for Christmas and can get a furlough, let them go home. If they travel by hitchhiking and incur no expenses of consequence, and later we pass a bill which gives them 2 cents a mile or 3 cents per mile coach fare, that can be made payable to them at some future date after Congress acts, and to cover the mileage traveled.

My principal objection to this amendment is the discriminatory approach it takes. As much as I like my friend from New York—I have been in his district, I know some of his people, I know he is doing a grand job in representing them well, and they deserve all of that—to me this is a national proposition, and every man now in the service or who may be called into the service at some future date is involved and is entitled to the same consideration. If I supported the proposition, I would by no means limit it to $15,000,000. I would make it apply to every man in the naval and military service who received a furlough and who traveled home and could show evidence that he had been home to see his folks. I would let it apply on that basis. That would be my general approach.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In reference to the gentleman's remark about it applying to all the men in the service, I submit that since 600,000 have already been granted their furloughs they would be eligible anyway, and this would embrace all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right; but does this limit it to that group?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is where I disagree with the proposition. I would gladly support the amendment if you will make it apply to all the boys.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr Chairman, I intend to support this amendment, and I informed the gentleman from New York over a week ago that I would support his amendment.

What amuses me, Mr. Chairman, is that during the debate on the extension of the Selective Service Act many Members drew a comparison between the boys in the camps getting $21 a month and the men in industry making big wages. In the debate on the antilabor bill that passed the House this week, some of the proponents of the bill drew the comparison between the boys in the camps getting only $21 a month and the men outside getting large wages. They cried with horror at the thought of our boys in camps being away from home and family, with very little chance to get back home—they viewed with alarm and were shaken to their foundations at the threat to democracy.

I say to those who made those remarks and those comparisons that if you meant what you said, then support this Hall amendment, because this is the least you can do to help those kids get home for Christmas. This is your chance to prove your talk was not hypocrisy—that you are truthfully interested in democracy and that you had the welfare of these boys at heart.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman knows what has been done as far as the railroads are concerned. Are they willing to make greater concessions in railroad fares? That might help remove the objections of some of the Members.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would be for anything that would help the boys get home, those that can get home. I would not care what legislation was advanced if it would help them get home for Christmas.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe the railroads would give them a lower rate?

Mr. FOGARTY. They give them a lower rate to some extent at the present time—half a cent a mile or 1 cent a mile, I think it is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Frankly I do not believe the boys that could not go home would begrudge the boys that could go home the chance to go. During the last war men who were selected for especially dangerous duties did not complain because their comrades did not have that duty to perform. The men are not as selfish as some would make them out to be.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not think so, either.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to have them all go home.

Mr. FOGARTY. The main reason I rose here today is to say that I should like to see those kids get home for Christmas; they deserve at least that consideration.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is not this the first all-American proposal that has been before this House in many weeks?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is; and we should pass it with more speed than some of the previous measures got.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows that today a man in uniform, if he has a certificate from his commanding officer, can go to any ticket office on any railroad in the United States and buy a ticket at the rate of 1 cent a mile.

Mr. FOGARTY. Either 1 cent a mile or half a cent a mile.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. One cent a mile.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman favor limiting this only to the boys who are going home on Christmas furlough? Does not the amendment automatically limit it to that?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; it does; that is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think there is a defect there in the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am going to support the gentleman's amendment as he has put it before the House. If he should change it in the near future, I would go along with him on any changes he makes. A lot of my colleagues have been in favor of throwing money around all over the world to bring freedom and democracy to the peoples of other nations; all right, but let us not be unwilling to pay the fare of these boys who have homes and families. We have a greater obligation to freedom and democracy here. Help to preserve the finest thing there is in the world—the love of a boy for his home.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to the gentleman may I say that there is an addition of $15,000,000 to the $10,000,000 already in the bill. It was mentioned in my argument, and I specifically advised that it is my desire to see this money spent for Christmas furloughs. If it is the sense of the House to do this, and my amendment is adopted, I believe the War Department will proceed accordingly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered to this bill by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], which provides for an increase of $15,000,000 for travel allowances to pay the transportation of soldier boys from their respective camps to their homes on furlough. We must bear in mind that tens of thousands of these soldier boys receive only $21 per month. An overwhelming majority of them are young men in very moderate circumstances, and they come from families who are in very moderate circumstances. A great majority of them cannot pay their way home on their furloughs and neither can their families provide the money for that purpose. They must take care of their insurance premiums, laundry, shaving equipment, soap, stamps, shows occasionally, and many other items of expense so that at the end of each month the average soldier does not have anything left. In fact, he must deny himself of the luxury of an occasional hamburger or hot dog. In thousands of instances where these young men are granted furloughs to go home on a visit they must thumb their way. I have picked up scores of them along the public highways. Many of them are taken long distances from their homes. Before they could thumb their way to their homes and return, their time of furlough would have expired.

Our young men are being transferred from time to time to places overseas, and every one of them should have an opportunity to visit his home, his family, and friends. The furlough will mean nothing to the average soldier unless his transportation is paid by the Government. The Government can secure transportation for the soldiers and sailors at 1 cent a mile.

I have received scores of appealing letters from fathers and mothers urging me to vote for the Hall bill so that it might be possible for their sons to visit them. I am happy to have an opportunity to respond to their appeal.

The bill before us calls for approximately $8,300,000,000. Two billion fifty-six million four hundred and ninety-six thousand two hundred and forty-six dollars may be given away by the President to Russia, Turkey, China, Great Britain, or any other country. Congress, but not with my vote, on the demand of the President, has heretofore voted approximately thirteen billions to give away to any country or countries on the face of the earth that the President desires to give the money or equipment. The first lend-lease bill for seven billions was approved on March 11, 1941. If this bill becomes a law, then Congress will have voted to give away $15,041,496,246 in less than 9 months. In other words, Congress has voted to give away a sum equal to $110 for every man, woman, and child in America in 9 months, and we are told that there will be another big bill brought before Congress early in 1942 providing other billions of lend-lease-give-away. Everybody knows that none of this money will ever be paid back that we are giving to Russia, Turkey, China, Great Britain, and other countries. It is estimated that it will cost the Government on an average not more than $25 to pay the transportation of our soldier boys from their camps to their homes and return.

The administration and the administration's leaders were very active, and are now active, in taking fifteen billion or more from the taxpayers of this country and giving this vast sum to foreign countries, but the administration and the administration's leaders are here actively opposing this amendment of our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and they may be able to defeat it. How many of the Members who oppose paying the transportation of our defenders to visit their homes will accept mileage for themselves in going to their homes after this session and in returning on January 3, 1942, to the new session of Congress?

I shall vote to recommit this bill and strike from it the $2,056,496,246 of the lend-lease-give-away. There are many other objectionable features in the bill but it is claimed that they are necessary for our own national defense. I shall vote for the six billion or more provided in this bill and then I shall have voted for more than fifty-six billion, every dollar that the President has asked from the Congress for the defense of this country and the Western Hemisphere.

Investigations now being conducted by a Senate and House committee are disclosing some sordid conditions of graft and waste. I am afraid it will develop into a national scandal. When this bill passes, Congress, at the behest of the President, will have voted approximately $69,000,000,000 for the defense of our own country and to give away to other countries. What an enormous sum of money this is. We now have 132,000,000 people in our country. This means that Congress has voted in the name of national defense since July 1, 1940, in less than 18 months, more than $530 for every man, woman, and child in this country, or more than $1,600 for the average American family, and this is only the beginning. This is more than twice the cost of the other World War and many billions more than double the assessed value of all the farm lands in the United States with the improvements thereon. Yet the administration is fighting over a few million dollars in the Hall amendment to provide transportation for our soldiers to visit their homes and their families, and is requiring the American soldiers to serve for $21 to $30 per month. The administration had repealed the law limiting profits to be

made on Government contracts in the manufacture of munitions of war and we are now told that some of these concerns are making as much as 250 percent profit. Lobbyists, fly-by-night brokers, and others are dipping deep into these billions. I have never thought it was just and fair for one part of our population to do all of the sacrificing and the other part take all of the profits.

INCREASE THE PAY OF OUR SERVICE MEN

We take the flower of the young manhood of the Nation and put them into the Army at $21 per month—70 cents a day. At the end of 4 months we increase it to $30 per month—$1 a day. This includes some of our very best young farmers, young businessmen, lawyers, teachers, carpenters, machinists, painters, mechanics, and other skilled workers, while others remain at home and, with less intelligence, skill, or ability, receive $7, $10, and perhaps more, per day, with time and one-half for overtime and double time for Sundays and holidays. On the other hand, the soldier and sailor must be subject to call 24 hours a day and 7 days to the week. He receives no extra pay for overtime or for Sundays or holidays.

War has resolved itself into a great game of machines, skill, and intensive training. The soldier must be able to handle powerful and complicated machines and vehicles. Our armies must be mechanized through and through, and the instrumentalities of war must be handled by physically fit, well-trained, and skilled men.

We should be willing to pay these physically fit, skilled, and trained men such salaries as would induce them to adopt some branch of our defense service as a career. They should not be required to render this unusual service, leave their homes, their families, and friends for 70 cents a day or $1 a day and about one-fifth as much as many common laborers receive remaining at their homes with their families and required to work not more than 8 hours per day.

There are a number of measures before Congress now that provide for substantial increase in the pay of our soldiers, sailors, and marines. I hope that we will be given an opportunity to vote for some of these bills and give substantial increase in pay to our defenders.

THE SECRET IS OUT

We have been told by the President and his leaders from time to time that the repeal of the neutrality law, the extension of the draft, passage of the lend-lease bills, and other similar measures were in defense of the United States and the Western Hemisphere and to keep us from being involved as active belligerents in the European-Asiatic-African wars. But the secret is now out. Consternation was created in the Nation's Capital on yesterday, December 4, 1941, when the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., published a letter of the President dated July 1941 to the Secretary of War in which he called upon the Secretary of War and others to make an investigation and report the number of men and the amount of equipment necessary to defeat the German Army in Europe.

In September 1941 the high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy made their report in writing. This report was likewise printed on yesterday. Some few have attempted to deny it for the President, but the President has not denied it, and no one in authority has denied it.

The papers report that the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy have set on foot an investigation to find out who let the secret out. The President did not ask his Army and Navy leaders as to whether or not we ought to go to war; he wanted to know what number of men and how much equipment it would require to win the war. Make no mistake about it, the President, long ago, determined in his own mind, in my opinion, to take this country into the European-Asiatic-African wars if it was possible for him to do so.

This Board made up of the high ranking admirals and generals of the Army, aided by Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, stated in substance in their report, I am informed, that it would require 10,000,000 soldiers and sailors and the plan is for our soldiers and sailors to carry on the war in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the islands of the seas. In other words, if the President can have his way, our ships and our men will be fighting in every part of the globe, and the main purpose is to save the British Empire. It will cost anywhere from $125,000,000,000 to $150,000,000,000. It is planned to start the great push on or about July 1, 1943.

We can begin now to see why the War Department has bought enough clothing, shoes, hats, caps, and other equipment for an Army of 10,000,000 men. Many of us have charged that the purpose of the appropriation of these billions and the passage of these various measures had but one object in mind, and that was for this Nation to engage in this world-wide conflict on such a gigantic scale as was never dreamed of by man in all history. Congress and the people alone can prevent our involvement in this long, bloody war. Let us assert as we have many times that no one has threatened to invade the United States or any of our possessions. In fact, no country has laid the weight of a finger upon any American or the rights of any American, but the President has had our ships and our men to go thousands of miles to the war and butt into it. Americans have no direct interest in the Burma Road in southern Asia, and neither our citizens nor their rights are involved in Thailand in southern Asia.

Why are we butting into those remote countries nearly 8,000 miles from our own country? They lie adjacent to the British possessions on the Malay Peninsula in southern Asia, and at the end of the Malay Peninsula is the great British naval base of Singapore. We are simply trying to help save Singapore and the British Empire, and I shudder to think what this far-flung war policy of the administration will do to our country. Before it is over this country will furnish its full quota of blood, tears, and suffering. Its national debt and national obligations now are far above $70,000,000,000 and before it is over it may be one hundred and fifty billion. The industrial, economic, social, and financial structure of our country has been greatly upset. It is just the beginning. The end can mean nothing less than bankruptcy and ruin and the loss of our own liberties and freedom.

Millions of loyal Americans are appealing to this administration and to Congress to preserve democracy on this side of the Atlantic and Pacific and preserve this fine heritage of our wonderful country for our own children and not dissipate it in fruitless quarrels and wars throughout the world.

If Mr. HALL's amendment is defeated, tens of thousands of American soldiers will be denied the privilege of visiting their parents and their homes unless the Senate, when the bill comes to them, amends it and puts this provision in the bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely rose and objected to the limiting of debate on the amendment, not because I expected to speak on the amendment myself, but because I was very much interested in hearing the amendment debated. It seems that every time a proposal comes before this House for something that is pro-American, something for our own boys, the cry goes up to limit the time for debate—anything to defeat the measure. That has been the case with many proposals that have been brought before this House since I have been here. Someone suggested that we have not had time to get a report on the Hall bill. Let me tell you what my experience has been in getting reports. The Federal Government literally stole so much property from the taxpayers in my district. They admitted the property was stolen—not in so many words—but they refused to do anything about it. I introduced a bill to take care of the situation; and what kind of a report does the committee get back on the bill? This is what they said: "It is not in keeping with the President's policy." Since when, I ask you, did legislation always have to be in keeping with the President's policy? If that is not dictatorship, I do not know what it is.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman think for a moment that the American taxpayers would refuse to pay this amount of money for the boys to be sent home?

Mr. WILSON. Certainly not; they would be glad to do it. When I think of the thousands of dollars that were spent just the other day to launch the battleship *Indiana* at Newport News—yes; dollars spent to buy champagne for high-salaried officials to imbibe freely, and also to indulge in feasting—then I wonder how in the world anyone could object to a few dollars for these boys who are sacrificing—yes; preparing to die—for this country. Who is going to do the fighting? Mr. Chairman, if we adjourn, we will get 20 cents per mile to go home for Christmas. How can we refuse these boys 1 cent per mile?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is well to remember at this point that this $15,000,000 is just 1 percent of the $1,500,000,000 included in this bill for lend-lease to other nations. Surely we are not going to be picayunish and refuse to allocate these $15,000,000 to our own boys.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; and only one-fifth of 1 percent of the entire appropriation. Mr. Chairman, when I think of giving all this money to Russia and England and think of the Members in this House who have, under false pretenses, voted to send these boys to war, and who just Wednesday voted against all-out production of arms to defend their lives, I wonder how they can go home and face their people. I did not vote to put these boys into war; but, thank God, I voted to produce everything possible for our money with which they may defend their lives and this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I feel that when we spend $34,000,000 for a War Department building just across the river we ought to be able to spend half an amount representing only a small percentage of that amount to let the boys come home, where they have left their mothers, their fathers, their wives, brothers, sisters, and their sweethearts. Let us send them back home for Christmas. I have been here only 8 months. However, I have voted for all necessary defense appropriations. This Congress is spending $60,000,000,000. I feel that is a necessary part of defense to allow these young men at least an opportunity to go home for a short interval. This will pay their mileage, and I know we can get a rate of 1 cent per mile.

We have had two Thanksgivings at home ourselves. Why can we not give the boys at least one Christmas at home? I want to tell you Members, whether Democrats or Republicans, you should vote for this amendment. I am not getting up here as a demagogue. Most of my soldier-boy friends are close enough to home to be able to come home, but some of them are not. This amendment will provide for transportation of the soldiers to their respective homes on their Christmas furlough. Let us vote for this amendment.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. Does the gentleman think this would contribute to the morale of the boys in the camps?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think it will not only contribute to the morale of the boys in the camps but to the entire Nation as well.

Mr. HAINES. And the folks back home?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAINES. I presume the gentleman has received some letters from the folks at home asking him to support this legislation?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes. I have received a considerable number of letters and cards from my constituents. In fact, I have more letters from people favoring this legislation than I have about any other legislative matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment providing funds for soldiers' furloughs is important to my district, because we live so far removed from the centers where many of these boys are in training. It is 3,000 miles from where I am now speaking to where I live in Portland, Oreg. In passing from Washington to my home, usually by automobile, I find many, many of these men in uniform trudging along the road with their thumbs up wanting a free ride. I always accede to their requests and speak to them about conditions in the camps. If there is one thing more than any other that is in their hearts today it is an opportunity to go home for a little visit, whether it is for the Christmas holidays or any other time.

I had a letter today from a young man from my district in the service calling attention to the fact that in all likelihood they would be called overseas, probably beyond the Americas, although it is true that the law as enacted by us provides that they shall not go beyond the Western Hemisphere. If we can afford to spend, as we are, some $60,000,000,000 for carrying out this all-out defense program, is it not within the rule of reason that we can spend a small stipend of $15,000,000 to permit these boys on their regular furloughs to go to their homes to keep up their morale and their families' at home? Certainly they cannot do it on $21 a month. What surprises me more than anything else is that anyone here would raise his voice against it; that the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge would, in effect, block the way to allowing $15,000,000 for an additional appropriation for these boys to go home.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to say to the gentleman I am heartily in accord with everything he has said. I think it is a mighty good amendment, and I am going to vote for it.

Mr. ANGELL. I hope that not only will this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] pass by a large majority but that we will almost unanimously, if not unanimously, approve the measure allowing $15,000,000 out of probably the $100,000,000,000 we will expend before we are relieved from duty in the Seventy-seventh Congress to permit these boys to go home on a little furlough. As they have said, possibly it will be the last furlough many of them will have for a long, long time. I personally want to commend the gentleman from New York, my colleague [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], in his insistence, in time and out of time, that we make this modest provision for our men in uniform. As I said a moment ago, the surprising thing to me is that these gentlemen who are willing to give a billion dollars to Russia without the scratch of a pen, without saying anything about it to us in the Congress, or $2,000,000,000 as provided in this bill for lend-lease, or a total of over $60,000,000,000 over all for war purposes, would then draw the line and say, "We will not allow a measly $15,000,000 to let these boys in uniform have a little respite from their training service and go home over the holiday for a short furlough." In this connection, we should remember that when we called these boys to training service we told them it would be for only 1 year. After getting them into the service we scratched the agreement and extended their term a year and a half. It looks now that before the service is over they will be sent overseas or to bases on the fringe of or beyond the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, this is not a sentimental matter. In my humble opinion, I think it is one of the most important items we shall have under consideration today. We have not provided in the wage or salary we pay to a drafted man a sufficient sum for him to save enough to pay his way home when he gets a furlough. Having served for 2 years in an army, I know something of the value to morale of these furloughs home. You cannot train a man when he is not in the proper frame of mind to receive training.

Last week I was discussing this same subject with three or four officers in one of the big training camps in Georgia. One of them said, "CAMP, somebody up there suggested that we pay the boys' railroad fare home if they can get furloughs Christmas." He said, "That thing has been discussed in the camps more than anything else, and I hope you do it. It will do a lot for their morale."

Let me call your attention to the fact that the armies of Europe give their boys furloughs at stated intervals, sometimes as frequently as every 3 months. They pay the boys' transportation home and let them stay 7 days, then pay their way back. We are lending to those armies under the lease-lend program, and they are doing this thing suggested by the pending amendment. I think it is as little as we can do to provide railroad fare for the boys to go home Christmas, and I am going to support it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman support a proposition to adopt a policy that we allow all men who are given furloughs, whenever that time may be, to have travel expense home?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is the weakness of this proposition.

Mr. CANFIELD. I do, too; but we cannot let all the boys go at once. Those who do not go Christmas should be allowed to have furloughs soon afterward. I think the War Department should adopt such a policy without legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for many years it was my privilege to serve as an enlisted man in the armed forces of our country and I spent the Christmas holiday period sometimes five or six thousand miles from home; therefore, I understand how it feels to be away from home and the family fireside during the holiday period. In the interest of the young men who make up the armed forces, and their families, I heartily support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

As you travel over the country almost every weekend you find a soldier or sailor or marine on the highway asking for a ride. Naturally you pick him up. Generally you find that he is on his way to visit his mother, dad, or sweetheart. You ask him whether he has any money. Some are too modest to tell the truth, but the majority of them are without money.

The soldier, sailor, and marine of today is in a similar position to those of us who served during the first World War. During 1917–18 we had war-risk insurance, just like the young men today have national life insurance. We were told to take a $10,000 policy and we took it. There was deducted from our pay on the first of every month $6.60. Then in addition we were urged to buy a Liberty bond, just like the young men are today being implored to buy defense bonds. There was deducted from our pay on the first of the month $10 as our monthly payment on the Liberty bond. Then we were told further, if we had any dependents at home, just like the young men are today, that we should send an allotment back home. So the average fellow sent an allotment back home that amounted to about $15 a month. As a rule on the first of the month many soldiers, sailors, and marines during the period of the World War actually found themselves in debt to Uncle Sam to the extent of $1.60. When a furlough was offered them they had no money to travel on. They stayed in their camps or aboard ship. Many of the young men today find it impossible to get home to visit loved ones because of the deductions and other obligations that they have as a soldier, sailor, or marine in our armed forces. So by adopting this amendment you simply provide we will say on an average about $25 to send these soldiers, sailors, and marines home to see their mothers, dads, or sweethearts.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Many of these boys, perhaps more than half of them, come from homes that are absolutely unable to get up the money to send for the boys?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. They have not the money and these boys ought to have the chance to come home?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. The membership of this House will recall that during the discussion relative to the retention of selectees it was stated that the War Department proposed establishing a new policy of transferring the soldiers or regiments from one camp to another to give them a little sightseeing so that the morale of the men would be improved. If you want to boost the morale of the armed forces today, give them $25 and let them go home for Christmas, and they will return to their posts with renewed vigor and confidence.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. Is it not true that many of our Pennsylvania boys are quite a distance from home? I have some communications from our boys down in Texas and they do not see how they can get home for the holidays.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. The Pennsylvania boys are at Camp Shelby, Miss., Fort Benning, Ga., Fort Bragg, N. C., and in various other States, while many are in the far islands of the Pacific, and they all want to come home for the Christmas season. This may be the last Christmas many of these boys will spend in the United States, and I can think of no finer contribution to the morale of our armed forces than to give them a trip home.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to provide $15,000,000 to pay transportation for our soldiers who receive leave for Christmas. I certainly hope it will pass. I cannot see how anyone could afford to vote against it. Many of our boys cannot get home if they have to pay their own transportation.

I really had intended to talk about something else, but it is right in line with this matter. I believe I can show how we could save more than what is involved here by doing something about the lobbyists that are infesting this city and the amount of money that it cost the Government. That is what I intended to talk about.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I called the attention of the House to Resolution No. 347, which I introduced calling for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the activities of lobbyists and to recommend to this body legislation to outlaw the "defense broker" and commission agent of defense contracts. If we cannot exterminate him from the scene, at least require registration and some kind of regulations under which they must declare themselves and under which their operations must be governed.

I said then that their existence here implied that all was not well with our system. That was the easy inference to draw. These men are being paid salaries and fees amounting to a king's ransom for supposedly using their influence and contacts to get contracts for a favored few. Suits are cropping up and are now pending to collect these fees for ostensibly delivering millions of dollars' worth of defense orders.

There is only one other conclusion, and that is the one I chose to adopt. If these men are not getting the contracts through their efforts—if these orders would come regardless of whether or not they were on the scene—then they are impostors of the worst sort. They are extorting money under false pretenses. I here and now want to call a spade a spade—that is what they actually are doing.

We must have faith in the men in our Government. I am not asking for a blind and unreasoning trust. I know that most of these men in key positions have proved themselves well and continue to acquit themselves in an honest and patriotic manner. That is why I resent the presence of the contract lobbyist and salesman, the "profit patriot," who slyly implies a corruptness on the part of officialdom. The facts are otherwise.

I have a testimonial in my possession which I want to bring to the attention of this House—yes, more publicly to the whole Nation. Sensational charges may make better reading and may be more avidly followed in the press, but here is a tribute to the men of the Maritime Commission which should warm the hearts of all Americans with any amount of idealism and faith in their Government. All too often officials hear only from the critical and never kindliness from the appreciative.

I want to quote these remarks of Mr. Clarence Skamser, secretary of the Globe Shipbuilding Co., of Superior, Wis. This company is comparatively new and is beginning on a contract negotiated with the Maritime Commission. I have always had a great amount of respect for Admiral Land and his men, so I am most happy to make public this letter of commendation:

> We learned many things during our long stay in your city, but the one that makes us feel best is the first-hand knowledge we have gained in respect to the workings in the Commission.
>
> It's an agreeable surprise to learn that all we heard is not true and to find that the men making up the Commission are as straight thinking and as aboveboard as any group we know. Even though we had not received our award, we could not help but have the highest regard for them.
>
> We appreciate, too, why you advised against political intervention. After all, it was up to us to prove to them that we could do the job, and as long as we got an even break with the other yards, we could have no complaint. And that is exactly as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, this man was here for several weeks while negotiating with the Commission. He was heckled and pestered by men who represented that they could secure results for a stipulated fee—that they had connections through which they could work. Their proffered help was spurned; the Globe Co. went directly to the Commission. They found the men there preeminently fair and honest; they dealt with them in an open and straightforward manner and were awarded a contract.

Personally, I want to add that I know the Army and Navy are employing the same fair tactics in dealing with industry. I am sure that the procurement officers of all departments will welcome legislation removing the order solicitors for profit.

I want to again remind this body that this resolution has no bearing on the legitimate officials of corporations doing defense work, nor to the legislative representatives appearing on behalf of pending bills.

This shows that the defense workers who are peddling pap about being the fair-haired fixers are sailing under false colors. The companies that hire them must add their exorbitant fees to the contract price, and the American taxpayer has to pay the bill. Why should the people of the Nation skimp and save to buy bonds while we allow part of the money to be paid to the bogus defense broker? We here in Congress have a duty to perform. This cancerous condition must be excised from our national economic picture. They are mere confidence men working under the guise of trained business agents. They are getting money under false pretenses. They are selling America short.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is not a pleasant subject to discuss or oppose. I was selected by the minority side to watch public expenditures. I, too, want to save the morale of our boys. I voted not to keep them in over a year because of morale, as I found it, and I feel that I was more closely associated with them than most of you. I live within a few miles of a large camp.

I will tell you what the boys really want, and if the gentleman will suggest what the boys really desire, I will vote for it. I have asked those boys over and over again what they most desire and it is always "transportation out of camp." That is their great desire when any period of leave is theirs. They now have to walk, usually many miles, to any village or facilities of the United Service Organizations. I take some of them in my car very often. Whenever I leave home for the larger part of my district I drive through a camp and I am nearly always accompanied by soldiers. I feel that I know what they want. Amend this so as to give them transportation out of camp and we will be doing something. Why the Army cannot furnish transportation for short trips in and out of camp I cannot understand. Of course, this suggestion is most appealing, but we all know that it is only a gesture. There is yet no authority to use the money and it is very impracticable.

Nearly everybody travels at Christmas time. Railroad facilities are not available. I do not want those boys taken home in cattle trains. Perhaps they would be willing to do it. However, the last time I went home there were four boys on the train, and they were complaining because, they said, "We are soldiers and we cannot get decent accommodations because we are soldiers."

You would send some boys home and you could not send all. Of course, many must remain in the camps. We have no report from the Army officials as to what they could do if authorized. Do they not love their soldiers as much as we do? Do they not want to please them as much as we do? Do they not want to preserve the morale as much as we do? I think so. They have not approved of this.

You desire to raise this travel expense item from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000 for this purpose, and it more than doubles this appropriation. You complain about witnesses being ejected by other speakers. I will not try to be frivilous about this matter. I am very serious.

However, no matter how you vote, I want you to remember this little quotation. It came to my attention last evening:

Here's to you, as good as you are;
And here's to me, as bad as I am;
But as good as you are, and as bad as I am,
I'm as good as you are, as bad as I am.

Surely I need not feel that I am less appreciative of our soldiers than you. This is ineffective legislation and we should not deceive ourselves or them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 13, noes 91.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have been reading about it in the newspapers and I have been talking to the railroad people about handling this Christmas crowd. I understand the railroads now have all the cars that are available lined up to take the boys home who have already been provided for and given furloughs, and it would be absolutely impossible to transport any more, except in freight cars.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have no doubt but that that is the correct situation.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why this amendment should not be adopted. For the benefit of those members of the Committee who are not in the Hall, I may say that the amendment is an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the item "Travel" under the Army appropriation, increasing the amount from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000, the avowed purpose being to provide funds with which members of the Army might have their railroad fare home Christmas if they got a furlough.

In the first place, let me say that the amendment would not accomplish its purpose even if we adopted it. Merely to put the money in the bill would not accomplish the purpose, for two reasons: One is that the Army does not have the legislative authority to spend any funds which they have for the purpose of paying transportation home for enlisted men in the Army on furlough. So unless accompanying the appropriation of this money you would pass legislation, this would be purely an idle gesture, and you would be holding out a golden apple to the boys that they could never reach at Christmas time. That is reason No. 1.

Reason No. 2 is that this will not become a law, perhaps, and be signed by the President before the 18th or 20th of December, entirely too late for the administrative machinery to be put into effect to give anybody the benefit of such provisions.

Let me say in all seriousness, without any effort to be flippant or to ridicule this suggestion, that this is a thing about which we might work up a good deal of mushy sentiment. We might even arouse ourselves to the point of having a little Christmas tree down on the table here, and maybe singing a few Christmas carols as we pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in a serious and grim business. I have been to some of these camps and I find these men in the camps to be not little boys who want rattles handed to them at Christmas time but grim, hardened American citizens who are being trained for the grim and serious business of answering the call to service if that call comes.

I am willing to vote every dollar out of the United States Treasury and more besides if it is necessary to give these young men equipment, training, preparation, and protection; but do not let us start pinning any bouquets on them; do not let us apply any softening process. Aside from that, and speaking of morale, what could you do today that could be a more serious blow at the morale of the armed forces of America than to adopt this amendment? It applies only to the Army. Think that over, if you please. The bill the gentleman has introduced and this amendment apply only to the Army.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; not now.

Mr. WILSON. The Army boys are the only ones that have been drafted; the others volunteered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Who are the American boys today that are already under fire? They are in the Navy and in the Marine Corps and in the Coast Guard. They cannot even get furloughs home. The boys on the ships that are engaged in the Atlantic patrol, who are already in the thick of this thing, and whose families do not know what morning they may pick up the paper and read the sad news about them, not only cannot get furloughs home but when their ships get into the ports they cannot get furloughs off the ships to go home because we are in a serious, grim business.

Now, pick out the boys who have been drafted and who have been selected for training, a training that is benefiting them every day they serve there.

Every man in this House regretted the necessity for having to pass a conscription bill. No one wanted to do that. It had to be done, but those boys are getting better treatment, better protection, better care than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and his colleagues received who served in the World War, because we are trying to do everything that we can to provide for

their comfort and their safety. How can we justify selecting one small group and conferring this upon them? Only a small portion of the men who are conscripted will get a furlough home. What are you going to do with the rest of them? Can you justify giving one boy $25 or $30 to go home, with a furlough, and saying to another boy, "You not only cannot have your furlough but you cannot have the $30?" What does that do for morale? Where are you going to stop it? What are you going to do for the boys in the veterans' hospitals? They would like to go home for Christmas. Ought we not give them a ticket home? Oh, I plead with you gentlemen, let us scrape the bottom of the United States Treasury for anything that calls for equipment, or paraphernalia, protection, or for their physical being or mental equipment or their health or anything else, but do not let us make this a mushy, soft, sentimental proposition that we are going into.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I suggest to the gentleman that the situation is so serious in England that they are now drafting women.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I have an amendment that I would like to offer at the proper time to take care of the men in the Navy and in the Marine Corps. And one more comment, and that is that as far as those who are confined in the veterans' hospitals are concerned, the veterans of the World War, and the American Legion, and others will take care of them and the veterans will get a ticket to their homes at Christmas.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what they should do, and we should do everything that we can for those boys in the camps. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has a bill pending before the Committee on Military Affairs. There will be a hearing on, and the report will be had from the Department, and they will undoubtedly work out if they can something that will not show partialities and put us in the position of having passed half-baked ill-considered discriminatory legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman know that the history of the Congress shows that the Congress repeatedly has voted appropriations for this small group or that small group.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not a good way to legislate, and we ought not to start it today. Of course, the question of farms ought not to be mentioned—about forty or fifty million dollars, nobody knows how much; but if you pass this amendment the War Department could not spend it, and if they could spend it and they had the legislation to warrant it, they could not put the administrative machinery to work in time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If we make some provision for the welfare of our own soldiers, would it not be a whole lot better than to appropriate a billion and a half dollars in this bill that the President can do as he pleases with, to give to Turkey, like some of the north countries?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Every dollar that we spend of this lend-lease money which can be spent by Great Britain, Russia, Turkey, or any other nation is just that much nearer preventing us from the necessity of having to have these boys fight with the guns that we are putting in their hands.

Mr. RICH. Has the Committee on Appropriations ever had anybody come from these foreign countries to tell the Committee on Appropriations that they needed this money to spend, in order to help them?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no; and if we had the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be the first one to get on the floor of the House and say the Committee on Appropriations is having foreigners coming over here to run our business.

Mr. RICH. Yes; because I am for America first, I want to help America and I do not want to do all I can to help these European fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL), there were—ayes 62, noes 88.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 80, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHORRERA AND RIO HATO ROAD, REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

To enable the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Panama in connection with the construction of a highway between Chorrera and Rio Hato in the Republic of Panama, fiscal year 1942, $873,000, to remain available until expended and to be additional to the appropriation for this purpose in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1939.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph which has just been read by the Clerk appropriates $873,000 in connection with the construction of a highway between Chorrera and Rio Hato in the Republic of Panama. I want to call the attention of the Members of the Committee to the fact that we are providing most of the cost for the construction of this road, which is intended eventually to provide a link in a highway that will serve motorists going from this country down through Central America. When I was in Panama last April I found that a great many American people who had gone from the States down to the Canal Zone found themselves bothered by the fact that Panamanians insist upon following the continental system of driving to the left of the road. It results in a great deal of confusion, a great many accidents, and it causes a great deal of expense in the changing over of automobiles. It has seemed to me that Panama ought to conform to the rest of the countries in North and South America and use the right-hand drive the same as her neighbors do.

Some suggestion was made while I was there that if the United States was going to contribute most of the cost for constructing this highway it would be the appropriate and courteous thing for the Panamanians to adjust their custom to that of most of the other countries of the two continents. While it might be that we might tie a condition upon this particular appropriation to require that that be done before the appropriation would be available, that probably would interfere with the construction of the highway, so I am not offering an amendment to that effect. But I do take this occasion to call attention to the situation and to express the hope that the Panamanians, in appreciation of the gold mine we are providing them in all the construction activities in the building of this highway and other improvements now going on, that they will conform to the custom of most of the Americas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, during the World War our service men rode free because of the fact the Government took over the railroads. I believe it would be a worthy gesture of this Government, which is so benevolent to foreign countries and foreign service men, to at least give free transportation to our own boys in service so they may enjoy the company of their fathers, mothers, wives, and friends at Christmas. I was in hopes the amendment would pass, and voted accordingly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation of $173,000 for the Panamanian highway, which might be deemed very advisable. It might be a good-neighbor policy, but we have discussed with Canada the advisability of constructing a highway between the United States and Alaska. We do not have any developments as to the advisability of getting this highway, and it seems to me that now is a good time, by the tokens we are offering to Canada and to Great Britain, to have legislation forthcoming in Canada to grant the United States the right to assist jointly with Canada in the construction of this highway to Alaska. If we are to use Alaska for the purpose of a defense area, and to join it up with the United States by highway, certainly the means of transportation by boat from Seattle or the west coast is not an appropriate manner of getting to Alaska as compared by highway.

I hope that consideration will be given by the House of Representatives to securing permission from the Canadian Government at once to assist us in the construction of a highway between the United States and Alaska. It is in the

interest of national defense, and Canada should cooperate and cooperate now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering an appropriation bill of over $8,000,000,000. This legislation involves a huge potential expenditure of funds. We are all familiar with the demands made by the general public throughout this country for a reduction in expenditure of money on nondefense items. There has been a perfect barrage of propaganda going out over this country which has for its purpose spreading the belief that Members of Congress are making unlawful and unwarranted use of their franking privilege, thereby burdening the Post Office Department with the tremendous burden of carrying franked mail and thus contributing to the deficit in the Post Office Department.

On yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] submitted to the Congress in his extension of remarks a series of tables and figures bearing upon that question. Because I was furnished this morning by the Comptroller of the Post Office Department, the most recent available figures upon this subject, numerous Members of Congress have asked me to present them to the Congress as an answer to the propaganda charging Members of Congress with abusing the franking privilege of Members of Congress to burden the Post Office Department and build up the Post Office Department deficit.

I call your attention to the fact that these statistics, which I will ask the privilege of inserting in the RECORD at the proper time, indicate that the greatest burden on the Post Office Department arises from the use of governmental agencies in sending our penalty mail.

Services performed for other branches and agencies of Government, and to aid of certain general welfare and national-policy projects, sometimes referred to as "nonpostal credits"

Service	Fiscal year 1937		Fiscal year 1938		Fiscal year 1939		Fiscal year 1940		Fiscal year 1941	
	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates	Number of pieces	Estimated revenue at regular postage rates
As listed in act of June 9, 1930:										
Penalty mail (other than Post Office Department)		$32,625,126	882,352,048	$34,166,571	967,583,181	$36,408,851	995,571,096	$39,905,033	1,118,461,730	49,020,19
Free registry (other than Post Office Department)	12,019,409	1,456,801	10,985,053	1,524,236	11,535,024	1,822,274	12,029,101	1,628,477	12,089,675	2,537,306
Franked mail	42,795,758	1,137,655	24,217,512	779,369	35,570,127	1,003,659	44,975,397	1,217,561	30,779,974	926,843
Second-class publications free in county	462,209,428	647,383	400,204,742	637,150	380,844,629	609,024	371,905,741	606,269	371,324,086	616,353
Free mail for blind	1,205,693	171,627	1,176,468	188,091	1,253,446	257,287	1,507,228	254,001	2,042,120	265,656
Publications receiving reduced rates (religious, scientific, educational)	858,204,679	259,848	645,686,163	171,474	635,293,642	191,583	888,313,462	316,952	893,585,521	314,868
Aircraft service (estimated excess during the year of cost of aircraft service over the postage revenues derived from air mail)		6,151,978		5,232,796		8,147,595		9,402,888		5,156,254
Other: Custodial and maintenance service in quarters used by other Government agencies		5,760,464		6,310,539		6,834,617		7,503,223		8,254,654
Total		57,347,800		49,110,226		55,374,890		60,834,395		67,092,124

In addition to the foregoing, a study made of such services performed during 1941 indicates that other somewhat similar services were performed by the Postal Establishment such as selling and accounting for internal-revenue stamps valued at $4,828,545.95; selling and accounting for 1,257,313 migratory-bird hunting stamps valued at $1,257,313; selling and accounting for 3,967,581 United States defense savings bonds valued at $981,768,250; accepting and accounting for veterans' adjusted-service bonds presented for payment; registering and finger-printing 5,000,000 aliens (act of June 28, 1940); transporting diplomatic mail for State Department; conducting examinations by Post Office personnel for Civil Service Commission; collecting and accounting for customs charges amounting to $10,300,000 on dutiable merchandise.

The figures on the costs of such services are not yet available.

Penalty mail is the type of mail you get from the Department of Agriculture with that little sign up in the corner, "Government business. Penalty $300."

Now, just see what has occurred. In 1937 the amount of penalty mail reflected in postage that would have been paid at the regular postage rate was $32,625,126. In 1941 that had risen to $49,020,190, an increase from $32,000,000 to $49,000,000 in penalty mail from 1937 to 1941.

Now, let us look at the franked mail and see what the situation is.

Franked mail: The postage revenues that would have been paid at regular postage rates would, in 1937, have amounted to $1,137,655. In 1941, despite all the editorial comment and all the propaganda that has gone out charging Members of Congress with abusing the franking privilege, the facts indicate that the amount of postage, had it been paid on franked mail, would have been $926,843, a decline, if you please, of the postage that would have been paid if postage had been put on franked mail from $1,137,655 in 1937 to $926,000 in 1941. It does seem to me, therefore, that in view of the facts indicated in this report from the Comptroller of the Post Office Department, that the charges that Members of the Congress are abusing their franking privilege in an unwarranted manner, are not justified by the facts.

If you will take all the other items of free mail and reduced-postage mail which appear in this table you will see that the principal increase in the burden on the Post Office Department arises from the terrible increase in the amount of penalty mail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The figures indicate that the amount of postal revenues lost through publications receiving reduced rates has increased from $259,000 to $314,000. The free mail has increased from a 1937 figure of $171,000 to a 1941 figure of $265,000. The second-class publications free in the county was $647,000 in 1937 and $616,000 in 1941. So when you get the totals you will see that the principal burden upon the Post Office deficit does not come from the increase in the use of the franking privilege by Members of Congress, it does not come from the increased use of the other facilities of the Post Office Department at reduced postal rates, but it does come from the tremendous use of the Postal Service of this country by the administrative agencies of Government which are sending out these tons and tons of penalty mail, a large part of which finds lodgment and resting place in the wastebaskets of Members of Congress and others who receive it.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I may suggest to the gentleman that he distinguished in his remarks just what type of mail the Congressmen usually use. Is it not true that all Members of Congress have a great amount of mail directly in answer to requests and relating to official business?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, of course; and they are supposed to use the franking privilege only for that purpose. The mail I am referring to that Members of Congress use is that mail which is referred to in this table as franked mail. The penalty mail is the mail sent out by the departments of the Government that you receive every day in your offices and that is sent out by the ton all over the United States.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. As a matter of fact, the reports of the Post Office Department have shown that the amount of franked mail sent out by Members of Congress approximates 2½ percent of the total of franked and penalty mail.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is approximately correct.

Mr. BUCK. The newspapers in our own districts, which are criticizing us for sending out franked mail, forget the privileges they enjoy, which in the case of newspapers sent free might amount to $90,000,000 a year.

Mr. KEEFE I do not know that they are forgetting, but I think the average person is confused between franked mail and penalty mail. They are inclined to consider all this penalty mail as franked mail. The Members of Congress do not use penalty mail; they use franked mail. The departments of the Government use penalty mail, and that is where practically the entire increase in this postal deficit is as shown by this report.

Mr. BUCK. I am in accord with the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Much has been said about Members of Congress franking copies of their remarks made on the floor of the Congress to the folks back home. Is it not true that under penalty mail thousands of copies of speeches by Cabinet members are scattered throughout the Nation?

Mr. KEEFE. I assume that is true; at least, I have had occasion to throw a good many of them in the wastebasket, the same as the gentleman has.

I am going to take the time, some of these days, to tell you something about what it is costing the people of the United States to send out all over the country this penalty mail, which does not serve the purpose for which perhaps it is intended.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has also been known that certain members of the official family have sent out Christmas greetings under penalty mail.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know as to that, but I do know that one agency of the Government, or its employees, did send Christmas greetings to me at least in a penalty envelope. I do know that.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I want to take this occasion to compliment the brilliant gentleman from Wisconsin for having the temerity to defend the House of Representatives against these attacks so promiscuously made by the press of the Nation. I compliment him.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, short years ago, when the novelist Ibañez was popular reading, the story of the Four Horsemen was on every tongue. But the story does not end there. They followed the opening of the four seals of revelations. Then came the opening of the fifth seal to disclose the slain under the altar of the earth. Finally came the opening of the sixth seal.

Its opening was followed by an earthquake; the sun became black; the moon turned to blood; the stars fell; the rich men, the great men, the captains, the mighty men, the bondsmen, and the freemen hid in the dens and rocks of the mountains. The day of wrath had come.

THE DAY OF WRATH

How little we hear of the aftermath of the present world struggle; yet our day of wrath is approaching. The very preparation we make to meet the forces from without helps breed destructive forces from within. The time is at hand for careful internal defense.

THE DOMESTIC SCENE

Consider the domestic scene. Small business is begging for life. Priorities are strangling the material supply. Government's own figures on cantonment construction and acquisition of defense supplies testify to inefficiency and waste. Actual expenditures for defense in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, are estimated at eighteen thousand million dollars. This is $135 per capita, or $515 for every family. One dollar of every five earned this year goes to Federal expenditures. Next year it is estimated at one dollar of every three. The debt now stands at $415 for every man, woman, and child.

When World War No. 1 began it was but $12.36. A debt of ninety billion means about $700 for every person in the land. Every child now born will be endowed with opportunity and the privilege of sharing in a huge public debt. The national pay roll stands at an all-time high and includes 1,477,000 persons. Federal subsidies, first spurned and then reluctantly accepted, are now demanded by large groups of our people. By the end of the fiscal year the cost of borrowing money will be one and one-half billions annually, and that amount increases as the debt grows. Bank deposits and excess reserves are at record levels. Two and one-half billion ounces of useless silver clutter our vaults to accelerate the inflationary spiral. Twenty-two billions in gold are causing grave concern. There is a growing allergy toward work. Employment in defense industries increases at the expense of employment in nondefense industries. More than 3,000 plants have been or are being expanded for defense at a cost of more than four billion to the Government and one billion to private enterprise. Notwithstanding huge defense outlays, unemployment in October was estimated at 3,900,000 persons. Ten strikes affecting defense and involving 6,900 workers were reported at the week ending November 22. Living costs are soaring. The handmaiden of spending is taxes, and already people are recoiling from additional tax suggestions. A former Member of this House has filed suit against the Empire Ordnance Co. for a commission of $687,000, representing 1 percent on seventy million of defense business. What must the folks back home think as they read that fact in their daily newspaper?

We are unanimous for a boom but not for the effervescence and headache which attends a boom. As population levels off, the debt burden becomes even more ominous because debt is but a speculation on time. There is airy talk of repudiation without realizing that we must repudiate ourselves. Daily we venture into new land without a road map. The stimulation of defense will end. The Horsemen will cease to ride. The fifth seal will be opened to disclose the slain crying for vengeance on the living who dwell in the earth. The sixth seal will be broken. The economic earthquake will come and the day of wrath will be at hand. Then what?

TIME TO PREPARE OUR DOMESTIC HOUSE

Somber-hued as this picture appears, there is time for preparation of our domestic house against the fury and shock of peace. The pattern is clear and distinct. Not once in 2,000 years has it varied. The transition will be marked by a continuing exhilaration. Then follows deflation, an impoverished world, a demand for disarmament, disrupted world currencies, rehabilitation loans, unemployment, despair, the application of the lease-lend formula to domestic problems, distrust, and then denouement. There will be no royal road to readjustment. We must prepare now for the impact of peace. The economic road map for the return journey must be ready.

PARTNERS—SACRIFICE

Today, as we appropriate funds for defense against forces from without, should we not immediately design a program for defense against the mounting forces from within. There is a remedy. Its essence is quite simple. Every element of the Nation must become partners in sacrifice. It is a stern but necessary choice. As Shakespeare expressed it, "What king, Bezonian? Speak or die." The choice is between sacrifice and destruction. Perhaps a realistic program will assist the choice and here it is:

First. Government can be reasonable and stop hoarding. Business is entitled to live.

Second. Nondefense spending can be curtailed and emergency activities which have lost their emergency character can be eliminated. Government must become a partner in sacrifice.

Third. In the defense program, the best brains are cheap at any price. Efficient spending requires efficient spenders.

Fourth. Let there be a vigorous use of the broom on defense brokers and favoritism. The growing belief that influence is required to obtain defense contracts is an expeditious way of destroying faith in the integrity of that Government which millions of boys receiving $21 per month are expected to defend.

Fifth. Aid to Russia is one thing; accepting Russian doctrine is another. Purge government of communism. It is better to crack down now than to crack up later.

Sixth. Priorities have brought distress. The law on competitive bidding should be modified to permit direct negotiation of defense contracts with distressed industries and distressed areas.

Seventh. We planned our way into our present domestic plight. We must plan our way out. Now is the time to prepare the blueprint of transition.

Eighth. American production is the last best hope of an embattled starving world. Why not more emphasis on production and a little less emphasis on allocation?

Ninth. There are still 48 States in the Union. Let defense work be equitably distributed so that all taxpayers might share.

Tenth. The 18 major private defense industries now employ 2,700,000 persons. What of the other 130,000 industries who must live, pay taxes, and provide jobs? Let time limits be shortened on prime defense contracts to compel farming-out and diffusion.

Eleventh. A sound labor policy is imperative. Congress has authorized and appropriated sixty-seven billions for defense. It might as well be 67 cents unless dollars can be translated into defense materials.

Twelfth. Business as usual, strikes as usual, bureaucracy as usual will end in an unusual result. Take the priority off of belt buckles and pull up a couple of notches in the interest of national welfare.

Thirteenth. New taxes if any should be designed to conserve and not destroy capital. We shall need healthy industries to get through the period of wrath which lies ahead. Taxes should conserve the incentive to save because saving is a testimony in our faith in the future.

As partners in sacrifice, let us also be partners in devotion to the cause of our economic salvation when the emergency is over.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we are considering a very important measure. It provides for the expenditure of the further sum of $8,000,000,000 for national defense. This makes a total of $68,000,000,000 in the last 18 months. It means a charge of about $2,700 for every family in the United States. And yet we are advised our defenses are still inadequate. On the question of adequate defense there is little argument. Our people want it as promptly and as effectively as it can be done.

Mr. Chairman, since we are giving consideration to the most important of our problems, I want to express my view that those who are responsible for carrying out this tremendous program could do well to put their house in better order. I ask that attention be given to at least three important matters.

Stop the graft, the waste, and the extravagance now going on in our defense effort. I refer particularly to the unwarranted and scandalous fees that are paid to certain individuals, some of whom have held high positions in Government, for claiming to assist in securing defense contracts. They are sometimes referred to as defense brokers. Most of you know, or have heard of, Charles West, a former Member of this body. He has also held some high positions in the present administration. He was a sort of go-between the White House and Capitol Hill at one time. He is now in private practice. He claims a balance of fees of $687,000 for acting on behalf of the Empire Ordnance Co., of New York, in securing defense contracts of $70,000,000. He says he was entitled to $700,000 and that only $13,000 has been paid. It also appears the company, controlled by Mr. Edward Cohen, of New York, is really some kind of a holding company. I understand Mr. Thomas Corcoran, former associate of the administration is also engaged in representing concerns interested in defense contracts.

The House Military Affairs Committee is investigating Mr. Leon K. Schanack, of New York, an alleged "profit-patriot," whose commissions on defense contracts are estimated at approximately $200,000. This money is said to come by way of the Greenwich Machine Tool Co. of New York. Another so-called broker had less than $5 in his pocket a year ago, and now has a bank account running into six figures. There are a number of other instances that have come to the attention; for example, the case of an agent who got $5,000 for doing little other than delivering a check from one concern to another.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that with the expenditure of billions of dollars there is bound to be some extravagance, but I say to you that the stopping of the payment of unnecessary commissions, fees, and exorbitant profits will come none too soon. After all, the whole business is charged to the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, just the other day a distinguished Member of the majority side of the House said his committee were of the opinion now that we had overpaid for cantonment lands alone approximately $100,000,000. As I have said, there is bound to be some waste, but we have had too much of it.

Mr. Chairman, there has recently been some discussion about the political phase of the matter. This is no time to play politics. Men should be appointed to positions of responsibility in policy making because of their ability to do the job and not because they belong to a political faith. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we still have our pressure groups.

Mr. Chairman, one thing more: I believe it is high time that the administration should be more frank with Congress and with the people. Yesterday a newspaper announced certain plans were in the making for increasing our armed forces up to five or ten million men. The leadership of the House have told us they are sure the statement is incorrect. Why cannot those in charge of the program explain the situation? If it is a matter that cannot be properly discussed, then say so. Woodrow Wilson said, "Honesty and competency require no shield of secrecy." So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the administration proceed to get rid of these "lobby brokers" and all of their kind, and do it right now; that huge profits be stopped; that no favors be granted; that we have no partisan politics in the defense effort; that those in responsibility of the defense program be more frank and clear in dealing with the American people.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the releases of the purchases of the War Department bear out the figures given in that statement yesterday.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I thoroughly agree with the genial gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] who preceded me in the fact that there are exorbitant profits and that those exorbitant profits should be wiped off the books. In the first 17 months of our defense program there was in excess of $2,090,000,000 over what the program should have cost; but I am getting just a little bit tired of the innuendos that Democrats are responsible for it. Let us look at the record. I know that Mr. Knox, the Secretary of the Navy, is not a Democrat; and I do not think that Mr. Stimson, the Secretary of War, is a Democrat; nor do I think that Mr. Knudsen, in charge of O. P. M., or that Mr. Stettinius are Democrats; and I can safely say that 9 out of 10 of those who are in charge of defense spending are not of the Democratic Party. It is about time that we of the Democratic Party request and vigorously insist that the administration, if you please, take out those who are responsible for this extravagance. If such a request was granted, I guarantee that 9 out of 10 of them will not be of the Democratic stripe. Those who are receiving these unwarranted prices for the contracts they got are 99 percent Republican.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And who does the voting for all of these expenses? Where do you get the votes for these expenses? And where are you going to get this money? It is right over on your side that you get the votes, and the people are going to have to pay.

Mr. HOOK. Yes; and we have to have a defense program, and we must have the money to save this country from the onslaught of Hitlerism, and I shall carry on and help vote the money; but I say it is about time that we got rid of the Republicans who are squandering the money that we appropriate. It is this abuse of squandering the defense money we provide to save our Nation from destruction that is the cause of the breaking down of national defense, and not the laboring man, as the propagandists would lead the unsuspecting public to believe.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, there was a sound of revelry by night. I notice in the United Press item that the Soviet Embassy had a reception. Incidentally, I was not invited. There was champagne and Scotch and caviar dished out very freely for the benefit of some 3,000 guests, and it was estimated by the United Press correspondent that it cost about $10,000 to hold

this celebration, but he noted that one $10,000 bill will not be missed out of the 100,000 $10,000 bills that we gave them without any hope of return.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Does not the gentleman believe that perhaps the Soviet Embassy put on that party in the spirit of casting bread upon the waters?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Undoubtedly, and it came back a hundredfold. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, let me call attention, as a contrast, to what is taking place right here among our own people.

Small business men are greatly disturbed and are becoming increasingly alarmed over their precarious future. Many of them are being forced to quit business; many more will follow. It is estimated that by the end of 1942 anywhere from 50,000 to 100,000 small businessmen will have been forced to quit.

This will mean that many more thousands will be thrown out of employment, and will be looking for jobs. Where can they find them? Only in defense industries. But that will not absorb the many thousands who are too old. No one will want them. Their only chance for a job will be W. P. A.

Let us examine the chances on W. P. A. The appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, was $1,350,000,000. The appropriation for the present fiscal year is $875,000,000, or a decrease of $500,000,000. However, during the first quarter of the present fiscal year, about 39 percent of all W. P. A. expenditures went into national-defense projects. The passing of many small business men and the unemployment of those now working for these small business men will mean a marked increase of demands on W. P. A. The average age of workers in industry is 37 years according to the last census, while the average age in W. P. A. is 43 years. Where can the man of 60 years, or even 50 years go, unless the Government gives him a chance. If W. P. A. takes care of those under 60, then old-age pensions can take care of those 60 and over.

How about old-age pensions? We passed the Federal Old-Age Pension Act in 1935. Its provisions are utterly inadequate. Some States are paying the old folks as low as $7 per month on which to live. How is that possible? All of us know that seven times seven would be needed to supply the minimum of decency. Yet in spite of bills, petitions, meetings, conferences, and caucuses, our prayers are disregarded and our entreaties go unheard. We are told that there is no money.

No money? As already stated, only recently we gave Russia $1,000,000,000, and of the party at the Soviet Embassy, referred to, Sam Love, United Press correspondent, wrote:

> The Russians, who found a billion-dollar baby in a local lend-lease store, responded handsomely tonight by throwing the gosh-darndest party Washington has seen since the historic "recognition" blow-out of 1934.
>
> It set the Soviet Embassy back about $10,000. But, between friends, what is one out of one hundred thousand $10,000 bills? The modest setting up of a beer and a pretzel.
>
> At least 3,000 guests, from admirals and generals to Office of Production Management clerks from the grass roots, dipped into the caviar, sampled Scotch and champagne, and admired a super-sturgeon baked and literally bedecked with red flags.

In addition, we have given Britain $23,000,000,000 to date in one way and another, and we are assured that more is to follow. Besides the foregoing, we have given other nations many millions. No money? Oh, yes; millions for foreigners, but not a dime for our old folks. Champagne and caviar to celebrate a billion-dollar gift, while, cold and hungry, our own people must suffer in silence. Ten thousand dollars for a blow-out by the Communists, while our old people in some States are told to feed and clothe themselves on 23 cents a day. If someone will give them their clothes, then they can eat 7-cent meals. And even these tragic pittances would not furnish a roof over their heads or fuel to warm their half-starved bodies.

Let us have less champagne and caviar for foreigners and more ham and eggs for Americans.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] have rendered a great service in furnishing revealing figures in connection with the many abuses of the penalty mail privileges now being enjoyed by the many bureaus and departments of the administration. While these abuses continue to increase, the Government, at the same time, is calling for conservation of paper and ink supplies. The hundreds of mimeographs of the various bureaus grind night and day flooding the newspapers of the country with propaganda which one Washington newspaper recently characterized as "highly uninformative information."

This Washington newspaper, the Daily News, recently showed the utter disregard of the bureaucrats for the pleas for economy in nondefense spending and for conservation of paper. This newspaper conducted a survey of the situation in its own office with the result that it printed an article to the effect that each day's mail brings more than 3 pounds of propaganda hand-outs across the editor's desk. What little news these hand-outs contain usually has been covered by the newspaper's own reporters or press associations, with the result that most of the propaganda finds its way into the wastebasket.

It was pointed out that a typical day's mail of Government propaganda contained 77 releases, ranging from a single Marine Corps flimsy to a 24-page magazine published by the Office of Production Management. At first-class rates the cost of mailing would be 86 cents. Actually, since the pieces arrived in 50 different envelopes, the loss in postal revenue represents nearly three times the bulk 86-cent rate. Each of the Washington newspapers receives an equal volume of this publicity and varying amounts of the same material are mailed to 3,500 daily newspapers throughout the country and to the larger number of weekly newspapers and magazines. I have had many complaints from editors as to the amount of propaganda they are receiving. One letter, which is typical, demanded legislation to abolish every last publicity bureau. Let me read what this editor wrote:

> There is one law that I wish you would get enacted. It would be one to abolish every last Government publicity bureau. All they do is to make us poor editors work an extra hour or two each day throwing away their tripe. We are now threatened with a paper shortage. If Government publicity bureaus would quit sending out their blurbs, at least a quarter of the pulp shortage would be taken care of right there.

This editor is right, but instead of a decrease in the amount of Government propaganda I fear he will see an increasing amount during the weeks and months to come.

The United States Government, according to estimates, will spend at least $10,000,000 in the fiscal year 1942 for publicity activities merely for national defense and to popularize the war. This will provide employment for no less than 1,436 newspaper representatives, clerks, stenographers, psychologists, cartoonists, song writers, and such who will spread the good word in one form or another. Those workers are spread through at least eight different departments: The War Department, Navy Department, Treasury, State Department, Office of Emergency Management, Selective Service System, Office of the Coordinator of Information, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Relations, and Office of Facts and Figures.

The Navy Department alone has a staff of more than 211 persons engaged in publicity work. Thirty-nine of these are officers, 14 are enlisted men, and 54 are civilians, all located in Washington. In the field it has a staff of 104 officers, together with the necessary clerical assistants. There is no budget for this organization but it is estimated that it must cost not less than $1,000,000 a year. Likewise the War Department has a publicity staff of no less than 259 persons. Many of those are Regular Army officers detailed to this task; and here again there is no direct appropriation by Congress for such a function.

The State Department, in the Division of Current Information, is carrying on a comparable type of work, but the Budget for this item is only $110,113 a year. This organization in the State Department has for one of its principal tasks the determination of the general plan and tone of American foreign broadcasts.

The Treasury Department is spending about $3,300,000 a year on publicity, primarily for national-defense purposes. Its regular propaganda organization employs from 10 to 50 persons and it has a temporary staff of 43 persons in Washington dealing with the problem. Throughout the country it has a field staff of probably 130 persons. This organization is engaged in building up general public morale for the war and devising various appeals for patriotism.

In the Office for Emergency Management there is a publicity organization of close to 240 on a budget of approximately $885,000 a year. This organization is engaged in doing nothing but publicizing

national defense and the war and justifying appropriations.

The Office of the Coordinator of Information, which is headed by Col. William J. Donovan, has a staff of at least 175 persons in Washington and 40 in New York. This is supposedly for the purpose of coordinating all defense information that comes to Washington and the preparation of a basic background for American foreign news broadcasts. It is doubtful whether this organization can function on a budget of much under a million dollars a year.

In the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Relations there is another very large propaganda division for the dissemination of the good word about defense. This organization has a publicity staff of no less than 75 persons and a budget for their salaries of at least $250,000. In addition it has $3,000,000 for special project work in propaganda; $600,000 will be used for production of motion pictures to be displayed in Latin America; at least a million will be used to supply Latin American newspapers with American news services; and $700,000 will be used to subsidize American broadcasts to Latin America. A subsidy of at least $200,000 has already been given to the World Wide Broadcasting Foundation of Boston to subsidize broadcasts over station WRUL. Slightly larger subsidies are to be given to the Columbia Broadcasting System and the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. MOSER Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, listening to the discussion this afternoon, I am prompted to seek this time to rise and speak in the light of the voice of experience, and tell my colleagues in the House of Representatives a personal experience that I had while in the capacity of a post-office inspector. A man appeared at the post office in Chicago, Ill., and pretended to have influence whereby he could place people on the pay roll to do work at Christmas time. He met these men and encouraged them, telling them that they could not expect to go to work unless they bought a uniform. They paid him in money a part of the sum to get the uniform, and he took the money from these prospective applicants, as much as he could collect, and then disappeared. I went before United States Commissioner, Judge Beiter, in Chicago and swore out a warrant for his arrest for violation of section 32 of the United States Criminal Code, which very clearly provides that any person pretending to have such influence or be in a position to wield such influence shall be subject to the penalty of that Criminal Code. He was bound over and indicted by the grand jury and sentenced by the court to serve a term in a county jail in northern Illinois.

Knowing that statute to be applicable to the ramifications that have been resorted to by the people we have heard discussed this afternoon I consulted with the Speaker several days ago and introduced a bill, H R. 6151. It is very brief. It only extends and delineates a little further on the subject, outlining some of the titles and terms that these people use. Also it increases the penalties.

I feel that I should take occasion, in the light of this discussion, to bring that matter to the attention of the House.

In my official capacity I went through the World War period. Much that has been discussed this afternoon was in line with the investigations with which I was charged in the matter of investigating cases of disloyalty, sedition, espionage, and anything else that any of the coordinate branches of the Government might be called upon to investigate with a view to effecting prosecutions.

The machinery of law is available, and if evidence is being disclosed before a subcommittee of our Committee on Military Affairs, to which the newspapers have given publicity, I sincerely trust that the chairman of that committee or someone sufficiently interested in getting possession of that evidence will place it before the Department of Justice and urge thereupon the prosecution of these malefactors.

When the first teller bell rang this afternoon, I was in conversation with the Attorney General's office on that very subject. I do not feel that I violate any trust or confidence, but I do feel that we can have the cooperation of the Department of Justice in the criminal prosecution of these malefactors whom we have heard discussed here, if the evidence we have heard is available is presented in proper form.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure most of you were here when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] said that these gentlemen who are wrecking the defense program, profiteering and finagling here in Washington are all Republicans.

I recall that we had a college professor from Ohio who became a Member of Congress and later was drafted by the administration to run for the United States Senate from my own State. He was not a Republican. He was drafted to run against Vic Donahey, a substantial citizen of Ohio, former Democratic Governor. He ran as the administration's candidate for Senator. You know him—Charley West. Was he a Republican?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Has the gentleman overlooked the fact the President thought so highly of the capabilities of this gentleman that for a long time he was the contact man between the White House and this House of Representatives?

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman. He was contact man for the White House. Certainly the President did not select a Republican. He selected a Democrat for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. That is the polite word for "lobbyist," is it not?

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Who is responsible for placing this man that the gentleman spoke about in the Cabinet?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield just there?

Mr. RICH. I would like to have an answer to that. Who is responsible for placing him in the Cabinet?

Mr. BENDER. It was not one of the Republican Roosevelts.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Who is responsible for keeping them there?

Mr. BENDER. That answers itself. He is a Democrat.

Then we have this man they call Chip Robert and "Little Evy" Robert. Not Republicans. I recall in connection with the Dupont Circle Apartment affair no Republicans were involved there. And "Tommy the Cork," who does not occupy an office here, was one of the President's right-hand men. Is he a Republican? My friends, I knew that at some time or other they would get around to charging the Republicans with all the shortcomings of the present administration. Pretty soon we will be charged with the New Deal.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Who is responsible for voting all this money for the various nondefense departments of Government? Are they members of the Republican Party?

Mr. BENDER. You know who runs this House. In fact, you know who runs Washington. They even referred to the majority as "rubber stamps." Certainly those of us who are here understand that it is not the Republican Party. For some time when I first came here I heard them talk about Teapot Dome. Those fellows, reprehensible as they were, were mere pikers compared with the boys who are now operating on the defense program. As a matter of fact, I wish the gentleman from Michigan would study his politics a little more.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I will yield.

Mr. HOOK. I notice the gentleman said that Charles West was liaison officer between the White House and the Congress. He probably now is liaison officer between that Republican bunch I spoke of and the contractors who are getting the gravy.

Mr. BENDER. Well, he certainly knows on which side of his bread the gravy is.

Then, as I recall, the members of the firm of Roosevelt & Sargent were not the Republican Roosevelts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. CREAL. I only want the RECORD to show that on the teller vote on the amendment to give the boys transportation on their Christmas furloughs I voted "aye."

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, for just a few minutes I want to get back to this bill and to matters that are germane to it, and I am going to anticipate the Clerk somewhat in the reading of the bill. On page 24 of the bill appears an item of $30,000,000 for the Bonneville Administration for transmission lines. The Committee on

Appropriations and the subcommittee that handled this, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], assisted by the chief clerk of the committee, Marcellus Shield, have made a report on Bonneville and Grand Coulee, which appears on pages 28 and 29 of the committee report. There was accord not alone among the entire membership of the subcommittee but in the whole committee when they reported the bill on this $30,000,000 item, and I do not anticipate any difficulty here in the Committee of the Whole House.

This report, however, is so exceptional and so completely clarifies what has heretofore been misunderstood in this House during the 5 years these mighty projects have been moving forward that I want to take the time now to read it into the RECORD and give the membership and the public at large a full understanding, in language clear-cut and concise, just what these projects are, what progress they have made to date, and what needs to be done in the immediate future, and the great part they play in national defense. After a reading of this report, I know that no person need ever say they do not understand these great projects.

I read from the report:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The amount recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration is $30,000,000. The Administration is the marketing agency for the salable power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and is charged with the responsibility of the construction and operation of the necessary transmission facilities for that purpose. The funds provided in the bill are for materials and equipment necessary in the construction of additional transmission lines and substations.

The expedition of furnishing the facilities for generation and transmission of power from these two dams arises from the necessities of the national-defense program. The estimates of power needs of the United States within the next few years for national-defense purposes indicate a requirement of 20,000,000 additional kilowatts of which 3,000,000 kilowatts are expected to be provided in the Pacific Northwest and the Bonneville-Grand Coulee area.

Funds have been provided for the procurement of the full complement of 10 generators at Bonneville Dam and the last of these is expected to be installed by December 1943. Funds likewise have been provided for nine generators at Grand Coulee which will complete installations in the west powerhouse and the last of these is expected to be installed by May 1944. Further installations at Grand Coulee must await completion of additional powerhouse accommodations. On the basis of the present schedules for the installation of these generators the present generating capacity of 356,400 kilowatts will rise to 1,166,400 by December 1943 and to 1,490,400 kilowatts by May 1944.

The natural deposits of defense raw materials in this area and the accessibility to them of the power facilities of these two large dams make the area ideal for the development of national-defense industries and advantage is being taken of these circumstances to a very extensive degree. Power demands for defense industries are now in excess of the supply. The defense load commitment has risen from 65,000 kilowatts in July 1940, to 525,000 kilowatts at present and the prospective needs are rapidly accumulating. All power now being generated 24 hours a day is being used and contracts in effect or substantially agreed upon are in excess of the supply.

In order to get the power from the dams to the industries to be served in the area an extensive transmission system is necessary. This consists primarily of a 230,000 volt double-circuit steel transmission grid encircling the entire territory from Grand Coulee Dam to the Puget Sound area, from the Puget Sound area to the Portland, Oreg., area, and then back to Grand Coulee, with the necessary substations, feeder lines, and interconnections.

The provision of the transmission lines is geared in point of time to the installation of the generators and the readiness of those lines to carry the power when it is ready for delivery. The entire cost of the transmission system and substations is $156,000,000, of which $60,000,000 has heretofore been appropriated, $30,000,000 is included in this bill, and leaving $66,000,000 for future appropriation. The amount included in the accompanying bill is expected to be devoted to the procurement of necessary materials for extension of these lines. The construction of lines requires from 18 to 24 months from the time the money is made available. The $30,000,000 for materials at this time will enable the administration to take advantage of purchases and priorities in a market which is rising and which will cost more if purchased later and will enable the administration to have the lines ready when the power is available at the dams.

Revenues from power from the two dams were $1,874,444 in the fiscal year 1941. They are estimated at $6,500,000 for the fiscal year 1942 and at $10,500,000 for the fiscal year 1943 and are expected to rise to $22,500,000 in the fiscal year 1947 on the basis of the utilization of the full generating capacity of 1,490,400 kilowatts.

The power investment is estimated at $322,000,000, consisting of $156,000,000 for transmission lines, $51,000,000 power allocation of the cost of Bonneville, and $115,000,000 power allocation of the cost of Grand Coulee. The Administration estimates that the rate structure is sufficient to provide expenses of operation and amortize this cost over a period of 40 years.

Provision for these transmission lines is recommended by the Office of Production Management to enable the Administration to meet the defense demands at the earliest possible date.

The Government has made provision for a tremendous production program, and plants are projected and being projected to manufacture the defense articles needed. Power is the key to production. All of the power-generating facilities have been provided for 1,490,400 kilowatts. Failure to make provision for the necessary transmission lines will hinder the defense effort and deprive the Government of the revenue which will start as soon as the power is ready to be taken away from the dams.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that no finer, more thorough, more complete, unbiased, and impartial statement of these two mighty projects could have been made, than can be found right here in the report of the committee, and I commend the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], his clerks, and the whole committee. I also desire to compliment Dr. Paul Raver and his assistants for the excellent presentation made in justification of this appropriation, when they appeared before the committee.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman will inform the House whether or not, of this full $30,000,000, the cost of expanding these facilities including the transmission lines, only 32 percent will be charged off to the power users as related to the original construction cost, or whether or not the power user is going to pay the cost of the installation?

Mr. LEAVY. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, I will say every dollar of this money will be repaid with interest at 3 or 4 percent.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is 100 percent of that cost charged to the users?

Mr. LEAVY. Of this cost; yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given an additional minute so that I may propound a question of him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman has referred to a public-owned transmission line. In the State of New York there is a proposal now to construct a $25,000,000 public-owned transmission line from New York City to transmit surplus power from New York City to Messina. That line would have been built by private interests. I wonder if there is anything in this bill or any appropriation in this bill which would appropriate $25,000,000 for this proposal.

Mr. LEAVY. I do not think there is.

Mr. BEITER. None of the funds in this bill could be used for the construction of that proposed line?

Mr. LEAVY. I do not think so.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I compliment the gentleman for calling attention to the facts in this regard, and also wish to call attention to the fact that on yesterday, at page 9446 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I commented on the report and also gave some additional facts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to recommit this bill, H. R. 6159, and strike out the so-called lend-lease appropriation. I shall then vote for the bill with the understanding I am sanctioning only the appropriation for our own Army and Navy.

I continue to feel I cannot vote to give away billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money so long as foreign nations have between fifteen and twenty billion dollars in this country they could pledge as security for loans to them.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrogate the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], who just spoke regarding certain power developments that are contained in this bill. I wish to draw his attention to page 25, where there appear two properties, one the Fontana

and the other the Douglas. I understand the Douglas operation is not to be appropriated for. It is stated on page 25 that the Fontana Dam is a new project and the schedule contemplates it will be ready for impounding water in the spring of 1944 and that the first generating unit will be installed in the fall of 1944.

Referring to the top of page 25, item No. 3 shows $7,000,000 for hydroelectric units in 1942. For what purpose is that expenditure if there are no dams ready to take hydroelectric units until 1944?

Mr. LEAVY. May I state to the gentleman that while I am a member of the whole Appropriations Committee, I was not a member of the subcommittee that wrote this bill. This refers to a project down in the T. V. A., thousands of miles away from the ones in the Pacific Northwest that I am particularly interested in, and I am not sufficiently familiar with the break-down here to intelligently answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DEWEY. Can the gentleman refer me to someone on the committee who can answer the question?

Mr. LEAVY. I am sure members of the committee can answer it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] might answer it, or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] might answer the question.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman. May I interrogate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] regarding this item of $7,000,000—item No. 3 on page 25 of the report? I cannot find where they are going to need any hydroelectric units because there are no dams ready.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. At existing dams, I may say to the gentleman. It is additional hydroelectric installation at existing dams.

Mr. DEWEY. It is tied up with items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, which presumably refer to Fontana and Douglas.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is a separate item. The Douglas Dam is not in here. Those are additional installations at dams that have heretofore been constructed. At nearly all of these places the installed capacity is greater than the present machinery that was put in there. Looking to the future, there might be occasion to add additional installations.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, he is referring to that steam-plant item?

Mr. DEWEY. No. This is hydroelectric.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMY OF THE PHILIPPINES

For all expenses necessary for the mobilization, operation, and maintenance of the Army of the Philippines, including expenses connected with calling into the service of the armed forces of the United States the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and expenditures incident to pay, allowances, operation, maintenance, and other activities of units and personnel of said organized military forces, and for the emergent mobilization and training of such forces, may be made without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of or accounting for funds of the United States, but shall be expended and accounted for in a manner prescribed by the President of the United States, $269,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943, which shall be available for payment to the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines upon its written request, either in advance of or in reimbursement for all or any part of the estimated or actual cost, as authorized by the Commanding General, United States Army Forces in the Far East, of necessary expenses for the purposes aforesaid, except that none of such moneys shall be available for the pay and allowances of personnel of said organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, when serving in the Philippine Islands, in excess of the pay and allowances authorized by Philippine law and regulations, and of which not to exceed $15,000,000 may be restored to the emergency fund for the President, created by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, in reimbursement of a like amount advanced therefrom: *Provided*, That any expenditures heretofore or hereafter made from said appropriation "Emergency fund for the President" for the purposes and in the manner authorized under this heading in this act are hereby authorized and validated: *Provided further*, That any appropriation for the Military Establishment may be applied to the purposes aforesaid subject to reimbursement by transfer from this appropriation of the value of such property or service as may have been or may thereafter be applied to such purposes, and any amount so transferred shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the appropriation so reimbursed during the fiscal year in which such amount was received and the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the committee for including the Philippine item of $269,000,000 in the bill. Some weeks ago General Gerow and two of his assistant officers appeared before the Insular Affairs Committee in support of House bill 5825, which is referred to on page 47 of the committee hearings by General Marshall in his testimony.

At that time General Gerow was asking that Congress provide some $55,000,000, this sum to come from the so-called gold-profit fund to the extent of about $23,000,000 and about $32,000,000 out of the sugar excise-tax funds which have been accumulating in favor of the Philippine Islands Commonwealth, all to be used partly for the purposes for which this $269,000,000 is now provided. I suggested to the general and his staff that they go before the Appropriations Committee and seek these funds.

May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or someone who can speak for him whether or not this $269,000,000 makes unnecessary the passage of House bill 5825, which General Marshall has referred to, and which is now on the Consent Calendar for consideration?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wanted that confirmed, because when H. R. 5825 was called up here last Monday I objected to its passage, and I believe the gentlewoman from Montana also objected to the passage of the bill. I think we have here the proper way to handle it. I was certainly opposed to using any of the gold profit for this purpose, and I was opposed to using the sugar excise-tax funds, which should be used for the purpose of rehabilitating the economic status of the Philippines in the event they acquire their independence.

As I understand the situation in the Philippines at the present time, their economy, generally speaking, is being badly interfered with, if not almost completely wrecked, by reason of the war activities in the Far East and the participation the United States is taking in the general war approach. I see no way at all how those people over there can go ahead with any kind of a military program without principal assistance from the Treasury of the United States.

Again I wish to compliment the committee on handling this matter in this way, and under permit to include in my remarks certain editorials from the Manila Bulletin, I first wish to submit one which deals with this very problem we are dealing with here today:

[From the Manila (P. I.) Bulletin]

CONGRESS IS CONFUSED

The United States Congress shows itself in a confused state of mind as regards Philippine finances. This is an outstanding revelation in connection with congressional approach to pending legislation pertaining to the financing of Philippine defenses.

A clear message is found in the records of the debates and votes in committees of the two Houses of Congress on pending legislation providing for diversion of special funds for defense purposes. It is perfectly clear that the overwhelming sentiment in Congress favors doing what is necessary for Philippine defense, but complications arise in committee hearings through proposals to utilize special funds, such as the gold-devaluation fund and sugar-excise-tax funds. It must be said in defense of the American lawmakers that their confusion grows out of a state of affairs and a policy for which Congress is only partially responsible.

The pending legislation relating to the financing of the defense program carries implications which Congressmen can fully understand only when they have a clear understanding of the future of Philippine-American economic relations. Congress is partially to blame for the fact of a great deal of misunderstanding and lack of understanding on this point, but the whole responsibility does not rest with Congress—far from it. It does not all lie in Washington. Manila also is largely responsible.

One cannot read the news reports on the House and Senate committee hearing on the pending legislation dealing with Philippine defenses without being impressed with the ever-evident willingness and clear decision to support the Philippine defense program, to make available the necessary funds. The picture as it is revealed in this connection is encouraging on the score of an appreciation in Congress of the need for strong defense, on the score of a readiness to accept responsibility for the needed defenses and on the score of determination to carry through, at whatever cost, the enormous defense program already undertaken. However, there are undisputable evidences of a hesitation in Congress to handle the finances in such manner as to confuse the future financial set-up. In other words, Congress hesitates to vote legislation without knowing the implications as to existing and prospective funds and the relation of these funds to the whole problem of Philippine-American relations.

Favorable is the fact that Congress is averse to backing into lasting commitments through emergency legislation. It is lamentable that this attitude of Congress should delay action on urgent legislation in an emergency period,

but the background of this whole case is so confusingly complicated that blind haste becomes distinctly dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, although the Filipinos cannot provide for these vast military and naval expenditures, there are certain performances they can carry out. I now refer to a very practical operation in which I believe the Filipinos are greatly deficient and, I may say, negligent. It is the matter of tilling their own soil and producing tons and tons of food for the population. The Filipinos are too greatly inclined to be lawyers, politicos, theorists. They are too much inclined to wait for the other nationals to till the soil, operate the merchandising establishments, and perform those other activities so necessary to make a strong, reliant, dependable nation. After all, Mr. Chairman, every group must have its numbers who will perform the practical and what we might term "menial tasks" so necessary in times of trouble. I am convinced that the Filipino in general operates on the basis that he can get some other person to do that for him. In times of adversity that general approach may prove to be fatal. I now submit for the RECORD another editorial from the Manila Bulletin:

[From the Manila (P. I.) Bulletin of October 17, 1941]

ON THE FOOD FRONT

Numerous reports indicate substantial progress on the food front in the Philippine emergency campaign. Increased interest and increased planting of vegetables are reported. Progress is encouraging.

However, it must be admitted that only a small start has been made if we reckon progress on the basis of the extreme backwardness before the start of the emergency campaign to awaken the country to a realization of vulnerability to the blockading of the channels of food imports. All the vegetable plantings so far effected would hardly do more than provide a temporary relief in event of a real emergency. Much more is needed to assure the people of the islands that they may not have to go hungry and suffer the weakness that results from dietary unbalance.

One of the most important points about the food campaign is the fact that if it is successful the benefits will be lasting, whether or not an emergency comes in acute form.

A recent arrival in the Philippines expressed great surprise over failure to find extensive vegetable gardens such as are to be found surrounding most cities the size of Manila. This visitor inquired about the source of supply for the tables and the reserve stocks of foodstuffs and commented on the dangers of further curtailment of shipping. When some of the newly planted emergency gardens were pointed out the visitor made the candid comment that if the showing is so small under emergency pressure the supplies must be next to nothing in normal times.

And that comment is far too close to the actual fact.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to secure some information. On page 5, under "Ordnance Department," the bill calls for the sum of $2,464,984,000 for ordnance service and supplies. In the hearings testimony was given which would indicate that the War Department plans to contract for 400,000 Springfield rifles at $60 per rifle from the Remington Arms Co. It is not possible to tell from the hearings whether or not such a contract has been entered into. I should like to have the chairman of the committee enlighten us on whether or not it has been entered into.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a supplementary order providing for rifles, all of which are to be sent to England. None of them is for our own troops. It is all lease-lend material.

Mr. CLASON. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman's statement that already the Remington Arms Co. has a contract to supply Springfield rifles through either the lease-lend program or any other program of the Government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is merely supplementary.

Mr. CLASON. But the Remington Arms Co. at the present time has a contract with the Government for Springfield rifles? If so, how many?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The operation is already under way, and this merely supplements contract already in force.

Mr. CLASON. What number of rifles does the contract call for?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are paying contract price of $60 per unit for these rifles.

Mr. CLASON. I only wish to know the number of rifles.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The number to be provided by the manufacturers is 400,000.

Mr. CLASON. That is on this supplementary order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. CLASON. What is the original which that supplements?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have no information on that.

Mr. CLASON. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the Remington Arms Co. is making these rifles, or is it securing parts by subcontracts?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such details are not brought to the attention of the committee, but the information could be readily secured from the Department. That is minutiae into which the committee does not go.

Mr. CLASON. It seems to me it is very important at this time in connection with this item involving such a large sum of money, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] has already brought out information to indicate that the Remington Arms Co. is not contracting directly with subcontractors, but is buying through brokers, who are making as high as 22 to 30 percent commissions on these contracts. If these rifles are going to England under the lend-lease program and there is any intention, provided the rifles are not returned, to charge England for them, it does not seem to me the Government is looking out properly for the interests either of its own citizens or of the British subjects.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The policy of the Department has been, wherever possible, to assist the small manufacturer through subcontracting. If for any reason this particular item does not comply with that policy we would not be apprised of the fact. We have no information on that phase of it.

Mr. CLASON. Somebody should get some information as to that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The general policy of the Government is to favor the utilization of subcontractors in order to help small business. Presumably all contracts and contractors follow that policy unless some special circumstance interferes. If the gentleman will ask of the War Department about this particular case they can give him the information he asks.

Mr. CLASON. Has the Government at the present time entered into any agreement with the British Government whereby any repayment for or any plan for disposing of articles furnished under the lend-lease program after the war has been determined upon?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Negotiations are now in progress with Great Britain and with all other nations we are supplying with lend-lease material. Negotiations have been concluded with three or four countries whom we are supplying with a smaller volume of material.

Mr. CLASON. Have they been concluded with England?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have not yet concluded negotiations with Great Britain, but when we do, ample provision will be made for reimbursement and compensation in accordance with the provisions of the lend-lease law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. That was the same answer that was given with regard to the agreement with Great Britain on lend-lease materials when the last bill was up for consideration. When do you expect this agreement to be reached with Great Britain?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, it is impossible to adjudicate such complicated questions overnight. As the situation develops, provision has to be made for contingencies which cannot be foreseen and which require intricate consideration and adjustment. It will necessarily be some time yet before negotiations can be concluded, but we may be certain that nations to which supplies are delivered will be required to account for and to make provision in payment for benefits received.

Mr. CLASON. Does the chairman expect that the United States Government will be paid in full for these items costing billions of dollars that are loaned or leased to foreign countries?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect ample recompense, either tangible or intangible, for all we are supplying.

Mr. CLASON. Would the gentleman think it is fair to charge England $60 for a rifle if Colonel FADDIS brings out that the United States permitted a broker to step in and make 20 percent profit which had nothing to do with the matter of supply?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our committee does not deal with that phase of

operations, we know nothing about such details. That is for the committee investigating expenditures, and I am certain all such questions will have their careful attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman has raised a legitimate and pertinent question in connection with this item. I am glad to assure the gentleman and to assure the Committee that the special subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Military Affairs will go into this matter very thoroughly and I am sure I am safe in my statement that if it is found that the Remington Arms Co. or any other company is jacking up prices unnecessarily in connection with Government contracts, the proper steps will be taken to recover this money. The items we have already discovered have been rather inconsequential items in a way connected with parts for the making of cartridges, but I again assure the gentleman and the members of the Committee that this matter will receive very thorough and searching investigation in all of its aspects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts has had several extensions of time, and we would be glad to give him more but we are behind schedule on this bill. I shall not object, but I trust we can close debate on the item and move along, as we are anxious to pass the bill this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts put a very direct and searching question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in charge of this bill. He inquired whether or not any of these billions would be repaid. He does not seem to be as well informed upon the subject as Mr. Anthony Eden of the British Government. When that question was put to him the other day about piling up debts in favor of the United States, he said that nothing had been said about any accounting, and no accounting had been made or report made.

Mr. CLASON. I want to answer the gentleman from Kentucky. It seems to me that after all these months, and in view of the tremendous sums of money involved, that it is not a very satisfactory answer to the Members of the House to say every time such a bill comes up, that negotiations are under way, but nothing specific can be said, not even that progress is being made in connection with the matter. Undoubtedly, it is most difficult to draft such an agreement, but let us enter into a fair proposition amicably now and not leave loose ends to create hard feelings after the war is over.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Anthony Eden seemed to indicate clearly that there were no negotiations, and that no accounting has been called for.

Mr. CLASON. I am in favor of the expenditure of the money contained in this bill under the Lend-Lease Act for war materials for Britain, Russia, Turkey and China. I have voted for each appropriation bill for this purpose.

I am in favor of giving them all the aid we can possibly give them. I believe it is a good investment for our own national defense and may save the lives of countless American boys.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can you conceive of any reason why a commission should be paid by this Government or by manufacturers in order to get a Government contract at this time?

Mr. CLASON. No. That is what I was asking about.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the newspaper statement to which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBINSON] refers was called to my attention and I directed an inquiry on the matter to the Secretary of State. The Secretary in a letter which I ask to include in the RECORD, supplies the information which the gentleman requests. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 3, 1941

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: In your letter of November 28, 1941, you call my attention to a statement made by Mr. Eden in the House of Commons to the effect that under the lend-lease arrangement there is no accounting and no debt is piling up and suggest that the exact tenor and purport of Mr. Eden's remarks be examined by the State Department in order that the Congress may not misunderstand the situation.

An examination of Mr. Eden's statement in its context shows that he was replying to a misinformed and unjust criticism of the purpose and effect of the Lend-Lease Act in which the accusation was made that the recipients of lend-lease aid were being placed in bondage to repay debts which were accumulating. Mr. Eden's remarks were made in the course of repudiating any such intention or effect in the operation of the Lend-Lease Act.

The procedures under the act and its purpose are clear. An exact record is kept—as is shown from the quarterly reports made by the President to the Congress—of all aspects of the transactions and transfers occurring under the act. The act provides in section 3 (b) that the terms and conditions upon which any foreign government receives any aid shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory. The very name of the act and the explanations of its underlying purposes made before the committees of Congress and upon the floor of both Houses during its discussion make abundantly clear that its purpose was in the true sense to lend our aid to the nations resisting aggression and upon terms of benefit and value to the United States to be determined in accordance with the varying circumstances and possibilities of each situation.

As has been stated to your committee by an officer of this Department, negotiations are now under way with the British Government concerning the terms of the transactions and the nature of the benefits to the United States. I can state both that there is no purpose in these negotiations to propose terms such as were intemperately charged in the statement to which Mr. Eden was replying, and also that the discussions are concerned with considerations of value to the United States, tangible and intangible.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the chairman can make any statement in regard to the announcement in the paper the other day in connection with the extension of the one billion dollar lease-lend loan to Turkey, that the extension was to be made to Great Britain who would in turn be able to take care of her commitments to provide military aid to Turkey, by passing it along to Turkey?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That matter has not come before the committee, because the question had not developed at the time the bill was reported to the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the chairman would care to state whether in his opinion it would be better business for us to make these extensions directly to the several countries rather than to make them to Great Britain and let her get the credit with these individual nations, and have just one creditor, or would it be better for us to spread our creditors?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is purely an executive matter under the authorization of the Lease-Lend Act.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] it certainly would be to the advantage of the United States to have many creditors, because we know that in the last World War the only creditor that has seen fit to pay us was little Finland, and England repudiated her debt. So that if you except all the debts of all of the other countries and take only Great Britain, you know you are not going to get anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to refer to the language at the top of page 7 of the bill, which reads:

When serving in the Philippine Islands, in excess of the pay and allowances authorized by Philippine law and regulations.

In connection with this $269,000,000 can the gentleman say whether or not it is the intent of the military authorities in charge of the Philippine Constabulary and the Philippine forces to increase

the pay of those men so that it will conform to the same rate of pay which is paid to men in the United States Army? I am informed that there is a very strong movement in Manila at the present time to have the Commonwealth Legislature raise the pay of the Philippine officers and men so that that pay under their law will conform to the same rate of pay which is drawn by our men in our service, and thereby meet the requirements of this bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is specifically provided for in the bill itself. The gentleman will note on pages 6 and 7 it is provided that "no such moneys shall be available for the pay and allowances of personnel of said organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, when serving in the Philippine Islands, in excess of the pay and allowances authorized by Philippine law and regulations."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I may say to the chairman, the question I raise is this: Is there a movement on, in the military policy of the Philippine Commonwealth, to make the rate of pay which these men draw by legislative act over there conform to the pay which our men draw in the service of the United States?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman has noted, there has been some mention in the newspapers of the possibility that the Philippine Legislature may take some such action. Of course, any action by the insular legislature is entirely out of our province. That is a matter of their exclusive jurisdiction. But I will say, however, that the rate of pay and allowances, as provided here, amounts to about one-half the pay of our own forces.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I understood.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken in the House since I went on a tour of duty as a Reserve colonel in the Army maneuvers, and since I have returned I have been somewhat busy with grand jury proceedings. In view of the fact, however, that we are now considering a national-defense measure, I wanted to take this occasion to report very briefly on what I saw at the Army maneuvers. In the first place, I want to go on record as saying that the morale of our soldiers is exceedingly high, that their spirit and their cheerfulness is excellent, and that they have been undergoing in those maneuvers a very rigid and constructive training under fine Army officers from top to bottom. It was one of the biggest Army maneuvers—the biggest, probably—ever held in the United States, if not in the world, and, as far as I could see and learn, I believe it was conducted from beginning to end in a very fine military manner. I have come home with the absolute conviction that the American soldier is the equal of any soldier in the world; and there is every reason for that when you analyze it, because the American boy physically, mentally, and morally is not only the equal but, I believe, the superior of any boy in the world, and given the training they have had in these maneuvers they become trained soldiers, and with about 6 months' further training, and particularly with supplies and equipment which are lacking in some cases, our Army by the 1st of July, at least for defensive purposes, will equal any army in the world. If any army in the world—Nazis included—ever comes over here looking for trouble, we will give them all the trouble they are looking for and give them a first-class licking as well. I could go on at some length on this subject. I also want to say I was assigned while there by General Drum to the new tank attacker unit. I consider General Drum to be one of the best commanding officers we have had in our Army.

I believe General Griswold, his opponent, is also a fine officer; and General Devers, head of the tank force, is one of the very best officers in our Army. General Marshall, our Chief of Staff, is likewise an able, efficient, and outstanding officer. I think we ought to be proud of the leadership of the Army of the United States.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I may say to the gentleman that it was my privilege also to be in the maneuver area several times. I think one of the outstanding things, in addition to what the gentleman has commented on, is the fine way in which the people of the South received the boys who participated in these maneuvers.

Mr. FISH. Yes. We got wonderful cooperation and welcome from all the people of the South.

I was assigned by General Drum to the antitank unit, or what we call the tank-attacker group, a new kind or almost a secret weapon at that time, although now, of course, it is well known as an important combat unit which General Drum devised. The tank-attacker groups are composed of mechanized and motorized troops with 75's, 3-inch guns, 37-millimeter guns, machine guns, tanks, engineers, signal corps, and so forth. The units of that group are supposed to find enemy tanks, follow them, and fight them. It was a great experience, and perhaps as great as I wanted for the time being, because I averaged about 4 hours' sleep a night during the time I was attached to tank-attacker unit No. 1 under Col. John T. Kennedy. But the scheme worked; they found the tanks; they attacked them and stopped them. General Drum has discovered a definite way, I believe, of stopping tanks.

I want to take the few moments remaining to me this afternoon, if I may, to make some comments not only as an individual Member of this House, but as the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on the statement that appeared in the public press yesterday that someone in the Army or the Navy, and possibly the President was preparing for an American expeditionary force of 5,000,000 and an army of 10,000,000 men. I am unwilling to believe that the President has given his support to any such program providing for an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 men. In fairness to himself he should deny it immediately. I want to go on record as saying that I believe there would be few, if any, Members of Congress who would get up on the floor of the House or go back to their districts and say they were in favor of an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 Americans. That proposal of a new A. E. F. has been disavowed by every party platform, it has been repeatedly disavowed by the President himself and by almost every Member of Congress. I am not accusing the President of anything, but I want the people back home to know that there are few, if any, Members of Congress who are in favor or who would dare to say they are in favor of an American expeditionary force of 5,000,000 soldiers fighting all over the world.

We are now confronted with a crystal-clear issue. All other issues are minor, such as the repeal of the Neutrality Act, lend-lease bill, and all the rest; they are water over the mill dam. Now we have reached the main issue and that is, Shall we go into this war or shall we stay out? Shall we have an expeditionary force or shall we not? And, furthermore, Shall Congress decide the war issue in the American and constitutional way, or shall it be decided by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or someone else for us? These three issues are one and identical. They constitute but the single greatest issue before the American people, and I am only asking the Members of the House to decide this issue by one yardstick and one yardstick alone: What is best for America? Not what is best for the British Empire, the Communists, or the Chinese.

It is not asking too much of you Members of Congress to think this issue through upon that one basis, what is best for America. I do not care which side you are on or what your decision is as long as you think it through. We must bring the war issue up on the floor of the House, discuss it, argue it, and debate it, because it involves the safety, the security, and the destiny of America, the greatest nation in the world.

I want to say one thing further, and I want you to believe what I am saying to you comes from my heart, and from the mind; it comes from every fiber in my body. I have believed it for 20 years. War is the greatest criminal folly and the height of all futility, and I believe the day we go into war we will have lost, although we may be victorious in 5, 10, or 20 years, as Senator PEPPER said, and

at a cost of $100,000,000,000 a year. One or two years of war would bankrupt America. We would have an impoverished nation.

I am not talking about lives. Today's paper refers to an army of 10,000,000. There would probably be 3,000,000 killed and 3,000,000 more maimed and disabled, to come back to a living death. Not a single family in America could escape death, blood, and tears, even if we won, even if we crushed Hitler. I am for crushing Hitler by aiding the democracies. I have no use for the Nazis, and I have voted for the appropriations for lend-lease supplies for Great Britain. I repeat, if we enter the war and finally destroy the German Army, we can only do one thing and that is to revive communism, and help establish communism in Germany, Italy, Poland, France—all of Europe—with American lives and treasure. We are now asked to go out and spread the four freedoms even in Soviet Russia. It seems obvious to me that if we crush Germany, Germany will go communistic. The Russian Army will then overrun Europe and Europe will be communistic. We in America will be impoverished and bankrupt. We will have revolution, chaos, destruction of our liberties, we may even lose our form of government and have a dictator such as has never been known. That is the alternative, communism abroad, and the loss of our free institutions, bankruptcy, impoverishment, and ruin and disaster at home.

All I ask is that we think this thing through on that one yardstick, what is best for America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In connection with the very interesting statement which the gentleman has made, and the confidence which he has expressed in the President's opposition to any such mythical expeditionary force as has been mentioned, has the gentleman found any substantiation of the report pertaining to an expeditionary force of 5 or 10 million men, or any other number, or any plan for raising such a force, beyond a statement by one newspaper agency and that without factual proof or corroboration?

Mr. FISH. I hope the gentleman is correct, but if the gentleman is not correct I trust this issue will be taken to the public and to the American people in the next campaign.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman concedes that such an expedition could not be made without legislation by Congress, and that the inference drawn by the commentator in the one newspaper article which is the sole basis for all of this discussion, is wholly unwarranted by the documents it purports to quote?

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman think then the President ought to disavow it himself?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the President of the United States, or the Chief Executive of any other nation attempted to disavow every misrepresentation made by the columnists of the daily newspapers, he would have no time to devote to any other interest, either foreign or domestic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 102. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the Secretary of War to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense article procured from funds appropriated for the Military Establishment since March 11, 1941, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, No. 11). The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under authority of this paragraph shall not exceed $500,000,000.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened most interestingly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I am at quite a loss. Perhaps it is due to my dullness of comprehension, and, if so, he is in no way responsible for my bluntness. But did I hear him say, or did you hear him say, that he took no stock in this report of an expeditionary force and that he could not believe the President had sanctioned such a thing? Moreover, that he did not know of any Member of Congress who favored such a thing? In the very next sentence did you hear him say, or am I mistaken, "Now I come to the main issue; that is, whether or not we shall have war and an expeditionary force"?

What is there about an issue if there is nobody on the other side? Did he not say that? Read the RECORD, unless he changes it. He said he did not believe the President said that and he did not believe any Member of this body favored it. "Now we come to the main issue," he stated; and what is the issue? There is nobody on the other side. Instead of a flat repudiation of the papers that published it, in answering the question of the gentleman from Missouri, he said he wanted to go to the country with it. He wanted to go to the country with what? I thought when you went to the country with something it was on a controversy that at least the Congress was divided about. I never heard before of anybody wanting to go to the country with an issue, having the people vote on something, when there was nobody on the other side. If he did not say that I will eat the page of the RECORD on which his statement appears. When asked a pointed question, whether or not he believed that the report was false, he crawfished a little bit after he got back to his seat, but he wanted to go to the country with it. He said here he did not believe it, yet he wants to go to the country with it to have a referendum, I guess, to find out whether or not the people believe it. That would be an issue, perhaps, a referendum.

I want to apologize if I have misunderstood his language. If I am correct, he should make some clarification, either when he corrects his remarks or later.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 7, line 22, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and on page 8 strike out lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether or not you have given very much thought to the matter of appropriating here for lend-lease purposes, but if you will figure it up you will find that with the $7,000,000,000 we have already appropriated and the $5,985,000,000 later appropriated, plus the $1,556,496,264 and the $500,000,000 I am just now asking to strike out, there is a grand total of $15,043,496,264.

I was thinking this morning as I passed down the aisle here voting on an amendment to increase an appropriation from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 in order that the boys might come home in order to see their fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters and sweethearts just what these fathers and mothers are going to think and what these sweethearts and brothers and sisters are going to think back home when they find out that we voted that down and are now going to give some foreign countries $500,000,000 of the money of these fathers and mothers. That is something for us to think about here. Just exactly how long can you maintain the morale of the boys who are now in the service if you continue a process of this kind?

A few days ago we paid out in 1 day over $5,000,000 for interest on the obligations of this country, and we were asked this morning to increase the appropriation to $15,000,000. Nobody around here thought that these boys would come back if they got the $15,000,000, because there is no bill here that provides for them to come back at all. There would be an appropriation to increase the amount to $15,000,000, with no authority to bring the men back. The bill is still in committee, and everybody knows that the bill will not come out of the committee.

I am interested in the question I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations yesterday. It was a direct question, and I could have had a direct answer if the chairman had seen fit to answer it, if he knew. It may be that he does not know. This is the question I asked him, and here is his answer:

Mr. JOHNS. Just one more question, if the gentleman will permit. This appropriation contains an additional amount for lease-lend. Can the gentleman inform the House just how much money of the original $13,000,000,000 has already been spent? I do not mean how much has been allocated under contract, but what has been actually spent? The Treasury reports show something over $600,000,000.

On December 2 the report of the Treasury of the United States showed that we

had actually paid out of the $13,985,000,000 exactly $654,923,462.97.

What is the reply of the chairman to that question? Did he answer it? He said:

We are expanding as we go ahead. It is proceeding at an accelerated tempo. Expenditure is now at the rate of $200,000,000 a month. It takes some time to get underway. In many cases we have to build facilities in order to get production started. As of the 13th day of November we had allocated the entire $7,000,000,000. As of December 1 about 40 percent of the $5,985,000,000 which was made available on October 28 had been allocated.

I want to know just exactly how much of this money has been paid out. I am not interested in any promises of contracts to somebody; neither am I interested in how much has been allocated to anybody. No one around here will say anything about to whom this is allocated. I do not know whether it is allocated to somebody to build some nice little fence or whether it is allocated to England or Turkey or Russia or whom. I think the people of this country ought to know where this money is going and how much of it is going to certain places.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. I was very much interested, of course, in the letter the chairmay had here this morning which he said denies the statement the gentleman from Kentucky made here about the statement made by Anthony Eden in the House of Commons. I am not like what my good friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] says about the President. I think that Anthony Eden actually said in the House of Commons just exactly what is reported. I do not know anything about this letter. If it is here, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will put it in the RECORD today, so that the American people can make up their own minds as to what was said over in the House of Commons.

The Milwaukee Sentinel, published at Milwaukee, Wis., on December 3, 1941, said this:

The most illuminating, and certainly the most honest, acknowledgment of American prodigality in the present war was made in a recent Commons debate by Britain's foreign secretary, Anthony Eden.

Mr. Eden spoke in answer to a critic of the British Government, who said:

"When this is all over the United States will hold us in financial bondage."

To which Mr. Eden replied:

"That is not true.

"Under the lease-lend arrangement there is no accounting and no debt piling up."

Immediately conscious of probable American reaction to this frank declaration, other British sources hastened to explain.

But the explanation merely confirmed the Eden declaration.

It said Britain "is, of course, committed to return or replace everything she receives, and everyone knows this is an obligation which must and will be met. Mr. Eden sought to assure the British people that there would not be another gigantic war debt to be paid off with money they don't have and won't have, and thus there won't be the recriminations that followed the last war."

If there is no accounting of what Britain receives, how can there ever be return and replacement?

If there is to be no debt for which Britain is accountable to America after the war, what constitutes the obligation "which must and will be met"?

Surely it must be enormously reassuring to the British people that the lease-lend arrangement is not another "hiring" of money and materials, as Calvin Coolidge described the previous arrangement.

Mr. Eden probably spoke "out of turn," but he spoke honestly and in strict accordance with the facts.

It might be wished an equally representative and authoritative American statesman would speak as honestly to the American people and at least give them an accurate understanding of the lease-lend arrangement on a level with Mr. Eden's assurance to the British people.

I am not going to follow this any further, but I said on this floor when this first started, that it is just as well that the American people know that they are not going to get this money back as it is to fool them, as they were fooled in the last war, when we loaned them millions of dollars, and they never paid it back, and the people of the United States still feel they ought to have it, and up until this war started, they expected that they would get it back. That is the situation confronting us. Billions of dollars have been appropriated, but nobody knows where it is going, or how much of it has already been spent, except the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, or how it is being allocated. I think that we are getting ready for this expeditionary force that was reported in the newspapers yesterday, and that we are getting these appriations ready, so that when the time comes the money may be used when the people will not be in such good mood to appropriate it as they are now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNS. I do.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I refer to section 102. I make the point of order that it is not in order because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on that point of order. The point of order comes too late, debate having been had on the proposition. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman's suggestion that I put this information in the RECORD, if the gentleman had been giving any attention at all to the proceedings here on the floor this afternoon, he would have known that the information has already been placed in the RECORD in the form of a letter from Secretary Hull, than whom no man in America more completely enjoys the confidence of the Congress. His letter is a complete answer to the gentleman's inquiry, and has already been inserted in the RECORD in full.

As to the second point raised by the gentleman, relative to lend-lease expenditures, when the gentleman asked his question yesterday, I took for granted that he was submitting a constructive question, and that he was really seeking information. So I gave him the information applicable to the question which he raised. As the House knows, the controlling factor is not the amount expended, but the amount allocated.

So far as expenditures are concerned, operations are proceeding as rapidly as facilities permit. There is nothing Congress—or anybody else—can do that is not being done. The real gage is in the allocations. There is the bottleneck, if any. In order to expedite; in order to carry out the program; in order to keep its production going and supplies moving, allocations must be kept current, and that means keeping appropriations current and funds available.

All funds have now been allocated and eventually production will stop unless further funds are provided. For this reason it is imperative that we make appropriations now; and for this reason I gave the gentleman what I thought he requested. However if he merely wanted to submit an oratorical question, I cite him to page 9430 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where, in the last half of the first column of my remarks, the figures to which he so emphatically refers are to be found. If he had glanced through the RECORD he would have noted that:

From March 27, 1941, to June 30, 1941, $21,000,000 was actually paid out. From July 1 to November 29, a total of $633,000,000 had been paid out, making a total since March 27 of $654,000,000.

There is the information about which the gentleman is so deeply concerned.

As to the gentleman's argument in behalf of his amendment, it is difficult to answer specifically, because at no time did he give any reason for eliminating the appropriation, or any facts in support of his amendment. He simply wants to strike it out, because the House rejected some other amendment he thought ought to go in. That is the only reason he advances as warranting the mutilation of the bill.

Now, what would be the effect of the gentleman's amendment if the House in a moment of mental aberration should agree to it? Much has been said about avoiding the necessity of sending an expeditionary force abroad. And it is my understarding that the gentleman takes that view. The best way in the world to avoid the necessity of sending an expeditionary force abroad is to provide this money and send weapons over to arm foreign soldiers and enable them to keep the war over there. By that means we will keep the war out of America and America out of the war. But if the gentleman is opposed to sending arms and wishes to deny these men fighting to protect their

hearthstones from the invader, the arms with which to defend themselves and their homes, his amendment is the way to do it. Nothing will do more to crush the nonaggressor armies which stand between America and Hitler than the passage of the gentleman's amendment cutting off funds for arming our Allies abroad.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri were asked to explain this $654,000,000, as to where the merchandise which comprises that item went and to what countries it went, he could not tell you. He does not know. He cannot give you a definite statement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely in error in that statement. If he will consult Senate Document 112, the report of the President, made at the last date provided by law, under the operation of the Lend-Lease Act, he will find a complete report of every expenditure in detail.

Mr. RICH. I will say we tried to get this information from the War Department and the War Department will not give it to us. They say they do not know. They will not give it to a Member of Congress. That was stated in the report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will merely refer to the document, he need not phone anybody. It is all here.

Mr. RICH. I do not yield any further, because the gentleman cannot answer the question.

Now, this section in controversy gives the President the power to grant to the Secretary the right to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease-lend, or otherwise dispose of. It gives the President an opportunity to do away with $500,000,000 worth of merchandise and equipment that is now for our own national defense in any way and manner he sees fit. He now has too much power. I say to the House of Representatives that our house is not in order. We have not taken care of our national defense. Everything we are doing now is for foreign countries. We are shipping out of this country the things that were manufactured for our own defense, and we could not defend our own shores if we were attacked.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to strike out title 3 of this bill, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may eliminate the whole title at one time, but if unanimous consent is not granted, then I am going to be compelled to offer 10 amendments in order that we might accomplish that.

I do not know how the House feels about taking care of our own national defense. I am for America 100 percent, and I want to build up our own national defense before we ship out everything that we have got in this country to defend our country with, and then permit some enemy to come and attack us.

Now, that is the situation in which we find ourselves today. It is a deplorable condition. Certainly we should not permit the President of the United States to take all the things that are being manufactured and most of them now contracted for under the Lend-Lease Act and give it to other countries.

It was stated here we have contributed through lend-lease, which includes the $1,556,000,000 in section 3, a total of $14,541,000,000. If this resolution is passed today it will amount to $15,041,000,000 for lend-lease. That is a terrible sum. That means $112 for every man, woman, and child in America. The people have to go down in their own pockets at some time in the future to raise this money in order that the President of the United States may give it to countries which he may deem advisable.

Then I notice in the paper the British are to make war on Finland; the only country we have loved, up to 3 months ago, for taking care of their obligations. Now Great Britain is going to declare war on them. When they do that the United States, through Secretary Hull, has demanded them to stop their aggression on Russia. What did Russia do to Finland a year ago? It was a terrible situation. Every Member of Congress disapproved of the acts of Russia. Now you are going to turn a somersault and try to prohibit Finland from defending herself. Where are we going to? We certainly do crazy, funny, unethical things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What I want to say is, the biggest thing before the country today is not this seven- or eight-billion-dollar appropriation bill, but the biggest thing before the country this December day is whether this thing that came out yesterday is true or false. That is the biggest thing.

The gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of this committee, is the only man I can think of who spoke yesterday who declared there was nothing to it; that it was just a newspaper timing proposition, with no foundation at all. I think he is the only man who went that far. Following him was our distinguished leader, JOHN TABER, who agrees with him on the war policy, who said that all the quotes he thought were substantially true. Now, there is the difference. There was not anybody else who said it but the gentleman from Missouri.

We know from the news releases of last night that there were hurried conferences between the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the President yesterday to find out who it was that leaked.

Now, who was it leaked? That was important. I think it is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] referred to the campaign of next year. My goodness! This question of being in this war is going to be over before the November election of next year. It will be too late to make an issue out of this 10,000,000-man expeditionary force next November.

One of the reasons I am against this bill is because most of this money is intended to be used for the purpose of getting this Army of 10,000,000 men ready. I believe they are really counting on it. If this is not true why did not the President deny this thing? Why does he not deny it?

There are just two reasons for this information getting out, in my opinion: Either somebody let this leak out in order to cower Japan, or they saw that it got out to sort of apprise the American people gradually and softly of what was coming, or just what is in their minds.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think we have reason to believe that if this story of an A. E. F. were not true the President would deny it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Certainly.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Because when the same newspaper published a story about a women's defense organization the President within 24 hours called it a cockeyed lie, to use his expression, although some of us women Members had documentary evidence of the truth of the story in our desks.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The other day the President took the time in his press conference to jump on one little magazine which said something unkind about a President in South America and called the story a lie. I think it is safe to assume that they did this to cower Japan, and it is the truth. We have been buying socks and shirts for 10,000,000 men. We know that we are equipping an army of 10,000,000 men, yet we go right ahead and do it. Now, if this was not let out to cower Japan, then it was done to let the people know kind of easy like—because the President is not denying it at all—that we are getting ready for an army of 10,000,000 men. I am against this bill, because this ordnance, the biggest item in this bill, is a getting-ready for this army of 10,000,000. They are fooling us. Let us wake up on this thing. Do not say the President would not consider any such thing, for the President is committed to crush Hitler, and the Army told him that to crush Hitler would take 10,000,000 men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the remainder of the committee's time be allotted to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussions relative to a report indicating the possibility of an expeditionary force, and in view of the fact it is conceded the President knows nothing of the report, that the Secretary of War has no idea of authorizing such a force, that the Secretary of the Navy has no knowledge of it, the question arises as to whose idea it could be. Who is it that first suggested the possibility of an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 men?

I am wondering whether or not the emissaries of Hitler in this country could have been responsible for the suggestion in order to get the reaction of Congress and the people. It has been intimated that 2 years ago, before Hitler undertook to overrun Europe, the question was asked in this country whether there would be an expeditionary force. We knew that England and France had not paid us for

our aid in the World War. It was suggested we would be foolish to again be caught in the same trap. I do not know whether it was propaganda or not, but we subscribed to the suggestion and said, "No," all the way from the President of the United States down to the humblest citizen. We said "No," there would be no American expeditionary force in Europe. Of course, this was exactly what Hitler wanted to know before he arranged his campaign to overrun Europe. Now, since he has practically rearranged the map of Europe and before charting his plans to enlarge his operations for next year in his world-domination program, he would like to know whether the United States would be willing to send an expeditionary force of 5,000,000 men to foreign soil. Therefore, in view of Nazi propaganda in this country for the last 3 years, and in the absence of anyone who is willing to say that he or she is responsible for circulating that report, I can see that it may be the Nazi emissaries trying to find out whether we have changed our minds or not. Perhaps Hitler and his associates would like to know in advance just what the sentiment is in this country and just what we are planning to do so they will be able to chart their program for the next few years.

I think it is just as reasonable to make this assumption as it is, in the absence of any additional information, to say it comes from the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Navy, because we all know that this Congress has already gone on record by legislative edict as opposing an expeditionary force. We have said that it cannot be done under any circumstances without further action of the Congress. We said that last year when we passed the Selective Service Act. Then why, why should we be putting up a straw man now only to knock him down? Why should we be putting up this idea and call it an issue, in order to discuss it?

To my mind, the issue suggested comes from other sources. It does not come from the fertile brain of Members of Congress, because we know it is futile, we know it is absurd, we know it is absolutely uncalled for in view of the definite, positive action we have heretofore taken. Does it come from the emissaries of Hitler, and then leave to us to peddle it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS), there were—ayes 19, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. I would like to know what the reading of section 103 means.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a citation, that is all. It is a citation for the purpose of identification. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Care of the dead, $100,000, of which amount $10,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the fiscal year 1941.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of around $8,000,000,000 making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943. This is a gigantic amount of money, and when it is passed and the money made available we will have made available for national defense around $68,000,000,000 in the last 2 years. We of the Appropriations Committee are certain that next February or next March there will be additional appropriations for the same purpose. I know there is not now and there has not been objection toward making appropriations for actual national defense. I am pleased that our investigating committees are working and bringing to light the efforts to sabotage our defense by those who are trying to make big profits out of national-defense expenditures. The public demands that we get a full dollar's worth of defense for every dollar we are spending. Therefore I hope these committees be continued until all of these alleged "rackets" are eliminated.

It was my privilege to attend the recent Army maneuvers in North and South Carolina, and I wish to compliment the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] and his committee members for attending these maneuvers and for the fine reports they have made. Those of us attending those maneuvers had the opportunity of visiting with many of the officers and enlisted men and discussing with them their various problems. We visited with General Drum and General Griswold and their staffs. We attended the critiques following each days activities in the field. We went with the men into the field, and we ate with them and visited their tents and places of abode. I wish to take this opportunity of telling you that I am proud of the men and officers whom I saw in action in those maneuvers. They displayed the best spirits possible. Their morale was excellent and their cooperation was ideal. I believe they represent the finest manhood in the world, and when eventually trained will be the best soldiers in the world.

It was a real pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to find our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Colonel FADDIS, actively engaged in the field with his troops, and we were pleased to be given a fine report of the work done by our other colleague the gentleman from New York, Colonel FISH, who was also engaged with his troops in the same maneuvers.

One thing that impressed me was the close friendship between officers and men. To find that in critiques the noncommissioned officers were to be brought together with the commissioned officers in order to work out the various war problems indicated a great advance in our Army psychology. I believe that this coordination between officers and men on the great problems confronting them from day to day will aid in bringing our Army up to the modern standard toward which it is working.

While we found the men and officers in the best of spirits, Mr. Chairman, we found a shortage of very important modern mechanized matériel. There is sufficiency of shoulder arms, but there seems to be a lack of small-arms ammunition, which the soldiers seemed to miss, because they appeared to want that part of the activity which makes war games more realistic.

Mr. Chairman, these maneuvers are over. It was a great war game, and I hope it has resulted in much good training for both men and officers. But I hope that this training is directed at actual national defense and the defense of the Western Hemisphere. In this debate there is so much talk about another American expeditionary force. I hope there is no truth in these reports. I pray that nothing like that is planned now. Our people do not want it. The cold fact is that our Army is not ready for it. We just do not have the trained men nor the necessary personnel for any such undertaking. The Army experts to whom we talked in these maneuvers told us that we are far behind in being ready for such a thing. Even some of the foreign military experts who were there indicated that fact to us. Our confidential meetings with the War Department experts also indicate that we are not ready. So let there be an end to the talk about another American expeditionary force. Let us here concentrate on building up our own defense and the defense of our own hemisphere and include something toward winning the economic war which is bound to come in the post-war period. That problem is not discussed here today, but it will be a serious problem.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Senator LODGE, who has been in training in the South, stated in Worcester on Tuesday last, "There is a shortage of ammunition." Does not the gentleman deplore the fact that we are so far behind in our small arms and ammunition? I mean cartridges from .30s to .50s?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are many plants that could be used. There are many plants in my district that could be used, but those plants have not been used. Lowell produced more cartridges during the World War than any other community. Those buildings are ready for use today with highly trained labor available, power, railroads, and sidings, heat, and light.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusets. It is a tragic thing.

Mr. STEFAN. The Army, in my opinion, is cognizant of that fact and is trying to bring up the necessary supplies.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are not acting very quickly on it.

In fact, there has been an incredible delay. If available facilities had been used, the shortage of cartridges would not exist today.

Mr. STEFAN. Perhaps that is true.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to something that came to our desk in the last day or two. I refer to the advance copy of Fortune. I recommend that all Members read it. That article on How Good Is Our Army? should be the handbook of the Army and Navy and the people of America who are interested in really developing an army for real national defense or any other emergency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—DEFENSE AID

SEC. 301. To enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, further to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, and for each and every purpose incident to or necessary therefor, the following sums for the following respective purposes, namely:

(a) For the procurement, by manufacture or otherwise, of defense articles, information, and services for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and the disposition thereof, including all necessary expenses in connection therewith, as follows:

(1) Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and components thereof, $830,507,246.

(3) Tanks, armored cars, automobiles, trucks, and other automotive vehicles, spare parts, and accessories, $583,139,000.

(5) Miscellaneous military and naval equipment, supplies, and materials, $17,850,000.

(6) Facilities and equipment for the manufacture, production, or operation of defense articles and for otherwise carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, including the acquisition of land, and the maintenance and operation of such facilities and equipment, $125,000,000.

(b) In all, $1,556,496,246, to remain available until June ?0, 1943.

(c) Each of the foregoing appropriations shall be additional to, and consolidated with, the appropriations for the same purposes contained in section 1 (a) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, and section 101 (a) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942, and the proviso in section 101 (f) of such latter act shall be applicable to such consolidated appropriations.

SEC. 302. Any defense article procured pursuant to this title shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine, in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign government, whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby.

SEC. 303. This title may be cited as the Second Deficiency Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite the consideration of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read, and that amendments be in order to any paragraph of the title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against title III that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out for the benefit of the Chair what there is in the title that is legislation?

Mr. RICH. It reads as follows:

To enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, further to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States.

It gives the President of the United States power here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, that is merely a repetition of what is in the act of March 11, 1941, which fully authorizes every item in the title with the exception of section 302, and that paragraph is no longer subject to a point of order because consent has been given to consider it and allow amendments to be offered to it. Section 3 of Public Law No. 11 of the Seventy-seventh Congress provides in full for the authorizations necessary to the consideration of this title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has examined the act of March 11, 1941, which authorizes the appropriations contained in this title, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RICH moves to strike out all of title III, beginning in line 6, page 11, and ending on line 25, page 12.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—and I shall not object—I call attention to the fact that if we intend to get through with this bill today we must expedite action. If we do not complete the consideration of the bill today, it will only delay the hope of the leaders that we shall be able to get away substantially prior to Christmas. If the consideration of this bill goes over until Monday, it will only hold back on the other end. I make this observation in the hope that the consideration of the bill will be completed today.

Mr. MOTT. How far this side of Christmas does "substantially" mean?

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to make it next Friday or Saturday; a week from today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation and the authorizations for 1941 and 1942 for national defense and lease-lend amount to over $69,000,000,000. Think of that, over $69,000,000,000 you have appropriated and authorized at this session of the Congress, the greatest sum of money ever appropriated by any body in the world in the same time. For lease-lend under the act of March 27, 1941, you appropriated $7,000,000,000; under the act of October 28, 1941, you appropriated $5,985,000,000; and the amount in this bill is $1,556,000,000 for lease-lend, a total of $14,541,000,000. Adding in the $500,000,000 you appropriated in section 102 a few minutes ago makes the total $15,041,000,000, or $112 for every man, woman, and child in America. The President can and will give it away. It is other people's money, and he is used to it. Do not forget that.

We are giving the President of the United States power to make a distribution to the various countries as he sees fit, and you call it national defense. Again I say, I am for the national defense of America 100 percent, but I do not believe that this is for our national defense.

It is only for the aid and assistance of foreign countries, to the detriment of the American citizen, the American taxpayers. I am against this bill and I am against this section because I have no idea that this administration is now going to cut it out. When the administration wants a thing you vote it through. Remember, this will rise up to plague you.

The gentleman from Michigan a while ago tried to accuse the Republicans of making these huge appropriations. What bunk. You will find when the roll is called on this bill, as you have on all other bills, that this administration is responsible. You New Dealers furnish the majority vote.

The death knell of American liberty, American independence, and American freedom is being sounded. You are going to wreck America on the rocks of financial distress. No truer words were ever spoken than those uttered by the President of the United States, and I quote:

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If Government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

No truer words were ever said, but no one is doing more to put this country into bankruptcy than the President of the United States and this Congress. What are you going to do about it? Where are you going to get the money? You will find out when you go back to your taxpayers that they are going to raise hullabaloo with you because you are putting them in this position. You are nation wreckers, not builders. I do not see how your constituents and mine are ever going to stand the burden you are placing on them. I am sure the majority of the Members of Congress think the same as I do and realize that they are going deeper and deeper into the slough of despond and into bankruptcy; yet you are willing to take the recommendation of the President without due consideration, giving him billions and billions and piling them up on our national debt without any recourse. It certainly will be a sorrowful time for America.

Let me quote this little piece of poetry:

BUILDERS OR WRECKERS

I watched them tearing a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town.
With a ho-heave-ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and the side wall fell.
I asked the foreman: "Are these men skilled,
And the men you'd hire if you had to build?"
He gave a laugh and said: "No, indeed,
Just common labor is all I need.
I can easily wreck in a day or two
What builders have taken a year to do."
I thought to myself as I went my way,
Which of these roles have I tried to play?
Am I a builder who marks with care,
Measuring life by the rule and square?
Am I shaping my deeds to a well-made plan?
Patiently doing the best I can?
Or am I a wrecker who walks the town,
Content with the labor of tearing down?

Your forefathers built up a great Nation in 154 years, and the New Deal will tear it down in 12 to 15 years so that your liberty will be gone, your freedom lost; your wealth dissipated and a dictator will rule, in place of the people under the Constitution. I say it will be too bad for our people and our country. I am against the bill, for it is another step of eight billions nearer bankruptcy and a dictator.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is much use of saying anything more to the House about my opposition to this appropriation. I am still of the opinion that all we have spent of the $13,000,000,000 or $12,985,000,000, is $654,523,462.97. That is all that has been shown we have spent of the original appropriations, although we are asking here now to appropriate over $2,000,000,000 more, to be given as a blank check to the President of the United States to give to anyone he desires. I know that the people of this country do not want anything of that kind, and I know that we are going to pay the penalty, and the time is not far away when we will hear in no unmistakable terms from the people of the United States. I have stood in the Well of the House and fought these large appropriations ever since I have been in Congress. I expect to continue to do so, and some of these days—and it is not very far away—you will hear from the people back home, and you will hear from them in a way that some of you will not overlook or misunderstand what is being said. With this total appropriation here, if you pass it you will have $15,043,432,264 that can be given away to any foreign country that the President wants to give it to. There is no doubt that it will be handed out to anybody that the President believes ought to have it. The taxpayers will have to pay for it. When March 15 comes next year, then for the first time the Members of Congress will hear from back home, and they will hear in understandable language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we do not have time today to discuss a bill such as this, involving the expenditure of the mere sum of eight and a quarter billion dollars for national defense. It may be of interest to the members of the Committee to learn at this time that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the entire revenue collected by our Government amounted to $7,370,108,377, or about one billion less than this single appropriation bill provides.

Yesterday in Colorado funeral services were held for one of the most distinguished Members of the United States Senate, who passed away last Monday. This man was a loyal, patriotic American, who had been privileged to serve as the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, which has considered these deficiency appropriations. Probably the last statement which Senator Adams made prior to his death was quoted in the New York Times on November 20, when he called attention to the fact that we were being asked to appropriate for war supplies "far in excess of the needs for American defense," and that the military production program was being conducted with "incalculable waste."

This newspaper article continues:

Senator Adams thought that Congress should scrutinize this bill with extreme care, voting only such funds as the Army and Navy were able to show were needed at this time. He cited testimony taken by his committee on previously approved money bills as showing that Army and Navy appropriations, taken together with $13,000,000,000 provided for the lease-lend account, would keep all of the industries of the country presently manufacturing munitions busy until the end of 1943.

The addition of another $7,000,000,000, he said, could only mean an even greater dislocation of private industrial activity, with consequently greater repercussions when the private firms were asked to pick up the manufacturing load after the war ended.

I say to you at this time that title III has no place in this bill. Heretofore Members of this House who have been in disagreement over whether the lease-lend aid is an essential part of our national defense, have had an opportunity to vote on all of the essential defense items dealing with our own defense program. Now such defense items are merged with lease-lend, for the first time.

In appropriating these billions, we should pause to consider the financial conditions which will obtain in the post-war period. Chaos and bankruptcy will confront the Nation, and we may discover that the four freedoms which we are seeking to preserve in foreign lands will have disappeared here. I favor all sound defense measures, but contend that we must not be unmindful of our responsibilities to develop an impregnable preparedness on this continent, and then to preserve the liberties and security of the American people. This should be our first concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be a tragedy if this amendment were to be adopted. I did not vote for the Lease-Lend Act, but I think that for us now, after having gone where we are, to say that we are not going to make this appropriation for the lease-lend policy would be folly as far as the Nation is concerned.

I have not been too happy about the way in which the discussion has gone on here with respect to the article which appeared in the papers yesterday. I do not believe we are going to win this war by bluffing, but when we do say we are going to do something I cannot see that anything is to be gained by pulling our punches.

If, as has been stated so positively by leading spokesmen for the majority party that an expeditionary force is not contemplated and will not be sent, I have no objection to plain words on that point. I want them to be plain—to our own people and to the world. In fairness to England and Russia and China there should be plain speaking on that point.

On the matter of production and the supplying of arms, however, the country has spoken and our word has been given. And, indeed, when you start handing a man guns to shoot somebody else, you better hand him aplenty and be sure he has plenty of ammunition, and be sure you are getting set to defend yourself if anything goes wrong with him. That is what this bill seeks to do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I am not going to yield in my limited time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see why there should be any disguising the fact that this bill does carry some body blows for Mr. Hitler. The chairman of the committee during the hearings made this plain statement to the committee, that previous appropriations had provided production facilities for 4,000,000 men and some funds were asked in this bill to provide some additional production facilities.

We were told in plain language by representatives of the War Department that this bill would provide a reservoir of ammunition and critical supplies over and above that needed for an army of the size we now have. We were told that the aim was to produce or to put ourselves in position to produce whatever was needed to insure the safety of the United States. We were told that more estimates will be before us in January.

I hope that this bill is a body blow to Mr. Hitler and that it is only a part of what is to come. Why should we hesitate to face the fact that we are going to appropriate $150,000,000,000 or $200,000,000,000 if necessary before we get through with this?

Why not be frank with the people and let them know what this program will cost? Why try to soften the blow and cripple the program?

It should be remembered that these lend-lease goods are not transferred until they are completed and that even then, by the provisions of section 302 of this bill the President is directed to retain them for our own use when our defense will be best served thereby.

In the hearings on the Army appropriation bill for 1941 the question was asked by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] and myself, and we were told by representatives of the War Department that it would take $100,000,000,000 for us to match the preparedness that Mr. Hitler already had. That was 2 years ago. Do you think we can catch up with him under high-cost conditions without spending more than that? Why should we worry about the figures in this bill or

what was published in the paper yesterday when every Member of the House has been circularized by a letter and when the papers last July carried a statement by the Federal Power Commission in which it was said that our defense expenditures would be $3,000,000,000 a month by the middle of 1943?

The time to have worried about the cost of becoming policeman for the world was when we took on the job, and some of us did worry about it. I wish the entire cost of war, pensions and all, could be brought before us so that while we prosecute our part in it we would endeavor to end it, but I do not see why we should get excited and say we are going to pull our punches, or intimate that we are pulling our punches, when we are not.

Before me is a Member of the House who recently called my attention to a newspaper article in which the Governor of my State made a speech in Milwaukee. He was quoted as saying that the sentiment in my State was overwhelmingly isolationist, but intimated that the House and Senate delegation was divided and that I was on the fence. Let me assure him or anyone that when it comes to a question of the security and defense of the United States, I am neither on the fence nor on the wrong side of the fence. I support what I think is at that time the best way for the United States to maintain her independence and security.

I did not vote to get started down this road. I tried to suggest a different course for America. I would keep my eyes open for a road into the clearing today—and for the whole world. But by all that I have I am not going to try to cut off the supply of gasoline now that we are on this road. I do not want to see us stranded. I want the United States to get through.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Are we permitted to offer amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending to strike out the title, but the gentleman may offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HARE. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 12 at the end of line 23, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That any person acting for or in behalf of the United States Government found guilty of knowingly disbursing or expending any of the funds herein appropriated for an obviously inconsistent purpose other than that for which appropriated shall be subject to a fine not exceeding $10,000 or imprisonment for more than 3 years, or both within the discretion of the court."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am compelled to make a point of order against the amendment. I will be glad to reserve the point of order and give the gentleman an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. HARE. I do.

Mr. RICH. May an amendment be offered to a paragraph when there is an amendment pending, when it is not an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to strike out the title. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is a perfecting amendment.

The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I am not unmindful that a point of order may properly be raised against it, but I want to say it is very discouraging and disheartening to Members of Congress, particularly to the members of the Appropriations Committee, who give days and weeks and sometimes months in an effort to analyze and properly interpret the justifications for appropriations, to find that frequently, according to testimony recently submitted to some of the committees of Congress, these appropriations are expended for purposes contrary to what they were intended.

My primary purpose in bringing this to the attention of the House is to emphasize to committees that have already been authorized to investigate the manner in which these defense appropriations have been expended, particularly the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the special committee provided for yesterday. Many reports are current to the effect that large sums of money have been spent contrary to the purposes and intention of the Congress and your Appropriations Committee. We would like to see these committees bring to Congress at the earliest possible date legislation that will not only take care of those who are violating the purpose and intention of the acts of Congress but give to them such punishment as their actions may warrant.

I understand, of course, that the amendment I have offered cannot be placed on this bill for the reason that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill, which is contrary to the rules of the House; but there is no reason why such legislation cannot be enacted at an early date if the investigations are made and facts are found to justify it. As stated at the outset, my purpose is to emphasize the necessity for immediate action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not like the size of these appropriation bills. On the other hand, we have taken part in the war. Shooting is going on. Unless we are going to be obliged to send troops over into Europe and Africa and have troubles all over the world, we are going to be obliged to supply Great Britain with the things with which to fight.

I can see nothing in opposition to this title except a determination on the part of those who oppose it at this time that our own boys shall be actually involved in the shooting in actual military hostilities as quick as we can get there; and I cannot see any question but what it is an invitation to everybody else to pick on us. I do not want to see that situation. I want to see America go on and defend herself in the best way, and I think that that is the safe way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

The things here in this bill are not on so large a scale as some have stated. If you wish to see what is intended turn to page 90 of the hearings where you will find a statement in the middle of the page by General Brown that tells you just what these estimates will do. The facilities, the essential items, are only for 1,725,000 men. They do include certain critical items of equipment for 3,000,000, and they include production facilities to take care of 4,000,000 men, but not the equipment, not the things to work with. The thing is not as unreasonable as it has been made to appear.

I hope the House will sustain the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is little use in detaining the Committee in speaking against this amendment to strike the title which further extends the lease-lend policy; but echoing somewhat the sentiment of the distinguished gentleman from New York, it is exceedingly hard for me to understand the reasoning of some of our colleagues and some of our other distinguished American citizens who hate war so much, who are so horrified at the thought of the bloodshed and devastation that follows war, but who yet are unwilling to make an economic contribution to the people who are giving their lives and giving their destiny to try to stop the thing we want to see stopped before it gets to our own shores. Certainly a man must be hard of comprehension if he does not understand by now that if we do not have to meet the forces of aggression now rampant in Europe and Asia there will only be one reason, and that is because they are stopped before they get here. Now, if that be true——

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is not true.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is only the gentleman's opinion, and the gentleman, fortunately, is in a great big minority.

If that be true, then it is my opinion, and the opinion, apparently, of a great many other Americans, that this war is going to be settled in the industrial production of America and our ability to put those implements in the hands of the people who are fighting.

It has been slow, there have been disappointments, there have been things to criticize, strikes have delayed them. I could occupy hours talking about those things, but the other side of the picture is that in a period of less than 2 years we have accomplished miracles in America. The industrial establishments of this country are turning from their lines, tanks, planes, and ships. We are building a ship a day. Every time the sun sinks, a vessel slides into the water for the purpose of carrying our commerce and carrying defense materials; and we are just now on the point, as Mr. Knudsen tells us, where we are about to blossom out with all of this production for which we have been appropriating money, building factories, building tools, and training men.

Now, do we want to avoid war? Then sustain the hands of the men who have stopped Hitler; and they have stopped him, in my humble judgment. Adolf Hitler is on the downward path and we, largely because of the sustaining strength and the moral influence of this great country that stands for liberty and freedom, heartened the British people; we not only sent them tanks and planes, but we told them that this great Nation was standing behind them and willing to contribute to the defense of their country. We heartened the Russian people, we heartened the Chinese people. Contrary to the expectation and prediction of our military experts Adolf Hitler is bogged down in Russia tonight. If we can go forward with our industrial production Adolf Hitler will continue to go the downward path and we shall be spared the ravages of war.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In the Rostov area where the Russians have driven the Germans back, as the gentleman says, it is impossible for troops to operate except when the ground is frozen or in the middle of the summer and early fall. The best military information is they cannot reorganize in that area this winter but will have to wait until after the spring thaw and the summer before they can make an attack upon the Russian oil fields. If we can get the materials to them before next summer it means everything.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IV—General appropriations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 13, after line 1, insert a new paragraph: "Legislative—House of Representatives: For a special employee for the majority at the rate of $5,000 per annum, to be appointed by the Speaker. Fiscal year 1942, $2,500. Such position is authorized to continue only during such period as it is occupied by the first incumbent thereof."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. The minority has two similar positions, and the majority side is hopeful this position will be voted. I am sure if it is, the Members on all sides will be most pleased with the one who will be the beneficiary of this action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third deficiency appropriation bill for this year, so far as general appropriations are concerned. You have heard much said about cutting down the regular appropriations for the Government. The country wants it. The committee in charge of this bill has seen fit to add to the bill for various departments of Government millions and millions of dollars.

It seems to me if we are going to cut down the regular appropriations of Government this committee should have had the courtesy to call on the subcommittees for the various departments, asking the members of each subcommittee if they thought these appropriations were necessary, but they did not do that. They have just included them in this bill. No well-regulated or well-organized business in the country would do such a thing as has been done by this Appropriations Committee. These items are brought to you today for your support. Are you going to cut down departmental expenses? If so, here is your chance. A vote against the bill is a protest; a vote for the bill and you are not for economy.

Every one of you said to your constituents: "We will cut down the regular appropriations for Government." Why do you not do it? You let the department heads come in here and ask for various sums—ever-increasing sums. The subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee know nothing about it until the bill is brought before the full committee. This is unsound committee procedure and unbusinesslike. You have asked for additional money for the Supreme Court, you have asked additional money for the independent agencies, you have asked for additional money for the Federal loan agencies, Public Health, the Federal Works Administration, the Department of Commerce, Department of the Interior, the various Territories, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, Department of State, the Treasury Department, and then you have also increased salaries.

If we are not on the road to bankruptcy, I do not know anything about this Government operation. With all due respect to the members of the Appropriations Committee—and I do respect the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], as well as other members of the committee—why, in the name of Heaven, do you not cut down the appropriations? Why do you let these bureaucrats come in here and add to the appropriations? I just cannot understand it. I just cannot see why you are losing all signs of trying to economize. We need men on the Appropriations Committee and in the House of Representatives who can say "No," who will demand economy, who will cut out much of the work set up in the departments. Certainly it will mean a change, but it will be for the best interest of the Government.

Remember the President's promise to cut out unnecessary functions of government, to consolidate departments. Why is he not as good as his word? Why did he set up many, many more and add thousands and thousands of workers to the Federal pay roll, when he promised economy? Why? Why? Why? I cannot forgive him for promising economy, then becoming the greatest spender the world has ever known.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION

Access roads: For the construction and improvement of access roads and for replacing existing highways and highway connections as described in and in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (Public Law 295) and for reimbursement of and transfer to the appropriation for Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department, not to exceed $400 000, on account of expenditures from said appropriation for the purposes hereof, $74,600,000, to remain available during the continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941; and in addition thereto authority is granted, during the continuance of such emergency, to enter into contracts for the above purposes in amounts not to exceed in the aggregate $50,000,000.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am emphatically opposed to any effort to eliminate from this bill funds for starting the access-road program, or to any action that will further delay the starting of this work which is so important to our national-defense effort. I therefore urge that no objection be made to the road item that is now to be considered, and assure Members that every dollar in this bill is urgently needed.

The President has twice recommended that legislation be enacted providing funds for access roads to military and naval establishments, defense industries, and sources of needed raw materials. Testimony submitted to the Roads Committee during the consideration of the authorizing legislation explained in detail the very comprehensive studies that had been made throughout the country at the sites of these various defense establishments by representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the State highway departments, and the Public Roads Administration proves the acute need for this item.

Each proposed access-road project receives the most careful study and consideration before approval. No access-road project will be placed under construction until it has been certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

Testimony of the Commissioner of Public Roads before the Appropriations Committee indicated that the total estimated cost of all access roads to certified Army and Navy and industrial establishments is $300,000,000. The Army

now has 19 new posts that have not yet been certified as to access roads, and new industrial establishments for the production of defense materials are being created. The $300,000,000 estimate of total cost of access roads has been divided into 3 groups. The first group includes those projects which are considered essential and are therefore of first priority, the estimated total cost of which exceeds $122,000,000. The second group is listed as desirable projects, at a total cost of $30,000,000. And the third group lists what are considered as useful projects, the estimated total cost of which exceeds $147,000,000.

It is absurd for anyone to contend that our Army and Navy Establishments are now served with adequate highway facilities. Informed persons know that our defense effort is being impeded by the lack of such facilities. I quote the President relative to this matter:

> The authorization for the construction of access roads to military and naval reservations and defense-industry sites upon certification of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as to their military or naval necessity is unquestionably an authorization for the construction of roads urgently needed for the national defense. The Secretaries of War and Navy regard this authorization of primary importance and urgency.

Testimony submitted to the Roads Committee completely and emphatically supports the statement just quoted.

The Public Roads Administration and the State highway departments are ready to proceed with this vital work as soon as the funds are made available. Through a wise provision carried in the Hayden-Cartwright Act of September 5, 1940, surveys and plans have already been made for upward of 1,500 miles of these needed access roads.

While the bill under consideration will appropriate an almost unprecedented amount, the item for access roads, although relatively small, is one of the more important going to make up the total. The appropriation of $75,000,000 and the authorization to let contracts for an additional $50,000,000 will permit the access-road program to get under way without further delay. It is urgently important that this start be made now, and I again express the hope that there will be no opposition to this item of so vital importance to the Nation's defense.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Development of landing areas: For an additional amount for development of landing areas, $50,000,000, of which not to exceed $2,375,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1942: *Provided*, That the limitation upon the total number of public airports and other public landing areas in the program is hereby increased from 399 to 503.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 23, line 2, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$57,865,300."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the Budget figure. I think it is in harmony with the wishes of the committee as expressed in the report. The committee report states very specifically:

> In making the reduction in the Budget estimate the committee does not indicate a desire to curtail the program or delay the prosecution of the necessary features of it.

This is the paragraph that provides the money for the airports that are to be developed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority on the selection of the Army and Navy. It contemplates the construction of 104 airports scattered through 32 States.

I have talked with the Civil Aeronautics people and they tell me that in view of their requirement that local communities must provide the land they would not feel free to operate unless the Budget figure is restored; that is, they cannot go to a community and say, "You vote bonds or take whatever steps are necessary to provide the land for these airports," until they are assured of having the money to carry out the improvements.

My amendment merely restores the Budget figure and is in harmony with the proviso in the paragraph increasing the number of airports to 503, which embraces these 104, an increase from the present 399. It is in harmony with the sentence in the committee report which states that it is not the intention of the committee to curtail the program. The adoption of the amendment is necessary if the airport program is to be carried out for the 104 airports.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. The Subcommittee on Appropriations will start its hearings on the regular appropriation bill for this Department in the next month. Why cannot this matter be considered at that time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason it cannot go over until that time is that there would occur a delay in the acquisition of the land and the development of these airports. These airports are to be developed because of the military necessity.

I have in my hand a clipping bearing a London date line of November 16 which points out that the Royal Air Force is handicapped in its bombing efforts because it lacks sufficient air fields in the country that can handle the large planes. The difficulty comes in the return of ships. England's airports far outnumber ours. We are terribly deficient because fields have not kept pace with the increase of planes.

If the gentleman will examine the hearings on this question, he will find that these airports are wanted by the Army and the Navy for the purpose of developing airports that can accommodate the large ships that are moved across the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the cut of $7,000,000 in this item was made because the committee felt that too much money was being spent for what we got; that the Civil Aeronautics Authority, by exercising a little better business management, could save $7,000,000, or 10 percent of the appropriation, without the least bit of trouble.

I have seen a lot of these operations. I have seen where they have paid enormous prices for land. I have seen where they have paid enormous prices for buildings and for the operations connected with them. If the Civil Aeronautics Authority want to install business management, they can save much more than the $7,000,000 and do much more than they said they could when they came before the committee. This does not reduce the number of the fields at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The cost of the land is not included in this, because the Civil Aeronautics Authority requires the local communities to provide the land in these projects. The testimony indicates that, and that is what the Civil Aeronautics people told me. They require the local communities to provide the land. This money is for the improvements.

Mr. TABER. This is for the improvements.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am quite sure the gentleman will find that no part of this fund or any of their funds is available for the purchase of land.

Mr. TABER. None of the money provided on page 23 is available for the purchase of land.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They cannot buy the land with any of their funds.

Mr. TABER. Not unless we specifically say so in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand the gentleman, then, he is not seeking to cut down the number of civil airports which the Army and Navy people have said they wanted developed to be suitable for military planes, nor is he seeking to delay the starting of them. He believes, if I understand him correctly, that the Civil Aeronautics Board should go ahead and enter into commitments for the full number of airports indicated in the language which raises the present limitation from 399 to 503 but try to accomplish them within the funds carried in the bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and I believe they can do it if they will exercise a little better business judgment and a little more energy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota), there were—ayes 4, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Tennessee Valley Authority fund: For an additional amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, fiscal year 1942, for (1) beginning construction of an hydroelectric project on the Little Tennessee River near Fontana, N. C., (2) installing additional electric generating units with a total rated capacity of approximately 324,000 kilowatts in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority, (3) installing an additional steam electric generating unit with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts in the Watts Bar steam plant and for developing units of other steam plants to their complete capacity as provided in the original plans of installation, (4) purchase or building of transmission facilities needed to connect this project and these units to the existing transmission system of the Authority, to interconnect the Authority's system with neighboring systems, and to deliver the power produced by this project and these units to the market, and (5) the acquisition of land necessary for and the relocation of highways in connection with the accomplishment of the above project; $25,000,000, to be available for the administrative objects of expenditure and subject to the conditions specified under this heading in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the unanimous verdict of the 12 members of our subcommittee will be allowed to stand as the judgment of the House in respect to the construction of the Douglas Dam of the Tennessee Valley development.

In the conduct of our legislative operations the House, I think, very properly, gives a great deal of faith and credence to the decisions of its subcommittees and when a subcommittee reaches a unanimous decision its finding is especially impressive.

This is easily understood, for the subcommittee goes into the subject with great thoroughness, investigating every phase and angle of the matter involved. Our subcommittee patiently listened to a large volume of testimony, interrogated many witnesses, including two delegations from Tennessee who represented the opposite viewpoints of the controversy, and evaluated many pages of well-documented evidence on the subject. When it came to a vote, after we had heard all of this evidence, not a single hand was raised in our subcommittee in favor of proceeding with the construction of the Douglas Dam. In a very real sense we sat as a jury in this case. It so happens that our subcommittee has 12 members, the same as a jury. When a jury spends days upon days hearing exhaustive evidence and in pondering over a case and then reaches a unanimous decision there is a fair presumption, at least, in favor of the justice of its conclusion. I believe there should be in this instance.

At the beginning I want, if I may, to dispel the myth that those who oppose the construction of the Douglas Dam and the resultant ruin of a fertile empire are handicapping national defense. That is not true at all. There are plenty of alternate ways of securing the equivalent of the power which the Douglas Dam would produce, without depriving the State of Tennessee of one of its most productive domains and removing from the tax duplicate thousands upon thousands of rich acres whose tax revenues are now a tower of strength in supporting local county governments.

To say that the men who came up from Tennessee to oppose this proposition and their associates at home are lacking in patriotism and insensible to the needs of national defense would be a gross libel on as fine a body of citizens as can be found in the United States. As Judge J. T. Stokely, who headed their delegation, a splendid gentleman and a leader of the bar, said to our subcommittee, it is a matter of history that in the Civil War the first and second districts of Tennessee furnished more troops to the Federal armies than any other congressional district in the United States in proportion to population and the men who were not in the Federal armies were in the Confederate Army.

In 1898 and 1917 this record of patriotic response to the call of our country was repeated, and, bringing the record up to date, I am informed that Cocke County, Tenn., which would be ruined in considerable part by this dam, has not had to send a single man under the selective-service system, because the county quota has all been filled by volunteers. I am certain, as a matter of fact, that if this dam were really necessary for national defense the delegation from Tennessee would not have been here opposing it, and I am sure our subcommittee, which has gone to the very limit in cooperating with the Government for national defense, never hesitating and voting colossal sums for that purpose, would not have decided against it. We know from our intensive studies of the proposition that alternates can be provided that will do everything required.

There was nothing abstruse about the question that was presented to us. It was a plain, simple proposition as to whether we should approve a power project that would inundate a populous little empire as fertile as the valley of the Nile, or whether we should find a way to secure the equivalent or a greater number of kilowatts of electric power by some plan that would not bring about all of this ruin. Our subcommittee preferred the latter method, and it is my considered belief that our decision will stand up unchallenged in the court of public opinion when all of the facts are known and appreciated.

The picture we had before us was one of tragic ruin of an area affecting about 60,000 acres, including 31,800 acres which would be entirely flooded. This doomed area of 31,800 acres is a very valuable, thickly settled bottom land, mainly given over to trucking. One cannery is located in the area to be flooded and four other canneries derive their raw material mainly from that area. There are 4,000 people employed in connection with the production of crops on the lands which would be flooded, and the processing of those crops in five canneries. Approximately 2,000,000 cases of vegetables are grown every year on the soil that will be covered with water if this dam is built. I think that what the construction of this dam would do to the immensely fertile and productive section that it would blot out is perhaps best told in a letter I have received from James A. T. Wood, a judge of the county court and an outstanding citizen of Dandridge, Tenn., and I ask you to listen to this graphic and realistic description:

NEWPORT, TENN., *November 22, 1941.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As we said at the hearing which your committee gave us, we have no fight on the other items for which the appropriation is requested, our objection being confined solely to the proposed dam on the French Broad River near Dandridge. Our appeal, to which the Tennessee Valley Authority has turned a deaf ear, is against the needless and wanton destruction of a small agricultural empire, the deprivation of the means of livelihood of some 4,000 of our citizens, and the flooding of our homes, our schools, our churches, and our cemeteries. In short, our appeal is against the needless destruction of a splendid civilization, built up over a period of nearly 200 years, by the courage, the toil, and the hardships of our ancestors, merely for the purpose of adding less than one-fourth of 1 percent to the power facilities of the United States, when steam facilities, which are available to produce the same power, can be installed in less time and at a small fraction of the cost of the proposed dam.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. T. WOOD,
Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the area that will be doomed if the Douglas Reservoir is constructed is a very old settlement interwoven with many affectionate recollections of those who have lived there and whose rugged ancestors helped to create the State of Tennessee out of the wilderness. It is preeminently a community of homes. As one who attended all of the hearings when these good people appeared I could not fail to note, as they spoke to us, how the love of home was pressing and straining against their hearts. There are a number of very old cemeteries in the area and it was evident when witnesses were testifying that the golden strands of memory were leading them back to the silent cities of the dead, where their fathers and mothers sleep. In these very old cemeteries time has done its devastating work and it is doubtful whether the bodies could now be removed with any certainty of identity.

I will confess as one member of the subcommittee that there was something very sad and revolting to me in the thought of invading the sacred precincts of the dead. Then, too, there was the thought that the Creator made a world of incomparable beauty for us to live in and placed in it the means to sustain life, and it seemed to me little less than sacrilege that by any act of ours we should wipe out a very fair and extremely productive spot of God's creation. We must remember that this land when taken over for a reservoir is not put under water for 1942 and 1943 or any other limited time, but it is blotted out forever.

Surely a step as serious as that should not even be considered if it is possible to obtain the power needed for national defense in any other way, within a reasonable time limit. That this is possible I do not have a shadow of doubt. Surely, among all of the limitless power possibilities of this mighty country some place can be found, some method can be devised, to produce 100,000 kilowatts of additional power for national defense without dispossessing those good people in Tennessee, wiping out their schools and churches, lacerating their home ties, flooding their cities of the dead, and destroying their farming empire of matchless fertility.

I think I know right off-hand one combination by which this power could be produced without doing any such damage to property owners, and no doubt there are others. The plan I suggest is not a visionary one but is well buttressed by facts brought out at our hearings. It involves a combination of water and steam power, the construction of the so-called Holston Dam and the development of the Sheffield steam unit. The Holston Dam could be built without any appreciable damage to private property. It would furnish 90,000 kilowatts of continuous power as against 100,000 which they say the Douglas Dam would produce. The Holston Dam development would come into production in 24 months, which is some 6 or 8 months after the estimated time of completion of the Douglas Dam. But the Sheffield steam unit can be completed so that production there will begin in less than 12 months, or considerably earlier than at the proposed Douglas Dam. This combination of the Holston Dam and the Sheffield steam unit would produce 140,000 kilowatts of power, or 40,000 more than the Douglas Dam alone would be capable of producing.

Last summer two highly capable and efficient Indianapolis power engineers, Mr. Thomas N. Wynne and Mr. Thomas H. Hays, went to Tennessee and spent some time there making a thorough survey of the Tennessee Valley power development. These men are of eminent standing and well known in engineering circles throughout America. They came to the conclusion that steam was not being utilized nearly to the extent that economy and efficiency of operation would indicate to be advisable. At the Sheffield unit they found a large and well-engineered steam power plant built in 1918 during the previous World War emergency, with an ultimate capacity of about 125,000 kilowatts in which only 60 000 kilowatts had been installed. The plant building was provided, however, with the foundations, facilities, and space for an additional 50,000 to 75,000 kilowatts.

Through their knowledge of the power industry they located a turbine at the Detroit Edison plant and arranged with its owners to take it over and then they submitted a proposal to the Tennessee Valley Authority whereby they agreed to furnish this unit so that it would produce 50,000 kilowatts of continuous power, or one-half of the estimated production of the proposed Douglas Dam, and they offered to do this at the very low cost of $1,800,000 as against an estimated cost of $37,700,000 for the Douglas Dam plant. In other words, they promised that if allowed to complete this steam unit they would furnish one-half of the amount of power that could be produced by the Douglas Dam at less than one-eighteenth of the cost. They found boilers already installed to connect up with the turbine. They found that the transmission lines for the Sheffield steam plant, as already constructed and in operation, were capable of carrying this additional load.

We were told in our hearings in October that the Detroit turbine had been assigned to magnesium production in Texas. Mr. Wynne went to Detroit to investigate and on November 25, 5 or 6 weeks after we were informed this assignment had been made he sent me the following telegram:

DETROIT, MICH., *November 25, 1941.*
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Turbine still available on skids in Detroit Edison warehouse.

T. N. WYNNE.

A report is in circulation that this turbine is worn out and has no further possibilities of service, and on December 2 I wired to Mr. Hays asking him for a report on its condition. In reply I received the following telegram:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *December 3, 1941.*

With reference to Detroit turbine, our proposition included complete overhauling and placing turbine in first-class operating condition. After proper repairs turbine good for 5 to 7 years' service. Owner contemplated installing turbine and using it if increased load warranted it. Electric Bond & Share offered to buy this turbine for their own use, but was withdrawn by present owner.

THOMAS H. HAYS.

Mr. Chairman, this would indicate that the Detroit turbine is still available under the contract of the Indianapolis engineers with the owner, but whether it is or not it would seem to be an inexcusable disregard of economy to fail or refuse to develop the Sheffield unit according to the original plans of installation. Even if this turbine is assigned, that would not affect the merits of finishing the steam plant at Sheffield in accordance with the proposal of my Indianapolis constituents.

The facts of the case are that the Office of Production Management has the entire authority to assign idle steam turbines to the various defense plants, and, of course, they could reassign this turbine to the T. V. A., or could obtain a new turbine that may be under production for some utility or power plant where the need for the same is not as urgent as it is for the T. V. A. property. It seemed to some of us that all of the Government authorities dealing directly with this problem of power are obsessed with the water-power idea and opposed to the steam-power plan of generating electricity for national defense, even when the cost differential in favor of steam is as startling as in the case of completing the Sheffield steam unit compared with the construction of the Douglas Dam. It seemed to some of us that the entire problem should be reexamined in the light of a greater utilization of steam. With that thought in mind our subcommittee inserted in the language of the bill now before us the following provision:

And for developing units of other steam plants to their complete capacity as provided in the original plans of installation.

The question presently confronting us was whether we shall give the Office of Production Management an opportunity to think the matter over and present to us an alternate plan that will not devastate hundreds of homes, deprive thousands of employment, and wreck two or three counties in Tennessee. No great harm can come from this brief delay, as meanwhile we shall be proceeding with the construction of the Fontana Dam and the Watts Bar steam plant, which are authorized in this bill. In our zeal to make progress we should give some consideration, at least, to the humanities involved.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

For an additional amount for expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, $3,000; and the limitation of $6,480 on the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to $6,710.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 24, after line 2, insert the following:

"NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, YORKTOWN, VA.

"The limitation contained in title II of the act approved July 1, 1941 (Public Law No. 146, 77th Cong.), with regard to the cost of buildings erected by the Civilian Conservation Corps shall not apply in connection with the construction, with existing funds, of a courthouse at Yorktown, Va."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, except for the importance of this amendment, I would hesitate to take the time of the committee on an amendment which is subject to a point of order.

The purpose of the amendment is to permit execution of an agreement entered into between the county of York and the National Park Service on June 19, 1941. It was agreed by a perfectly valid agreement that the Secretary of the Interior might designate as an historic site the lot on which there stood the courthouse in York County, Va., which was burned in 1940.

Under the Historic Sites Act, approved August 21, 1935, title 16, section 462, clause (e), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract and make cooperative agreement with States, municipal subdivisions, corporations, associations, or individuals with proper bond where deemed advisable to protect preserve, maintain, or operate any historic or archaeological building, site, object, or property used in connection therewith for public use, regardless as to whether the title thereto is in the United States, provided, that no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of

the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

Under this act the agreement referred to above was entered into between the United States of America by Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and York County, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia, acting by and through its board of supervisors and duly authorized officials.

It was recited in the preambles to said agreement as follows:

First. That the Yorktown Courthouse and grounds located on lot 24 in Yorktown, Va., are recognized as possessing national significance as a portion of the Town of York, besieged and captured by the American and French troops during the Revolution, and part of the battlefield of Yorktown commemorated by Colonial National Historical Park.

Second. That the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on October 28–29, 1937, approved additions to Colonial National Historical Park as necessary for the proper development and interpretation of this area for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States, and it is proposed to carry out that recommendation by designating the Yorktown battlefield area, together with the courthouse lot, a national historic site.

Third. That it is the purpose of the National Park Service to preserve its structures and grounds in and about Yorktown in a manner consistent with the eighteenth century aspect of the town, and to facilitate such purposes it is desirable that public and other properties in Yorktown should be preserved or developed in a similar manner.

Fourth. That the county was desirous of securing assistance from the Department of the Interior for the reconstruction of the courthcuse and related buildings on lot 24 in Yorktown known as the courthouse lot, in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown; and

Fifth. That the Secretary desires to cooperate with the county in constructing a courthouse in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown and to insure a more adequate protection for the priceless county historical records which are essential to the development of the Colonial National Historical Park, and also wishes to make possible archaeological excavations at the historic site of the Yorktown Courthouse.

The agreement provides that in consideration of the recitals above set out and pursuant to the authority contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes," the said parties—that is, the United States of America, acting through the Secretary of the Interior, and York County, acting through its supervisors—have covenanted and agreed to and with each other and in consideration of the mutual promises above expressed as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States:

(a) That he will designate lot 24 in Yorktown, known as the courthouse lot, as national historic site;

(b) To cooperate with the county in the erection of a county courthouse and related buildings in keeping with the historical setting of Yorktown, within the limits of available funds;

(c) In his discretion, to expend such funds as may be available by appropriation or donation for the purpose of assisting the county in the appropriate restoration of its historic structures and their surroundings within the national historic site.

By article II of the agreement, the county of York agreed for itself, its successors, and assigns as follows:

(a) That the county will retain and preserve in perpetuity, so far as it is reasonably able to do so, the grounds and restored ancient structures which it owns on lot 24, which lot fronts on Main Street in Yorktown, Va., 132 feet, and extends in a northerly direction along Ballard Street 165 feet.

(b) The county will not erect or permit to be erected any new building or buildings on any portion of the grounds designated by the Secretary as part of the national historic site, without prior consultation with the Secretary: *Provided*, That after the said courthouse shall be erected, then the county will not erect or allow to be erected any new building on said lot No. 24 that does not harmonize with the colonial architecture of said buildings and will submit plans of any building to be erected within this area for his approval, and if the county and the Secretary cannot agree as to the architecture of said building, then the question shall be submitted to arbitration. The arbitrators shall be appointed, one by the county and one by the Secretary, and if the two so selected do not agree, then they shall select another, and a decision of the arbitrators shall be final; and it is further agreed that the arbitrators shall be disinterested persons.

(c) The county will advise with the National Park Service before permitting the erection or placement of any monument, marker, tablet, or other memorial in or upon the area designated by the Secretary as part of the national historic site.

(d) No alterations or repairs calculated to change the exterior of the courthouse and related buildings shall be undertaken by the county without prior consultation with the Secretary: *Provided*, That if the county and the Secretary cannot agree as to whether the proposed alterations or repairs would be in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown, then resort shall be had to arbitration as set forth in article II (b) of this agreement. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to repairs or additions to the present clerk's office or jail until after the proposed new buildings shall have been erected in their stead.

(e) To permit the National Park Service to carry on archeological investigations on lot 24 and to study and measure such structures and objects as may be uncovered by the archeological investigations.

(f) The county will grant to the National Park Service the first right to scientific publication of the results of such archeological investigations and studies.

(g) Artifacts discovered in the course of the above-mentioned excavations shall remain the property of the county but shall be placed on indefinite loan in the National Park Service museum at Yorktown, subject to temporary removal from time to time in the event of special exhibitions or exercises held at the courthouse.

By article III it was mutually understood and agreed:

(a) That lot 24, together with all structures thereon, shall remain the property of the county, to be used by it for courthouse and other public purposes.

(b) Whenever in this contract the Secretary is referred to, the term shall include his duly authorized representative.

(c) No Member of, or Delegate to the Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract or to any benefit that may arise therefrom, but this restriction shall not be construed to extend this contract if made with a corporation or company for its general benefit.

Pursuant to said agreement the Secretary of the Interior wrote the President of the United States under date of April 23, 1941, that one of the purposes of the National Park Service in developing and interpreting the Yorktown portion of the Colonial National Historical Park is to preserve its structures and grounds in and about Yorktown in a manner consistent with the eighteenth century aspect of the town; that to facilitate this purpose, it is desirable that public and other properties in Yorktown should also be preserved or developed in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown; that the act of Congress approved March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1490), authorized $2,000,000 to be appropriated for the purchase and development of lands and structures within the authorized limits of Colonial National Historical Park, which include the town of York and that of the $2,000,000 authorized for land acquisition, only $580,000 had been expended, leaving an authorization balance of $1,420,000.

The letter further stated that although the authorization of $1,420,000 appears to be liberal it would not go very far in purchasing city property within the limits of Yorktown; that it is, therefore, the opinion of our Secretary of the Interior that the National Park Service purpose at Yorktown can best be achieved by designating as a national historic site the Yorktown portion of Colonial National Historical Park and by adding thereto, as integral parts of the national historic site, such county-owned and privately owned areas and structures as may be covered by written cooperative agreements made with the owners under the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666); and that under this arrangement the buildings and structures would remain in county or private ownership, but their preservation or development in harmony with the historical setting at Yorktown would be guaranteed by the terms of the cooperative agreement covering them.

The letter further stated that owing to a fire which seriously damaged the county courthouse at Yorktown, Va., in December 1940, an opportunity has arisen to secure an agreement with the county commissioners—board of supervisors—under the terms of which the county will agree to the construction of a courthouse more in harmony with the historical setting of Yorktown and better equipped to protect the priceless county historical records which are essential to the accurate and authentic development of Colonial National Historical Park, and that moreover, at this time, the county commissioners would be willing to permit archaeological excavation of the county courthouse lot.

The letter further stated that through the medium of the C. C. C. camp now at Yorktown, the National Park Service is in a position to cooperate with the county in erecting on the county courthouse lot a county courthouse and related buildings of eighteenth century design. In return for this service, which will not obligate the general fund of the United States Treasury, the county is willing to donate to the National Park Service $15,000, to be used by the Service for the purchase of Surrender Field and other key sites within the authorized limits of Colonial National Historical Park which must be purchased by the National Park Service before the land-acquisition program at the Yorktown battlefield can be considered complete.

In said letter addressed to the President of the United States authority is requested to negotiate with the county commissioners for the consummation of the attached cooperative agreement, which embodies the above plans and which had the approval of the said Secretary of the Interior as to form and substance.

On May 7, 1941, the President approved the recommendation evidenced by his signature to the letter.

Accordingly, the courthouse lot in Yorktown has been designated a national historic site and part of the work in consummation of this agreement has been done. The old courthouse has been torn down by the National Park Service. The salvaged brick is in the possession of the National Park Service and, in addition, the National Park Service has purchased about $5,000 of material in order to carry out the agreement that has been entered into in good faith between the board of supervisors of York County (county commissioners) and the National Park Service.

Title II of the act approved July 1, 1941, Public Law No. 146, Seventy-seventh Congress, with regard to the cost of the buildings erected by the Civilian Conservation Corps, provides that the cost of any building erected under that act shall not exceed $25,000. The act specifically provides for the use of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but that the cost of any building erected thereunder shall not exceed $25,000. When the cooperative agreement above referred to, executed between the Secretary of the Interior and the Board of Supervisors of York County, was executed—that is, on June 19, 1941—by the terms of which the Civilian Conservation Corps might be used in the work of reconstruction, the cost would not have exceeded $25,000. Advancing prices since that time make it appear that the cost would aggregate around $32,215.93, the items of which are: Skilled labor, $9,395.63; material, $14,820.30; with an evaluation of C. C. C. labor as $8,000.

The amendment proposes to remove the limitation that prevents the execution of the agreement. If that limitation is removed, it is estimated that the cost would certainly not exceed $35,000.

The plans for the building have been prepared. The C. C. C. labor is available at Yorktown. The old building has been demolished. The salvaged brick from the old building is in the custody of the Park Service for use. The archaeological work provided for in the agreement has been performed. The money needed to perform the agreement is available. Material worth about $5,000 has been purchased by the Park Service. No additional appropriation is needed.

York County is to pay to the National Park Service $15,000 which will be used for the purchase of land within the authorized boundaries of the park. Congress has already authorized an appropriation for the purchase of additional land needed to round out the park, but there are no additional funds appropriated for that purpose. However, with the money paid by the county to the National Park Service amounting to $15,000 there can be bought the surrender field, where the British laid down their arms, thus assuring American independence, and other land necessary for the purposes of the park.

The records of the county are priceless. They extend back to the year 1632.

I wish to emphasize again that no additional appropriation of money is needed. All that is necessary to carry out the definite and binding agreement which has been made between the National Park Service and the county of York is by the adoption of my amendment, which reads as follows:

The limitation contained in title II of the act approved July 1, 1941 (Public, No. 146, 77th Cong.), with regard to the cost of buildings erected by the Civilian Conservation Corps shall not apply in connection with the construction, with existing funds, of a courthouse at Yorktown, Va.

The county of York has now no courthouse and is using a temporary building. I hope that the amendment may be adopted.

The only thing that prevents the consummation of this agreement is this limitation of $25,000 on buildings in the C. C. C. Act, and that only to the extent of about $7,000. The county needs a courthouse.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Are funds requested to be appropriated for this purpose?

Mr. BLAND. No appropriation is requested. The funds are available, and it is only the limitation on the cost of the building that is holding up the complete performance of the cooperative agreement executed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Board of Supervisors of York County and approved by the President.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I feel obliged to make the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. I am sorry the gentleman feels constrained to make the point of order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment involves legislation and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when final approval is given to the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill now before us, and which totals over eight billions of dollars, we will have appropriated for national defense since July 1, 1940, in round figures sixty-eight billions of dollars. Included in this $68,000,000,000 appropriation is fourteen and one-half billions of dollars in lend-lease funds.

Like many other Members of Congress, I have burned the midnight oil in reading the two volumes of hearings and analyzing this bill which, as you know, was not available in printed form until the past 24 hours.

It is my intention to support this latest appropriation of eight billions of dollars for national defense, despite the fact that the bill contains many items whose label as national defense is open to question. However, the real intent of this bill is to supplement our national-defense program by providing needed equipment and material for our armed forces, not alone in the United States and possessions, but likewise in Iceland, New Guiana, Bermuda, Greenland, Newfoundland, and on the high seas.

Whether or not we approve every item in this bill is beside the point when it is realized that, as a Nation, we owe a duty to the nearly 2,000,000 young men now in our armed forces to provide them with modern military equipment.

In supporting this appropriation, I am consistently carrying out my policy of approving and voting for every penny of the $68,000,000,000, including all lend-lease appropriations, requested by President Roosevelt and his military advisers as necessary to the defense of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said of the lack of unity in our Nation. There has been no desire on the part of any Member of Congress to think or act in a manner detrimental to the best interest of America.

It is true that there has been an honest difference in policy as to what constitutes a step in the direction of war, and this is best evidenced by the deep consideration given to the question of arming merchant vessels and permitting them to enter war zones.

There can be no doubt that the American people are overwhelmingly opposed to America's active participation in the present war. While our sympathies are with those nations resisting aggression, and our money and supplies through lend-lease appropriations have been made available in huge sums, the American people are definitely opposed to another American expeditionary force being sent to Europe.

It has been no easy task to differentiate between aid to war-torn countries and a definite step toward war. It is refreshing to note that partisan politics have played no part in opposing measures considered as leading America to the brink of war. For an illustration, when the House of Representatives on November 13, 1941, voted on arming merchant ships and eliminating war zones, party lines were ignored as 57 Democrats opposed the administration

while 22 Republicans supported the stand of the administration. The vote recorded 212 Members as favoring revision with 194 against. Among the 194 opponents to the measure are listed many stanch Democrats and followers of President Roosevelt, all of whom are chairmen of important committees. They are as follows:

Hon. GUY L. MOSER, Pennsylvania, Census.

Hon DAN R. MCGEHEE, Mississippi, Claims.

Hon. ANDREW L. SOMERS, New York, Coinage.

Hon. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, California, Useless Papers.

Hon. HUGH PETERSON, Georgia, Elections No. 3.

Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, New York, Expenditures.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE, Idaho, Irrigation.

Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, Texas, Judiciary.

Hon. HARRY P. BEAM, Illinois, Memorials.

Hon. J. WILL ROBINSON, Utah, Public Lands.

Hon EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York, Revision of Laws.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina, Ways and Means.

Hon. JOHN W. RANKIN, Mississippi, World War Veterans.

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN, California, Special Committee on National Defense Migration.

In addition to the above-named chairmen of important House committees, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable JOSEPH MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and chief exponent in Congress of the St. Lawrence project as a national-defense measure, is listed as being absent when the vote was taken on sending armed merchant vessels into war zones but recorded as being opposed to the measure. In like manner, the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. CAROLINE O'DAY, absent through illness, is also another stanch administration follower who is recorded as being opposed to sending armed merchant vessels into war zones.

Mr. Chairman, we have as Members of the House of Representatives 150 veterans of the Spanish-American and World Wars. Party lines mean nothing to these men who know and understand war from first-hand experience. It is interesting to note on the vote to send armed merchant vessels into war zones 82 voted against such action, 57 voted in favor of it, and 7 were recorded as not voting. Among the 82 voting against sending armed merchant vessels into war zones 2 were veterans of the World War, both holders of the Distinguished Service Cross awarded them as a result of heroism on the field of battle. I know everyone of the 82 veterans who opposed sending armed merchant vessels into war zones and their vote was the result of their honest conviction that such action was a definite step toward war.

As a further indication that party lines mean nothing when the question of keeping America out of war is being considered, an analysis of the vote on repealing the neutrality law discloses that while the measure carried by a margin of 18 votes those in favor of sending armed merchant vessels into war zones represented 45,000,000 American citizens, while those in opposition to the legislation represented 71,000,000. This analysis is further substantiated by the Gallup poll, which reveals the majority of the American people are opposed to America's entrance into the present war which in plain language means another American expeditionary force to Europe.

Returning to a discussion of the $8,000,000,000 appropriation now before us, much has been said in debate of the cost of our national-defense program. However, it must be remembered that modern warfare is more costly and that with approval of the measure before us we will have an appropriation twice the cost of our participation in the first World War and yet no actual declaration of war has been made.

This time next year our national debt may be $150,000,000,000 and taxation already becoming an increasing burden on the taxpayers of America is further pronounced by the constant increase in the cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the American people will cheerfully make every possible contribution in time, effort, and money to the upbuilding of an adequate national defense, conscious of the fact that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness cannot be measured in mere dollars and cents.

In conclusion, I repeat my assertion that I intend to support this $8,000,000,000 appropriation in the interest of national defense and, in so doing, maintain a perfect record of having voted for every dollar for national defense as requested by the President and the military leaders of our country.

As a representative of nearly 300,000 American citizens, the majority of whom oppose another American expeditionary force to Europe, I reserve the right to determine any policy as to whether it is actually aiding war-torn countries or designed to plunge this Nation into war. After all, the welfare of America should be our first consideration and when legislating let us pause and ask ourselves, Are we by our actions keeping faith with our fellow Americans?

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, general: For an additional amount for flood control, general, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1942, $17,600,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: Page 28 line 15, after the figures "1942" strike out "$17,600,000" and insert "$17,800,000."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will simply increase the appropriation by $200,000 for the initiation of construction of flood-control works at Prattville, Ala., which we have been working on for 4 years, and which has been fully considered by the committee but which, because the absence of a Budget estimate, was not approved.

These flood-control works are not only needed to save a lovely little city from destruction, but also to protect plants important to national defense. This fact is set forth in the report of the authorization bill and certified by the Navy's Chief of Ordnance.

The budget estimate has now been filed, and I understand that this amendment to provide $200,000 to enable the Army engineers to begin immediate construction on this authorized half million dollar project will be accepted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the Budget estimate was not received at the time the committee acted upon this, and has since been received, the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—CLASSIFICATION ACT, SALARY ADVANCEMENTS

For supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, on account of the enactment of the act of August 1, 1941 (Public Law No. 200, 77th Cong.), amending the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and Executive Order No. 8882, issued September 3, 1941, under the authority of said act, and on account of Executive Order No. 8842 issued August 1, 1941, to be added to and become a part of the appropriation available during said fiscal year under the following appropriation titles, namely:

LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT

For "Salaries, Office of Architect of the Capitol, 1942," $1,178.

For "Capitol Building and repairs, 1942," $2,900.

For "Improving the Capitol Grounds, 1942," $1,650.

For "Maintenance, Legislative Garage, 1942," $150.

For "Maintenance, Senate Office Building, 1942," $2,625.

For "Maintenance, House Office Buildings, 1942," $3,200.

For "Capitol Power Plant, 1942," $2,755.

For "Salaries, Botanic Garden, 1942," $450.

For "Salaries, Library proper, Library of Congress, 1942," $8,995.

For "Salaries, Copyright Office, Library of Congress, 1942," $1,140.

For "Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, 1942," $270.

For "Distribution of card indexes, Library of Congress, 1942," $2,615.

For "Index to State legislation, Library of Congress, 1942," $585.

For "Union catalogues, Library of Congress, 1942," $465.

For "Salaries, library buildings, Library of Congress, 1942," $3,240.

For "Salaries, Office of Superintendent of Documents, 1942," $6,050.

In all, legislative establishment, $38,268.

THE JUDICIARY

For "Salaries, Supreme Court, 1942," $1,760.

For "Care of Supreme Court Building and Grounds, 1942," $390.

For "Salaries, United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, 1942," $875.

For "Salaries, Court of Claims, 1942," $1,518.
For "Probation system, United States courts, 1942," $7,075.
In all, the judiciary, $11,618.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

For "Salaries and expenses, Office for Emergency Management, 1942," $13,012.
For "Salaries and expenses, Board of Tax Appeals, 1942," $4,400.
For "Salaries and expenses, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, 1942," $9,553.
For "Federal Power Commission, 1942," $20,000.
For "Salaries, General Accounting Office, 1942," $185,747.
For "Salaries and expenses, National Archives, 1942," $11,382.
For "Salaries, National Labor Relations Board, 1942," $20,310.
For "Salaries and expenses, National Mediation Board, 1942," $2,273.
For "Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board, National Mediation Board, 1942," $3,090.
For "General expenses, Smithsonian Institution, 1942," $4,144.
For "Preservation of collections, Smithsonian Institution, 1942," $9,398.
For "Salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, 1942," $642,125.
For "Salaries, Office of Administrator, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $1,737.
For "Salaries, Division of Personnel Supervision and Management, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $2,343.
For "Salaries, Chief Clerk's Division, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $450.
For "Salaries, Office of General Counsel, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $8,802.
For "Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $26,315.
For "Salaries, Office of Education, 1942," $4,848.
For "Salaries and expenses, vocational education, Office of Education, 1942," $3,188.
For "Salaries and expenses, vocational rehabilitation, Office of Education, 1942," $1,280.
For "Cooperative vocational rehabilitation, residents of the District of Columbia, Office of Education, 1942," $600.
For "Salaries, Freedmen's Hospital, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $8,105.
For "Salaries, Office of Surgeon General, Public Health Service, 1942," $1,605.
For "Pay of other employees, Public Health Service, 1942," $3,493.
For "Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, 1942," $47,400.
For "Disease and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service, 1942," $3,260.
For "Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $12,605.
For "Selecting, testing, and placement, defense workers, Social Security Board (national defense), 1942," $12,445.
In all, Executive Office and Independent Establishments, $1,063,910.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of Agriculture, 1942," $4,555.
For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $22,860.
For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $2,620.
For "Salaries and expenses, library, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $215.
For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Experiment Stations, 1942," $2,684.
For "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $6,300.
For "Salaries and expenses, Extension Service, 1942," $7,925.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1942," $29,610.
For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, 1942," $2,125.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, 1942," $117,935.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Dairy Industry, 1942," $7,172.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, 1942," $35,426.
For "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service, 1942," $161,221.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, 1942," $9,533.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 1942," $49,667.
For "White Pine blister-rust control, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $7,560.
For "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1942," $47,388.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Home Economics, 1942," $3,485.
For "Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act, 1942," $6,765.
For "Beltsville Research Center, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $1,245.
In all, Department of Agriculture, $526,291.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of Commerce, 1942," $905.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942," $3,230.
For "Field Office Service, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942," $2,395.
For "Customs statistics, Department of Commerce, 1942," $635.
For "Salaries and expenses, Social Security Act, Bureau of the Census, 1942," $360.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, 1942," $42,825.
For "Operation and administration, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $2,225.
For "Testing, Inspection, and Information Service, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $8,195.
For "Research and development, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $8,945.
For "Standards for commerce, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $1,166.
For "Magnetic and seismological work, Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1942," $295.
For "Salaries, Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1942," $10,910.
For "Salaries, Patent Office, 1942," $30,565.
For "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, 1942," $45,280.
For "Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, 1942," $3,645.
In all, Department of Commerce, $161,576.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of the Interior, 1942," $5,000.
For "Salaries, Office of Solicitor, Department of the Interior, 1942," $4,797.
For "Salaries, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, 1942," $1,325.
For "Expenses, Commission of Fine Arts, 1942," $45.
For "United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, Department of the Interior, 1942," $1,425.
For "Salaries, General Land Office, 1942," $14,000.
For "Salaries and expenses of Land Offices, 1942," $1,000.
For "Prevention of fires on public domain in Alaska, 1942," $300.
For "Salaries, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1942," $5,000.
For "Expenses of organizing Indian corporations, etc., 1942," $650.
For "Administration of Indian forests, 1942," $4,710.
For "Expenses, Sale of timber (reimbursable), 1942," $1,790.
For "Obtaining employment for Indians, 1942," $500.
For "Agriculture and stock raising among Indians, 1942," $7,000.
For "Indian school support, 1942," $26,525.
For "Indian boarding schools, 1942," $15,355.
For "Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, 1942," $1,335.
For "Education of natives of Alaska, 1941–43," $3,980.
For "Conservation of health among Indians, 1942," $23,705.
For "Administration of Indian property, 1942," $25,000.
For "Construction, etc., buildings and utilities, Indian Service," $1,455.
For "Geological Survey, 1942," $23,980.
For "Salaries and expenses, National Capital Parks, 1942," $3,000.
For "Salaries and expenses, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1942," $9,915.
For "Contingent expenses, Territory of Alaska, 1942," $165.
For "Wagon roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska (receipt limitation)," $1,000.
For "Salaries and expenses, government of the Virgin Islands, 1942," $1,000.
In all, Department of the Interior, $183,957.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For "Salaries, Administrative Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $7,000.
For "Salaries, Tax Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $6,000.
For "Salaries, Claims Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $3,500.
For "Salaries, Bureau of Prisons, 1942," $2,500.
For "Protecting interests of the United States in customs matters, 1942," $1,300.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bond and Spirits Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $1,700.
For "Examination of judicial offices, 1942," $600.
For "Salaries and expenses, veterans' insurance litigation, Department of Justice, 1942," $5,000.
For "Salaries and expenses of District Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice, 1942," $24,000.
For "Penitentiaries and Reformatories, Maintenance, 1942," $26,800.
For "Medical center for Federal prisoners, maintenance, 1942," $2,300.
For "Federal jails and correctional institutions, maintenance, 1942," $13,900.
For "Prison camps, maintenance, 1942," $1,800.
For "Medical and hospital service, penal institutions, 1942," $4,200.
In all, Department of Justice, $100,600.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For "Salaries and expenses, Division of Public Contracts, Department of Labor, 1942," $3,195.
For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1942," $3,590.
For "Occupational outlook survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics (national defense), 1942," $1,480.
For "Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, 1942," $3,825.
For "Salaries and expenses, child-labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act, Children's Bureau, 1942," $2,723.
For "Salaries and expenses, maternal and child welfare, Social Security Act, Children's Bureau, 1942," $6,332.
For "Salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau, 1942," $895.
In all, Department of Labor, $22,040.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

For "Salaries, Office of Postmaster General, 1942," $1,585.
For "Salaries, Office of First Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $6,565.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, no one has been more critical in the past than I have of the Army and the lack of preparedness. I just want to say that this is no time for us to beef or squawk. It is time to shut up and to show that we can take it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARTWRIGHT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. I am in receipt of a telegram from the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EDWIN M. SCHAEFER, who had leave of absence from the House because of illness. The telegram, dated December 8, reads as follows:

Illness prevents my attendance today. Can you request House to permit you to make statement that I am in full accord with recommendations of President and, if possible to be present, would vote for resolution.

EDWIN C. SCHAEFER,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two communications that I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. O'CONNELL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, another former Member of the House of Representatives has gone to his eternal reward. On last Saturday Dr. John M. O'Connell, of Westerly, R. I., succumbed to an illness which has sapped his strength for the last few years.

Dr. O'Connell served in the House of Representatives from 1932 to 1938. Many of you remember him and will be sorry that the world has lost a truly fine character.

Dr. O'Connell was born in Westerly, R. I., in August 1872. He attended the public schools there and, after graduation from Philadelphia Dental College, he returned to Westerly, where he lived and practiced medicine until his decease.

He was a member of the Knights of Columbus, the Elks, American Legion, and many other professional, social, and political organizations.

Always showing a keen interest in the affairs of his town and State, Dr. O'Connell in 1928 became a candidate for the Rhode Island General Assembly as a Democratic candidate for representative. He was elected to the State house of representatives, in which office he served for two terms, distinguishing himself as an honest and able legislator.

At the expiration of his term in that office, he became a candidate for Congress from the Second Rhode Island District. He was elected to serve in the Seventy-third Congress, and served continuously through the Seventy-fifth Congress, when he retired from public life because of failing health.

During his term of office in the House of Representatives, he was a consistent supporter of the President, and his term of office was outstanding because of his close watch on the interests of the people whom he represented. He set a high standard for congressional service in keeping with his previous record of service in public, professional, and private life.

To know him was to respect him, and Westerly and the State of Rhode Island mourn his passing, and into the eternal keeping of the Creator we commend his spirit.

TOO MUCH TALK

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include excerpts from a communication addressed to me by the Executive Department of the United States, relative to the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE WAR

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a statement from Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ATTITUDE OF ISOLATIONISTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, after what has happened, this is now certain: The America First Committee isolationists should apologize to President Roosevelt. They always challenged that he was violating his campaign pledges. What will they now say that America is attacked?

Our belated preparation and mobilization for war was due in part to what some of the isolationists inside the House and outside the House have said and their influence on public opinion. Roosevelt warned the Nation time and time again that continental distances are myths and that oceans are mere ribbons of water and are no ramparts of defense. He was scoffed at and laughed at by some isolationists in Congress and many out of Congress. We who insisted upon building up our defense and voting billions for strengthening and augmenting the Army and the Navy were called warmongers by some of the more rabid isolationists. Time has proven the President was right. Time has proven that those of us who voted to amend the Neutrality Act were right.

Thank goodness we have a man like President Roosevelt as our Commander in Chief. His logic, his brilliance of mind, his sincerity, his facility of expression, his uncanny insight into events to come will lead us to victory.

I am sure erstwhile isolationists in Congress will willingly follow his leadership. They will not cherish their old delusions in any new form. We are now united, and united we stand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article on the political history of Edgefield County, S. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, after voting on all legislation, including $8,000,000,000 additional for national defense last week, and being advised that nothing controversial would be taken up early this week, I left for my home on Saturday night. On reaching Columbia, Mo., having learned of the situation, I drove hurriedly to St. Louis, but was unable to secure transportation to enable me to get

whether they be rivers, harbors, reservoirs, or just ditches. Perhaps it would be as well to start by mentioning the findings of the survey of reservoir sedimentation made by the Soil Conservation Service, since it gives an inkling of what is going on in the way of costly erosion of croplands and rangelands.

This survey has shown that out of more than 12,000 reservoirs built in this country around 2,000 already have been filled to the top of the dam with the products of erosion. Approximately 2,500 other reservoirs, built at a cost of about $250,000,000, are not yet filled but are silting at the rate of at least 2 percent a year. If better control is not provided at the sources of the silt, these 2,500 reservoirs will be filled or rendered practically useless in less than 50 years. When we consider the fact that more than $1,000,000,000 worth of new reservoirs are under construction in the United States in 1941, this consideration is something to be concerned about.

All this huge quantity of silt comes from soil erosion, some from comparatively slow geological erosion and some—the greater bulk—from accelerated erosion on unprotected fields, overgrazed pastures and ranges, and rapidly cutting stream banks, and highway embankments. Measurements of rates of soil losses on agricultural lands under various types of use indicate that some 3,000,000,000 tons of soil are stripped from these lands annually, most of it the result of accelerated erosion. Millions of tons of eroded soil reach the oceans every year—probably close to a billion tons. But the greater part is stranded temporarily or permanently along the lower sides of fields, in thousands of stream channels, in reservoirs, in lakes, and ditches. Other huge quantities are laid down over fertile bottom lands as unwanted fine material or as water-assorted sand of relatively low productivity.

Soil surveys by Federal and State soil technicians have shown that the greater part of the once-productive alluvial lands along the lesser streams of the vast Piedmont area of the Southeast have been so covered with eroded soil and the channels so clogged with the same kind of material that they are no longer cultivable and are mostly covered with a swampy growth of willow, alder, blackberry, rushes, and cattails. Overflows have been greatly accelerated and in some instances malarial hazards have developed.

It would be interesting to have an accurate determination of formerly navigable streams that have become too clogged with erosion debris for any further navigation. We know of a great many instances of this nature, but we do not have anything near the complete story.

On my trips about the country inspecting the progress of the soil-conservation program I am constantly running into silting and silted reservoirs, ditches, and stream channels. Under the program of the Soil Conservation Service some 46 Civilian Conservation Corps camps have been engaged for 7 years in drainage improvements. This work, for the most part, has had to do with the cleaning out of silted drainage ditches. Some 70,000,000 cubic yards of washed-in soil material have been taken out of such ditches under this program, and the work can be said to have made scarcely more than a start, so enormous is the problem ahead. The material removed from these ditches is about the equivalent of the topsoil of 2,500 forty-acre farms.

Some drainage districts have been ruined by erosion. In one, in northern Mississippi, two-thirds of all the ditches have been filled with the products of erosion and the others nearly filled. Six years ago the district was abandoned, although the bonds were not to have been paid off until 1942.

THE BURIAL OF COLMA CREEK

Three weeks ago I saw an interesting example of the relation of water erosion to sedimentation along Colma Creek in south San Francisco, Calif. Here I found that such land abuses as downhill cultivation, fields left bare of protective vegetation in winter, overgrazing, neglected gullying, and sale of topsoil for lawns and flower gardens in urban areas have contributed to a very severe erosion problem in the trucking, hog raising, and dairying hill country of San Mateo County. Many gullies, starting as trivial washes that could easily have been controlled, have cut down into soft, sandy understrata that erode almost like melting sugar. Erosion of roadside cuts and fills also has contributed enormous quantities of silt, mainly in the form of sand.

In less than 50 years the land along Colma Creek has been covered and re-covered by annual sedimentation to an accumulated depth of more than 25 feet, according to observation of those who have long lived along its course. During the past 8 years, I was told, approximately $400,000 has been spent by south San Francisco in handling the floods and sand that spread over the stream bottoms year after year I saw a ditch that had been cut through the sand deposit to a depth of about 12 feet as a means of passing on sand and flood flows. This job alone, I was told, cost around $235,000. And still sand flows out of the expanding sore spots upstream into the ditch and over park areas and baseball fields.

At one time barges are said to have carried hay up Colma Creek to the Charles Lux ranch about a mile from San Francisco Bay. No boat of any kind could go up there now. Furthermore the bay itself is shoaling about the mouth of the creek.

Highway and county officials are providing about $100,000 for the maintenance of erosion-control installations and plantings along the new Junipera Serra Boulevard that crosses eight drainages leading into Colma Creek. The Soil Conservation Service has been asked to install eight risers for silting basins above the embankment of this highway to stop the silt now passing beneath the boulevard.

Much erosion-control work is being carried on by the San Mateo soil-conservation district in its cooperation with farmers and dairymen operating on the watershed of Colma Creek. It will be interesting to observe the control effects of these operations. I suspect it may eventually cost in the neighborhood of a million and a half to $2,000,000 to handle this problem of erosion and silting within the limits of this one diminutive part of the Nation.

GULLIES MEET THE PACIFIC

It was here, about 10 miles south of the Golden Gate, that I saw a monster gully that began in a cabbage patch and now empties in the Pacific. This gapping chasm seems to be even deeper than what we had supposed was the deepest man-made gully in the United States—Providence Cave, of Stewart County, Ga

While I was in California I was told that, following the severe erosion experienced in several of the southern counties during the early part of this year, a number of farmers had requested that assessments on their lands be reduced because of the erosion damage, particularly damage to productive valley lands by overdeposits of erosion debris. This was in one of the richest agricultural counties of the State A member of the board of supervisors of that county told me that they were striving to get a soil-conservation district established, and that when this was done, the county would, in all probability, be ready to put in $100,000 annually to help with the erosion problem

Sedimentation surveys of the municipal water-supply reservoir at High Point, N. C., made in 1934, before the erosion-control demonstration program on its watershed started, and again in 1938, after the conservation work closed down, revealed that the average annual silt deposition in the reservoir had dropped to 24 percent less than it was before the conservation work was done. The annual loss of storage was reduced from 0.77 to 0.59 percent and the net soil loss from the entire drainage area from 0.93 to 0.71 ton per acre, as measured by the amount of sediment entering the reservoir. This reduction took place even though there was an equal number of intense storms and slightly higher run-off after the 1934 survey. This accomplishment seems even more impressive when it is considered that only 35 percent of the total acreage in this watershed was placed under erosion control.

Studies of water purification at High Point and 21 other towns in the North Carolina Piedmont have shown that a reduction of 25 to 30 percent in the silt burden of the streams would result in a saving of $7 per million gallons of water treated. This would result in a benefit of $94,500 annually to these towns.

POWER LOST BY RESERVOIR SILTING

During the first 9 months of 1941, in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama, electric current lost due to depletion of storage capacity by sedimentation had an estimated value of more than $250,000. Silting surveys conducted by S. C. S. in these four Southern States show that water storage capacities of major power reservoirs have been reduced by about 370,000 acre-feet in the last 25 years. All these reservoirs are located in areas of intensive farming, and the silting is the result of erosion of farm lands in these watersheds.

There are hundreds of reservoir storage sites in this region which might be developed, at great cost, but if the present rate of silting continues the region eventually will be faced with a severe shortage of water-storage possibilities. With the adoption of adequate conservation measures, silting can be reduced to a fraction of present rates.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION

Coming now to the national program for conservation of soil and water started in the fall of 1933, I want to touch briefly on the general nature and scope of the work.

We were late in getting this program under way—too late for some localities in various parts of the country. Some communities were pretty well depleted of good land and farmers who once made a living had mostly moved out. The north central part of Fairfield County, S. C., is one such community. The Lickskillet section in southwestern Georgia is another; and Neri in the West Cross Timbers of Texas another. The hilly section up north of Marion, Ala., some of the country lying to the north of Ocoee, Tenn., scattered areas in the rougher sections along the Des Moines River in southeastern Iowa, and portions of the watershed of the Puerco River, N. Mex., are other localities which were permitted to go too far. Little further practical use can be made of these erosion-scoured lands except for forestry and grazing.

Not only had no attempt been made by the Federal Government to get under way a completely coordinated erosion-control and water-conservation program on the crop and grazing lands of the Nation, but very little had been done in the field of soil-conservation research until the erosion experiment stations got under way about 1930. Even the important control structure, the field terrace, which was in use as early as 1830 in parts of South Carolina, was not subjected to the scrutiny of research until a hundred years later. No one knew until about 1933 that field terraces should never have a gradient exceeding 6 inches in a linear distance of 100 feet and on highly erodible lands not to exceed a fall of about two or three inches in 100 feet.

For "Salaries, Office of Second Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $6,100.

For "Salaries, Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $10,905.

For "Salaries, Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $3,730.

For "Salaries, Office of Purchasing Agent, 1942," $395.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts, 1942," $1,590.

For "Post office inspectors, salaries, 1942," $20,050.

For "Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service, 1942," $585.

For "Railway Mail Service, salaries, 1942," $17,450.

For "Operating force for public buildings, Post Office Department, 1942," $211,730.

In all, Post Office Department, $280,685.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For "Salaries, Department of State, 1942," $30,320.

For "Passport agencies, Department of State, 1942," $1,245.

For "International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada, 1942," $577.

For "Salaries and expenses, International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, 1942," $400.

In all, Department of State, $32,542.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Exchange Control, 1942," $3,075.

For "Salaries, Division of Research and Statistics, Treasury Department, 1942," $2,045.

For "Salaries, Division of Personnel, Treasury Department, 1942," $1,070.

For "Salaries, Office of Chief Clerk, Treasury Department, 1942," $2,600.

For "Salaries, operating force, Treasury Department Buildings, 1942," $6,600.

For "Salaries, Division of Printing, Treasury Department, 1942," $1,755.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department, 1942," $4,850.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Public Debt, 1942," $21,365.

For "Salaries, Office of Treasurer of United States, 1942," $16,835.

For "Collecting the revenue from customs, 1942," $250,855.

For "Salaries, Office of Comptroller of the Currency, 1942," $2,220.

For "Collecting the internal revenue, 1942," $377,975.

For "Salaries and expenses, Processing Tax Board of Review, 1942," $840.

For "Salaries, Secret Service Division, 1942," $405.

For "Salaries, Office of Director of the Mint, 1942," $1,480.

For "Salaries and expenses, Mints and Assay Offices, 1942," $4,855.

In all, Treasury Department, $698,825.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For "Executive Office, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $955.

For "Purchasing Division, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,140.

For "Department of Inspections, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $5,435.

For "Poundmaster, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $225.

For "District Buildings, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,455.

For "Assessor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $5,595.

For "Collector, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $700.

For "Auditor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,930.

For "Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, District of Columbia, 1942," $40.

For "Chief Clerk, Engineer Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $555.

For "Municipal Architect, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $950.

For "Department of Insurance, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $620.

For "Surveyor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $375.

For "Commission on Mental Health, District of Columbia, 1942," $188.

For "Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole, District of Columbia, 1942," $315.

For "Administrative expenses, compensation to injured employees in the District of Columbia, 1942," $1,005.

For "Register of Wills, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,513.

For "Recorder of Deeds, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,466.

For "Motor vehicles, District of Columbia, 1942," $95.

For "Free Public Library, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $6,560.

For "Collection and disposal of refuse, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,315.

For "Public schools, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $23,760.

For "Metropolitan Police, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,995.

For "Fire Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $45.

For "Health Department, general administration, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,302.

For "Health Department, medical services, District of Columbia, 1942," $5,650.

For "Health Department, laboratories, District of Columbia, 1942," $650.

For "Health Department, inspections, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,465.

For "Tuberculosis, Sanatoria, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $10,163.

For "Gallinger Municipal Hospital, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $3,105.

For "Juvenile court, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,390.

For "Municipal court, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,005.

For "Division of Child Welfare, detention of children, District of Columbia, 1942," $345.

For "Workhouse and reformatory, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $10,403.

For "District Training School, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,920.

For "Industrial Home School for Colored Children, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $810.

For "Municipal Lodging House, District of Columbia, 1942," $135.

For "Temporary Home for Former Soldiers and Sailors, District of Columbia, 1942," $135.

For "Transportation of indigent nonresident persons, District of Columbia, 1942," $165.

For "Militia, District of Columbia, 1942," $525.

For "Public parks, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $7,355.

In all, District of Columbia, exclusive of highway and water funds, $108,755.

Highway fund, gasoline tax and motor-vehicle fees: For "Department of Vehicles and Traffic, salaries, highway fund, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,535; and for "Trees and parkings, salaries, highway fund, District of Columbia, 1942," $540; in all, $3,075, to be paid wholly out of the special fund created by the act entitled "An act to provide a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106), and the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937.

Water service: For "Washington Aqueduct, District of Columbia, 1942," $4,185, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the Water Department of the District of Columbia.

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942.

In all, District of Columbia, including highway and water funds, $116,015.

In all, title V, $3,236,327.

The restrictions contained in appropriations or affecting appropriations or other funds available during the fiscal year 1942 limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services or for other purposes are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the increases in compensation under said act of August 1, 1941, and said Executive Orders No. 8842 and No. 8882: *Provided*, That all appropriations and funds, including the appropriations herein made, available during the fiscal year 1942 for the payment of salaries of civilian officers and employees who are subject to the provisions of said act of August 1, 1941, and said Executive Orders No. 8842 and No. 8882, shall be available from and including October 1, 1941, for the payment of within-grade salary advancements as of October 1, 1941, or any subsequent date on which such officers and employees became, or will become, eligible for such advancements in accordance with said act and Executive orders: *Provided further*, That the head of any department, establishment, or agency is hereby authorized to allocate from the sum herein appropriated under any appropriation title administered by him to any subappropriation included under such title such amount as he may determine to be necessary to meet expenditures for within-grade salary advancements in accordance with the provisions of said act or Executive orders.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The first section of title VI carries a provision for restoring Mr. David Lasser, one-time president of the Workers Alliance, to the good grace of this great Government, so that he might come back on the pay roll. When I first read the provision I thought of that old song, Will You Love Me in December As You Did in May? Of course, that is a little short of the distance—by 1 month—but I am wondering whether or not this Congress, after it removed David Lasser from the pay roll in June, proposes to restore him in December. He appeared before the committee and made a case, after a fashion. Representative FLANNAGAN appeared in his behalf and Representative VOORHIS, of California, sent a memorandum to the committee in his behalf. Mr. Millard W. Rice, a representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appeared in his behalf. It should be stated, however, that Mr. Rice appeared as an individual and not as a representative of the V. F. W. or the D. A. V. He frankly informed the committee that he did not recall the number of the chapter of the D. A. V. to which Mr. Lasser belonged; that he knew little about Mr. Lasser; that he had no regular contact with him; and that for the most part his information was obtained around a lunch table in the Senate restaurant.

Mr. Lasser in his statement to the committee indicated that he had spent several months contacting Members of Congress after his separation from the Federal service, in which he was holding a position in the W. P. A. at a salary of $4,400 per year. It is, however, singular to me that, since I was an author of the amendment whereby Mr. Lasser was separated from the Federal roll, that he at no time contacted me or called my office.

Now, let us turn to the basic case against Mr. Lasser. I admitted in June that it was rare procedure to remove an

individual from the Federal rolls by an amendment to an appropriation bill. It is so obvious, however, that it becomes quite impossible to remove undesirable people from the Federal service by any other method.

It is here proposed to restore Mr. Lasser to the rolls by a legislative provision in an appropriation bill. It is clearly subject to a point of order. I, however, do not propose to make that point of order. I prefer to let this matter be disposed on its merits and I am only too glad to see it resubmitted to the Whole Committee with such action as the Committee cares to take.

Let me remind you that Mr. Lasser appeared before the W. P. A. investigating committee of the Appropriations Committee in April 1939. His testimony and that of the secretary-treasurer, Mr. Herbert Benjamin, covers 150 pages of the hearings.

On page 42 Mr. Lasser freely admits that he attended the twentieth anniversary celebration of the Soviet revolution in Russia. Why was he there? On April 13, 1937, he issued a release as president of the Workers Alliance characterizing those Members of the Congress who brought about a $50,000,000 cut in W. P. A. appropriations as resorting to "misrepresentation, outright lies, tricks, bluffs, and tricks."

He was associated with Mr. Benjamin, the secretary-treaurer, from 1936 to 1939, and this is the same Mr. Benjamin who, on page 135 of the hearings, testified:

I would say in connection with all this that my membership in the Communist Party is, of course, no state secret.

Is it not strange that while Mr. Lasser has disavowed any connection with the Communist Party, that in April 1937 he contributed a signed article to the Daily Worker over his own signature and begged for contributions to the cause of his alliance. I exhibit here to you copies of the Daily Worker of April 1937 which came from the files of the investigating committee. If Mr. Lasser was so intent on ridding the Workers Alliance of Communists, why was he using the official organ of the Communist Party in an appeal for funds?

Now consider Mr. Lasser's answer to the question from Mr. O'NEAL as recorded on page 178. Mr. O'NEAL asked, "Do you consider the Communist Party a subversive organization?" Mr. Lasser's answer was, "My impression from reading the material that Mr. Benjamin has furnished is that it is not."

If Mr. Lasser entertains this idea about the Communist philosophy, the Congress has, indeed, been wasting precious funds and much time to seek out the Communists in the country and separate them from the rolls of the Federal Government. If Mr. Lasser entertained such a view, then certainly there is double reason why he should be prevented from reentering the service of the Government.

On pages 65 and 66 of the hearings the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made repeated efforts to secure an answer to the question as to whether or not Mr. Lasser was a Communist. He objected to this question. He said, in fact:

I am here before this committee in a purely official capacity as president of the Workers Alliance of America. I would like to state that I believe the question is not a pertinent one. I have nothing to hide of my political beliefs, but I believe my personal political beliefs are not germane to the question here at issue any more than my religious beliefs.

In answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], Mr. Lasser said:

I am not prepared, nor do I believe this is the time and the place nor the committee, to determine the relative merits of communism or say whether it is or is not pertinent to the administration of the Government.

After this sidestepping, Mr. Lasser finally stated that he was not a Communist. But how can one reconcile that denial with his refusal to return a forthright answer with his observation that from the material which he examined communism was not subversive, with his signed contribution to the official organ of the Communist Party, and with such other evidence as appears in the investigation hearings?

Are we now to go soft and restore Mr. Lasser in December after removing him in June? The time has arrived to become earnest and determined and to remain earnest and determined in dealing with communism if we are to do a job.

Finally, let me make this observation while it is fresh in my mind. Only yesterday and today a subcommittee of one of the committees of this House of which I am a member has been taking testimony from one of the large agencies of Government, and from the Administrator of that agency who has $100,000,000 per year to spend. When the chairman of the subcommittee asked the Administrator point blank whether he would remove a Communist from the pay roll, his answer was, "I would have to take that under consideration. After all, Mr. Chairman, Russians are dying on the battlefields today." The chairman of that subcommittee expressed his amazement at the reply. I, too, was amazed, and I am frankly concerned when the administrator of a Government agency frankly states to five Members of Congress that he would have to take under consideration the removal of a Communist from the Federal pay roll. We have moved far on the pathway of self-destruction when the matter of separating Communists from the Federal rolls must be taken under advisement.

That same Administrator was not familiar with the prohibition on Communists and bundists in the appropriation under which he operates until he was refreshed when the chairman of the subcommittee read to him the pertinent provision in the Departmental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1942.

Is it not time that we become rather steadfast and deal earnestly with this moving problem before it engulfs the Government?

Let me repeat what I stated before, I shall make no point of order against the provision which would restore Mr. Lasser to the Federal rolls. I am willing to see the merits of the matter tested in this body this afternoon.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. The second proviso of section 1 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, which reads: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of David Lasser," is hereby repealed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the paragraph is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and have them appear at the point where we discussed the item relative to highway appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. LAMBERTSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to strike out all of title III.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DWORSHAK) there were—ayes 31 and noes 97.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 56, nays 252, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—56

Andersen, H. Carl	Heidinger	Reed, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Hill, Wash.	Rich
Arends	Howell	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Burdick	Johns	Shanley
Butler	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Knutson	Stratton
Coffee, Nebr.	Lambertson	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Landis	Tinkham
Crowther	Mason	Vorys, Ohio.
Curtis	Moser	Wheat
Day	Murray	Wilson
Dewey	O'Connor	Winter
Dworshak	O'Hara	Wolcott
Engel	Oliver	Woodruff, Mich.
Grant, Ind.	Paddock	Youngdahl
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser	
	Rankin, Mont.	
	Reed, Ill.	

NAYS—252

Allen, La.	Crosser	Gilchrist
Anderson, Calif.	Culkin	Gillette
Angell	Cullen	Gillie
Arnold	Cunningham	Gossett
Barden	D'Alesandro	Graham
Barnes	Davis, Ohio	Granger
Barry	Davis, Tenn.	Grant, Ala.
Bates, Ky.	Delaney	Guyer
Bates, Mass.	Dickstein	Gwynne
Baumhart	Dingell	Hall, Leonard W.
Beam	Dirksen	Hancock
Beckworth	Disney	Hare
Beiter	Ditter	Harness
Bender	Domengeaux	Harrington
Blackney	Dondero	Harris, Ark.
Bland	Doughton	Harris, Va.
Bloom	Downs	Hart
Boggs	Duncan	Harter
Bolton	Durham	Healey
Boykin	Eaton	Hébert
Brooks	Eberharter	Hendricks
Brown, Ga.	Edmiston	Hess
Brown, Ohio	Elliott, Calif.	Hobbs
Bryson	Ellis	Hoffman
Burgin	Elston	Holmes
Camp	Englebright	Hook
Canfield	Faddis	Houston
Cannon, Mo.	Fellows	Hunter
Carlson	Fish	Imhoff
Carter	Fitzgerald	Izac
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Jackson
Case, S. Dak.	Flaherty	Jacobsen
Clason	Fogarty	Jarman
Claypool	Folger	Jarrett
Cochran	Forand	Jenkins, Ohio
Coffee, Wash.	Ford, Thomas F.	Jenks, N. H.
Cole, Md.	Fulmer	Jennings
Collins	Gamble	Jensen
Colmer	Gathings	Johnson, Luther A.
Cooley	Gavagan	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Cooper	Gearhart	Johnson, Okla.
Copeland	Gehrmann	Johnson, W. Va.
Courtney	Gerlach	Kean
Cravens	Gibson	Keefe
Creal	Gifford	Kelley, Pa.
	Myers, Pa.	Sheppard
	Nelson	Sheridan
	Norrell	Sikes
	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson
	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Pa.
	O'Toole	Smith, Wash.
	Pace	South
	Patman	Sparkman
	Patrick	Spence
	Peterson, Fla.	Springer
	Peterson, Ga.	Starnes, Ala.
	Pheiffer, William T.	Stearns, N. H.
	Pierce	Stefan
	Pittenger	Sullivan
	Plauché	Taber
	Poage	Talle
	Powers	Tarver
	Priest	Tenerowicz
	Rabaut	Terry
	Ramsay	Thom
	Ramspeck	Thomas, N. J.
	Randolph	Thomas, Tex.
	Rankin, Miss.	Traynor
	Reece, Tenn.	Van Zandt
	Rees, Kans.	Vinson, Ga.
	Rivers	Wadsworth
	Robertson, Va.	Walter
	Rockefeller	Ward
	Rodgers, Pa.	Wasielewski
	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
	Russell	Weiss
	Sabath	West
	Sanders	Whitten
	Sauthoff	Whittington
	Scanlon	Wickersham
	Schuetz	Wigglesworth
	Schulte	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Scott	Wolverton, N. J.
	Secrest	Worley
	Shafer, Mich.	Wright
		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—122

Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Richards
Anderson, N. Mex.	Haines	Rizley
Andrews	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Baldwin	Hartley	Rogers, Okla.
Bell	Heffernan	Rolph
Bennett	Hill, Colo.	Romjue
Bishop	Hinshaw	Sacks
Boehne	Holbrock	Sasscer
Boland	Hope	Satterfield
Bonner	Johnson, Calif.	Schaefer, Ill.
Boren	Johnson, Ind.	Scrugham
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Shannon
Buck	Kefauver	Short
Buckler, Minn.	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Buckley, N. Y.	Kleberg	Smith, Va.
Bulwinkle	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Burch	Kopplemann	Snyder
Byrne	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
Byron	Lea	Steagall
Cannon, Fla.	Lewis	Stevenson
Capozzoli	Ludlow	Sumners, Tex.
Casey, Mass.	McArdle	Sutphin
Celler	McGranery	Sweeney
Chapman	McIntyre	Thill
Chenoweth	Maas	Thomason
Clark	Maciejewski	Tibbott
Cluett	Magnuson	Tolan
Cole, N. Y.	Mansfield	Treadway
Costello	Martin, Mass.	Vincent, Ky.
Cox	Mills, La.	Voorhis, Calif.
Dies	Mitchell	Vreeland
Douglas	Murdock	Welch
Drewry	Nichols	Wene
Elliot, Mass.	Norton	Whelchel
Fenton	O'Day	White
Flannagan	O'Leary	Williams
Flannery	O'Neal	Woodrum, Va.
Ford, Leland M.	Osmers	Young
Ford, Miss.	Patton	
Gale	Pearson	
Gore	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Green	Plumley	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bennett for, with Mr. Woodrum of Virginia against.

Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Tibbott.
Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cluett.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Costello.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Capozzoli.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Young.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Patton.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Green with Mr. O'Day.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Anderson of New Mexico.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Wene with Mr. Cannon of Florida.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Sutphin.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Kopplemann.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 310, nays 5, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—310

Allen, La.	Beiter	Camp
Andersen, H. Carl	Bender	Canfield
Anderson, Calif.	Blackney	Cannon, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Bland	Carlson
Angell	Bloom	Carter
Arends	Boggs	Cartwright
Arnold	Bolton	Case, S. Dak.
Barden	Boykin	Chiperfield
Barnes	Bradley, Mich.	Clason
Barry	Brooks	Claypool
Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.	Clevenger
Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio	Cochran
Baumhart	Bryson	Coffee, Nebr.
Beam	Bulwinkle	Coffee, Wash.
Beckworth	Burdick	Cole, Md.
	Burgin	Collins
	Butler	Colmer

Cooley	Hook	Pheiffer, William T.
Cooper	Hope	Pierce
Copeland	Houston	Pittenger
Courtney	Howell	Plauché
Cox	Hull	Ploeser
Cravens	Hunter	Poage
Creal	Imhoff	Powers
Crosser	Izac	Priest
Crowther	Jackson	Rabaut
Culkin	Jacobsen	Ramsay
Cullen	Jenkins, Ohio	Ramspeck
Cunningham	Jenks, N. H.	Randolph
Curtis	Jennings	Rankin, Miss.
D'Alesandro	Jensen	Rankin, Mont.
Davis, Ohio	Johns	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Day	Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, N. Y.
Delaney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rees, Kans.
Dewey	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Dickstein	Johnson, W. Va.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Dingell	Jones	Robertson, Va.
Dirksen	Jonkman	Robsion, Ky.
Disney	Kean	Rockefeller
Ditter	Keefe	Rodgers, Pa.
Domengeaux	Kefauver	Rogers, Mass.
Dondero	Kelley, Pa.	Russell
Doughton	Kelly, Ill.	Sabath
Downs	Kennedy	Sanders
Duncan	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sauthoff
Durham	Kennedy, Michael J.	Scanlon
Dworshak	Keogh	Schaefer, Ill.
Eaton	Kerr	Schuetz
Eberharter	Kilday	Schulte
Edmiston	Kinzer	Scott
Elliott, Calif.	Kirwan	Secrest
Ellis	Knutson	Shafer, Mich.
Elston	Kocialkowski	Sheppard
Engel	Kramer	Sheridan
Eng'ebright	Landis	Sikes
Faddis	Lanham	Simpson
Fellows	Larrabee	Smith, Ohio
Fish	Leavy	Smith, Pa.
Fitzgerald	LeCompte	Smith, Wash.
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Smith, Wis.
Flaherty	Ludlow	South
Flannagan	Lynch	Sparkman
Fogarty	McCormack	Spence
Folger	McGehee	Springer
Forand	McGregor	Starnes, Ala.
Ford, Miss.	McKeough	Stearns, N. H.
Ford, Thomas F.	McLaughlin	Stefan
Fulmer	McLean	Stratton
Gamble	McMillan	Sullivan
Gathings	Maciora	Taber
Gavagan	Mahon	Talle
Gearhart	Manasco	Tarver
Gehrmann	Marcantonio	Tenerowicz
Gerlach	Martin, Iowa	Terry
Gibson	Mason	Thom
Gillette	May	Thomas, N. J.
Gilchrist	Merritt	Thomas, Tex.
Gillie	Meyer, Md.	Tinkham
Gossett	Michener	Traynor
Graham	Mills, Ark.	Van Zandt
Granger	Monroney	Vinson, Ga.
Grant, Ala.	Morrison	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ind.	Moser	Wadsworth
Gregory	Mott	Walter
Guyer	Mundt	Ward
Gwynne	Murray	Wasielewski
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Myers, Pa.	Weaver
Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson	West
Hancock	Norrell	Wheat
Hare	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitten
Harness	O'Brien, N. Y.	Whittington
Harrington	O'Connor	Wickersham
Harris, Ark.	O'Hara	Wigglesworth
Harris, Va.	Oliver	Wilson
Hart	O'Neal	Winter
Harter	O'Toole	Wolcott
Hartley	Pace	Wolfenden, Pa.
Healey	Paddock	Wolverton, N. J.
Hébert	Patman	Woodrum, Va.
Heidinger	Patrick	Worley
Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.	Wright
Hess	Peterson, Ga.	Youngdahl
Hill, Wash.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Zimmerman
Hobbs		
Holmes		

NAYS—5

Crawford	Rich	Sumner, Ill.
Lambertson	Shanley	

NOT VOTING—115

Allen, Ill.	Boland	Byron
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bonner	Cannon, Fla.
Andrews	Boren	Capozzoli
Baldwin	Bradley, Pa.	Casey, Mass.
Bell	Buck	Celler
Bennett	Buckler, Minn.	Chapman
Bishop	Buckley, N. Y.	Chenoweth
Boehne	Burch	Clark
	Byrne	Cluett
Cole, N. Y.	Lea	Scrugham
Costello	Lewis	Shannon
Dies	McArdle	Short
Douglas	McGranery	Smith, Maine
Drewry	McIntyre	Smith, Va.
Eliot, Mass.	Maas	Smith, W. Va.
Fenton	Maciejewski	Snyder
Flannery	Magnuson	Somers, N. Y.
Ford, Leland M.	Mansfield	Steagall
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Stevenson
Gifford	Mills, La.	Sumners, Tex.
Gore	Mitchell	Sutphin
Green	Murdock	Sweeney
Haines	Nichols	Thill
Halleck	Norton	Thomason
Heffernan	O'Day	Tibbott
Hill, Colo.	O'Leary	Tolan
Hinshaw	Osmers	Treadway
Hoffman	Patton	Vincent, Ky.
Holbrock	Pearson	Voorhis, Calif.
Jarman	Plumley	Vreeland
Jarrett	Richards	Weiss
Johnson, Calif.	Rizley	Welch
Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Utah	Wene
Kee	Rogers, Okla.	Whelchel
Kilburn	Rolph	White
Kleberg	Romjue	Williams
Klein	Sacks	Woodruff, Mich.
Kopplemann	Sasscer	Young
Kunkel	Satterfield	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Short.
Mr. Boehne with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Bennett.
Mr. McArdle with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Green with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Patton with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr Kleberg with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Tibbott.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cluett.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Hill of Colorado.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Mills of Louisiana with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Capozzoli.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Young.
Mr. Wene with Mr. Haines.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Sasscer.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. O'Leary.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Sweeney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE AUTHORIZED TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk of the House may be authorized to correct the section numbers in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may be permitted to extend their remarks in 5 legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] to say that they are unavoidably absent from the House. If they had been present, they would have voted against the motion to recommit and in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I much regret that I have to make a point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I must call the attention of my friend from New York to the rule that it is not in order to announce how absent Members would have voted if present.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard on that. It is not in order under the rules excepting where a Member gets 1 minute to address the House. Under those conditions he may say anything he wants to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not even by that subterfuge. It has been held by Speakers of the House repeatedly that the procedure of the House does not permit it. It is a very bad practice, and we do not want it to get started. I much regret to have to raise the question of order.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman as to the correctness of his theory; but, as I understand it, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. He was given the unanimous consent of the House to proceed for 1 minute; therefore he is permitted to say anything so long as he uses parliamentary language.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am in warmest sympathy with

the statement of the attitude of the Members to whom the gentleman from New York refers. I wish there were some parliamentary way for this information to be made available to the House at this time. But it is a rule of long standing—and a very salutary one—and we cannot relax it for one and enforce it for others. As a matter of fact, a point of order is not required. It is the duty of the Speaker, and the practice of the Speaker to enforce it just as he would enforce the rule against an explanation of a vote during roll call or any other automatic rule of procedure. These gentlemen have their remedy. They can themselves rise at any session of the House and by securing the floor announce how they would have voted or on what grounds they would have voted or any other matter pertaining to their vote or their failure to vote, without attempting to vote by proxy. Knowing all three of these gentlemen as I do, I am certain they would prefer to observe the rules of the House rather than to violate the rules of the House even for this questionable advantage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. Even though the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, when he began making the explanation he did, the Chair must sustain the point of order under all precedents.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication which was read:

DECEMBER 5, 1941.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on War Claims, same to take effect immediately.

Very respectfully,
MARTIN F. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 379), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That MARTIN F. SMITH of Washington be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on World War Veterans' Legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 380) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY OF ANANTA KHITTASANGKA, A CITIZEN OF THAILAND

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 251, authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the same matter that was up before the House this morning?

Mr. HARTER. So I understand.

Mr. MICHENER. And it was withdrawn at the suggestion of the Speaker. Will the gentleman tell the House what has transpired since the time it was withdrawn this morning by the chairman of the committee at the suggestion of the Speaker and the present hour?

Mr. HARTER. I am unable to answer that question. I only know that this resolution and the passage of it is greatly desired by the Secretary of State. This young man is the son of the present Prime Minister of Thailand and will be in the Military Academy without expense to our Government. The State Department wishes this passed.

Mr. MICHENER. It is a good-neighbor gesture?

Mr. HARTER. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I might contribute something in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] talked to me an hour or so ago and told me that the matter would be brought up later in the day. At that time he told me he had consulted the Members on the minority side and thought that everything was all right. As I recall, rather than take up unnecessary time when the unanimous-consent request was submitted earlier in the afternoon, the Speaker requested that it be withdrawn. The gentleman from Kentucky told me that the gentleman from Ohio was going to submit the unanimous-consent request later and he thought that everything was all right. The impression I had was that he had conferred with the Republican Members who had manifested an interest when the matter came up earlier in the day.

Mr. MICHENER. As I recall, the matter was called up unexpectedly earlier this afternoon. No one on this side knew anything about it until the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] came in after it had been called up and said that it was all right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want it understood that I insist that when a similar unanimous-consent request is submitted it be agreeable to the Republican members of the committee that the request be submitted, and that the leadership on the Republican side be consulted. I am very sorry that the leadership present today was not consulted. I assumed the leadership had been consulted.

Mr. MICHENER. We do not know anything about the bill, and it is now 6 o'clock and there is no one here. To call up by unanimous consent under such circumstances a matter about which the House has no information and which the House had no notion was going to be called up is just not good practice, unless it is an emergency matter which requires such treatment.

Mr. HARTER. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that this matter was considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs and practically all the members were present, including the Republican members. The matter was thoroughly discussed and gone over, and the resolution was unanimously voted out by the full committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Personally, I shall not object, but I do hope that matters of this type will not be brought up at this hour under like conditions.

Mr. HARTER. I can only confirm what the majority leader has said, that when I was requested to bring it up in the House at this time I was told that the leadership on the gentleman's side of the House had been consulted and that it was agreeable all around.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, may I ask if this is going to be a precedent for the entry into the Military Academy of Chinese and Russians?

Mr. HARTER. I am unable to answer that, but I do not expect that this sets any great precedent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit Ananta Khittasangka to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that Ananta Khittasangka shall agree to comply with all regulations for the police and discipline of the academy, to be studious, and to give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction, and that said Ananta Khittasangka shall not be admitted to the academy until he shall have passed the mental and physical examinations prescribed for candidates from the United States and that he shall be immediately withdrawn if deficient in studies or in conduct and so recommended by the academic board: *Provided further*, That in the case of said Ananta Khittasangka, the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended, and the provisions of law relating to age limitations upon the admission of candidates to the academy shall not apply.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLOSIVES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution,

storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes, approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385)" with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SOMERS of New York, PETERSON of Florida, and ENGLEBRIGHT.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1623) to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill is of such a character and of such importance that it should not be taken up tonight. I shall have to object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the appropriation bill passed today, and to include a letter from Mr. Ezra B. Whitman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from volume 1, No. 1, of the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the bill passed this afternoon, and to include two editorials from the Manila Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a short resolution which I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an editorial on labor bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the point in the debate this afternoon when the Tennessee Valley Authority item was under consideration, and to include therewith two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SENATOR SHEPPARD

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, today in the foyer of the Capitol there was unveiled a portrait of a great American, the late Senator Morris Sheppard. The presentation of that portrait to the Government was made by the chairman of the Texas delegation in the House, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN. It was a beautiful and a justly deserved tribute to that great man.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including the address delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks made this afternoon and to include a brief statement by the late Senator Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks made in the Committee and to include therein a table which I referred to in connection with those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. LARRABEE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMASON of Texas (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for 1 week, on account of death in the family.

ORDER OF BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Can the majority leader advise the House as to whether or not there has been any change in the program for next week since the last announcement?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; with this exception: I stated yesterday there would be two noncontroversial bills called up on Monday by the Committee on the District of Columbia. I wish to correct that. There may be four or five bills which are noncontroversial. There may be some explanation, but I am informed by the chairman of that committee that they are not controversial.

On Monday the bill (H. R. 6009) to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard disabled in line of duty and as a direct result of armed conflict while engaged in extrahazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who died for such cause, and for other purposes. That has been reported out unanimously.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the Lesinski bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the Lesinski bill. I told the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] he should take the matter up first with members of his committee on your side and then with the gentleman from Michigan. I do not know whether he has, but I assume he has.

Mr. MICHENER. He has said that he was going to call it up on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I told him that under the circumstances, if agreeable to your side, I would have no objection to the Speaker recognizing him, and that bill may be called up. I understand there is no controversy over it.

Then, of course, the extension of the Soil Conservation Act will come up on Monday. With those two exceptions, there is no change from the announcement that I made yesterday.

Tuesday will be the Private Calendar and Wednesday will be the national defense housing bill.

Mr. MICHENER. The distinguished majority leader made a suggestion during the debate this afternoon that it was hoped to get away from here for some kind of a permanent adjournment the latter part of next week. Does the gentleman still entertain any such anticipation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Sometimes between entertaining and hoping there is a slight difference and sometimes a large difference. I have a very strong hope that we will do it, and I think I speak the sentiments of the Speaker and the leadership on your side. I am confident I do. I think it is only fair and just that it should be done.

I can assure the gentleman from Michigan that everything possible to accomplish that will be done. I do not want to raise any false hopes, but I can give one assurance: That everything possible will be done to try to attain that end.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has the hope but his suspicion is that the

event to which he refers will happen in the week beginning December 15.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair statement, but I can assure the gentleman that I am going to do everything I possibly can to remove the suspicion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an interesting letter I have received from Secretary Morgenthau relating to the tax on admissions to entertainments held for men in the military and naval service within the limits of training camps or sites. It is a very interesting letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COPPER FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I hope I can condense my remarks into something less than 35 minutes, and I hope that if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] is on the floor, he will remain and give me his attention inasmuch as I desire to discuss some of the matters mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas last Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I was reared in the country. Our family enjoyed the same privileges and underwent the same hardships that were experienced by the average American farm family. As I grew to manhood my family moved to town. I was presented with the opportunity to secure a good education and to train myself as a lawyer. For nearly 20 years I have practiced my profession in a city where I enjoy all of the conveniences of modern science, but I have not forgotten the days when I studied my lessons under the flickering light of a kerosene lamp, or the times when I hauled water in a barrel. I know from personal experience just how much lights and electric power mean to the comfort and health, as well as the material prosperity of the average family, and while I am now personally enjoying all modern conveniences I cannot forget the fact that the great bulk of the farm families of my State are still without the convenience of either electric lights or running water.

However, in recent years these farm people have discerned a ray of light. The Rural Electrification Administration has enabled farmers to borrow money from the Government to build their own systems to bring lights to 58,810 Texas farm homes. In addition to these homes, the private utilities have, during the same period, furnished electricity to 42,000 rural customers, as against a total of 11,500 rural people who were getting electric service prior to the inauguration of the R. E. A. The greatest single step in the extension of electricity to rural people in Texas was made when the Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District entered into a contract with the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, Inc., for the sale of all of the power generated by the great Morris Sheppard Dam. Under the provisions of this contract all the power produced at this great stream-control dam, which was financed and built by public money, was made available for distribution to public and defense agencies over the lines of a publicly owned and operated transmission system, which is financed entirely by a loan from R. E. A.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The gentleman will remember when my colleague, Mr. WINTER, had 30 minutes to speak on this subject earlier this week, he spoke about 5 minutes and then extended his remarks. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would not care to do likewise?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas wants to discuss a serious problem and expects to make a speech on the floor rather than to insert some remarks in the RECORD. Of course, he would be very flattered to have the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] listen to the entire speech because he knows that the gentleman from Kansas represents a great agricultural district whose people must be interested in the progress of the R. E. A., but if the gentleman from Kansas does not see fit to remain on the floor, the gentleman from Texas will be sorry, but will continue his speech.

To my mind this is a logical arrangement. The power produced by a publicly built dam is sold to and transmitted by a publicly owned and financed transmission system to be used exclusively in the public interest either for direct defense purposes or by publicly owned local distributing systems. These local distributing systems are owned by farmers. They receive no grant or gift from the Government. They borrow their money from the R. E. A., and they repay it. In fact, at the present time I am advised that of all obligations yet due on such loans, repayments are 127 percent of the amounts due, and that only 1 percent of the maturities over the Nation are delinquent.

At a meeting of the 79 R. E. A.-financed co-ops of Texas and New Mexico, held in Fort Worth, Tex., last week, it was shown that not one owed a dollar of overdue indebtedness. I consider this a remarkable record. The Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, Inc., is financed by such a loan. It was organized in February 1941. It began construction last spring, long before anyone ever suggested a shortage of any kind of material. It first contracted for aluminum transmission lines. As soon as it was suggested that the Nation needed aluminum for defense the directors of this cooperative asked the contractor to substitute some other conductor. At that time the O. P. M. stated that there was plenty of copper and publicly announced that a very substantial amount of copper would be available for R. E. A. uses each month. Relying on the statements of the defense agency that is supposed to know about these things, the directors of the Brazos Transmission Cooperative went ahead with their building program. About the same time the directors of the Farmers' Electric Generating Cooperative in east Texas did the same thing. The contractors who had contracted to erect these lines ordered the needed copper wire. Much of it was delivered, all openly, legally, and with the full knowledge of the O. P. M. It was delivered to the contractors, not to the cooperatives, as so many critics of the program have erroneously stated. Actually the wire that has been pictured as lying in cotton fields, and which the gentleman from Kansas referred to in his extension of remarks last Monday, is wire purchased by and delivered to Sandberg & Johnson, contractors, who bought this wire last spring to enable them to carry out their then existing and still existing contract to erect lines for the Farmers' Co-op. The fact that this wire is now in cottonfields is due to the fact that the lines of this farmer agency run through cottonfields, and the contractor has scattered the wire along the lines they are building. No, my friends, the gentleman from Kansas is mistaken when he so blandly repeats the very words of the power companies about hidden copper.

If the farmers of Texas were, as the gentleman from Kansas and the private utility companies state, actually hiding copper they would follow the example of the utility companies and hoard it up in a locked warehouse. For many months private utilities over the Nation have been receiving deliveries of copper. In fact, most private utilities now have vast stores of copper on hand, and in most cases are telling all prospective customers that they have the material to build any desired lines at a moment's notice, in spite of the fact that very few such private utilities have any available power to sell.

I have on my desk a copy of a letter from the Federal Power Commission dated November 6, 1941, stating in plain words that the large private utilities in Texas will not have enough generating capacity in 1942 to meet the loads that the companies themselves forecast. It is also pointed out that the companies' forecasts are less than the forecast of the Power Commission, and that they include in their estimate of available power for next year power to be produced in as yet unfinished plants that are now under construction. It is also interesting to note that the Federal Power Commission states that the Texas Power & Light Co. has scheduled a 30,000-kilowatt expansion to their Trinidad plant, and the Dallas Power & Light Co. has scheduled a 30,000-kilowatt new plant near Dallas. This in addition to a plant of approximately 10,000-kilowatt capacity, for which the O. P. M. recently granted the Dallas Power & Light Co. a priority order in the city of Dallas. When these facts are known, can it be doubted that new electrical energy is needed in Texas?

In view of this situation, the directors of the Brazos River Transmission Cooperative realized that if that agency was to render its maximum contribution to national defense it should do everything possible to furnish as much power as possible. It has always been recognized

that it would sooner or later be necessary to build a steam plant to firm up the river power in order to get the maximum value from the water power falling over Morris Sheppard Dam. This dam was not built primarily as a power dam but as one unit of a stream-control system. It does produce power, and that power should be used, but it needs a steam plant to make the maximum power available. It is evident from the announced building programs of the private power companies that they were making no provision for new power in central Texas; their new construction is centered around the city of Dallas. Thus, if the private power companies were left to monopolize the development of power in our State, all new industry would be forced to locate around the presently existing industrial centers. I feel that central Texas is entitled to at least an opportunity to compete for the location of defense industries. Without power our section of the State cannot hope to get any kind of industry. Apparently the private power companies want to concentrate every industry at Dallas. The directors of the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op felt that the rural people were citizens just the same as the people of Dallas. The R. E. A. in Washington felt that the erection of a steam-generating plant at the southern end of the system would be a safe investment and one which could be expected to liquidate itself.

With these facts in mind, the R. E. A. has agreed to make loans for steam generating plants at Temple and at Gilmer. The gentleman from Kansas stated in his extended remarks that the east Texas lines would not be needed for 2 years as there is no power with which to energize them. Of course, if the gentleman from Kansas and the Electric Bond & Share have their way there will never be any power to energize these lines, but this objection seems just a shade insincere when we consider the fact that the private power companies are getting priorities for steam generating machinery in Texas to serve the same general areas, and particularly when it is known that on December 1, the very day when the gentleman from Kansas inserted in the RECORD the utility company's claim that the east Texas lines could not be used for 2 years, the Texas Power & Light Co. went to the commissioners court in Dallas County seeking to prevent the construction of the lines necessary to connect the east Texas project with the lines of the Brazos River project. The Brazos River Co-op has a supply of power at Morris Sheppard Dam, about 100 miles from Garland, Tex. About half of the line to Garland has been built and construction is progressing on the remainder of the Dallas County line. The lines must cross about 15 or 20 miles of Dallas County. The city of Garland owns its municipal plant. Recently two new defense industries, the Guiberson Diesel engine manufacturing plant, and the Southern Aircraft Co., have been located at Garland. The city had to have additional power if these defense plants were to be served. The private utilities have alleged that they needed more generating capacity at Dallas. The Brazos River project has the power today. The utilities have complained that it was being wasted.

The Brazos River Co-op has contracted to furnish power to the city of Garland and to connect at Garland with the lines of the east Texas project. If the gentleman from Kansas and the Texas Power & Light Co. do not succeed in stopping the construction of these lines, the entire east Texas project will be energized just as soon as the necessary lines and transforming stations can be built—within a few months—not 2 years as they would have you believe, and in addition, two vital national-defense industries will be supplied with power.

The gentleman from Kansas, the Dallas newspapers, and the private utilities would have you believe that these farmers' cooperatives in Texas seek to divert copper that is needed for national defense into nonessential channels. Such is not the fact. Within the past 10 days I have personally visited Mr. Donald Nelson, Mr. William Batts, Mr. Leon Henderson, and Vice President Wallace and discussed the copper situation with each of them. I have told each one of them that our people do not want and will not take a pound of copper that is needed for military purposes. That any day the Army or Navy tells us that they need the copper our farmers have in their R. E. A. systems that we are ready to tear down our lines and turn them over to the military authorities if the private utilities are required to do the same. But there is no such need for copper. I have been assured by all of the officials with whom I have talked that the Army and the Navy are receiving and will continue to receive all the copper they need, and that there will be in excess of half a million tons of copper per year for allocation to civilian uses.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Has not the gentleman taken the position all along that the rural electrification projects and the farmers that he so ably speaks for do not want to take one single pound of copper that can be used for national defense, but that after all national-defense requirements of every kind have been met he does expect an equitable distribution to be made of the remaining copper?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right. That is my position, and I am sure it is the position of the gentleman from Texas who has so ably expressed it. I know it is the position of the farmers in Texas who are the beneficiaries of the R. E. A.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I want to assure the gentleman that that is also the position of the farmers in the State of Iowa.

Mr. POAGE. I will say for the farmers of Iowa that they have always been interested in this program.

As I see it, it is just as important to furnish power for the feed mill, the cream separator, and the silage cutter on the farm as it is to furnish power for the convenience of the city dweller, who does nothing but sit at home and listen to his radio and run his vacuum cleaner, or for commercial advertising lights in Dallas. It takes copper wire to bring electricity to Highland Park in Dallas just as it does to bring it to the farm in Bell County. To my mind, the needs of the farmer who is producing the food and fiber needed for defense are entitled to prior consideration as between the two.

The present program of the Brazos Electric Transmission Cooperative involves the construction of something like 700 miles of transmission line and the erection of a steam-generating plant at Temple. The transmission lines extend from the Red River to Temple. About 200 miles of such lines are high-voltage lines, for which the wire has already been delivered, and much of which has already been constructed. The contracts for the construction of all of these lines were let many months ago. The local R. E. A. co-ops throughout central Texas are under contract to receive their electrical energy from these lines early next spring. If the private power companies can prevent the completion of these lines now they will be able to destroy practically all possibility of future completion. With the threat of competition removed, the private utilities would be at liberty not only to restore the outrageous rates they have so long charged, but they will also be in a position to absolutely control the location of any new industries that might come to the Southwest; and from the evidence now before us, those of us who live in the smaller cities of central and north Texas could only expect them to still further concentrate industry in the Dallas region. If the affiliates of the Electric Bond & Share are not attempting to bring about this kind of concentration, why do they object so violently to the erection of a steam plant at Temple? At the very same time that we were working on the plans for this Temple plant the O. P. M. granted a priority for material for the erection of a steam plant of approximately the same capacity in Dallas where the city charter allows a 9-percent return on the investment. The Temple plant will only charge enough to pay the cost of construction. It will not attempt to make a profit, but if private management is really so much more efficient, as the private utilities claim, then they should not fear this competition.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have observed that the gentleman from Texas has always voted for necessary defense items. Does he not feel that agriculture is an essential defense item?

Mr. POAGE. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has well expressed it when he said that food will win the war and write the peace. It has been said that the outcome of the battle of Britain would be determined on the farms of America, and I think that is true. It is just as vital to have the food to supply the men in the lines as it is to produce

matériel to supply the guns. Neither can operate without the other.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I border Texas on two sides and I believe the farmers of Oklahoma are likewise interested in the R. E. A. for the farmers.

Mr. POAGE. I am sure the farmers of Oklahoma are interested. They have had a struggle with the same utility-control group, that we have in Texas, and were paying some of the highest rates in all this Nation, until the R. E. A. came along and gave competition.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I read a very interesting report made by the Rural Electrification Administration a few days ago concerning the progress that has been made in electrifying rural areas in Texas. As a result of the leadership of the gentleman now occupying the floor and others of his colleagues of the Texas delegation, during the last 7 years I am informed we have increased the use of electricity in rural homes from 11,000 homes 7 years ago to approximately 100,000 homes today.

Mr. POAGE. One hundred and eleven thousand new ones.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. They are receiving electricity today and were not receiving it when this administration went into power.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, can it be consistently urged that the power to be produced at Temple, Tex., is not needed. If the existing private power companies need to expand, and they say they do; if they are faced with a shortage of power, and they say they are; why should the R. E. A. be criticized for building a plant that will not only make available the rated capacity of the new plant but also "firm up" and make usable at all times approximately a like amount of river power that is at present unusable? Can the private utilities with a like expenditure of funds and materials produce a like amount of power anywhere in Texas? It is obvious that they cannot. Therefore, can their complaint that the R. E. A. is wasting defense material be made in good faith?

And what of the transmission lines that the Brazos Co-op is building? The private utilities suggest that the farmers of central Texas who are constructing these lines are not cooperating with the needs of national defense. They say that they could furnish the lines to transmit this current. Of course they could. I have no doubt that they either have or could easily get all the copper they would need, but they would have to build the new lines themselves, and I have been unable to understand how it helps national defense for the private utilities to use material that they say should not be used by the public agencies. There has been much misleading information in regard to the use of this power from Morris Sheppard Dam. The utilities have tried to give the impression that they could simply make a connection and all the power of this great dam would become instantly available.

In the first place, they have failed to tell the public that that connection would be between 20 and 30 miles in length, because no private utility has any high-voltage line to the dam site. They then fail to tell that if they built this connection, which would require just as much copper as if the public agency constructed it, that it would connect with a line that is already loaded almost if not completely loaded to capacity. Electric transmission lines are like water pipes—they can only carry a given amount of "juice"; and while the affiliates of the Electric Bond & Share do own lines that could transmit the power from a point about 30 miles from Morris Sheppard Dam to most points in Texas, these lines cannot transmit that power and the power they are now carrying. Nor have the private utilities told the public that before anyone can transmit power from this dam that it was necessary to build a transforming station. This station is now nearly complete, but there never has been a time as yet when anybody could transmit power from this dam, and yet the utilities and their officers have repeatedly tried to lead the public to believe that only the obstinacy of the public agencies has kept them from connecting with an available source of wasted power. As a matter of fact, the utilities are in no position to use this power at this moment themselves. They simply do not want the people of central and north Texas to use it.

This dog-in-the-manger attitude on the part of the private utilities is not hard to understand. They are in business to get all they can from the users of electricity. They now profess a great interest in the rural business, but prior to the establishment of the R. E. A. it was practically impossible for any farmer to get any private power company to sell him electricity at any price, and if he succeeded in getting it at all he had to pay most exorbitant prices for the current as well as pay utterly fantastic sums for the line to his residence. Only the very few could afford rural electricity. The companies said the rural business was unprofitable, but just as soon as the R. E. A. began to loan money to farmers to build their own power lines the private companies began to want the business. At first the private utilities in Texas refused to sell power to the R. E. A. co-ops, but when the R. E. A. began to offer to finance local generating plants, and when the city of Bartlett offered to sell the local co-ops power from the Bartlett municipal plant, the Texas Power & Light Co. and its affiliates decided to sell the power and established a rate of 15 mills, wholesale. This rate, which was about as cheap as the small generating plants could offer, was retained until a little over a year ago. Just after we began to work on creating the Brazos River Electric Transmission Cooperative, and the Farmers' Electric Generating Cooperative in east Texas, the power companies cut their rates. Each time we took a new step they cut their rates further until effective the day after the charter was granted to the Brazos Cooperative, the private companies cut their wholesale rates to the local co-ops to the present figure of a little over 6 mills in the Brazos territory, or about 40 percent of what they were charging 7 months before. It seems to me that such a tremendous voluntary cut proves conclusively that the companies were previously overcharging the farmers.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Since the R. E. A. was organized for the benefit of the farmer, does not the gentleman feel that the benefits of the R. E. A. should be confined to the farmers?

Mr. POAGE. I do not know anybody else that is getting direct benefits of the R. E. A. I think the R. E. A. is primarily for the benefit of the farmer. But I think the providing of rural electricity in McLennan County is a benefit to the people of the city of Waco, my home town. I do not get rural electricity, but it helps me that my farmer neighbors do get it. It makes my home city a better town in which to live. It adds to the income of the people of Waco, Tex., because the farmers of the surrounding country are able to make a better income for themselves. So I would not want to say that the benefits should be confined simply to the farmers. I think the benefits permeate through all strata of society and I am glad they do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it not a fact that since the R. E. A. set-up, from which the farmer is getting the benefit, the man who lives in the city gets a benefit to the extent that the city rates have been lowered by reason of the rural use?

Mr. POAGE. No; unfortunately I do not think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is true in my town.

Mr. POAGE. That has not happened in the Brazos territory. The attorneys for the utility companies stated in my presence at the meeting with the Brazos River Board at Temple last spring that all of these rate reductions were simply the result of economies in generation and transmission which they had been able to effect and to pass on to the consumer. They further stated that it was the policy of the Electric Bond & Share companies to pass all economies on to the consumer. I raised the question then as to how it happened that the companies were able to effect economies coming to 60 percent of the total cost insofar as the power that was going to these particular rural co-ops was concerned, whereas no economies were effected in connection with that portion of the power generated at the same plants and transmitted over the same lines for sale in the cities of central Texas. I wondered then, and I still wonder, if the fact that the R. E. A. enabled these cooperatives to offer competition in rural areas while no competition was offered in cities like Waco and Temple did not account for the reduction. Certainly, if the T. P. & L. did effect economies amounting to 60 percent of their wholesale prices from September 1940

to March 1941 they were most unfair to Waco and all other cities in the central Texas area. We received no rate reduction in Waco, and yet today of all the 199 cities of more than 50,000 population in the United States only 18 have higher electric rates than Waco, Tex. The truth of the matter is that competition is not only the most effective but the only effective curb on electric rates in Texas today. The competition afforded by the Brazos River Electric Transmission Co-op has already resulted in a saving of $75,000 per year to the rural co-ops of Texas, and unless the building program now under way is stopped it will certainly result in additional savings to other cooperatives throughout the area.

I do not mean that the public agency can sell electricity lower than the present competitive rates of the utility companies. Under the R. E. A. plan the co-ops must charge enough to pay all operating costs and in addition to repay the capital investment in their plants. They can and are meeting these payments on about one-half the rates previously charged by the private utilities, and when the plants are paid for they will belong to the farmers themselves. So the co-op charges are in fact collected in large part for the benefit of the farmers themselves. It must also never be forgotten that the present utility rates in rural areas in Texas would never have been established had it not been for the threat of public competition. Certainly these low rates will not be extended to other co-ops or even retained where they are now in force if the building program of the R. E. A. is halted. So we can see rather clearly the true motive that activates the private companies who find it so "wicked" for the R. E. A. to loan money to Texas farmers to build lines and generating plants. The utilities are simply using national defense as a smoke screen, but they are at least directly and openly interested.

The bitter criticism of the Dallas newspaper is not even excusable on the ground of self-interest. They profess to be nonpartisan, although the city editor of one of the most bitter newspaper critics of the R. E. A. happens to have just left some 15 years employment with the Texas Power & Light Co., where he served as publicity man. Possibly he is finding it difficult to abandon his training. Practically all of the Dallas papers have been most intemperate and unfair in their uncalled-for attack on the efforts of our central Texas farmers to secure reasonably fair electric rates and a reasonably adequate supply of electricity for our part of the State. The Dallas papers have repeatedly stated that it is wrong to loan public money to the farmers to build power plants to produce power that is admittedly needed, or to build transmission lines that must be built by someone, if existing power is to be made available. At the same time every one of the big Dallas papers are urging every Member of Congress to support a proposition to authorize a project that will involve hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal money as an outright gift for improvement of the Trinity River, for the sole purpose of reducing freight rates to Dallas. Incidentally, the organization that is in charge of this proposal is headed by the President of the Texas Power & Light Co. Of course, if freight rates are reduced between New York and Dallas and are not reduced between New York and Waco and Temple, the merchants in our central Texas cities are going to find it increasingly hard to compete with Dallas. Of course, there is no shortage of actual transportation facilities between Dallas and the Gulf of Mexico at this time.

There are today at least a half a dozen railroad lines between Dallas and the Gulf, all adequately equipped to transport any freight that needs to move. There are at least an equal number of well-equipped truck lines. The only question involved is that of cost, yet these Dallas papers insist that it would be a worthy project for the Federal Government to contribute hundreds of millions of dollars as a gift to get this project started with continued Federal contributions for upkeep, all to reduce freight rates to Dallas. At the same time they feel that it would be wicked and unpatriotic to let the Government loan less than 1 percent of that amount to build a generating plant in central Texas, which would use only a tiny fraction of the material that would be used by the Trinity project and which is intended not simply to batter down rates, but in addition to provide absolutely indispensable energy, which must be produced by someone if the farmers of the great central Texas region are to make their maximum contribution to the national-defense program.

In short, the private utilities were never interested in the rural market until R. E. A. was established. The power companies in Texas still charge some of the highest rates in the Nation, except where they have been faced with competition. Where the R. E. A. has made loans that enabled public agencies to offer competition they have reduced rates very drastically. The activity of the R. E. A. is solely responsible for these rate reductions. There is not enough power generating equipment in Texas to meet the anticipated needs for 1942. The private utilities have undertaken to build and are building new plants and new lines in Texas. No one has objected to their expansion. Their expansion is centered around the city of Dallas. Central Texas was left to shift for itself, but as soon as it was able to secure a substantial loan from R. E. A., the private utilities, with headquarters in Dallas, and the Dallas newspapers, all began to howl about the sinful waste of public funds. At the same time these same Dallas institutions are trying to get an outright Federal grant to aid in reducing freight rates to Dallas of more than 100 times the amount of the loan sought by central Texas. I take my stand with the farmers and with the smaller communities of central Texas. We do not want and will not take 1 pound of copper or $1 of money that must come from supplies or funds needed for national defense, but we do insist that we be allotted material to build publicly owned generating and transmission facilities just as long as the private utilities are receiving the same kind of materials, and we insist that the Government can well afford to lend the Brazos Electric Transmission Cooperative $1,000,000 if it can give the Trinity project a subsidy of $200,000,000. All we ask is equal rights for all and special privileges for none.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6-month death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States; and

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 8, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Monday, December 8, 1941.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 5695, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation mechanics.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, December 9, 1941.

Business to be considered: Resume hearings on the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, December 9, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1116. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1941, submitting a report, together with

accompanying papers, on reexamination of Sacramento and San Joaquin River system, with a view to construction of a fresh-water canal between Sacramento River and Suisun Bay, requested by resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted April 13, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1117. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, school district No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1118. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of air corps advanced flying schools and air corps service schools to wear aviation badges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1119. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1120. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of B. H. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 5739. A bill amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on Labor. H. R. 5638. A bill to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6182. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5893. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6163. A bill to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4779. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of June 10, 1922, so as to equalize the rates of pay of commissioned officers of corresponding grade and length of service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6120. A bill granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5881. A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; to provide for regulation and control within the District of Columbia of such solicitations; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this act; to authorize appropriations therefor; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1484), Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4465. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota; with amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6004. A bill to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 248. Joint resolution to direct the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic; with amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6003. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, report of committees was delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray; with amendment (Rept. No. 1476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 6181. A bill to extend eligibility for appointments to the West Point and Annapolis Academies to the sons of service-connected World War veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 6182. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. Res. 378. Resolution requesting the President and the Secretary of State to negotiate for the purchase of a part of the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr CARTER:

H. R 6183. A bill for the relief of James Theodore Helm; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization

By Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

H. R 6184. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E P. Ball; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr MARCANTONIO:

H. R 6185. A bill for the relief of Father Michael O'Reilly; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6186. A bill for the relief of Frederick Rush; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 6187. A bill for the relief of Henry Tachudy and family; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 6188. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Dennis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2123. By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution of the National Grange favoring application of economic devices as best means for holding down inflationary tendencies and opposing arbitrary price fixing unless necessary. If price fixing becomes necessary demands that all groups be included, action be taken to prevent profiteering, standards be provided to assure equity, and that Congress retain control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2124. Also, resolution of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, approving House bill 5912, for relief of agricultural producers whose crops were reduced by reason of drought or other uncontrollable natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2125. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of the Carpenters Local Union, 1445, of the United Brotherhood of C. and J. J. of America, Topeka, Kans., requesting the immediate enactment of a just and adequate old-age pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2126. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Welfare Federation, Pasadena, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1941

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

O Thou blessed Christ, Companion of our days, Mediator of the Infinite God and the Creator of a new world of being which men may know if they follow Thee and in which Thy tender love is ever available to lonely and despairing souls: Help us to find in Thee a sustaining sense of justice which shall become a passion for the amelioration of the wrongs of men, as honor calls us to the defense of every sacred ideal of our beloved country.

Keep us fine and true in our individual and corporate lives, steadfast in purpose that we may endure with patience and calm determination every trial, discipline, and sacrifice through which we

may be called upon to pass, as we meet the exactions of these days out of which must emerge the future destiny of mankind.

Bless Thou the Congress with intuition and courage; strengthen our President with the strength of Thine own indwelling, and comfort him with the knowledge that today the loyalty of every citizen is pledged under his leadership to the service of the Nation as it undertakes its solemn task.

Do Thou have in Thy holy keeping those who have given their lives in the service of our country, and grant that in the new life they may serve Thee with clearer vision and greater joy. Assuage the anguish of those who are thus bereft, be Thou their Comforter and Friend, and bring them to a fuller knowledge of Thy love.

O Christ! Whose voice the waters heard
And hushed their raging at Thy word,
Who walked'st on the foaming deep,
And calm amidst its rage didst sleep,
Oh hear us when we cry to Thee,
For those in peril on the sea!

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 4, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385); asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 61, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 8th day of December 1941, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States; and

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Herring	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hughes	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Bunker	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. I desire to make a brief announcement. My colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] and the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are on their way to Washington and will be here this afternoon.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is detained at his home by a death in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is on his way to Washington and will arrive later today or early tomorrow.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is on his way from Puerto Rico to attend the session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution just received from the House of Representatives be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61), which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 8th day of December 1941, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is concurred in unanimously.

Mr. BARKLEY. I now move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives, in compliance with the concurrent resolution just adopted.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, escorted by the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms and headed by the Vice President and President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress held this day is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.

The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, 1 hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During the intervening time the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. Very many American lives have been lost. In addition American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Yesterday the Japanese Government also launched an attack against Malaya.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam.

Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands.

Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island.

This morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

Japan has therefore undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area. The facts of yesterday speak for themselves. The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our Nation.

As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy I have directed that all measures be taken for our defense.

Always will we remember the character of the onslaught against us.

No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory.

I believe I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger.

With confidence in our armed forces—with the unbounded determination of our people—we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God.

I ask that the Congress declare that, since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1941.*

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH JAPAN

The Senate having returned to its Chamber (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), it reassembled, and the Vice President resumed the chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Doxey	Maloney
Andrews	Ellender	Maybank
Austin	George	Mead
Bailey	Gerry	Murdock
Ball	Gillette	Murray
Bankhead	Glass	Norris
Barbour	Green	Nye
Barkley	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Hatch	Overton
Brown	Herring	Pepper
Bulow	Hill	Radcliffe
Bunker	Hughes	Reed
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Rosier
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Chandler	La Follette	Shipstead
Chavez	Langer	Smathers
Clark, Idaho	Lee	Smith
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Danaher	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Davis	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McNary	Tobey
Truman	Van Nuys	Wiley
Tunnell	Wagner	Willis
Tydings	Walsh	
Vandenberg	White	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration without reference to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed unprovoked acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on the passage of the resolution I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on the joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, those of us on this side of the Chamber are withholding remarks. I was hoping that there would be no comment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure I shall not interfere with what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, the Senator has a right to speak if he insists.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should not want to proceed further without making the record clear.

Mr. President, out of peaceful Sunday skies, without a word of warning—yes; and even screened by the infamous treachery of pretended amity in pacific negotiations at Washington—like an ambushed murderer, Japan has violated our soil, killed our citizens, struck at our possessions, assailed our sovereignty, and disclosed to us the pattern of a purpose which reeks with dishonor and with bloody aspiration.

There can be no shadow of a doubt about America's united and indomitable answer to the cruel and ruthless challenge of this tragic hour—the answer not only of the Congress but also of our people at their threatened hearthstones.

To the enemy we answer—you have unsheathed the sword, and by it you shall die.

To the President of the United States we answer—for the defense of all that is America we salute the colors and we forward march.

Mr. President, I am constrained to make this brief statement on my own account, lest there be any lingering misapprehension in any furtive mind that previous internal disagreements regarding the wisdom of our policies may encourage the despicable hope that we may weaken from within. I have fought every trend which I thought would lead to needless war; but when war comes to us—and particularly when it comes like a thug in the night—I stand with my Commander in Chief for the swiftest and most invincible reply of which our total strength may be capable. It is too late to argue why we face this hazard. The record stands. The historians can settle that conundrum upon another day, when we have finished with this task. For now, it is enough that the attack has come. For now, nothing else will be enough except an answer from 130,000,000 united people that will tell this whole round earth that though America still hates war, America fights when she is violated. And fights until victory is conclusive.

God helping her, she can do no other.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the issues are so clear and our position was so definitely set forth in the address delivered today by the President of the United States that the Senator from Texas and his associates did not feel that it was necessary to make any address or remarks upon the joint resolution. We are, of course, glad to have the agreement of the Senator from Michigan.

I therefore ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass? On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER'S name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER]. He is flying to Washington at this time. It is a matter of keen regret to him that he was not able to reach here in time to record himself upon this joint resolution. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY (when Mr. CAPPER'S name was called). The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is on his way to Washington. On account of public matters, he has been delayed. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. HOLMAN's name was called). The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is flying to Washington. He has been absent on account of public matters. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BUNKER (when Mr. McCARRAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McCARRAN] is now on his way to Washington. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY (when Mr. SCHWARTZ's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] left Washington last week by direction of the Senate as a member of the committee to attend the funeral of the late senior Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams. He has been detained in his return to Washington. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho was called). The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS (when Mr. WALLGREN's name was called). I desire to state to the Senate that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is now on his way to Washington by airplane. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on this joint resolution.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who is ill and under the care of a physician, would, if present, vote "yea."

The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business. They are en route to Washington, but have been unable to reach here in time for this vote. If present, they would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is necessarily absent, but is en route to Washington. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. DOXEY. I desire to state that my colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is en route to Washington. He has been unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN], who is in Arizona on official business, attending a hearing of a subcommittee, is now en route to Washington. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—82

Aiken	Connally	La Follette
Andrews	Danaher	Langer
Austin	Davis	Lee
Bailey	Downey	Lodge
Ball	Doxey	Lucas
Bankhead	Ellender	McFarland
Barbour	George	McKellar
Barkley	Gerry	McNary
Bridges	Gillette	Maloney
Brooks	Glass	Maybank
Brown	Green	Mead
Bulow	Guffey	Murdock
Bunker	Gurney	Murray
Burton	Hatch	Norris
Butler	Herring	Nye
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Chandler	Hughes	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Clark, Mo.	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Reed	Taft	Van Nuys
Reynolds	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner
Rosier	Thomas, Utah	Walsh
Russell	Tobey	White
Shipstead	Truman	Wiley
Smathers	Tunnell	Willis
Smith	Tydings	
Stewart	Vandenberg	

NOT VOTING—13

Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Holman	Wallgren
Brewster	McCarran	Wheeler
Capper	Schwartz	
Caraway	Spencer	

So the joint resolution was passed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 131)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $2,350,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 132)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $33,860 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 134)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department and the naval service, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $33,750,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AIRPLANE ENGINE RESEARCH LABORATORY, CLEVELAND, OHIO (S. Doc. No. 133)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation pertaining to an existing appropriation of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for construction of an airplane engine research laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS IN CONNECTION WITH FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

OVERTIME PAY FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate letters from The Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (2), War (4), Navy (3), Agriculture (6), and Commerce; the United States Civil Service Commission (2), the Office of Education and Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency, the Work Projects Administration (2), and Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency, the United States Board of Tax Appeals, and the Office of Production Management, Executive Office of the President, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Veterans Association of the Seventy-first Regiment, National Guard of the State of New York, of New York City, favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit strikes affecting all defense projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of New York City Public Library Employees Union, No. 251, of New York City, favoring a special appropriation for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to enable that service to hire additional personnel to dispose of pending applications for citizenship and to eliminate unnecessary delays; to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1240. A bill designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 864);

S. 1412. A bill to amend the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted land; without amendment (Rept. No. 865);

S. 1927. A bill to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancherio; without amendment (Rept. No. 866); and

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency; without amendment (Rept. No. 867).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 139. A bill to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases; with amendments (Rept. No. 868).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 5074. A bill to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 882).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1630. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the line of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; with amendments (Rept. No. 881);

S. 1943. A bill to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to

Thomas Orgo; without amendment (Rept. No. 869);

S. 1957. A bill to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 870);

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 871);

S. 1994. A bill to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by naval forces in foreign countries; with amendments (Rept. No. 872);

S. 1995. A bill to amend the act approved June 23, 1938, entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes;" without amendment (Rept. No. 873);

S. 2028. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), so as to transfer the administration of the Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, to the Commandant, Twelfth Naval District; without amendment (Rept. No. 874);

S. 2086. A bill to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 875);

S. 2087. A bill to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 876);

S. 2088. A bill to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 877);

S. 2090. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to such other persons as may be specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 878);

H. R. 2799. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 879); and

H. R. 3149. A bill providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 880).

EXTENSION OF NAVAL ENLISTMENTS

Mr. WALSH. I am authorized by the Committee on Naval Affairs to report an original bill which provides for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes. I will say that the Navy Department has made a request that this bill be enacted today. It is a bill similar to one that has been considered in the past by the Naval Affairs Committee and a favorable report authorized; but the committee were of the opinion that it would not be necessary to take action until a state of war existed.

Very briefly, it provides for the "freezing" of enlistments in the Navy during the period of the war. If this bill is not enacted, any enlisted man in the Navy whose term expires tomorrow or next week can be discharged from the Navy. This bill would "freeze" in the Navy during the period of the war all enlisted men.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 2093) to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in time of war all enlistments in the Regular Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and in the reserve components thereof as applicable, may be extended by the Secretary of the Navy for such additional time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided*, That all men whose terms of enlistment are extended in accordance with the provisions of this act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the government of the Navy: *Provided further*, That men detained in service in accordance with this act shall, unless they voluntarily extend their enlistments, be discharged not later than 6 months after the termination of the condition which originally authorized their detention.

SEC. 2. In time of war that portion of section 1422 of the Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 484; 34 U. S. C. 201) which reads as follows: "All persons who shall be so detained beyond their terms of enlistment or who shall, after the termination of their enlistment, voluntarily reenter to serve until the return to an Atlantic or Pacific port of the vessel to which they belong, and their regular discharge therefrom, shall receive for the time during which they are so detained, or shall so serve beyond their original terms of enlistment, an addition to one-fourth of their former pay:", shall be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department, which I send to the desk, be printed in the RECORD in connection with the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit the Secretary of the Navy, in time of war, to extend the enlistments of all enlisted men in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard for such additional time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense. The men so detained, unless they voluntarily extend their enlistments, are to be discharged not later than 6 months after the termination of the condition which originally authorized their detention.

The proposed legislation would also suspend, in time of war, that portion of section 1422 of the Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 484; 34 U. S. C. 201), which provides for the payment of an additional one-fourth of their pay to men held overtime.

The Navy Department considers that, in view of the existing state of war, it is extremely urgent that all trained personnel of the Navy be retained in service.

The Navy Department strongly recommends enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—GASOLINE AND FUEL OIL SHORTAGES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 189, which proposes to enlarge the authority of the special committee to investigate conditions relating to gasoline and fuel-oil shortages, created by Senate Resolution 156, submitted by me, and which was agreed to by the Senate on August 28 last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIORITIES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment an amendment heretofore presented and intended to be proposed by me to the resolution (S. Res. 157) creating a special committee to investigate the administration of priorities. This resolution was favorably reported from the Committee on Commerce on August 28 last and, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, where it is now pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert Grant, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, vice Paul E. Ruppel, term expired.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Commerce:

John M. Carmody, of New York, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1940, vice John J. Dempsey, resigned.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported original Senate bill 2093, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2094. A bill to provide for the rank and title of the Commandant of the Marine Corps;

S. 2095. A bill to further amend the act approved June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 944), as amended;

S. 2096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

S. 2097. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Board of Trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2098. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reita M. Lary; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2100. A bill relating to the citizenship of Belle Soltz; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2101. A bill relating to the war-risk insurance policy of William Daniel June; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2102. A bill for the relief of William Daniel June; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2103. A bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. CONNALLY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 116, declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same; which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, Ananta Khittasangka, a citizen of Thailand; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUGAR QUOTAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5988) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENTS IN SENATE CHAMBER AND OFFICE BUILDING—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBMITTING REPORT

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 201) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time for submitting the report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with respect to the results of the study required to be made by Senate Resolution No. 150, relating to the acoustics, redecorating, and for better lighting of the Senate Chamber and the Senate Office Building, agreed to on September 8, 1941, is hereby extended to February 8, 1942.

OLD COAST GUARD STATION BUILDING AT TWO RIVERS, WIS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1916) to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis., which was, in line 3, to strike out "Treasury" and insert "Navy."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit a concurrent resolution providing for clarifying changes in the bill just acted upon, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1916) to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis., is authorized and directed to make the following changes:

(1) In line 5 of the engrossed bill, strike out the numerals "1284" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "1248"; and

(2) In the title of the engrossed bill, strike out the numerals "1284" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "1248."

MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, USE, AND POSSESSION OF EXPLOSIVES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385), and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GUFFEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEDICAL CARE AND HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on December 4, 1941, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 165) to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization, to make the following correction, namely: On page 2, line 12, of the engrossed bill strike out the word "therein" and in lieu thereof insert the word "herein."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the purpose of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It merely proposes to correct an error in the enrollment of a bill. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

RADIO OPERATORS ON MERCHANT MARINE SHIPS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5074, which I reported a few minutes ago, with an amendment. It is an extremely important measure, and it is very desirable that it be acted on at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5074) to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill. In fact, as a member of the committee, I supported the proposal, but I think a statement about the bill should be made by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this bill has to do with radio operators on merchant-marine ships. It is highly desirable at this time that every safeguard should be taken to see to it that the men who serve in such capacities on our ships shall be fitted, both by ability and by loyalty, to serve in such important capacities.

It is undoubtedly true that the opportunities afforded radio operators and the importance of their duties have developed faster than the legislation on the subject has progressed. This bill attempts to remedy that situation. There is no doubt of the fact that a radio operator on a merchant-marine ship today has opportunities not only for usefulness but also for doing very serious damage.

The bill which was passed by the House provided that radio operators might be suspended by the Federal Communications Commission for certain stated reasons. The Senate Commerce Committee have reported an amendment which strikes out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and provides that no one shall serve as a radio operator upon any merchant-marine ship if his appointment is disapproved by the Secretary of the Navy. The bill as amended would leave the control and regulation generally of radio operators in the hands of the Federal Communications Commission as is the case today. However, it would permit the Secretary of the Navy to prevent any radio operator from serving on any specified trip, route, or in any specified area.

It is imperative, I think, that the Secretary of the Navy should have such power. The Navy is charged with the duty of making the seas safe, and certainly in that connection the radio operators in merchant-marine ships occupy

positions of great responsibility. We think that from the standpoint of the Government the amendment we have suggested is better than the text of the the House bill and that it is otherwise more efficient. It is more expeditious. We think it is also fairer and better generally from the standpoint of the radio operators.

I hope the Senate will consider and pass the bill immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Does the Senator believe that this bill will effectively deal with the "fifth columnists" who are now radio operators on the merchant-marine ships of this country?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the bill provides the best method we can suggest for dealing with such matters. It would permit the Secretary of the Navy, when he believed that a radio operator was not the one best fitted for a specified trip, route, or area, or whatever his reason might be, to prevent him from serving on that ship.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Secretary have to give his reasons?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; the bill would give the Secretary of the Navy the arbitrary right to decide whether a radio operator shall or shall not make a certain trip, or work on a certain route, in some specified area.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, but not after July 1, 1943, or the date upon which the President proclaims the existing national-defense emergency terminated, whichever occurs first, for the purpose of strengthening the national defense by providing additional safeguards, it shall be unlawful to employ any person or to permit any person to serve as radio operator aboard any vessel (other than a vessel of foreign registry) if the Secretary of the Navy

(1) has disapproved such employment for any specified voyage, route, or area of operation, and

(2) has notified the master of the vessel of such disapproval prior to the departure thereof.

No such vessel shall be granted clearance, depart, or attempt to depart from any port or place in the United States, its territories or possessions, or the Canal Zone, while having on board a person serving as radio operator in violation of this act. For any violation of this act, the master and the owner shall be severally subject to a penalty of not more than $1,000 for which penalties the vessel shall be liable. Such penalties on application may be mitigated or remitted by the Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland another question. Does he think the penalty of a thousand-dollar fine is sufficient? If a man were a "fifth columnist" and intent on sabotaging or blowing up a ship, a $1,000 fine would not make much difference, would it? I think the penalty should be very much heavier.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The penalty is upon the ship and not upon the individual.

Mr. BRIDGES. I mean there should be a penalty of such a nature as to be more effective.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Probably the fact that a penalty is provided would be sufficient, irrespective of the amount named.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, if there is to be any penalty under this measure, it ought to be under the Secretary of the Navy, because he may do anything he pleases.

Mr. BRIDGES. The penalty would be on the owner or operator of the ship for failing to carry out the order, as I understand.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON JAPANESE SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued by me today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America has been attacked in a dastardly manner and war declared on her by Japan. This is undoubtedly pursuant to the tripartite agreement between the Axis powers, Germany, Japan, and Italy.

We as a people did not want war; it has been brought to us. Now we will take care of the job. There is no division in our ranks now. The criminal attack on Hawaii and Guam and elsewhere has made America one. We have but one purpose, and that is to win the war and preserve our American way of life.

Let us now have:

(a) Less loose talk and more action but no underestimation of Japan's strength.

(b) More defense production and more for our money.

(c) Extension of the workday for everyone. This is no time for hysteria or complacency; no time for life as usual.

(d) No grafters or racketeers should be permitted now in Government or in industry.

Japan asked for it. We will, with God's help, carry through to victory.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON JAPANESE ATTACK

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD editorials from a number of newspapers dealing with the treacherous attack by Japan upon this country.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 8, 1941]

TO A VICTORIOUS END

In this solemn hour the first thought of every American will be of his country, "the drumming guns that have no doubts" have spoken. That union in face of peril, which was grievously lacking, is at hand. How to cooperate, what one can do to aid the flag that protects us all, becomes the instinctive thought of every citizen.

The attack itself, an act of naked aggression committed while Japanese envoys were actually in discussion with our State Department, and the President's message lay before the Emperor, came as a dismaying shock. Because Americans could not themselves take such action, it is difficult for them to conceive of the mind which instinctively acts without thought of law or honor. But if the manner of the aggression was a surprise, the fact that this Nation at last finds itself at grips with Japan will hold no corresponding astonishment. The course of Japanese militarism, seeking conquest in defiance of every legal and moral obligation, could not fail, if continued, to clash with this Nation's essential rights in the Pacific area. It had been the hope of Americans that the liberal elements among the Japanese people might be able to restrain these reckless aggressors. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull deserve all praise for their patient efforts to support these elements and preserve the peace. Since the clash now appears to have been inevitable, its occurrence brings with it a sense of relief. The air is clearer. Americans can get down to their task with old controversies forgotten.

That task is plainly not confined to the Pacific. If the ambitions of the Tokyo militarists brought the issues of the Pacific to a bloody climax, they did so in the closest cooperation with their allies, the militarists of Berlin. But one war is being fought in the world today, and in the most accurate sense, Hitler is the master of the totalitarian group. Whether we should now declare war upon Germany as well as Japan is a matter of practical diplomacy. The fact is that the craters sunk at Honolulu by Japanese planes have brought to American soil the same war that has killed its thousands in Europe and enslaved so many of the free nations of the world

The battle is on. It cannot stop in the Pacific until Japanese militarism has been ended for all time. It cannot stop in Europe until the power for evil of Nazi militarists has been equally destroyed and their captives freed. If the maneuver of the Japanese attack was designed with any thought that its surprise would distract this Nation from its part in the world scene—in the Atlantic, in Europe, in Africa—the sooner the minds that so underestimated American intelligence are disabused of this notion the better. We know that we state no more than the simple truth when we declare that this war against our enemies—wherever they may be—will be fought to a victorious end with the last energy, the last resource, and the last ounce of determination of every American man and woman.

[From the New York Times of December 8, 1941]

WAR WITH JAPAN

There is only one possible answer to Japan's attack. That answer is an immediate declaration of war by the United States against Japan. This is so clear and so inescapable that Congress can be relied upon to act with

all possible speed and to give its answer with that unanimity which will speak for a united Nation.

We do not need at this stage to consider the reasons for the timing of this almost incredible assault upon the outposts of our defense by a nation whose emissaries in Washington were still expressing friendship for our people. Whether Japan has yielded at last to pressure from Hitler, who has obviously wished for many months to deflect American power from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or whether this is primarily and essentially an independent Japanese adventure, launched by a military clique in Tokyo whose powers of self-deception now rise to a state of sublime insanity, we cannot know until events have given more perspective. It is possible that the second hypothesis is the more credible one—since Hitler, much as he may wish to direct our attention to the Pacific, can scarcely desire at this time the open and formal entrance of the United States into a war which will certainly and automatically find us openly and formally at war with Germany as well before that war is finished. These are conjectures of great interest and importance. But they do not count in the face of explosive facts. The only thing that matters now is that a deliberate attempt has been made by an enemy power to destroy the defenses of America.

To that attempt we will reply. We will reply with our full force, without panic and without losing sight of our objectives. We will make war upon Japan and we will put an end to these interminable and unbearable threats of Japanese aggression. But in making war upon Japan we will not overestimate the ability of Japan to do us harm; we will not mistake the lesser danger for the greater danger, and we will not forget that Hitler, and not Tokyo, is the greatest threat to our security. The real battle of our times will not be fought in the Far East. It will be fought on the English Channel. We can count on our Government to recognize this fact. We can count on it to plan a strategy of war which takes account of the imperative necessity of maintaining an uninterrupted flow of strength to the main battle front in Europe. If Hitler is smashed, the situation in the Far East will take care of itself automatically. But if Hitler wins in Europe, we shall be in deadly danger, even if we have crushed Japan. We must so dispose of our own great strength that we can use it on two fronts to best advantage.

Whatever the military and naval strategy which we employ, we now go into battle in response to crystal-clear aggression and in defense of no far-away ideal, but of our own United States. In this crisis we must have unanimity, sacrifice, and American patriotism at its best. It is proper and necessary now to appeal particularly to those individuals who have opposed the President's foreign policies and to those organized groups which have fought at every step the recommendations he has made.

The Japanese attacks yesterday at Hawaii, at Guam, on American ships within a few days' steaming distance of our own Pacific coast have blown away with the force of a hurricane the whole structure of myth upon which opposition to the President's policies has been based—the myth that we were "not in danger"; the myth that it was "fantastic" even to imagine a direct attack on the defenses of the United States; the myth that the President has been "trying to drag us into war," instead of trying—as must now be so abundantly clear, even to the last skeptic—to find dependable allies for us in an hour of great need and to strengthen those allies for the test of strength that lay ahead. We do not impugn—we have never impugned—the patriotism of those who have held these beliefs, and asserted them so freely and so confidently. But we have questioned the wisdom of a judgment which they themselves must now revise in the face of accomplished fact. We know them to be good patriots and good Americans. When we appeal to them now for instant support of the President, we do not for a moment doubt that the appeal will be successful.

The time has come to forget pride of judgment, throw partisanship to the winds, and rally to the flag of the United States. Let us close our ranks without a moment's loss of time. Let us act at once to conserve that national unity which is our richest heritage. Let us bury every selfish interest in devotion to the national will. Let us be done with every influence and every circumstance which would impede American production and delay the full flow of our incomparable strength into this struggle to survive.

The United States has been attacked. The United States is in danger. Let every patriot take his stand on the bastions of democracy. We go into battle in defense of our own land, of our present and our future, of all that we are and all that we still hope to be, of a way of life which we have made for ourselves on free and independent soil, the only way of life which we believe to be worth living.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 8, 1941]

WAR: LET JAPAN HAVE IT!

Japan has unloosed war upon the United States with a blind fury and a reckless disregard of consequences that stagger the imagination.

The sea and air attacks against American possessions in the Pacific, followed by a formal declaration of hostilities by the Japanese Government, have destroyed at one blow the hopes and prayers of the people of this country that such a catastrophe would not befall.

The United States didn't want this war. The heads of our Government were striving, even at the moment the Japanese touched off the explosion, to work out a formula for peace and stability in the Pacific and the Far East.

But to no avail. The Army jingoes in power in Tokyo threw reason to the winds and went berserk in an insane adventure that for fatalistic abandon is unsurpassed in the history of the world.

In one day of superlative madness Hitler's partner in the Orient, for purposes best known to the war lords in Tokyo and the inner council of the murderous Axis in Berlin, challenged the war power not only of the United States but of Great Britain.

Japan has attacked our naval bases. She has killed and wounded our service men. She has struck at our ships. Unprovoked by any act of ours, she has given an imitation of a Nazi blitz copied after the methods of that master of slaughter and destruction, Adolf Hitler.

Do the war-mad officials of the Japanese Government honestly believe they can get away with a crime like this? Or are they intent upon committing national hara-kiri?

Although Ambassador Nomura and special envoy Saburo Kurusu have appeared to be honestly trying to reach a settlement basis at the Washington conferences, the attitude of the Tokyo war makers in all matters touching Far East problems has been one of duplicity and mendacity.

With two-faced smugness Tokyo officials have played the United States for what they could get out of us. They have twisted facts out of all semblance of reality. They have lied about the barbaric war which for more than 4 years they have been waging against China. They have lied about their imperialistic designs on Indo-China and Thailand.

To what end? To the end that when the President of the United States went over their heads and appealed personally to the Japanese Emperor for aid toward a peaceful settlement, the fanatic Tokyo jingoes struck at America before the Emperor could reply to the President. It's doubtful whether the mild "Son of Heaven" was even permitted to read Mr. Roosevelt's message.

The whole history of the negotiations, and now the ruthless attack upon outposts of the United States, testify to the criminal disregard by the Japanese Government of the first principles of international honor and integrity.

Let it be remembered, now and henceforth, that the United States shut down on exports of oil, gasoline, and other war needs to Japan not to cripple Japan's legitimate enterprises but to stop the growth of a Japanese war machine that eventually, it was readily conceivable, would be used against us. Japan has been under no threat from America, even though Tokyo's policy of aggression was contrary to our interests in the Pacific and endangered our access to vital defense materials in the Dutch Indies.

Here, then, is a war the United States didn't want, didn't provoke; a war the United States with every reasonable, patient effort tried to avert.

It is a war the Far East partner of Hitler wantonly hurled upon us.

In this solemn hour, with its portents of grave events not only in the Pacific but in the Atlantic, there can be no question of the unity of the American people. All personal issues, all partisan issues, all regional issues today must give place to one indomitable purpose: Decisive victory over Japan for the protection and welfare of all that Americans hold dear.

This is no time for doubting, for fearing, for hesitating. It is the hour for war to the limit. From ocean to ocean and border to border, and in all our outlying possessions, it is the hour for unity, faith, and unyielding determination.

It is the hour, in short, when all Americans must stand solidly behind the President. He is the Nation's head. He is the leader, the symbol of our representative Government and of our way of life. To him in this crisis the Nation owes undivided loyalty.

We shall not falter now. Our great Navy and air force are on the line of battle. Japan has cast the die. Japan has invited just retribution. Japan has asked for it—

Let Japan have it.

[From the Baltimore Sun of December 8, 1941]

WE SHALL WIN

Japan's declaration, following by a few hours her sudden attack on Hawaii, puts the United States into this second and most terrible war of the nations.

Like most of the attacks planned by the Axis partners, this one, too, was sprung after deceitful discussions and maneuvers. It was begun by Japan on the day after the United States Government, through President Roosevelt, made a friendly and respectful appeal to the Japanese Emperor for a peaceful settlement of the issues in dispute. News of it came at the very moment when Secretary Hull was receiving Japan's two envoys, pretending still that they were representing a friendly power.

Thus the United States enters the conflict with its record clear. It has stood from the beginning for a series of principles without the observance of which a peaceful and progressive comity of the nations is impossible. These principles the Japanese, like the Nazis and the Fascists before them, have called "obsolete." The world they envisage and the world they are slaughtering millions to achieve is a world divided among the strong and ruthless nations, with the weaker and the honorable as their slaves.

That world is not for the people of the United States. We cannot and will not submit to the destruction of international honor, the levying of tribute on the weak by the

strong, the parceling out of the world and its resources among the self-appointed dictators of human affairs. Since force is to be the determining factor, we resort to force.

The United States is today the strongest nation in the world. It has the greatest fleet. It has an air force already powerful beyond our hopes, and it has an industrial potential able to multiply many times and in short order its present striking power. It has a people proud of their heritage and conscious of their might. It knows the meaning of freedom and the cost of maintaining freedom.

Therefore we enter the conflict, which has thus been brought to us, with no sense of fear and no forebodings. We know we shall have to pay a high price for our freedom, but we also know that we shall be able to account for Japan in the Pacific and at the same time continue to give the fullest aid to Britain and the other nations now beating back Hitler and his allies in Europe.

We have the right on our side. We have our unmeasured force. We shall win.

[From the Washington News of December 8, 1941]

UNITY

"Till, dazed by many doubts, he wakes
The drumming guns that have no doubts."

Kipling wrote that back in 1894 of An American and the American Spirit.

America has been attacked. The drumming guns are sounding. And many problems have been solved on a Sabbath day. Chief of these is the problem of national unity. We will have that unity—from here in.

America now turns, as Kipling said, "a keen, untroubled face home, to the instant need of things."

IN WAR

It came, not by attack from Europe, as so many feared, but in the Pacific, which most Americans believed impossible.

Japan has attacked us without cause. The United States was still pleading for peace, still offering Japan honorable friendship, when she struck without warning.

The bombing of Hawaii, the torpedoing of ships on this side of the Pacific, were not acts of irresponsible commanders or even the result of some sudden decision by the Tokyo government. The orders must have been issued and confirmed by the Mikado, many days ago to permit the aircraft carriers and submarines to reach these battle stations so many thousands of miles away.

Thus the treachery was complete. It was premeditated. It was carried out while the United States Government, in patience and good faith, listened to long professions of friendship masking her plans for surprise attack.

So be it.

The Japanese found us slow to wrath. They will yet find us mighty in wrath. They found us unwilling to strike the first blow. They will yet find us striking the last blow.

They have played us for suckers. So we have seemed to them—for did we not supply them with the steel, oil, and other war materials to fight us?

Yes, we paid that price for peace. And we lost. But in the losing, we gained something which Japan lacks—something essential to give a peaceful and democratic people the will to fight and the will to win. That essential is clear proof to Americans that their Nation is not the aggressor but the defender.

Japan has provided that proof. The attack on Hawaii united America in a common horror and in a common resolve—a unity as grim and complete as if Japan had struck individually at 130,000,000 Americans.

She has thereby eliminated our chief dangers—indifference and division. Whatever the initial military and naval gains from her betrayal, they are insignificant beside the defense spirit and untapped power which she has heedlessly provoked.

As this newspaper for many months has called for concentration on Pacific defense, for all-out preparedness, for an end of strikes as usual, business as usual, luxury as usual, so today we repeat those now too obvious necessities.

The losses suffered in the Battle of Hawaii will not have been in vain if they turn Americans from fears of Atlantic invasion in some distant future to the Pacific reality ignored so long. At last we may stop underestimating the Japanese. Hitler is attacking, indeed; but through the Japanese, as he has so long tried to do.

We must fight with everything we have. It will not be easy. But the greater our concentration and the greater our sacrifice, the sooner the victory.

America salutes the President, who fought so nobly for Pacific peace, and who now leads us in the just cause of self-defense. America salutes the armed forces, who have never lost a war.

[From the Los Angeles Times of December 8, 1941]

ACT OF A MAD DOG

Japan has asked for it. Now she is going to get it. It was the act of a mad dog, a gangster's parody of every principle of international honor.

The attack on Honolulu by short-range bombers proves past dispute that it had been days if not weeks in deliberate preparation. The "peace negotiations" were mere play acting to throw us off our guard.

The one respect in which Tokyo's "coup" differs from those of Hitler is that she has atacked no weak and defenseless nation. Instead, she has invited her own destruction by the swiftest and most ruthless means by which it can be encompassed.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of December 8, 1941]

CALL TO UNITE FOR VICTORY

By the act of Japan, America is at war. The time for debate has passed and the time for action has come. That action must be united and unanimous. Politics is adjourned, whether between parties, factions, or economic groups. From now on America is an army with every man, woman, and child a soldier in it, all joined to the one end of victory.

If war had to come, it is perhaps well that it came this way, wanton, unwarned, in fraud and bad faith, virtually under a flag of truce. For a war there can be only one side in action, and now there is only one side in thought or feeling. Its slogan is "Americans Unite for Victory and Freedom!"

We cannot know how long this war will last, how wide it will range, nor what it will cost us in toil and sacrifices and in treasure. We do know that whatever the cost, we will pay it, and that our reward will be to hand down to our children the free America which our fathers bequested to us.

Americans, unite!

[From the Chicago Tribune of December 8, 1941]

TO STRIKE WITH ALL MIGHT

War has been forced on America by an insane clique of Japanese militarists who apparently see the desperate conflict into which they have led their country as the only thing that can prolong their power.

Thus the thing that we all feared, that so many of us have worked with all our hearts to avert, has happened. That is all that counts. It has happened. America faces war through no volition of any American.

Recriminations are useless and we doubt that they will be indulged in, certainly not by us. All that matters today is that we are in the war and the Nation must face that simple fact. All of us, from this day forth, have but one task. That is to strike with all our might to protect and preserve the American freedom that we all hold dear

---

[From the Chicago Sun of December 8, 1941]

SAYS BUT ONE CAN SURVIVE

It is war now, grim and to the death.

War to the death of Japanese and German militarism or to the death of the United States of America.

All that President Roosevelt foresaw and feared and worked against, all that lesser men refused to fear because they could not see, has come to pass. The thing of evil that is abroad in the world has coiled its ugly body and struck.

As Hitler struck at Europe, Japan has struck at America, cloaking words of peace in deeds of war and treachery.

Let no American think that this is a one-ocean war, a one-handed war or a war with one nation only.

We have been struck by the Weltschlange, the world serpent, its head in Germany, and its tail in Japan.

It was Hitler who brought this war upon us, luring the Japanese with promises of aid and loot, filling their ears with tales of American weakness today and strength tomorrow.

The Nation is one, or it is nothing. That means it is one, with a single will and purpose, a single heartbeat.

COMMENTS BY CHICAGO NEWSPAPERS ON JAPANESE SITUATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, an editorial from the Chicago Herald-American, a column entitled "In the News," from the Chicago Herald-American, two editorials from the Chicago Sun, an editorial from the Chicago Times, and an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, all dealing with the Japanese situation.

I am very happy to state that these great metropolitan newspapers of the city of Chicago are in accord 100 percent with the resolution passed by the Congress of the United States today.

It is well to note also that the Chicago Tribune once again has placed at the masthead of its editorial page the famous phrase of Stephen Decatur, "Our country! May she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune of December 8, 1941]

WE ALL HAVE BUT ONE TASK

War has been forced on America by an insane clique of Japanese militarists who apparently see the desperate conflict into which they have led their country as the only thing that can prolong their power.

Thus the thing that we all feared, that so many of us have worked with all our hearts to avert, has happened. That is all that counts. It has happened. America faces war through no volition of any American.

Recriminations are useless, and we doubt that they will be indulged in. Certainly not by us. All that matters today is that we are in the war, and the Nation must face that simple fact. All of us, from this day forth, have but one task. That is to strike with all our might to protect and preserve the American freedom that we all hold dear.

[From the Chicago Herald-American of December 8, 1941]

The United States is at war with Japan, and will conduct the war with every resource at its command and with the grim determination and unswerving loyalty of the American people.

This conflict is, of course, undesired and unwelcome.

But it is accepted with complete confidence in ultimate victory. And it is entered with complete national unity. Japan has provoked this war unjustly and unconscionably.

The Japanese armed forces have attacked American Territory and cities, American military and naval bases, and have destroyed substantial American properties and killed and maimed an undetermined number of American citizens.

Japan must learn and will soon learn that wrath and might of America are as formidable as the patience of America has been deep and prolonged.

We have amply demonstrated our peaceful intentions and aspirations.

Now we will demonstrate capacities for war which this world has not yet seen and cannot match.

It has always been an axiom in history that a peaceful people provoked to righteous war makes the most fearsome adversary.

That is the position in which Japan will find, to its regret, that it has placed the United States and the peaceful American people.

If the Japanese Government has deluded itself that we are divided and afraid of war, it has deceived itself grievously and gruesomely.

Perhaps Japan has mistaken the processes and practices of American democracy, which have given freedom of opinion and expression to our people and their leaders for a fundamental and irreparable division.

If so, Japan does not know America.

We are in this war, and we will win it.

Not just part of us, but all of us, are in the war.

There is no holding back from whatever service and sacrifice is required to win it.

There is no longer any debate on the wisdom or necessity of our present course, for the very simple reason that it is our forward-looking, purposeful, and unrelenting American course.

There is no further discussion of how we got into this war, but realistic, complete, and patriotic acceptance of the fact that we are in it.

There is only one kind of American now—the kind who is willing and glad and without equivocation or reservation in his steadfast and dutiful support of his country, his President, and his Government.

There is only one spirit in America now—the traditional and historic American spirit, which makes ordeals and tribulations the very source of the strength with which we defend and perpetuate the rights and liberties of our people.

There is only one goal for America now—the winning of a war we did not want and did not provoke, but that will find our inexhaustible wealth of manpower, materials, production, and labor solidly supporting the armed forces of the Nation.

There must be and is an end now of all domestic issues and differences, of politics and economics and all else, until the war is over and won.

We are all Americans now, united and strong and invincible

We have a common and just American cause to serve and support

Let all Americans have one purpose—the successful conclusion of this unwanted war as soon as possible, and the restoration of the peace we desire and the resumption of our orderly democratic way of life.

Let all Americans be Americans in every thought and act, in the high spirit of their fathers, and with faith in the destiny of their beloved country and its cherished flag.

[From the Chicago Herald-American of December 8, 1941]

Well, fellow Americans, we are in the war and we have got to win it.

There may have been some difference of opinion among good Americans about getting into the war, but there is no difference about how we should come out of it

We must come out victorious and with the largest V in the alphabet.

We are not completely prepared for war.

We have not got a Swiss system of universal service that we will have to have some day, since the lands are full of robbers and seas of pirates.

But we will get better and stronger every day, and we will not have to get very good and very strong to knock the everlasting daylights out of Japan

We may have some small reverses at first, but do not let that worry you—if it happens.

It is not who wins the first round but who wins the last one that counts for victory.

And there is no doubt about the victory, folks—none whatever.

The worst thing about the war with Japan is that it will divide our efforts and prevent us from rendering the all-out aid to England that we were doing and planning further to do.

But we will still manage to keep Britain going with our right hand while we poke Japan in the nose with our left.

Japan has been wanting war for a long time.

It has been swaggering around Asia, murdering a lot of unarmed Chinamen.

Now it is going to get a war, and a real one.

Fortunately, we are well on our way toward a dominating and determining two-ocean Navy and an all-skies airplane fleet.

Fortunately, we can manufacture 10 ships to Japan's 1, and 10 airplanes to Japan's 1.

Naturally we can fly the planes better and fight the ships better.

And that means that as soon as we swing into action we will wash up the war.

Japan's attack on Hawaii is probably with the idea of keeping us on defense at home.

But we will not stay at home and we will not stay on defense.

Before the war is over we will have burned up all the paper houses in Japan and sunk most of their scrap-iron battleships and put this bunch of oriental marauders back on the right little, tight little, out-of-sight little island where they belong.

And we will have fenced them in there.

Then maybe we will let them have a little oil—coal oil or castor oil, we cannot tell which yet.

Our main concern now is about England.

This attack by Japan upon us is largely to create a diversion.

We must not be diverted any more than is necessary for our own protection.

The war is our war now—not only in Asia but in Europe.

We have got to win in both arenas.

The European war, to be frank and factual, is not going to be so easy, but we can win it and will.

We will do our best to help England now, and after we have washed up Japan we can concentrate on Europe and straighten things out there.

The politicians have had the war all to themselves for a long time.

It has been a wordy war—a windy war.

Now it is going to be a fighting war.

The American people are going to take hold.

The politicians proposed the war, and the American people are going to dispose of it.

There is going to be a new order in Europe and a new order in Asia all right, all right.

The American people are going to issue the order.

The new order, given mandatorially to the marauding nations of the world, will be:

"Keep the international law; maintain the peace of the world; dismiss your robber bands and pirate hordes; get back to your own confines and stay there."

That will be the new order, and, believe us, it will be a new order and a new era for most of the world except America.

But it will be an era of peace, an era of prosperity, an era of health and wealth and happiness, an era of decency and democracy, an era of righteousness and religion, an era of enlightenment and liberty for all.

[From the Chicago Sun of December 7, 1941]

The Nation is at war. It is easy for any American to establish a standard of conduct for his neighbors. The more critical the state of the country, the easier. The difficulty is to establish a standard for one's self.

In supreme crisis such as war, the problem simplifies itself. One is either for his country and its government, or against them.

The Chicago Sun offers a stern and sober statement of fact as a basis for its own conduct.

The United States is legally at war with Germany.

This is said in no loose sense and with no uncertainty. The American and German Nations are engaged in public war and an unbroken string of Supreme Court decisions running back 140 years will testify to that fact.

In 1799 a French privateer captured an American ship. It was recaptured by an American warship, and the question of salvage depended on whether the United States and France were at war or peace. The Supreme Court held that they were at war, Justice Washington saying (4 Dallas 37):

"It may, I believe, be safely laid down, that every contention by force between nations, in external matters, under the authority of their respective governments, is not only war, but public war. If it be declared in form, it is called solemn and is of the perfect kind; because one whole nation is at war with another whole nation. * * * But hostilities may subsist between two nations, more confined in its nature and extent; being limited as to places, persons, and things; and this is more properly termed imperfect war. * * * Still, however, it is a public war, because it is external contention by force between some of the members of the two nations, authorized by the legitimate powers. It is a war between the two nations."

These words have been quoted again and again by the Supreme Court, with approval, in later cases. They leave only one loophole through which it could be argued that the United States and Germany are at peace, to wit: That Hitler is exercising legitimate powers when he ordered his navy to sink American war ships, but that the President of the United States has no constitutional power to do anything that creates or recognizes a state of limited war, because only Congress can declare a solemn war. But the Supreme Court has passed on that, too. Twice, in cases arising out of the Civil War, it upheld the power of President Lincoln to order a blockade of southern ports, before Congress had acted, and declared that his action marked the legal beginning of the war.

In the *Protector case* (12 Wall. 700) the Court said:

"The question in the present case is, When did the rebellion begin and end? * * * The proclamation of intended blockade by the President may, therefore, be assumed as marking the first of these dates, and the proclamation that the war had closed as marking the second."

In the *Prize cases* (2 Black 635) the Court declared:

"The proclamation of blockade is itself official and conclusive evidence to the Court that a state of war existed which demanded and authorized a recourse to such a measure."

The United States and Germany are therefore at war, through the constitutional acts of their respective Governments. It is our intention to uphold the Government of the United States in its efforts to win the war.

[From the Chicago Sun of December 8, 1941]

JAPAN STRIKES

It is war now, grim and to the death. War to the death of Japanese and German militarism or to the death of the United States of America.

All that President Roosevelt foresaw and feared and worked against, all that lesser men refused to fear because they could not see, has come to pass. The thing of evil that is abroad in the world has coiled its ugly body and struck.

As Hitler struck at Europe, Japan has struck at America, cloaking words of peace in deeds of war and treachery.

Let no American think that this is a one-ocean war, a one-handed war, or a war with one nation only.

We have been struck by the Weltschlange—the world serpent—its head in Germany and its tail in Japan.

Japan has plunged us into war to the hilt, not only with herself but with Germany—war without limit in space or time or effort. We stand where Britain stands, where Russia stands. Never will there be peace or security for us until all the war-mad dictators lie upon the ground, their dreams of conquest shattered, their war machines beaten to scrap.

It was Hitler who brought this war upon us, luring the Japanese with promises of aid and loot; filling their ears with tales of American weakness today and strength tomorrow. If for strategic reasons, our Government does not proclaim at once the parity of Germany and Japan as enemies, let us not for one moment forget that it is nevertheless true, and that our task has been set for us by those who loosed the bolt of war.

Is there need, at this moment, to call once more for that national unity which should have been ours 2 years ago?

No; a thousand times, no.

The Nation is one, or it is nothing. That means it is one, with a single will and purpose; a single heartbeat.

Enemy agents there are among us, and "fifth columnists," but let us forget, in a split second, all the debates and discords that have divided loyal American citizens. There are no internal enemies but those who show themselves to be such from this day onward.

Not patriotic passion, but purpose, is the the need in Congress, and must be the keynote of American thought.

The labor law we need now is not one to push or repress, but to unite the will to victory of workers and employers alike.

The service of every man and woman belongs to the country; a universal draft in which there are no age limits.

"I offer you blood and tears," said Winston Churchill to his people. God willing, and every one of us doing his part, the American people will make it blood and tears of victory.

[From the Chicago Times]

AN AXIS POWER HAS STARTED WAR AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The conflagration about which President Roosevelt in 1937 warned the Western Hemisphere has spread to our land. A lunatic Japan, under the lash of a lunatic Germany, has commenced hostilities against the United States and Great Britain.

If war had to be for us, it came the way we would want it recorded in history. Never has there been a more clear-cut case of treacherous aggression against our Nation. Japan struck without warning at the very moment her Ambassadors were calling at our State Department, presumably seeking a peaceable settlement of Pacific affairs.

If anything were needed to make the record clear beyond question of doubt, President Roosevelt's direct appeal to Emperor Hirohito is that evidence. Persuasive, conciliatory couched in terms approaching humility, Mr. Roosevelt's was one of the most moving appeals for peace ever addressed by the head of one state to another in all the annals of mankind.

Yet from the nature of the attacks upon Hawaii and Guam and on American ships in the Pacific just a few hundred miles from San Francisco, it is plainly evident that for at least 2 or 3 weeks, while Ambassadors Nomura and Kurusu were in daily "peace conferences" in Washington, the Japanese Fleet was already in action against us. There is no other conclusion than that the Japanese diplomatic emmissaries were deliberately stalling to give their naval forces time to maneuver into position for attack.

The American people inevitably are united today With a single mind the Nation presses implacably toward smashing international gangsterism. Already the bitterest isolationists have announced their unswerving support of the Nation's defense. As Congress meets in joint session to hear from the President all the people, as well as Congress, concur unanimously in the resolution for a counter-offensive war.

In the wave of indignation against Japan the American people will keep a sane perspective. Japan has attacked us. It is against Japan we move. But Japan's action is only part of a world assault upon peace, justice, and international order. Had it not been for Adolf Hitler, Japan would never have ventured upon such a suicidal course.

It must be remembered that Japan, Germany, and Italy are signatories to a war pact aimed at world domination, with every nation to be assigned "its proper sphere"—as the Axis leaders may determine. War started against us by Japan is tantamount to war upon us by her two partners in crime. There can be no peace until those who seek to conquer the world by force and terror have been crushed.

No easy task has been thrust upon us by a mad military clique in Tokyo that has made this war against us on orders of a madder military cabalism in Berlin. We shall have our full share of blood, toil, tears, and sweat. We have talked about sacrifices. Now we shall have to make them—our dead in Hawaii have already made them.

There can be no fears as to the ultimate outcome of this ordeal. Aroused, united, able at least to throw our full tremendous strength into the struggle unhampered by doubts, confusion, and internal differences, the American people can deal blows no nation on earth can match.

A strange blindness afflicts nations or leaders of nations who believe in war as an instrument of national policy. They never detect the latent strength which democratic peoples possess underneath a veneer of apparent weakness, the surface appearance of disunity, which is the natural accompaniment of democratic processes.

So the aggressor nations send forth their grim war lords, their armies, and navies perfectly trained in the arts of slaughter and destruction. Then, sooner or later, the patient, peaceable people of the democracies, amiable people who have no ambition but to be left alone to live their own lives, get pushed around just too much. Reluctantly, they lay aside normal pursuits, put aside the unfinished business of peace, roll up their sleeves, and, made strong by righteous wrath, proceed to wallop the daylights out of the aggressors.

It has happened many times before. It is going to happen now. Let us hope that when this dirty business has once more been accomplished the peaceful peoples of the world will find the wisdom to set up some enduring form of international peace so that this time the sacrifices which we unitedly face will not have been made in vain.

[From Chicago Daily News]

A united Nation today, the United States is at war. We write these words in sorrow. We write them also with a sense, undoubtedly shared by a vast number of Americans, not exactly of relief at this tragic ending of the long nerve strain to which we have been subjected, but of deep faith that all is somehow for the best. We have tried in every reasonable way to avoid what has happened. At the hands both of Hitler and Japan we have been patient and long-suffering. To everyone the truth should at last be apparent, as the Daily News has for months been explaining: That Hitler's plans, in conjunction with Japan's, included—at his own chosen moment, under the Tokyo-Berlin-Rome alliance—a blitz attack on the United States. Sooner or later it had to come.

Thanks now to Japan, the deep division of opinion that has rent and paralyzed our country will be swiftly healed. It cannot be otherwise. Once more we shall be a united people, firm in a single determination—to maintain our liberties by the complete and utter defeat of our foes.

WAR WITH JAPAN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MEAD

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the Government of Japan has struck a new low, among the nations of the world, in the methods employed in the initiation of warfare. The direct assault on the United States yesterday by Japan finds few parallels in recorded history. The whole character of the unprovoked attack was reprehensible, infamous, and diabolical.

While Japan's emissaries were here in this city professing friendliness to the American people, while they falsely pleaded the cause of their country at the State Department, while they expressed affection for our leadership in the White House, their own nation's dive bombers and undersea craft were dealing death and destruction to our people and our ships in the Pacific.

Japan will never live this down. So long as present generations live, and probably much longer, Japanese diplomacy will be the subject of scorn, derision, and contempt.

The United States, and all the Americas, are swiftly accepting the challenge. The treachery of the Japanese can only result in their complete military annihilation. The only hope for the Japanese people themselves will be their own relentless purge of the sneaks and unprincipled, insane militarists who now lead the Japanese Empire.

The methods which were resorted to yesterday were in conformity with the technique of past Axis aggressions, the only difference being that this attack was more dastardly, more dishonorable. But Japan has stooped far below the gutter level. She has prostituted all the rules of human decency and accepted codes of international conduct. By foul and

despicable means she has spilled American blood. She will be repaid in kind—and repaid a thousandfold—for her outrageous conduct.

Aside from the barbarism of this sudden attack, we do well to keep in mind that for some time Japan has been a growing menace to our safety and security in the Pacific. Our trade and commerce, in fact, our right to the freedom of the seas, has for some time been threatened by the militarists of Tokyo. Our strategic materials, vital commodities, and normal exchange of commerce, have been placed in jeopardy. The future of the Philippines has been jeopardized. Yesterday's clouds of threat and uncertainty are now cleared. The enemy is unmasked. Our purpose is well-defined. We will seek out the enemy, and we will apply American force in the cause of justice, decency, and our own security.

Mr. President, no scintilla of criticism can be leveled at our President, our State Department, or the Congress in connection with the conduct of the recent negotiations. We have exerted every feasible effort to avert this conflict. We have even gone to the extent of making sacrifices in the matter of critical materials, in the matter of trade negotiations, and in the matter of friendly conciliation, in supreme endeavors to pacify the Nipponese and to maintain peace in the Pacific. The President of the United States, in a final plea, appealed directly to the highest Japanese authority, the Emperor himself, to use his mighty influence on the side of peace.

We know now the futility of all these efforts. It is a heartbreaking catastrophe. War must be waged, men must die, homes must be broken, because the Axis leaders in Tokyo have insisted upon this course. They have brought down upon themselves the curse and affliction of war. The have dug the grave into which they will inevitably fall.

In this fateful hour, Mr. President, we find our moral strength in our Nation's leadership. We can depend upon our President—our Commander in Chief—to direct the mighty force of the United States. We can depend upon our Navy to measure up to the highest traditions of the past. We can depend upon our military forces to be ever on the alert, and efficiently to carry out their missions. We can depend, too, upon the patriotism of capital and labor; they will set aside their differences, and will insist that work stoppages be averted by mediation. And, most important of all, we can depend upon the great civilian population of the Nation to unite as a whole—body, mind, and heart—promptly and enthusiastically to assume their responsibilities, and to discharge them with speed and vigor.

The Congress must support all efforts to combat this new spread of Axis aggression. War, with its tragedy, has come to our people. We will see it through; we will bring the Japanese militarists to their knees; we will fight as never before to guarantee our own security, and to restore the blessings of peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune today entitled "To a Victorious End."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 8, 1941]

TO A VICTORIOUS END

In this solemn hour the first thought of every American will be of his country. "The drumming guns that have no doubts" have spoken. That union in face of peril, which was grievously lacking, is at hand. How to cooperate, what one can do to aid the flag that protects us all becomes the instinctive thought of every citizen.

The attack itself, an act of naked aggression committed while Japanese envoys were actually in discussion with our State Department, and the President's message lay before the Emperor, came as a dismaying shock. Because Americans could not themselves take such action, it is difficult for them to conceive of the mind which instinctively acts without thought of law or honor. But if the manner of the aggression was a surprise, the fact that this Nation at last finds itself at grips with Japan will hold no corresponding astonishment. The course of Japanese militarism, seeking conquest in defiance of every legal and moral obligation, could not fail, if continued, to clash with this Nation's essential rights in the Pacific area. It had been the hope of Americans that the liberal elements among the Japanese people might be able to restrain these reckless aggressors. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull deserve all praise for their patient efforts to support these elements and preserve the peace. Since the clash now appears to have been inevitable, its occurrence brings with it a sense of relief. The air is clearer. Americans can get down to their task with old controversies forgotten.

That task is plainly not confined to the Pacific. If the ambitions of the Tokyo militarists brought the issues of the Pacific to a bloody climax, they did so in the closest cooperation with their allies, the militarists of Berlin. But one war is being fought in the world today, and in the most accurate sense Hitler is the master of the totalitarian group. Whether we should now declare war upon Germany as well as Japan is a matter of practical diplomacy. The fact is that the craters sunk at Honolulu by Japanese planes have brought to American soil the same war that has killed its thousands in Europe and enslaved so many of the free nations of the world.

The battle is on. It cannot stop in the Pacific until Japanese militarism has been ended for all time. It cannot stop in Europe until the power for evil of Nazi militarists has been equally destroyed and their captives freed. If the maneuver of the Japanese attack was designed with any thought that its surprise would distract this Nation from its part in the world scene—in the Atlantic, in Europe, in Africa—the sooner the minds that so underestimated American intelligence are disabused of this notion the better. We know that we state no more than the simple truth when we declare that this war against our enemies—wherever they may be—will be fought to a victorious end with the last energy, the last resource, and the last ounce of determination of every American man and woman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same.

CONTROL OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and since a great number of Senators have made inquiries in regard to the matter, I should like to announce that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor met this morning, according to agreement, at 10:30 o'clock. We were to have discussed procedure. All the members of the committee were stunned, of course, by the events which have occurred since we last met, and it was moved and decided that the committee meet on Wednesday next at 10:30 o'clock a. m., without prejudice to any action which has been placed before us, to consider procedure.

Mr. President, I am tempted to say, as a result of the remarks made by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] in regard to capital and labor—and I am sure I express the opinion of the entire Committee on Education and Labor—that we trust and hope that within the 48 hours between now and the time when the committee will again meet, some action will have been taken on the part of capital and labor whereby a voluntary method of avoiding stoppages in our defense program may be provided.

Mr BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah when he expects to hold hearings on the Smith bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah No decision at all was reached in our meeting this morning about procedure. I can say that no hearings were held on the Smith bill in the House committee; so, of course, out of fairness to all concerned, I think that if we go forward with the matter we shall hold hearings on the Smith bill.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator give me some idea as to how long the hearings will last? It seems to me that this proposed legislation, passed in the House by a large majority, should have the consideration of the Senate as promptly as possible. I was wondering how long the Senator from Utah thought the hearings would continue.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an answer also to the inquiry I am about to propound. The Senator from Utah speaks of hearings on the House bill. Is he contemplating hearings also on the Connally bill, and on the bill which has been before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor? In other words, is the committee to have hearings covering all the proposals, or merely on the measure passed by the House?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Connally bill is not before the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that; I know that it was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary; but I assume the Senator's committee would have a right to consider that bill in connection with the general subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I cannot answer for the committee in that regard, but I can in regard to the other bills. We have completed hearings on the Ball bill, which has been before the committee for some time and which has been reported and placed on the Senate calendar. We have also before us the Bridges bill and the Herring bill. We have held hearings on the Herring bill. The Bridges bill contains some features which are covered by the Smith bill, so that if we hold hearings on the Smith bill, there will be opportunity to consider the phases of the Bridges bill which are covered by the Smith bill.

As to the Connally bill, I think the provisions in the Connally bill which it was suggested should be attached to the Smith bill in the House of Representatives were dropped. Therefore there is not before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor a measure similar to the Connally bill.

Now, if I may answer the Senator from Virginia, I may say that if the chairman of the committee could have his way we would proceed with dispatch, and hear from all persons who should testify before us, but would limit the testimony so that there would not be vain repetitions. In that way I think we could meet the problem before us with dispatch and give due consideration to all the facts. It is the intent of the chairman at the present time to follow that course.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Utah contemplates reporting the Smith bill for the consideration of the Senate about next Monday. I understand that suggestion was discussed in the committee meeting. I was wondering if it would be possible to do that.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When the committee met and outlined the list of witnesses who would probably be called, it was assumed that 3 days of hearings would be sufficient and that we likely could be ready next Monday to make some sort of report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator made some reference to a bill which I introduced, and he said something about provisions of that bill being dropped. I did not quite understand what he meant by that statement.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When the measure passed by the House of Representatives was under consideration some provisions similar to certain provisions in the Connally bill were presented, but they were left out of the Smith bill as it was adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONNALLY. They never were in the Smith bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not in the way in which they are contained in the Connally bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I am talking about. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I expect at the earliest possible time to press for consideration of my bill. Some of the provisions of the Smith bill might very well be incorporated in the bill which I have offered. But I am insisting, so far as I can have any influence, that the two principles contained in the bill which I introduced—that is, the power to take over strike-bound plants, and at least the freezing of pre-strike relationships—shall be continued, because those principles are absolutely essential.

There is nothing in the Smith bill which authorizes the taking over of strike-bound plants. Here, let us say, is an employer who cannot produce or will not produce, or here is a group of employees who will not produce or cannot produce. If that plant is to operate, who else but the Government of the United States can take it over and see that it continues to operate?

The Smith bill still leaves the situation open to all the squabbles and disturbances and arguments between employers and employees which my bill is designed to bring to an end. The minute the Government steps in and takes over the Government itself is the employer, and if the plant is "frozen," the Government can operate it as it has been operated in the past.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, permit me to say that I believe the Senator should have made one exception, and that is with respect to the matter of wages.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; a Defense Wage Board is provided for that purpose. Everyone wants the employee to get a fair wage. But we do not want the employee to stand at the door of the plant with a club and say, "I am not going to work, and nobody else shall work." I do not regard the penalties contained in the Smith bill as of any force whatever. What penalty is there in saying, "You can go ahead and strike, but you cannot appeal to the Labor Board?" That is no penalty. That is simply striking one on the wrist with a silk handkerchief.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, since questions have been asked with regard to hearings, in order to make the answer complete I must add that hearings on the Connally bill have been held by the Judiciary Committee and after the hearings the bill was reported to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Hearings were held before the Judiciary Committee on the bill which I introduced, and in those hearings representatives of the War Department said they wanted the bill to be passed without amendment. The Navy Department, through its officers, appeared and said that if we passed the bill it would do the job. The Maritime Commission appeared, through its representatives, and said, "This bill will do the work. If it is passed we can build ships." That is what the hearings revealed. The Secretary of War informally told me last Saturday that he hoped to God the Senate would pass the bill which I have introduced. He said, "We can continue production in these plants and the War Department can get arms and munitions if your measure is passed."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, then I shall take the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator from Texas has just said is the sole purpose of the bill which he introduced. It is not proposed to be permanent legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, it would not be permanent legislation.

Mr. HATCH. It is proposed legislation intended to take care of the present situation in connection with strikes in defense industries. So, as the Senator from Texas has said, it is essentially a defense measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico, who rendered very efficient service in the subcommittee and also in the full committee, that the bill which I introduced is not essentially an antilabor bill, it is not essentially an antiemployer bill; it is essentially a national-defense measure, having for its primary and supreme purpose the continuation of production in these plants, which is the Government's interest. The Government's interest is more important than the interest of labor; it is more important than the interest of the employer. The bill is limited to the emergency. The plants must be turned back as soon as the Government finds that the employer can operate them and continue production. It is all temporary. We are not undertaking to solve on a permanent peacetime basis all the difficulties which the Smith bill and other measures undertake to solve. We do not have time to stop and do that.

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator if he does not feel, in view of the conditions which have developed as a result of the war, that the necessity for proposed legislation of this character will now be obviated? It seems to me that labor is alert to the situation which now confronts the country. I understand there are in the course of preparation at the present moment statements by labor showing their intention to give 100 percent loyal support to the Government in its program of national defense.

It seems to me that if at this time we were to pass special legislation aimed at labor we would do more damage than good. I for one would hate to see legislation of any kind directed at labor taken up by the Senate now. I believe that labor is as patriotic as any other group in the United States, and that we have no need to fear labor in the emergency which confronts us. I believe we will find from the statements which are about

to be submitted to the people of the country that labor is ready and willing to join with the other groups of the Nation to give loyal support to our Government.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield to the Senator from Virginia in a moment.

I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that I think labor as a whole is patriotic, but I do not think all its members are patriotic. If my bill is unnecessary it will not hurt anybody. If labor will continue to produce without strikes, and without disturbances, then the passage of this bill will not hurt labor at all. The imminence of war and the conditions of war make it all the more important that production shall proceed and shall not be interrupted. My bill is not an anti-labor bill. It is not an anti-employer bill. It is a Government bill. It is an an anti-enemy-of-the-Government bill, if you want to call it that.

Does that answer the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. But the purpose of the bill is to prevent strikes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly. But if there are to be no strikes, then it will not stop any strikes. Therefore it will not hurt anybody.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The bill of the Senator from Texas does not come into play until work is actually stopped at a plant. There must be a stoppage of work before the bill comes into play at all.

Mr. MURRAY. But it assumes that there is to be danger of strikes, which, it seems to me, is not a proper assumption.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I greatly respect the views of the Senator from Montana, and wish I had the optimistic view which he entertains, but that is what was the trouble in Hawaii yesterday. The Army and the Navy did not suppose that the Japanese would come over and bomb them, but they did. So I would rather not suppose that there will be no strikes. I hope there will not be any, but if there should be, I want the Government protected, so it can act—not next week, not after long hearings, but instantly.

Mr. MURRAY. But as the result of the statements sent over the country by the press, it is feared by some that the object of the proposed legislation is punitive; that it is designed to threaten labor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me it is not necessary to do that. I believe the passage of the bill would create a feeling that a bayonet was being pointed at labor to coerce it into a course which it is going to follow anyway.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that there is not a punitive line in the bill which I have introduced. All it provides is that the Government shall take over a plant when and if there is delay caused by a strike, or by any other cause. When the Government takes it over every man is free to quit if he wants to quit, or to work if he wants to work. The only coercive feature is that it is to be assumed that when the Government takes over the operation of a plant it will not permit two or three fellows at the front door with clubs to determine whether the plant is to produce. If that is punitive, let it be punitive.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me we should give labor an opportunity.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are giving labor an opportunity. Up to the time the Government takes over, labor has been working voluntarily under certain conditions under which it assumed employment. We propose to make sure that neither the employer nor the employee shall take advantage of the Government's extremity in its hour of peril by being able to demand that the relationship be changed to his selfish advantage.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator to a fact of which he is well aware, and of which every other Member of the Senate is aware, that in passing the Selective Service Act the Congress, with respect to industry, passed exactly such a law as is now proposed with respect to labor.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. If the measure now proposed is punitive, the Selective Service Act was punitive.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. HATCH. It seeks to apply to both sides the same standard that was set up in the Selective Service Act.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Texas made reference to the Smith bill. The Smith bill likewise applies only to the emergency, and applies only to strikes in defense industries.

Mr. CONNALLY. I mentioned the Smith bill. There are a number of bills the purpose of which is to lay down a permanent peacetime plan. I do not seek to do that.

Mr. BYRD. The Smith bill was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of nearly two to one. If the Senate ignores the Smith bill and sends over to the House a Senate bill, I predict that it will receive no consideration from the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONNALLY. The coercive strike which the Senator is threatening does not have any influence with me.

Mr. BYRD. I am not threatening any strike. I say that if the Senate refuses to consider the Smith bill the House will be justified in not considering the Senate bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that the Senate will consider it. The Senator from Virginia is against strikes in defense industries, and yet he is threatening the Senate with a sit-down strike unless it passes the kind of bill he wants to have passed.

Mr. BYRD. I am not threatening the Senate. I am only predicting what will happen.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is threatening a sit-down strike unless the Senate passes a bill the author of which lives in his State and is one of his constituents.

Mr. BYRD. I merely said that if the Senate should not consider the Smith bill the House would be justified in not considering the Senate bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am in favor of considering them all, and selecting the best bill.

Mr. BYRD. It is entirely satisfactory to the Senator from Virginia to have all the bills considered on their merits by the Senate itself.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not renew his threat of a sit-down strike.

Mr. BYRD. I shall be glad to renew it if the Senate does not consider the Smith bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With reference to the status of the various bills on the subject of strike legislation, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I am not a member of either the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Education and Labor. I think it is unfortunate that there should now be any controversy between those two committees with regard to the matter of jurisdiction over legislation of this sort.

The Judiciary Committee has reported the Connally bill, and it is now on the calendar. Any Senator may move to take it up at any time when he can obtain recognition for that purpose. I have been unavoidably absent, but I have been trying to keep up with the situation. As I understand, since the Connally bill was reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee the Committee on Education and Labor has had under consideration the so-called Ball bill; and since the House has passed the Smith bill, now that the Committee on Education and Labor has before it both the Ball bill and the Smith bill, upon which I understand no report has been made, if the Connally bill now on the calendar is taken up, either the Smith bill or the Ball bill is in order as a substitute or as an amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the feeling that until there has been some development through a hearing that would inform the Senate better than it is now informed—certainly better than I am informed—it might be unfortunate to try to take up the Connally bill and then offer either the Ball bill or the Smith bill, or any part of the Smith bill, as a substitute or as an amendment. It seems to me that until the committee has had a hearing and given those who are for the measure and those who are against it an opportunity to be heard, it might be of no disadvantage to let proposed labor legislation ride for a few days until the Committee on Education and Labor can have a hearing and make a report, if it wishes to make a report. At least we should have information as to the attitude of those interested in legislation before we take it up.

I should dislike to be called upon to vote in my present state of information, or misinformation, concerning the Smith

bill or the Ball bill as an amendment to or substitute for the Connally bill. I think a few days ought to be devoted to trying to clarify the atmosphere in respect to the various measures before we take up the question in the Senate. Of course, I have no objection to taking up as soon as possible any bill which is pertinent and necessary or advisable. But I feel that time might be gained, and we might gain something in constructive legislation if the committee were given an opportunity to develop the facts as they will be presented by those who favor and those who oppose the Smith bill or the Ball bill.

In a technical sense, we cannot consider all three bills. One of them has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and is now on the calendar. Have I stated the situation correctly?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am in hearty agreement with what our leader says, except in one particular. In that particular a correction should be made. The Ball bill is already on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not informed. I thought it was still in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am not hostile to any of these measures if they are meritorious and the Senate wants to approve them. I am only insisting on the retention of what I regard as the two most important features of my own bill. I refer to the power to take over strike-bound plants and the power to freeze relationships as they exist before a strike. When we make such provisions we take away any hope or inducement for a strike, and any temptation for a strike.

The Senator from Kentucky wants hearings. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate had full hearings, at which representatives of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. appeared. Those hearings have been printed, and are available to every Senator.

The reason why the Senator from Texas originally asked that his bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee was that he wanted some action. With all due respect to the Committee on Education and Labor, it has had labor bills before it for perhaps more than a year. I do not know whether it has held hearings; but it has not reported any bill. If the Committee on Education and Labor will report any kind of a bill to the Senate, then we can take up my bill, and perhaps amalgamate the two measures and send them to conference in an effort to work out a satisfactory measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point I was making is that there have been no hearings before either committee on the Smith bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. There have been no hearings on the Smith bill, the Brown bill, or the Jones bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Smith bill is now with the Senate, and it may be offered as a substitute.

Mr. CONNALLY. The House is making a big hurrah about passing the Smith bill. Everybody knows that a year or 6 months ago the House refused to pass any kind of a labor bill. Now it has become very virtuous and is rushing over here with a so-called bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. All I am trying to do is to see that some information is given to the Senate, through a hearing, with respect to any of the bills likely to be offered as a substitute for or an amendment to a bill which the Senate may take up. That is all I am seeking to do. It seems to me that ought to be done. As the Senator knows, I have been absent from the city and have not been familiar with the hearings held before his committee. I think it is always unfortunate when two committees get into any sort of controversy, however friendly, with respect to jurisdiction over legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Committee on Education and Labor will work as our leader has suggested we should work; we will hold hearings, and the testimony taken at the hearings will be presented to the Senate.

I think the Senator from Texas has gotten his ideas about the Committee on Education and Labor a little confused. In fact, the amendment which he offered is an amendment not to a bill from the Committee on Education and Labor at all, but to a bill which came out of the Committee on Military Affairs.

With reference to the suggestion that no action has been taken upon bills before the Committee on Education and Labor, I think our record stands about as well as that of any other committee. That is all anyone need say at this time, I think.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, one further word.

As has been wisely suggested to me by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who was very helpful on the subcommittee and on the full Committee on the Judiciary, there is no competition between my bill and the bill of anyone else, because mine incorporates principles which could very easily be incorporated in the other bills. All I am asking for is a chance. If the Committee on Education and Labor want to report the other bill, let them do so, and let the Senate consider it, so that I can offer my bill as a substitute or as an amendment; or they can offer theirs as a substitute for, or as an amendment to, my bill. If they will report the bill, I shall move that my bill be taken up and then they can move to substitute the House bill for my bill, or anything else.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the suggestion of the Senator from Texas is in order right now. The Committee on Education and Labor has upon the calendar a bill which stands in exactly the same legislative position as that occupied by the bill reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. If the Senator from Texas wanted to call up the Ball bill and desired to offer his bill as an amendment, that would be in order at this minute.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Ball bill represent the views and the final conclusions and all the conclusions of the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It did when it was reported. Many things have happened since then.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Committee on Education and Labor has nothing else to consider but the Ball bill, I will say to the Senator that I hope one of the other bills will be taken up.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The point the Senator from Utah desires to make is that every time the Senator from Texas suggests that we have been lax——

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not use the word "lax."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I know the Senator from Texas did not use the word "lax." Probably he used a somewhat harsher word in reference to the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And also in reference to the action of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that I was not trying to criticize his committee. I was merely telling him why I asked that my bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. As I ride along the road, I look across the fence and see a lot of gravestones. Well, I did not want to send my bill there. [Laughter.] With all respect, I wanted it referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, but I have no criticism. If I were on the Committee on Education and Labor, I suppose I would be in confusion and uncertainty about all these bills. But I am a one-track individual; I have a one-track mind; I had this idea, and I thought the Committee on the Judiciary would act. Mine is not an antilabor bill or an antiemployer bill. There is no reason why it should be labeled as antilabor. I moved to have it referred to the Committee on the Judiciary because it is a national-defense bill, and I thought the Committee on the Judiciary was national-defense minded. That is all I have to say.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah handled in conference the Connally amendment to a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the House kicked it out the window.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; but the Senator from Utah tried his hardest to take care of the Connally amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, and I am very grateful; and if the Senator from Utah will renew his efforts now, we shall get the Connally bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, if the Connally bill is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Utah will do his best in the committee. If it is referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, he will do his best. But out of fairness to the Senate of the United States he will stand, as he did before, and assert that the amendment of the Senator from Texas was an amendment to a bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and not

one from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; it was an amendment offered on the floor. The Committee on Military Affairs did not think about it. The amendment was offered on the floor by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as I recall. So there is no parenthood there for which the Committee on Military Affairs may claim exclusive responsibility.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. O, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is forgetting that members of the Committee on Military Affairs handled those provisions in conference, and that since that time the plant-seizure bill has been acted upon a an independent bill by the Committee on Military Affairs and by the Senate, and that the very reason urged by the Senator from Texas as to the necessity of passing his bill was that the plant-seizure bill did not cover strikes in mines. That is true; is it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. MEAD rose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to appeal for delay in considering this subject along the line suggested by the majority leader. If we should pass the Connally bill and send it over to the House, much as I esteem the distinguished Senator from Texas, I greatly fear that it would receive the same treatment it received on a previous occasion, and we should not gain anything, not only because they rejected it before, but because the Senate so far has refused to consider the Smith bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator from New York for the Smith bill?

Mr. MEAD. I have not come to that yet. I am about to discuss that bill.

If we do not consider the Smith bill, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is interested in obtaining consideration of that measure, will have justifiable reason to object to the entire procedure. If we take up the Ball bill, setting aside both the Smith bill and the Connally bill, we shall find confusion in the Chamber.

I make the point, Mr. President, that if we send the Ball bill to the House, they probably will give it the same sort of consideration they gave the Connally bill, because they will insist that, in keeping with the integrity of parliamentary procedure, the Senate should consider the bill they sent here before we reported a bill out of our committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Certainly; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator from New York now seeking, as a former Member of the House of Representatives, to threaten a strike on the part of the House if we do not wish to do what the House wants us to do? This is a joint legislative set-up, composed of two bodies.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. I was saying a moment ago, when the Senator from Texas was accusing the Senator from Virginia of inspiring a sit-down strike——

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator from New York threatening to join him?

Mr. MEAD. No; but the Senator from Texas was probably making an argument to hurry consideration of his bill, so that he could seize the Capitol, and make other Senators work, and stop the sit-down strike. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. In some cases I think that might be desirable, but I do not intend to make such an effort.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, speaking seriously, if we should pass any one of these bills today, we would not accomplish anything, because if we should send the Connally bill over to the House of Representatives, we know that the House would, as to that bill, take a position consistent with its previous attitude, and having some relation also to the failure of the Senate to consider the House bill which is now awaiting consideration, and which the Senator from Virginia is insisting shall be considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question purely for information?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If we should send any bill to the House—I do not care whether it is mine or not—is there any law which would prevent the House from substituting the Smith bill for it, and letting the entire subject go to conference?

Mr. MEAD. No; there is no such law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there any disposition on the part of the House to ignore such a situation and to say "We will not have anything to do with you?"

Mr. MEAD. No, there is no law; there is merely precedent. The House passed by an overwhelming vote a House bill dealing with the subject, at a time when there was no Senate bill on the Senate Calendar. Now we propose to send to the House a bill on the same subject, without considering the bill they sent to the Senate; and it occurs to me that in the past such a course has created some friction which resulted in the delay of legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am not speaking now for any of these bills, but I merely wanted to say, if the majority leader will bear with me for a moment, that we are now in a state of war; that when the World War came upon us the then President of the United States created a voluntary board to take over, to consider, and to handle the subject which is now covered by these bills. He appointed the late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the former President of the United States, Mr. Taft, and Frank P. Walsh as co-chairmen of the National War Labor Board. They drew up a set of rules and principles to govern the conduct of labor and industry in their controversies over wages, working conditions, and so forth. Perhaps now that we are at war, such an emergency industrial labor board will be created. If it is created, if it is voluntary, and if labor and industry will get together under a chairman selected by the President, we shall show the Fascist nations, the Nazi nations, the Communist nations, and all the totalitarian nations of the world, that we can settle our difficulties in true democratic fashion, without punitive measures, and without compulsion.

So, Mr. President, I believe delay in the matter of the consideration of these bills for a few days will probably promote rather than injure the chances of our effecting some method of settlement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator said that the House passed the Smith bill before my bill was on the calendar. The RECORD shows that my bill was reported on the 1st of December. When was the Smith bill passed by the House? It was passed on December 3, was it not?

Mr. MEAD. I was under the impression that the House bill came to the Senate before either of the Senate bills was reported.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; my bill was on the calendar on December 1.

Mr. MEAD. Then I stand corrected. Nevertheless, it occurs to me that we ought to wait a few days. Perhaps a national voluntary emergency board will be created by the President representing labor and industry, with an outstanding American as its chairman, and such voluntary board may draft a set of rules and regulations whereby all these differences may be ironed out. They could recommend the coordination of mediation and conciliation, and could recommend a suitable method of arbitration.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. It has been suggested to me this afternoon that the bill with reference to labor relations which was enacted during the last war has never been repealed but became inactive because of the ending of that war, and that now the present war status, in all probability, will revive that bill.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that certainly the Committee on Education and Labor should look into that question before we hastily consider some other legislation.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the contribution made by the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has given a great deal of time and attention to the matter before the Senate. It occurs to me that he is correct in his contention; and, therefore, if we wait a few days we will not be in any way interfering with the subject matter we have in mind.

I believe, Mr. President, that the machinery which was set up during the World War could be made effective and provide for a coordination of all the mediation and conciliation services which are now spread over several different departments; and I think some such action will be taken by the President. Therefore, I do not believe any hasty or punitive action should be taken by the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Vice President be au-

thorized to affix his signature to the joint resolution passed by the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, it may be now considered and confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John O'Keefe to be collector of customs, collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is no further business to be transacted this afternoon, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 9, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 8, 1941:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

John O'Keefe to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, long have Thy servants thirsted after Thee. Thou art merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and Thy mercy endureth from generation to generation. Thou hast lifted our people to a state wherein abound simple brotherhood and righteous living. In this day which no epitaph can flatter and no monument call back to life, there are iron-toned discords roaring with the flames of pain and death; comfort all who mourn their innocent dead and wounded ones; speak to us; give us courage in the darkness and let us hear the unvocalized voice saying: "This is the way; walk ye in it." In Thee we shall never be disillusioned, never disappointed, and never put to shame.

Eternal Father, strong to save, to Thee we lift our prayer of steadfast hope and faith while the calendar of history is being stained with pagan cruelty and deceit. We pray for life-giving calmness, majestic and invincible. If we are to suffer as a people, acquainted with grief and sorrow, oh grant that they may be heaven's challenge to turn us more devoutly to the blessings of the spirit. O Thou Christ of God, in the deeper processes of our Nation's soul hold us steadfastly to the realization that the richest garments of a country's character are often sewed with the crimson threads of sacrifice and suffering. Keep us free from passion and hate and bless our land with the enduring prizes of national unity, honor, and integrity. Almighty God, preserve the health of our President, our Speaker and the Congress, and direct them in all their ways. In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the previous session be dispensed with, and that the Journal be approved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, for the remainder of the day, it may be in order at any time for the House to stand in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 61), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, the 8th day of December 1941, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time today for the Speaker to recognize Members to move a suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m. by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed, without amendment, to a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H Con. Res 61. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session on Monday, December 8, 1941, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

The Doorkeeper, Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper also announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The SPEAKER. On behalf of the House the Chair appoints the following committee to conduct the President into the Chamber: Messrs. McCORMACK, DOUGHTON, and MARTIN of Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as members on the part of the Senate to conduct the President into the Chamber, the following Members of the Senate: The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

The Doorkeeper announced the members of the Cabinet of the United States.

At 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Senators and Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting the President of the United States.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 453)

The address delivered by the President of the United States to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress held this day is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.

The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, 1 hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During

the intervening time the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. Very many American lives have been lost. In addition American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Yesterday the Japanese Government also launched an attack against Malaya.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam.

Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands.

Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island.

This morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

Japan has, therefore, undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area. The facts of yesterday speak for themselves. The people of the United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our Nation.

As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy I have directed that all measures be taken for our defense.

Always will we remember the character of the onslaught against us.

No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people, in their righteous might, will win through to absolute victory.

I believe I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger.

With confidence in our armed forces—with the unbounded determination of our people—we will gain the inevitable triumph—so help us God.

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1941.*

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the President retired from the Hall of the House.

The SPEAKER announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate, the members of the Cabinet, and the members of the Supreme Court retired from the Chamber.

The joint session of the Senate and the House having been dissolved, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 254, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. I object.

The SPEAKER. This is no unanimous-consent request. No objection is in order.

Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker and my fellow Americans, the President of the United States has just spoken to the Congress and to the American people. A dastardly attack has been made upon us. This is the time for action.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is today in the gravest crisis since its establishment as a Republic. All we hold precious and sacred is being challenged by a ruthless, unscrupulous, arrogant foe. We have been the victim of a treacherous attack under cover of darkness. It came at a time when we were trying to establish a basis of peace through mutual understanding. Our ships have been sunk, our planes destroyed, many lives lost, cities and towns under the American flag have been ruthlessly bombed.

No one hates war more than I. Every night I have uttered a silent prayer that America might be spared active involvement in a frightful war. I know the horrors which come with war—the loss of lives, the sacrifices which must be made by all, the sadness and desolation it always brings.

America is challenged. That challenge comes in a ruthless way which leaves but one answer for a liberty-loving, self-respecting people. We are compelled by this treacherous attack to go to war. From now on there can be no hesitation. We must press the war with unstinted vigor and full efficiency. There can be no peace until the enemy is made to pay in full measure for his dastardly crimes.

We in America have wanted peace. We must now fight to uphold our national honor and make secure our freedom.

The attack on our territory will rally every patriotic American to support of the Nation's needs. In shipyards, in factories, in mines, in blast furnaces, on farms, all over this broad land there will be one spontaneous response. The people of America will unanimously meet the attacks of the aggressor and join in an irresistible effort of increased production. The boys in the training camps and the sailors who maintain the vigils of the sea must have—they will have—the tools and equipment to win this war.

In view of the developments of the past 36 hours, the President's request has my support. When the historic roll is called I hope there will not be a single dissenting vote. Let us show the world we are a united Nation. Let us boldly proclaim we will not permit any force to strike down freedom and progress here in America or replace our way of life with slavery and dictatorship.

God will give us the strength and the courage to drive to victory in a just cause—a cause which means all that makes life worth while to the people not only of America but in every country in the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and deep resentment against Japan that I rise to support a declaration of war.

I have consistently opposed our entrance into wars in Europe and Asia for the past 3 years, but the unwarranted, vicious, brazen, and dastardly attack by the Japanese Navy and air force while peace negotiations were pending at Washington and in defiance of the President's eleventh-hour personal appeal to the Emperor, makes war inevitable and necessary.

The time for debate and controversy within America has passed. The time for action has come.

Interventionists and noninterventionists must cease criminations and recriminations, charges and countercharges against each other, and present a united front behind the President and the Government in the conduct of the war.

There can be only one answer to the treacherous attack of the Japanese, and that is war to final victory, cost what it may in blood, treasure, and tears. This unprovoked and senseless aggression by

the Japanese armed forces upon our possessions must be answered by war.

Although I have consistently fought against our intervention in foreign wars, I have repeatedly stated that if we were attacked by any foreign nation, or if the Congress of the United States declared war in the American and constitutional way, I would support the President and the administration to the bitter end.

Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. The Japanese have gone stark, raving mad, and have by their unprovoked attack committed military, naval, and national suicide.

I shall at the proper time volunteer my services as an officer in a combat division, as I did in the last war, preferably with colored troops.

There is no sacrifice too great that I will not make in defense of America and to help annihilate these war-mad Japanese devils.

Now that we are to fight let us go in with our heads and chins up in the American way, and let us serve notice upon the world that this is not only a war against aggression and in defense of our own territories but a war for freedom and democracy all over the world, and that we will not stop until victory is won.

I appeal to all American citizens, particularly to the members of my own party, and to noninterventionists, to put aside personal views and partisanship, and unite behind the President, our Commander in Chief, in assuring victory to the armed forces of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, speedy action, not words, should be the order of the day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in this tragic hour words will not convey our feelings or express our righteous indignation. The Japanese unprovoked attack upon the United States without notice, while peace negotiations were still in progress, was dastard treachery and is characteristic of those totalitarian outlaws who talk peace while they have already drawn the dagger with which to strike.

We have but two choices today, either to fight or to surrender, and America, thank God, has never surrendered and never will surrender.

America is united. America will fight. America will win.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's attack of American territory by Japan was a stab in the back. This outrage was committed at the very moment the Secretary of State was conferring face to face with representatives of the Japanese Government, at their request, for the purpose of finding a peaceful solution. The Japanese envoys were engaged in diplomatic sham and committed one of the most dishonest acts in the world's history. The indignation of the American people has risen to demand justice and the protection of all that is America. Those of every national strain, proud of their American heritage and citizenship will stand up to the challenge made by Japan of their freedom. All of us are willing today to make every sacrifice to reach our goal. Awful as war is, Americans throughout our land demand a declaration of war today. There is no other choice now. Victory or defeat and it must be victory. Mr. Speaker, we know American men are brave, American women, too, are brave; together a united courage such as ours is certain of victory.

We are willing today to make every sacrifice to achieve our goal. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, the country is united today. United and courageous we march forward to victory.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, my late husband, Bill Byron, was in the last war. One of my sons is near military age. Should this conflict last long enough, I am willing to give my sons to their country's defense. I am 100 percent in favor of avenging the wrong done our country and maintaining our country's honor. We must go into this thing to beat the Japanese aggressor. I shall do everything by voice, by vote, everything within my power to bring about this end.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, prior to yesterday we were a divided Nation with respect to our foreign policy. This division of sentiment has interfered with the efficient marshaling of our energies and our resources. America has been a sleeping giant. This attack by the Japanese has awakened us. We are no longer divided. We are one people. We are a Nation galvanized into action. The whole world will soon learn that a truly peace-loving Nation can strike with awful force when thoroughly aroused.

Mr. Speaker, we, Americans all, at this critical hour in the life of our Nation place all that we hold dear—our lives and our sacred honor—upon the altar of our country and at the foot of our country's cause. God helping us, we will not fail.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday against the roar of Japanese cannon in Hawaii our American people heard a trumpet call; a call to unity; a call to courage; a call to determination once and for all to wipe off of the earth this accursed monster of tyranny and slavery which is casting its black shadow over the hearts and homes of every land. And this is what we are going to do before we are through. And when the battle is over, and it will be a long battle of blood, of tears, of sweat, and sacrifice—but it will be worth it, for when the battle is over—and I hope God may spare me long enough to see it—America will stand in the forefront to help create a world civilization of freemen everywhere, just as Americans today are free on American soil and propose at any cost to remain so.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is in effect a declaration of war against Japan. This is not a war of aggression on our part. It is more than a war for the maintenance of the sovereign rights of the American Republic and for the preservation of American dignity in the councils of the nations of the earth. It is not an idealistic war. The President's message succinctly stated what has happened since dawn on yesterday. This is entirely a defensive war. Our merchant ships, our naval ships, and our airplanes have not only been attacked during the last 48 hours, but our territory has been invaded. Our national-defense facilities have been bombed. Our cities have been attacked. Our soldiers and our sailors have been killed. The coldbloodedness of the attack has been exceeded only by the perfidy and treachery of the attacker. This resolution is a declaration of the American people, speaking in a constitutional way through their elected representatives in Congress, that they will defend their country, their homes, and their firesides against the avarice and the brutality of Japanese assault.

It seems to me that there can be but one honorable and realistic answer on the part of the Congress to this Japanese attack. Much as I abhor war, I am constrained to vote for this resolution.

As is well known in the House, and to the constituents whom I have the honor to represent here, I have been definitely opposed to involving our country in any foreign war except in case of defense. My voice and my votes in the Congress have been directed to that end. I believe thoroughly in America and in our way of life and doubt the wisdom of attempting to compel the world, by force, to adhere to the principles of government which we enjoy and which by choice we will defend to the end.

Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the solemnity of this occasion. To me, it is depressing and dreadful. I realize full well the implications of a great war with Japan. The sacrifices our people must make in both life and treasure cannot be appraised. However, we have been attacked and at this good hour Japanese soldiers are doing their best to destroy our country and to kill our people.

To me, there is no choice in this matter. Japan has cast the die. It is either surrender or fight. Our people will never surrender.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the time for action has arrived. My words, therefore, will be few.

Early yesterday morn, out of the fading darkness of the night before, hundreds of Japanese flyers, bent alone on murder and destruction, ruthlessly dive bombed and blasted the American islands of Hawaii.

The awfulness of Japan's treacherous crime against the people of the United States will find no counterpart in the bloody annals of man's rascality.

The screams of men stricken down, the wails of widows newly made, the cries of

helpless children, dying, will linger in the memories of a betrayed citizenship long after the last Japanese gun has been silenced by an outraged humanity, aroused, at last, to the challenge this evil, oriental power has flung at the world.

Americans will not forget this indignity to which this crafty outlaw nation has subjected us.

Those who died in this murderous assault will be avenged. The punishment which an outraged humanity will impose will atone in full measure the cowardly crime which has been theirs to commit.

And those who have died in this first attack will not have died in vain. The mighty effort which will be ours, inspired, as it is, by their noble sacrifice, will crush forever the lust for power, the greed for self, the dreams of conquest, which have motivated this unholy attack upon the decent people of the world.

Victory will attend our arms, triumph will soon be ours, tyranny will again be swept from the face of the earth which it now defaces and disgraces.

So let there be unity, in our every thought, in our every deed. Let every man, woman, and child lend the strength of his or her individual might. With the Nation united, no force in this world can prevail against our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this resolution. And to the success of our arms in the war that is to be waged I pledge my all, my life, my property, my sacred honor.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our Nation, despite its every effort to maintain a peaceful relationship with the Empire of Japan, today is faced with the challenge of war. A war not of our own choosing, but a war that has been wantonly and treacherously thrust upon us.

Never in the recorded history of civilized nations has there been a parallel of the treachery and deceit evidenced by Japan in its unprovoked attack upon our outposts in the Pacific. It took advantage of the white flag of truce under which its emissaries were conferring with our own representatives, ostensibly to determine a treaty of peace, and struck a dagger into our back. The reprehensible and diabolical character of this act does not admit of adequate description and condemnation.

Commencing with the assault on China in 1931, the Japanese by deceptive maneuvers have pressed forward their aggressions in the Orient. While continually encroaching upon the rights of others, Japan has marked her real intentions by pledges of good faith to our own and the other western nations who have sought to protect the national integrity and territory of the weaker nations.

It is in keeping with this record of deceptive dealing that the emissaries of Japan in Washington should conduct "peace" negotiations with the representatives of our own Government up to the very hour that Japanese war planes dropped their death bombs upon an unsuspecting and sleeping populace in the American Territory of Hawaii. For at least 2 weeks preceding the bombing of American territory at Hawaii and other points in the Pacific, Japan had undoubtedly been secretly making preparation for the attack. They took advantage of the time and opportunity that was afforded them by the willingness of our Government to confer in an endeavor to obtain a peaceful solution by making and perfecting plans to bring sudden destruction to our people and our defenses. However, there is no need to dwell further upon the perfidy of Japan. Its existence is plain and its record will never be effaced from the pages of history so long as civilization remains.

War is upon us. The need of the hour is for action. The duty of every American is plain. America will answer the call to duty with courage and unity. But do not let us make the mistake that our task will be an easy one. That is the way to fail. Our adversary has worked and labored for 10 years looking forward to the day it would challenge America. Unfortunately, we have helped them in their preparation for war against us. For many years Japan has received steel, copper, oil, and other manufactured products from us. We must now assume they have been turned into weapons to be used against us. Furthermore, to prosecute a successful war we will be called upon to wage it thousands of miles from our home base. This will have a tendency to delay and hinder a quick conclusion. We must be ready to bear early reverses like those suffered on Sunday morning, when hostilities were directed at several of our Pacific island possessions. It is natural that some early successes would result from the fact that our enemy struck suddenly and without warning. But we may rest assured that early success does not mean final success. America is aroused.

America is confronted with an enemy that is without conscience. It is resourceful and well supplied with the weapons of war. It is our duty by unity of thought, purpose, and action to bring defeat to this deceitful and treacherous foe at the earliest possible day. Whatever may have been the differences that have divided us in the past, there can be no division as to the desirability, the necessity, and the duty of attaining victory. Our cause is just. Our courage is strong. With God's help, we will win.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, this is a tragic hour for the American people. History will record it as a more tragic one for the peoples of the Japanese Empire.

Few men in America have the aversion to war and the desire for peace which are mine. There is no regret or bitterness in my heart because of my efforts for a peaceful world. Deep satisfaction is mine because of my modest efforts to bring our armed forces to the highest point of efficiency and coordination.

In destroying American lives and property and in violating our soil, the Japanese war lords have brought upon themselves the condemnation of decent peoples everywhere.

I have been a consistent opponent of this administration's foreign policy. For that opposition I make no apology. But the time for political differences is passed. We must unite. We must fight. We must win. We must end this threat to our sovereignty and our citizens. The path to victory will be long and stony. We must condition ourselves for setbacks and reversals. We must prepare ourselves for our part in the formation of a just and peaceful world for the generations to come.

The plain, patriotic duty of every American is to offer himself for service during this war in any capacity for which he may be fitted. It is my intention to offer my services to the armed forces for the duration of the war.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Japan has ruthlessly made war upon the United States. There can be only one answer for America to this inhuman act, namely, war with all our might and resources.

There cannot be, there must not be, any question in the mind of a single American citizen as to the ultimate outcome. Only complete victory over this treacherous foe can satisfy the American spirit of justice and liberty.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as these words are written, the unanimous vote—except one—in both Houses of Congress for the resolution declaring a state of war to exist between the Imperial Government of Japan and the United States is still echoing and reechoing through the Chambers and the corridors of the Capitol.

America tonight is stunned by Hawaii. It is amazed by Pearl Harbor. It is utterly without any explanation for what, on its face, appears to be an utterly inexplicable event. It is impossible at this time to find any explanation for what apparently happened, for it is impossible to know the extent and the effects of the shattering blow delivered so suddenly by the Japanese.

America had considered Pearl Harbor impregnable. Pearl Harbor was the pride of the armed forces of the United States. Pearl Harbor was the alert outpost standing strong as a Gibraltar between the United States mainland and the threat of the Japanese. So America had been told again and again and again. That was what America had been led to believe. It was what America had a right to believe.

Tonight America is certain of just one thing. We have been attacked. We are one people with just one determination—to subordinate every other consideration to the winning of this war.

The very immensity, the very mystery of the failure at Pearl Harbor to discover the advance of the enemy or adequately to meet his onslaught, cement together Americans of every section, of every creed, of every class, of every color, and every race behind the irresistible determination to keep freedom alive in our beloved land.

There must be some explanation for the stunning events at Pearl Harbor. There will have to be an explanation—sooner or later—and it had better be good.

Mr. Speaker, there is but one decision, regardless of everything else; that is to win this war as speedily as possible, as efficiently as possible, with the minimum loss of life or injury to Americans, both of the armed forces and civilians.

Recriminations could be indulged in. This is not the time for that. Accusations could be made. This is not the time for that. Criticisms could be leveled. This is not the time for that. The big job, the vital job, in this hour is to win this war as quickly and as decisively as we can. To do that, we must train, arm, and equip our forces. Nothing, nothing, must stand between the United States of America and her security. The most important thing in this world to the American people—and to the rest of the world—is the quickest possible triumph America can achieve in this war.

There is no necessity to analyze the vote in the House or the Senate on the war resolution. It spoke for itself. It spoke for that unity which now is America. From this time on, God help the individual or the group that seeks for selfish purposes to interfere with the Nation's preparedness.

Stunned as America is; righteously wrathful as America some time will be; amazed as America finds herself on this historic day, it may be said with perfect assurance that the soul of America does not quail; that the courage of America does not falter; that the capacity of America is equal to the task which confronts her.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the totally unprovoked aggression of the Japanese Empire, every American joins in the determination to defeat this infamous attack. We were ready and willing to do everything within our power to bring about peace in the Far East. Long after our suspicions had been completely aroused by the inconsistency of Japanese activities and Japanese conversations in Washington, we tolerated and encouraged continued negotiations. Our hands are clean. The Japanese military clique must take the full responsibility for the war we have just declared in response to the action of Tokyo. Our people are united as they have never been since the days of 1917 in the determination to end the era of military threats, to destroy forever the insane Axis belief that might makes right. I deplore the necessity for war. But when war has been thrust upon our people I thank God that we are a Nation resolute and strong in the conviction that what we must do is not of our own choosing. We shall fight this war until victory has been won. When the struggle is ended we shall free the Orient from the horror of the past decade. I have cast my vote for war with Japan, confident of the judgment of the American people and of history.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the roll is called upon the pending resolution, I shall vote in the affirmative. To delay in making speedy and vigorous answer to the challenge from Japan would be folly and weakness. The testimony to unprovoked and premeditated attack is overwhelming. Vigorous action is imperative. Let there be complete unity of spirit and purpose.

There lies before us the task of defeating and disciplining by force of arms a nation that has violated every amenity of diplomatic intercourse. We face the task of overwhelming a nation which has displayed a complete disregard for the virtues of fairness, decency, and sportsmanship. The President and Secretary of State have exercised gentleness, patience, and restraint in preserving peace in the Pacific. Their gentleness has been flouted, their patience mocked, their efforts trampled under heel. There remains for us no other course than to subdue and discipline the Imperial Government of Japan for this unwarranted and outrageous conduct.

It will be a grim, serious, and undramatic business. Let us discharge it grimly, seriously, undramatically. Let us not underestimate the size or duration of the task. Let us at the very outset kindle the determination, the sacrificial spirit and the unselfishness which will be requisite to this undertaking. In my humble way I propose to labor earnestly and diligently in the cause of complete and speedy victory. I am at the command of the Commander in Chief.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on Sunday last our American soil has been treacherously attacked by Japan, killing many of our fine citizens, soldiers, and sailors, like a slimy creature crawling in the dark, it struck without warning and struck while negotiations were in progress for a hoped for peace in the Pacific.

Having served in the last war, little did I think I would ever see this day come again in America; I had hoped for a peace, but you cannot deal in terms of peace with such people. Now that Congress has acted, the American people will stand united to destroy those who perpetrated this atrocious crime and caught unaware the fine boys of our Army and Navy. Our decision is clear. This was not of our making. We must fight with everything we have, that America may live.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr Speaker, 48 hours ago if someone would have said to me, "You will soon vote for a declaration of war against a foreign power," I would have considered that individual non compos mentis.

Since the outbreak of World War No. 2 I have consistently and conscientiously opposed and voted against every step which I considered was in the direction of our involvement in foreign war. I have proclaimed from the floor of this House, and from many platforms throughout the Nation, and over the radio to the American people that I would never vote to plunge this country into a war of aggression, and that only in the event of attack upon our sovereignty would I vote and support a resolution that would put us into a defensive war.

Mr. Speaker, like you and millions of our fellow Americans, I was shocked and amazed when the news broke yesterday that the Imperial Government of Japan attempted a dastardly and unprovoked attack on the Territory of Hawaii, resulting in considerable military and naval damage, together with considerable loss of life and injury to American citizens.

This attack is more reprehensible when it is recalled that it came at the very hour when conversations were being held at the Nation's Capital with the Japanese envoys and diplomats looking forward to the continuation of peaceful relations between the United States and the Empire of Japan.

After our participation in the Spanish-American War of 1898 we embarked upon a colonial policy when we took over the Philippine Islands, and subsequently other outposts in the Pacific Ocean. Whatever the charge of imperialism attributed to us by these acts—and there was some justification for such charges—the fact remains that the Territory of Hawaii is and has been for years a part of our Federal Government. Its duly elected delegate sits in our Congress, and we legislate for the Territory of Hawaii, just as we do for the 48 States of our Union. In fact, Hawaii is known as our forty-ninth State, and considerable agitation has been going on for several years to have Hawaii formally admitted into our federation of States.

Today the President of the United States, in a joint session of Congress assembled, stated that an assault has been made upon our sovereignty and our honor and that the United States take up the challenge of the Imperial Government of Japan, which has formally declared war on us, after a vicious attack upon our property and upon our citizens, which is unprecedented in our entire history.

The President calls for united action on the part of the Nation. I respond to that call as a Member of Congress and as a humble citizen of the Republic in sustaining his appeal. And I shall vote for a formal declaration of war to avenge this cowardly act on the part of Japan.

Our war with Japan must not be construed as a war to protect the material interest of any other nation in the Orient. The insult that brings about this declaration of war is directed to our own Government. The full strength and the resources of the Nation should be employed to crush the cowardly military caste that rules the Nipponese Empire.

Just as I felt for the past 2 years that over 80 percent of our people were opposed to being involved in the blood business of Europe and Asia without just cause, I feel at this very hour that the same 80 percent of our people are united in full support of war resolution against the Imperial Government of Japan, in the light of the event that transpired during the past 24 hours.

This is the only war in which we are now officially engaged. May God be with us as we go forward to victory, and may the loss of life be lessened in the days to come, when our fine American soldiers and sailors must face the terrible ordeal of conflict. Interventionists and noninterventionists alike are now brothers in a common cause. We did not provoke this assault, and we have every justification in protecting our honor under the circumstances. A united America heeds the call.

May the Divine Providence assist us in securing an early peace with victory. At some future day when the warring powers of the earth once more sit around the council table to prepare a world peace, let us insist that the United States of America, founded on a Christian civilization, speak through its representatives at the peace convention as Christ would speak for the poor and distressed people

of the earth. It is a well-known fact the doors of the peace council at Versailles were closed to the God of infinite justice and mercy, with the result that practically all the civilized nations of the earth are once more engaged in the holocaust of war.

Our continuation as a world power should not be bound up with the role of a bully to crush the weak and the oppressed, but, on the contrary, should be sustained by example and assistance in encouraging the many and varied races of the human family to emulate our way of life. The way that has sustained us since the days of Washington, Jefferson, and the founding fathers, and that with the immortal Lincoln, governments of the people, by the people, and for the people may take root and blossom everywhere throughout the earth when the insanity of war has disappeared forever.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, so far as I have been able to find, history reveals no act of aggression and mass murder as dastardly, as cowardly, or as contemptible as the attack made by pagan, godless Japan on the United States and the Christian people of the island of Hawaii on yesterday.

It was not only cruel and unprovoked warfare against a nation that had befriended Japan for almost a hundred years but it was malicious mass murder of innocent men, women, and children, who were blown to pieces on the streets of Honolulu.

The resolution before us declaring that a state of war exists between the Japanese Empire and the United States ought to pass without a dissenting vote. It represents the will of the God-fearing, liberty-loving, Christian men and women of America, whose resentment is unrestrained by the most brutal and uncalled-for episode in the history of nations that even claimed to be civilized.

We ought to have no trouble now in subduing subversive elements in our defense industries. We ought not to have any trouble now in coordinating and concentrating every force, every power, every ounce of energy in the prosecution of this war until we drive these pagan hordes from power, reestablish peace in the Pacific, and avenge this unprovoked attack in such a way that will be remembered for a thousand years.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the message of President Roosevelt leaves but one course open to the Congress. It is our solemn duty to recognize the existence of a state of war with Japan, a state of war which that nation has forced upon us through its treacherous conduct.

An unprecedented act of perfidy has shocked all the people of our country into a full realization of the gravity of our situation. They have been brought forcibly to realize the danger of the unbridled and voracious aggressor, a danger which many failed to appreciate, despite the warnings implicit in the experience of the invaded and subjugated nations of the world during the past few years.

The people of this Nation are now united. We will remain united as free people. Loving peace and hating war as we do, we will face the challenge of force and aggression. With all the strength of our being we will meet that challenge. We will add our material and spiritual might to the cause of the preservation of decency and liberty. We cannot with honor do otherwise. In this endeavor we will not, we cannot, fail.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the diabolically infamous treachery of the Japanese brands the race as never to have been and not now entitled to be trusted or treated as civilized. It confirms the judgment and wisdom of our forebears, who would and did exclude them from citizenship.

The coup of yesterday was Hitler inspired, and in it he cooperated.

In this crisis we should forego and forget party political expediency, personal opportunism, obsessions for pacifism, and everything else except our Americanism. Our liberties and our lives are attacked. They are at stake. I say consideredly that anybody who would not fight and vote to save and to protect both is, as I see it, irrresponsible or a traitor at this minute.

If the coat fits, put it on, for it is the truth; and there can be no rational justification nor alibi for a vote against the resolution as it is drawn and which is to be adopted in behalf of our defense.

We should and will declare that a state of war has existed. Can anyone doubt it with at least fifteen hundred Americans dead at the hands of the Japanese? How can any sensible person vote against it? They cannot. It is an incontrovertible fact.

Unitedly and unanimously we must vote and fight for freedom from all those things for which Japan and Hitler stand. We will not win this war as speedily nor as easily as we could wish or, as some believe, but we will win. We must.

The hour we have tried to avoid and to evade has struck.

We go forward today on the road to freedom and unity at whatever cost or else backward, as we submit to Hitlerism, paganism, and serfdom. A vote against this resolution is a vote to put us all in chains.

I shall vote to declare that a state of war against Japan has existed since they so despicably and perfidiously attacked us while we were at their request considering their offerings for peace.

I shall vote to exhaust, if need be, all the power and resources of this country to the end that nobody ever again will undertake so perfidiously to betray us in order that, starting with a clean slate, having destroyed the enemies of civilization and Christianity, there may be wiped off the face of the earth those paganistic philosophies and all those concurrent evils for which Japan and the Axis stand.

I am ready to vote.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is a fateful day which we have all sought to avoid. I am one of those who has earnestly and wholeheartedly sought to keep our Nation at peace. I have recognized our peril and have not only consistently supported every measure which I have sincerely believed was designed to protect and preserve our peace and national security, but have as consistently voted for every cent of appropriations requested by our President for our own national defense. I have as consistently opposed everything which, in my honest judgment, endangered our peace and national security.

In our efforts to keep our Nation at peace, we have failed. History will record as academic truths the facts and factors which may have brought about this conflict which has been thrust upon us, but they are of no avail at this hour. The die has been cast. Our choice has been made for us. During the very hour in which so-called peace negotiations were being conducted in Washington, Japan launched upon our Pacific possessions and upon our nationals a most cowardly, treacherous, and dastardly stab-in-the-back attack. There can be no alternative but for us to declare immediately that a state of war has existed between Japan and these United States since the early morning hours of December 7, 1941.

Just as earnestly as we have all sought to maintain the peace, just so must we now all turn with that same fervor and whole-souled desire to defeat our enemy in order to maintain and preserve our American way of life. I have this day volunteered my own services and offered to the Navy a small cruiser which I have on the Potomac. We must all dedicate ourselves now to the common cause to bring about that victory we must have, that victory we will have, that victory which, with God's help, will come at the earliest possible moment. May God bless and protect America.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, at the break of dawn on December 7, the armed forces of the Empire of Japan attacked the lands and the people of the United States of America by sea and by air. The roar of guns from warships and the bombs from the air caused untold loss of life and great damage to property among the armed forces and citizens of this Nation. This came without warning, unprovoked, and without just cause. In all the history of mankind, I know of no more infamous act of treachery perpetrated upon a peace-loving people. We have always been untiring in our efforts to remain at peace and friendly to all nations. This treachery is such that the people of America will rise as one to strike back with vicious fury. Our President has officially advised us that because of this treachery and infamy a state of war exists between Japan and the United States of America.

As much as I abhor war and have done everything I could to avert that catastrophe to my people, we must all agree that the unprovoked treachery of Japan calls for full support of our President and our Government with an all-out united effort and sacrifice, to the end that the perpetrators of this dastardly crime shall be brought to justice. I fully realize that this will mean sorrow in many homes and blood, sweat, and tears. In America, the land of freemen, where the right of freedom means more than life itself, we shall carry on to victory for the preservation of that freedom that we hold so dear. The people of my district have always given their full share of sacrifice in any call to duty.

People of all nationalities have come to our shores, enjoying the rights of free-

men. Americans all, with love of country deep-seated in their hearts, will answer the call to arms. Men and women from all walks of life will rally to the standard of liberty. Those who don the uniform on the field of battle or on the high seas may rest assured that full and supreme sacrifice of those at home, in the fields, in the factories, the mills, the mines, the forests, the offices, from town, county, and city, will be given as fully and completely as is humanly possible. This Nation places at the disposal of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, its property, its wealth, and the lives of its citizens in this hour of peril, so that liberty and justice will ring down through the ages in order that the civilized world will rid itself of such devilish technique.

All I can say in closing is that God be with us in this hour of peril so that America, the land of freedom, will stand gloriously for all time and that real civilization shall reign supreme in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have no choice. We did not want war, but war we have. This murderous onslaught can be met only with a complete declaration of war. The Congress of the United States, I know, will meet this in the constitutional way, and before we leave here this afternoon such a resolution will be passed. No matter what the sacrifice, victory will be ours.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, Japan has attacked the United States in a sudden outburst of gunfire and aerial bombardment. While the Japanese envoys were conferring with the Secretary of State in an effort to maintain peaceful relations, the fanatical war clique in Japan ordered warfare against the peace-loving people of America. The radio news flashes of war in the Pacific burst like bombshells in the homes of our people on Sunday afternoon. It was scarcely believable, hardly conceivable that Japan should wage war against our country. There was no threat of armed attack, no hint of violence, no break of diplomatic relations prior to Japan's sudden attack upon Hawaii and American possessions. Without warning Japan has loosed tons of explosives upon our property and our people. This has caused terrific damage to our Navy and our Military Establishments, and it has resulted in much loss of life. If only the military leadership of Japan had used reason instead of emotion. If only Japanese leadership had followed the will of their people for peace. If sanity instead of madness had been the watchword of the governors of Japan—there would have been no outbreak of hostilities between our two nations.

The United States has no other alternative than to recognize that a state of war exists between our country and Japan. We were attacked. Our citizens have been killed. Our property has been devastated. Our soldiers and sailors lie dead. Japan has declared war against us. Guam is under Japanese siege. Air attacks blast Hawaii and the Philippine Islands. Our warships and merchant ships suffer attack. All this means war. Insane, catastrophic war. Everyone in the United States must recognize that a state of war exists.

Since it is Japan's avowed intention to fight us, we must fight back. An attack made upon us must be repulsed. We will take no abuse from any nation. The honor, the dignity, the institutions of America must be preserved at all cost.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the infamous act of treachery committed by Japan against our Nation has aroused the fighting, unconquerable spirit of our people. I know that our armed forces, fighting in defense of our homeland and liberty will be invincible on land, on sea, and in the air. Our American boys can handle anything genius can invent. I know that industry and labor will unite as never before in one supreme effort to furnish our forces with the necessary implements of war. Once our military organization is fully equipped with guns, planes, tanks, and ships, we will, true to the glorious traditions of the past, carry Old Glory to victory.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am faithfully recording the determined will of every American citizen within the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts in voting this afternoon in favor of a joint resolution declaring a state of war to exist between the governments of the peace-loving people of the United States and the subjects of the treacherous, military despots of Japan.

At dawn yesterday, the war planes of the Mikado ruthlessly attacked our possessions in the Pacific, causing great loss of life, not only to our armed forces, but to our civilian population. By this wanton act of unprovoked warfare, carried out while the President of the United States was seeking to secure the continuance of peace in the Far East, the Japanese have aroused 130,000,000 Americans to a resolute determination to crush forever these arrogant Asiatic assassins.

The people of the United States are united, as never before, in the grave task which lies before us. We can confidently rely on the courage, the skill, and the fighting qualities of the men in our armed forces. We, the men and women of America, in the factories, on the farms, in every walk of life, pledge our every effort to our Army and our Navy that they shall bring victory to our cause.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and ruthless attack by the Japanese against the United States possessions in the Pacific, has no parallel in history. At the very moment our Government was bending every effort to maintain the peace between the Imperial Government of Japan and our country through negotiation, and when promises and more promises were being made by their representatives that they desired peace, at that very moment, like a thief in the night, our American soil was attacked, leaving both death and destruction as a reminder that our enemy had started on its program of war against the United States.

As we now, with as much calmness as possible, view this "knife in the back" action, and realizing the careful premeditated planning necessary to carry out this assault on our bases in the Pacific, we face the fact that the challenge thrown down to us will and must be met. There is no choice for true, patriotic, loyal, peace-loving, American citizens other than to follow our President in his request for the passage of a resolution setting forth that a state of war exists between the United States and Japan.

Our preparedness program has moved forward these last 2 years, implemented by huge appropriations made possible by the vote of many of us who were determined we should build up our defenses. These defenses are now needed and more and more must be added. The citizenry of our country as a unit, must now stick out its chin, roll up its sleeves and push forward in an all-out effort to meet this dastardly attack hurled into our very teeth. We will and must defend ourselves from those who would destroy us.

With a heavy heart, knowing what war is and can mean, I today join my colleagues in a vote for this resolution asked for by our Commander in Chief, the President. As one, loyal citizens of this country will heartily endorse the action of Congress today, all determined that cost what it will, we accept the challenge until victory is ours.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a day I have fervently prayed might not come but for which I have earnestly sought to have America prepare. The day is here and we must now meet the issue squarely, and with unanimity, and pledge the full resources of the Nation and its people to a successful prosecution of the war which we are about to declare in full confidence that under Divine guidance the best traditions of our Nation will be upheld.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this is undoubtedly the gravest and most serious question that has come before the Congress during the 7 years I have served in this body. The request that the President has made comes after an unwarranted and deadly assault has been made upon the citizens of this Government by Japan. There is only one sensible position for this Congress to take: We must accept the challenge which comes from Japan in the form of the most brutal attack that has been made upon this Government during the existence of our country. This attack is a part of the program of the totalitarian powers in their combined effort to wipe out the possibility of democratic government and to establish in its stead abject slavery. The bloody struggle engaged in by Germany, Italy, and now Japan is a challenge to civilization itself.

I fully concur in the resolution which we have just adopted in compliance with the President's request and pledge the unbroken and continued loyalty not only of the First Congressional District, which I represent, but that of the 15,000,000 Negroes in America. This seems to be a struggle to the death, and will determine for years to come, and perhaps for all time, the form of government that we are to have in this country, and perhaps in the world.

I wish to suggest that in this struggle, as in all previous struggles, the Negro proposes to give and will give all he has, including his life, for the success of our effort to withstand Hitlerism. In view of the sacrifices which my group has always made and in view of the sacrifices which

we are bound to make in this struggle, let me remind the Congress and the Government that the Negro expects the same treatment under our so-called democratic form of government that is accorded all other citizens. He would be unworthy of citizenship in this country if he contended for less.

It is my hope that the contribution which we have always made and shall continue to make will cause those in power and authority and will cause this country to recognize the Negro as a full-fledged citizen. If he is good enough to die for his country, he should be given the largest and fullest opportunity to live for his country without any type of racial discrimination. We are loyal Americans, and you can depend on us to the last man.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, America has been attacked; America has been invaded; and America is speechless. A majority of the Members of Congress last week predicted war with Japan, but none of us felt or could conceive that it would come as it did.

Americans are a religious people; every belief and creed is practiced and protected under our form of government. While many Americans were returning from worship on Sunday the almost incredible news that Japan had invaded Hawaii and the Philippines stunned the senses and shocked the very soul of each of us.

Before this news was flashed to the world America was a sleeping giant, but now she is awakened, united, and determined that this shall never happen again. By this sudden stroke of the Japanese, coming during the stillness and under the cover of the darkness of the night, when soldiers and civilians alike were peacefully resting in their respective abodes, a divided America has been unified, a sleeping America has been awakened, and a peaceful America is at war.

History will never recall a greater or more infamous outrage. Tradition will never relate a more unwarranted or more premeditated assault. The vilest snake, the lowest animal, and the most ravenous bird of prey gives its intended victim some warning before it strikes. The Japanese failed even to exercise the impulse common to all other living creatures. The only warning they gave our peaceful and slumbering people was a burst of shrapnel and the howl of dive bombers.

Today thousands are dead and thoustands are homeless; ships have been sunk and airplanes destroyed. What are we going to do about it? All Americans in whose veins courses the blood of our fathers demand war; every American under the protection of the Stars and Stripes demand action. Japan must be wiped from the face of the earth. She must never rise again. She must feel the same kind of misery that our people have been forced to endure. We must either surrender or fight. Our glorious history dictates our course. We must fight. We will fight. God being our strength, we are going to win. I for one will vote for a declaration of war against Japan.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Japan has attacked our Government and its people. They have succeeded in sinking some of our ships, destroying some of our planes, and have bombed and killed soldiers, sailors, and civilians. This attack was made under cover of darkness. It came without warning. It came while our President was still seeking a peaceful solution to the problems of the Pacific.

This attack along a wide-flung battle line clearly reveals that Japan, like the other Axis members, is bent upon world conquest and nothing will stop her short of superior force. The blood of our slain cry out of the ground for revenge. This is an attack upon a peaceful, liberty-loving Nation. This is an attack upon our country and its institutions. It is designed to conquer and enslave all the liberty-loving people of the earth. It will not succeed.

Every resource of this great Nation—material and spiritual—will be thrown into this conflict to destroy Japan. We must have unlimited production, uninterrupted by any means. We must toil and sacrifice. Yea, we must fight to win.

We are resolved by the help of God to see this conflict through to victory. It will be a victory for peace and decency; for freedom. We cannot fail in this our hour of destiny.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the community I represent here in Congress, I have no hesitancy in saying that the unwarranted attack upon Hawaii, despite such temporary advantages as might have been gained by this indefensible conduct, will result in the destruction of Japan as a military power. Hawaii has suffered the first brunt of the enemy's unprovoked assault, but the loss of life incurred will harden our determination to rid the world of this menace.

I know my community will support to the utmost degree any decision arrived at by the Congress and the President of the United States for the successful prosecution of the war so unjustifiably forced upon us. If I had a vote in the House it would be cast in favor of a declaration of war.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in my service as a Member of Congress, I have listened to the President of the United States ask for a declaration of war.

Never was such a request more justified than the one made today.

Our Nation has been attacked by a power with which we were, up to the very moment of hostilities against us, engaged in friendly negotiations to ensure peace. The cowardly and dastardly nature of that attack will not be forgotten throughout all history. We shall strike back in self-defense with all the resources at our command.

I wish to echo the words of other speakers that the time has come for action, not words. Already American lives have been lost, American ships have been sunk, and American property destroyed. The President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has promptly taken action to intercept and destroy the enemy. The people of the United States are behind him and can be counted upon to do their part in seeing this unprovoked war through to victory.

No longer are we Republicans or Democrats, interventionists or noninterventionists, but Americans. Our past differences of viewpoint upon matters of foreign policy should be forgotten. All that matters now is the successful defense of America from this dishonorable and contemptible act of aggression upon the part of Japan.

I shall support the President's request for a declaration that a state of war exists and sincerely hope that the vote upon the resolution may be unanimous, so as to emphasize our unity of purpose and our determination to avenge the treacherous act of a professedly friendly power.

The occasion here today reminds me of a similar one nearly 25 years ago when President Wilson, addressing the Congress in an extraordinary night session, solemnly asked for a declaration of war against Germany. There are 15 Members of the present House who were Members of the World War Congress. I know the other 14 Members have wished as I have, that we would never be called upon to vote for another war declaration. I have many times said that I would never do so as regards our participation in any foreign war.

Today, however, we have had war brought to our own doorstep. The United States itself has become the victim of aggression. With the security of our Nation at stake, we must all undertake to defend it with our lives and with all the material resources which we possess. We did not seek this war with Japan, but if the Japanese mean to have it, let us show them that an aroused America is a force to be reckoned with and one that is determined to be victorious.

This is a solemn hour. The decision we must make is a fateful one, but there can be but one answer. When our flag is attacked we arise as one to defend it. God grant that victory may be ours and that it may come speedily and with a minimum of bloodshed.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, the soul of America has been stirred. The treacherous attack launched by Japan against our outposts in the Pacific has united the Nation in a common cause, and has welded it together in a common devotion. An unyielding faith is America's answer to Japan's perfidy.

As a people, we loathe war. We have been devoted to peace and have pursued every means for its maintenance. We have endeavored to banish hate in the world and have set ourselves to the encouragement of good will among men. Unafraid ourselves, we have contributed unselfishly to dispel both suspicion and fears among others. We have clung tenaciously to our ideals and have made them of a warp and of a woof which could have been woven into realities. Others have torn down the loom and despoiled the fabric. Fervent as have been our hopes for peace, they now give way to a grim determination. War has been forced upon us.

Today we draw our strength from a great faith for the tasks which we must

do and for the sacrifices which we must make. That faith will not fail us.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, America awakened yesterday to find herself a victim of one of the foulest attacks in the history of this Nation. There is but one answer to this challenge, and that we shall give this day unequivocal language. This Nation closes ranks; no longer shall we hear the voice of the isolationists lulling us with the oft-repeated lullaby, "They can't attack us—the two oceans are our protector." Yea, we close ranks and in battle array go forth to meet this foul challenge; we shall not be deterred, please God, until this act of aggression has been avenged; we shall show the world we are not too proud to fight; that we are worthy scions of our sires who fought, bled, and died that we might live in peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, our whole country should keep constantly in mind as the guidepost for our action and our ultimate goal the motto of the great State of Virginia, that State that has given many great sons to the Union and the Nation, "sic semper tyrannis."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the United States has been attacked by forces of the Japanese Empire. These attacks, not only upon our naval base at Pearl Harbor but on numerous other islands under our flag, and synchronized so as to occur simultaneously with other attacks over a wide range of thousands of miles in the Pacific, together with the sinking and capture of our merchant vessels, show that these attacks were deliberately planned.

The attacks upon this Nation were actually being delivered at the very time that the Japanese Ambassador and his colleagues were negotiating with Secretary of State Hull. It will be remembered that these negotiations were being conducted at the request of the Japanese, and there can be no doubt that the negotiations themselves were intended as a blind for the purpose of deceiving this country.

This Government has done everything in its power to avoid war with the Japanese Empire. The dastardly and cowardly attacks the Japanese have made are the most treacherous and infamous in all history. American blood has been shed, American lives have been taken, American ships have been destroyed, and American territory has been assaulted. Our Government and our people no longer have any choice in the matter. War has been thrust upon them. The only thing we can do is to recognize that fact and act accordingly.

All of the energy, all of the resources, all of the treasure of this country must be dedicated to the supreme task of defending our Nation.

Politics must be forgotten; factional strife must be buried in oblivion; friction over domestic issues must be obliterated. The United States is at war. We must conquer or perish. With God's help, we must fight until victory crowns our banners, whatever the cost in blood, in treasure, in anguish, or in tears, that liberty may retain habitation among the nations and that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn hour, an hour when we must think clearly, speak frankly, and act deliberately. To declare war upon any nation is a grave act. There must be a reason that is beyond all doubt that differences cannot be determined by peaceful means.

I have been opposed to the United States interference in the political and economic life of nations in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa. I have maintained that America should stay in the Western Hemisphere to assert our authority, and then only when the conference table was no longer of use to nations. I wanted to use our good offices in America by the President, by the Secretary of State, and by the Congress to arbitrate differences for the Eastern Hemisphere. To the end that the conference table be used I have been zealous in extending our aid. Perhaps the President and the Secretary of State should have consulted the Congress during the deliberations in the past 3 weeks with the Government of Japan, but they were not disposed to do so, and now we find ourselves at war with the Imperial Government of Japan because she fired the shot against the Government of the United States in Hawaii Sunday, December 7, heard the world around.

Today we Americans are faced with a fact, a dreadful reality. A terrible crime has been committed by the Imperial Government of Japan in blowing up our ships, in bombing and killing our American people on the island of Hawaii. They have murdered in cold blood American citizens without warning. There is no other alternative but to declare war on the Imperial Government of Japan, and I shall vote "aye" on the resolution now before the House.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are about to cast the most important vote most of us have been, or ever will be, called upon to cast. We are about to do something that no other branch of the Government can do. That is to declare war. The Constitution in its supreme power gives to Congress the power and the responsibility of declaring war. I hope that I fully appreciate the weight of the obligation which is mine today.

The destiny of our country was prophetically stamped upon the Liberty Bell in the words from the Scripture:

> Proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof.

Our Nation has done more to bring that prophesy to complete fruition than any other Nation in the world. Are we to sit supinely by and allow the Goddess of Liberty to be torn from her proud pedestal and trampled into the dust by a nation which, just two or three generations ago, would be classed as barbarians and whose conduct on yesterday shows that they are still barbarians at heart?

Most of us are opposed to war. During the present emergency I have voted constantly against every action that I felt would lead us into war. My philosophy has been that we should stay as far away from war as possible. I felt, however, that should the time come that we would be compelled to go to war, either because of our unwise statements or conduct, or because of the aggression of some other country, I would so conduct myself as that I could in fairness and in good conscience give my unqualified support to my country. I have never felt it the part of wisdom to have made any statement or any promise to the effect that I would not under any circumstances vote for war. On the contrary I have felt that since war had from the beginning of time been the accepted method of settling disputes between nations it would probably continue to be until the spiritual inclination of the peoples of the world had taken a loftier plane than that which they hold at this time. The action of Japan yesterday impels the most peaceful individual to the conclusion that it is not safe for any country to adopt a policy of complete pacifism.

I am proud that I have the honor to represent a law-abiding and liberty-loving constituency. I shall vote for this resolution because to do otherwise would be to outrage my own conscience and would be to fail to respect the wishes of my constituency. It is one thing to be a malicious aggressor and it is another thing to be a righteous defender. The fight for liberty has never been considered a battle. The fight for liberty is a war and the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. When I cast my vote in favor of this resolution I shall feel the full approval of Lincoln's words:

> Let us do the right as God gives us to see the right.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been invaded. The fact is clear. Any invasion of the United States, its possessions or its interests, is war. Consequently I shall support the resolution before us recognizing a state of war existing between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan.

We have tried to remain out of the World War. It is apparent that we cannot do so under present circumstances. Consequently I shall support this resolution.

Only with force can the invaders be repulsed. We will rise with a God-given strength and smite the invaders.

All of us will make sacrifices. The measure of our devotion will be these sacrifices. Let us all, united for the good of our country, prepare for and make these sacrifices for the continued good of our beloved land.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I think that our entire foreign policy in recent years has been fundamentally wrong, in that it has utterly disregarded the wise advice of Washington, Jefferson, and other founding fathers against foreign entanglements. I want the record to show, as it does show, that I have not, by any acts of mine contributed in any way or at any time or in any degree to what I believe to be this erroneous policy of world involvement. I have opposed, and whenever Congress was allowed a vote, I have voted against every one of these deviations from correct principles because I wanted America to remain free, strong, and independent, and at peace with the world. By no act of mine have I contributed to the deplorable situation that now confronts us. I shall be glad,

indeed, if in my capacity as a Representative of the people who have to suffer and die in war I may be helpful in accomplishing, at the proper time, a reexamination and revision of our foreign policy that will bring us back to sounder and safer ground.

As for the question presently before us, however, Japan already has determined what my vote must be. If the United States had not been attacked I would not have voted to declare that a state of war exists between our two countries. I have repeatedly pledged, and would protect my pledge with my life if necessary, that I would not vote for war unless America was attacked. But we have been attacked, we already are in war, and the declaration that a state of war exists is merely the statement of an obvious and patent fact which the authorities hold is necessary for defensive purposes. Out of a clear sky, without warning, Japan has wantonly, cruelly, and treacherously attacked the United States at a time when our Government was making pacific overtures to preserve the peace. American property has been destroyed, American blood has been spilled, American lives have been lost in an insane thrust at our vital lines when a hundred million Americans were hoping and praying for peace. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. It does not matter now how many mistakes may have been made in getting us into the war. The fact remains that we are in it, and we must look to the future, not to the past. Japan has declared war on the United States. By the resolution before us we are not putting our country into war with Japan. We are already in war, and no one knows how soon or from what quarter the next attack will come. Under these circumstances, what can we do and what should we do? We should do everything that is necessary to defend ourselves and to see that American lives and property are made secure. That is the first duty and obligation of sovereignty.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, the United States has suffered a severe loss through the foul attack of Japan yesterday. There can only be one answer to this attack and that is immediate action by Congress.

We must meet force with force and with a united front. We will carry through to victory. This war will mean much suffering and sacrifice, but America in this fateful hour is willing and unafraid. The tactics used by the Japanese are despicable and smack of Hitlerism.

Our President, with a great show of patience, made every effort to bring about a peaceful settlement of this Nation's controversies with Japan. He held out the hand of peace, but was rewarded for his efforts with a stab in the back under the cover of night. In this crisis I hope that he will have the support of every man, woman, and child in these United States. He is our Commander in Chief, and as such assumes the great responsibility of leading us through this struggle to victory. He will live up to the occasion.

Fully aware of the dark days ahead, I do not hesitate to vote for this resolution authorizing our President to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Japanese Government.

PUERTO RICO AND THE WAR

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been provoked and attacked by surprise and treachery by a deceitful enemy whose envoys were in our home speaking of friendship and peace. At this moment that our Nation meets the challenge I want to be on record before this great body, on behalf of 2,000,000 American citizens living in the American Territory of Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico, where important naval, air, and military bases are being established, which are making of Puerto Rico a "Gibraltar of the Caribbean" and which is practically the American watchdog at the entrance of the Panama Canal, may be hit any time by the enemy. And I want to assure our fellow citizens of this great Republic that any enemy of the United States will meet in Puerto Rico with a people whole-heartedly faithful to this great Nation, and a tough and patriotic people as well.

On behalf of these 2,000,000 American citizens of Puerto Rico I can pledge the fortunes, the lives, and the honor of my people to fight and to die for this great country.

As the representative of the only Latin-American territory under the American flag, I hope that all Latin-American republics will back the United States of America in this great hour, when at stake is the security, the liberty, and the destiny of the whole Western Hemisphere.

Puerto Rico is sure that at the end the democratic forces of America will win the fight, which will be a victory for freedom and democracy for all mankind.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people will rally to the call of our Commander in Chief and unite to defend our Nation with all our might from an unwarranted, unprovoked, and treacherous attack by Japan. I deplore war, but the time has come when we must meet our enemy with courage and every resource available, and by an all-out effort we will be assured of success. I have faith that Almighty Providence will protect us, for our cause is a just one. This is not the time for speeches, but we must meet the challenge with action. All Americans must stand steadfast behind our leader. We must win. We will win. I have always contended that President Roosevelt was right from the start, and I will continue to support him 100 percent.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is a fearful responsibility to vote to take this great, peaceful Nation into war. I will not shirk my clear duty. My vote is to declare the existence of a state of war between Japan and this country. Honolulu is an American city. It is a city of peace and beauty, song and laughter. At dawn on a peaceful Sunday, when some men of our fleet and of our air force were on happy weekend leave, away from their battle stations, when others were asleep in their quarters, death rained from the sky—our ships were sunk, our planes destroyed, Americans were killed, without warning, and at the very time of this dastardly, atrocious, treacherous mass attack by the air force of Japan, almost unparalleled since the Dark Ages, the hand of friendship was offered by their diplomats in Washington. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at war. Japanese aggression has leaped at us across the broad Pacific. Isolationists have been proved wrong by the merciless logic of events over which we have no control. This is no time for braggadocio nor boastfulness. Uncertain hours, desperate days, grave dangers, a long and bitter struggle confront us, but in the end American sailors and soldiers will be facing forward and the rising sun of Japan will have set. It is significant that exactly 72 years after George Washington came Abraham Lincoln, and exactly 72 years after Abraham Lincoln came Franklin D. Roosevelt. He is our Commander in Chief in our hour of peril and a united Nation marches under his leadership. We have a rendezvous with destiny. Let us dedicate ourselves with heavy hearts and firm resolve to see this thing through. Mr. Speaker, it is not given to us to see what lies at the far end of the road. Yonder we see dictatorship aggression, 11 once independent nations crushed by Hitler, treachery, terror, death, but a united Nation under a great leadership with the help of God will sweep that aside and at the far end of the road we discern these words emblazoned in letters of living fire—duty, sacrifice, patriotism, civilization, liberty, democracy, peace on earth.

Mr. Speaker, the wanton attack by the Japanese naval and air forces upon our territorial possessions in the Pacific has united the American people most effectively.

We as a nation meet this challenge of war with determination that victory will be ours if forced to fight upon the seven seas and the five continents.

Although we were caught off guard, and only partially prepared for an offensive campaign against Japan, wisdom now dictates that this Nation devote all its energies to making this continent impregnable. We cannot do this, yet at one and the same time divide our armaments and scatter our forces.

Every gun and every ship will count from here on.

Every citizen must bend to the task of defeating the enemy. And in this task, we must all cooperate in the preservation of our own democratic institutions.

We have been attacked. We must now strike back, and quickly.

Let us not underestimate our adversary. Through our oil, steel, and junk metals, Japan has become one of the world's great powers. To subdue her will be a Herculean task. We of America now face a long, grueling period of blood, sweat, and tears.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a public statement which I issued to all Philadelphia newspapers as soon as I received reports on the afternoon of Sunday, December 7, of the treacherous action of the Japanese Government. My statement follows:

We have been attacked in the most cowardly fashion.

Whatever my Government does to defend our Nation will have my support.

If the President is about to request congressional action, I hope and believe he will receive a united, patriotic response to his message.

Since making the above statement I have learned that the President will deliver his message to the Congress today, and I assume that he will request that the Congress adopt a resolution recognizing the existence of a state of war. Naturally I will support such a resolution wholeheartedly. The American people are united in a determination to put an end to international gangsterism. I know that however long and hard the road may be we shall follow it to victory.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, there is but one answer that we can give Japan. The United States of America has been attacked. Japan has declared war on us. A state of war exists and we must meet the challenge that has been thrust upon us. The American people are ready, and, acting as a unit, will see to it that Japan receives the sound defeat that she deserves.

Casting aside every last vestige of decency, traitorous Japan, like a thief in the night, while her Ambassador and her special emissary were discussing peace terms with the Secretary of State, prepared for attack and planted her armed forces so that almost at the identical hour when her representatives were at our State Department she struck death blows and, after her surprise attack, declared war on us.

Although the Government of the United States, acting in all sincerity, sought by every peaceful means to reason with Japan, even resorting to pleas by our President to the Emperor of Japan, many Americans were skeptical of the sincerity of the Japanese, and events have proven these skeptics were right.

Japan has struck and struck hard at our military and naval stations in the Pacific. More than a hundred soldiers were killed and over 300 were wounded by Japanese airmen. More than 50 marines were made prisoners in China, and possibly 1,100 American workmen on Wake Island were taken prisoners. Civilians were killed by bombs and property was destroyed. One of our gunboats was captured and several of our warships are reported to have been hit by Japanese bombs. At least 1 Army transport has been reported sunk 1,300 miles west of California.

Naval experts say that from at least 10 days to 2 weeks were required for Nipponese submarines and other war vessels to get to the positions in which they were when they launched their attack. This is definite proof that the representations being made by Nomura and Kurusu were not sincere.

Our answer to this infamous outbreak must be quick and emphatic. The people of America, isolationists and interventionists, middle-of-the-roaders and carenots, workers and employers, rich and poor, strong and weak, all are now of one mind and are ready and willing to do all in their power to bring the conflict to a victorious end for the United States, and that at the earliest possible moment.

We are at war. There is no more time for arguments, and, furthermore, there is no room left for arguments. We must now act and act quickly. Full speed ahead for everybody and in everything should now be our slogan. Victory our goal.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, Japan's cowardly attack in the Pacific leaves us with no alternative but to strike back with every resource at our command.

Americans are traditionally a peaceful people, slow to anger and slow to take up the sword. But this natural aversion for war should not be construed as weakness, for once aroused, once an enemy threatens our homes, our institutions, or our way of life, no people are more to be feared.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are aroused today—aroused and united in a demand for vengeance against our common enemy.

As a Member of Congress, as a Reserve officer, and as a plain citizen anxious to do my bit, I pledge my sincere, loyal, and unflinching support of America's defense against aggression in the Pacific.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, tolerance, the watchword of America in the present world conflict until a brief 24 hours ago, has been ruthlessly violated beyond any further hope of endurance. The unprovoked and cowardly attacks on outlying possessions of the United States in the Pacific cannot be expected to go unchallenged by the American people.

We are a patient and peace-loving people. Our national ambitions have long been far above the avaricious tendencies of the Old World. We have sought by every decent means to stay out of a world conflict from which no good can possibly be derived. We will not even now suffer a loss of our high ideals, but act to further strengthen them by dealing as only we can deal with international bandits, highwaymen, and thugs, who violate all decency and out of the dark assault us.

The attack on our Pacific possessions yesterday is an attack on our homes, our institutions, and our ideals which we are pledged to protect.

As an American I can see no reason why we should not fulfill a solemn duty to enforce that pledge of protection to our country. As a Member of the Congress I pledge my full support to whatever course of action is democratically determined upon to see this thing through.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the die is cast. We are at war. The Japanese, like murderous imps from hell, are clutching at our throats. We have struck back and will continue to strike hard, with every ounce of energy we possess, in the defense of our people and our homes. In this hour of greatest tragedy, involving our lives and our very national existence, we must be just, calm, determined, strong, and united. We are. Our people are slow to anger, but when great provocation and justice demands, they rise in their righteous might to strike with every fiber of their strength, buoyed up by the justice of their cause. We are united in this grim business of defending our homes against the treacherous double dealing of this foe, who comes to our very doors from afar, with the stench of hell upon his garments, extending the olive branch with one hand, while with the other hurling death-dealing bombs upon innocent unsuspecting people. God, in His infinite wisdom, will visit the just retribution of the damned upon the perpetrators of this vile perfidy.

This great tragedy visited upon us by an unworthy foe has already brought death and destruction to our citizens going about their ways of peace. The homes and property and defenses of our people have been destroyed. We must and will fight to the last ditch to preserve America. No recourse is left to us but to strike back with all our power. Japan must be crushed. Her treacherous and dastardly attack on us, taking heavy toll in precious lives, while her impudent emissaries were mouthing false peace proposals to our President and our Secretary of State, will go down in history as one of the most diabolical events in the history of all ages. Japan's crazed war lords have become mad dogs loose in the world, ruthlessly destroying innocent people—first the peace-loving Chinese—now us Americans, who down through the ages have always befriended her. May we be forgiven for unwittingly furnishing to her much of the tools and implements of death and destruction she is now turning upon us, to snuff out the lives of our own people.

The only charge Japan can bring against us is that this great liberty-loving Nation has given material aid to the innocent Chinese in their heroic struggle to beat back the ravaging hordes from Japan, ruthlessly destroying their innocent citizens and their country. It cannot be overlooked that we at the same time also supplied Japan with much of the necessary materials needed by her to carry forward her conquest of this peaceful nation. We cannot confuse the issue now confronting us. Many of us gave a solemn pledge to our people that we would not vote to send our soldiers beyond the Americas to fight in foreign wars unless we were attacked. I made this pledge. I have maintained my pledge. We have now been attacked in the Western Hemisphere. We are fighting a war of self-defense. Japan has not only cruelly attacked us behind our backs while professing to plead for peace but she has actually declared war upon us.

I have done everything within my power, as God has given me the vision to see the way, to maintain our country at peace. Our efforts have been impotent to ward off the evil day. War has now been thrust upon us. It is not ours any more to decide. All that remains now is to defend ourselves. This we will do, with a prayer on our lips that God in His mercy and love, will soon bless our Nation with peace with all the nations of the earth.

Congress must not and will not, in this critical hour facing our people, fail to embrace the opportunity to pledge our full strength in men and resources to the grim task of beating down these hellish invaders spreading over the earth like a pestilence. In this momentous task—the greatest that ever confronts a nation, waging a war of self-defense—we will find no American holding back. We all will give in full measure our strength, our

devotion, our possessions, and life itself if necessary, to bring success to our righteous cause. We are now united in the one great endeavor which dwarfs all others—the defense of our firesides and our people. No one will halt or hesitate until these brown devils from over the seas have been crushed to earth and civilization saved from the ravages concocted by the diseased minds in control of this treacherous nation.

Our cause being just, we will win. Let us not, however, deceive ourselves. We cannot by swift blows crush these artful and clever geniuses of destruction. We must gird ourselves to face a long hard pull, and with the grim realization that the job will not be an easy one. It will mean reverses, hardships, privations, suffering, and death. Sacrifice, blood, and toil will be the price we must pay. In the end our cause will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, when the war lords and their henchmen who have brought this tragedy upon their people have been destroyed, a cankerous growth which is eating its way into the vitals of the nation will have been removed from the Japanese people. When that time comes—and God grant it may be soon—we in America will be the first again to lend a helping hand of fellowship to a contrite and penitent Japanese people and to help them to remove the murder stains from their blood-soaked garments, that they may again justly deserve the decent opinions of mankind and their country become again a law-abiding member of the family of nations and not an outcast, despised of men everywhere.

The tumult and the shouting dies—
The captains and the kings depart—
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following letters written by me today to the President and the Secretary of War:

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMANDER IN CHIEF: As I go to the Capitol for the joint session of Congress, I believe I am justified in anticipating what is to happen.

It is my opinion that a declaration of war should be declared against, not only Japan, but Germany and Italy as well. My reason for believing that war should be declared against Germany and Italy while declaring it against Japan is that these states are all members of an unholy alliance, seeking world domination by brutal force; and there should be no further waiting in declaring our intention to crush that aggression in all its parts.

Before I have cast my vote for a declaration of war, I herewith tender my services in any capacity with the armed forces at any place and any time you feel that I might be of greater service than I am now as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As I go to the Capitol for the joint session of Congress, I believe I am justified in anticipating what is to happen.

It is my opinion that a declaration of war should be declared against, not only Japan, by Germany and Italy as well. My reason for believing that war should be declared against Germany and Italy while declaring it against Japan is that these states are all members of an unholy alliance, seeking world domination by brutal force; and there should be no further waiting in declaring our intention to crush that aggression in all its parts.

Before I have cast my vote for a declaration of war, I herewith tender my services in any capacity with the armed forces at any place and any time you feel that I might be of greater service than I am now as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the first Japanese bomb that exploded on an unsuspecting Hawaii on yesterday blasted away all the hesitation, confusion, and doubt from the mind of America. It was from that moment on not a question what America would decide to do. The decision was already taken. The fires of destruction that were set by this same Japan in Manchukuo in September 1931 had run full circle round the world. The last great nation that had hoped it could cling to some sort of peace had been attacked. There was not a shadow of doubt about the aggressive nature of the attack. It had come at the very moment when the President was addressing peace appeals to the Emperor of Japan and when Japanese representatives were discussing with Secretary Hull their reply to American proposals for settlement of the problems of the Far East.

Millions of Americans had not believed such a thing would happen. They had believed the choice of war or peace was still theirs. But when the decision passed from their hands they were ready to meet it with all the determination and devotion of a united and intensely patriotic people. A hundred million people throughout the United States spent the afternoon and evening of Sunday, December 7, 1941, with their ears very close to their radios. And as they listened they began to realize that their world of that morning was gone and that they would be confronted on the next day with beginning the long and sacrificial task of building a new world on the wreckage of the ambitions of nations like Japan whose leaders place no limitations on the expansion of their power except the limit of military conquest which they could effect.

All that was yesterday. Today is Monday, December 8.

Acceptance by the Congress of the ruthless challenge of Japan and formal recognition of the fact that a state of war exists are foregone conclusions. The vote in all probability will be unanimous.

From that point on the manifold task of the American people will include the following:

First. To gather together the full strength of the Nation in order to bring the conflict, already joined, to as speedy and successful a conclusion as possible.

Second. To distribute the burdens as equitably and evenly among all our people as humanly possible—requiring of each a sacrifice commensurate with his ability to make sacrifice.

Third. To understand the causes of these wars, to see clearly they have come upon the peoples of the world because of the control of certain nations by groups which put their whole reliance in an arrogant and unconfined use of force.

Fourth. To cling to the fundamental values and ideals which have been the basis of civilization through all the ages and to begin even now the work of trying to bring the world back to them.

Out of the suffering and destruction through which the world must pass in the months and probably years that lie immediately ahead there must come certain forces of regeneration. They will be essentially religious and spiritual forces. For only that kind can survive a time into which we are heading. The sooner they begin to appear the better, for without them there will be hopelessness and despair. And hope is the one thing mankind cannot live without.

I do not believe that God has brought mankind to this time when there could be a full life for all human beings only to mock us and leave us to self-destruction. I believe there are scattered around the world men and women through whom these new forces of regeneration will begin to flow into the minds and hearts of men. Eventually they must find their way into the councils of nations, into the methods of doing business, into the rules that govern the distribution of necessary goods among the people.

It is for us to be alive and alert to these new forces, for we cannot tell from where they will come. But either this world and this life are no more than a mockery or else there will come the regeneration I am here predicting.

Two principal evils have brought this world-wide conflict upon mankind. The first of these is the ambition of selfish and arrogant men and the belief of certain peoples that they are superior to other men. The regenerative forces I have spoken of will strike down pride wherever they find it; they will level it to the ground; they will exalt the simple people of the earth on whom the full weight of this stark tragedy will fall.

The second evil that has brought this tragedy to the world is the failure of the leaders of the nations to provide the means of distributing an abundance of goods among all the people. For this lies at the root of the drive for living room, for foreign trade, for control of markets and of raw materials. The answer to this problem is the answer to war and the secure foundation for peace. Even as we seek to defeat the forces of wrong which have made war on the peace of the world we must address ourselves to this problem. Upon its solution depends the whole fate of future generations.

It is the solemn duty of every American in this hour to determine in his own mind where and how he can best serve. For not one person can be spared from the united effort. Somewhere there is a place for every one of us. And upon each doing his part will depend the success of the whole.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased the Members of the House saw fit to grant unanimous consent to the motion made by the majority leader the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in order that individual Members might have an opportunity to extend their remarks on the resolution by which the Congress declared a state of war to exist between the United States and Japan.

The speed with which this resolution was voted on, prompted by the desire of the American people to move with all possible unity and dispatch, frustrated by a few moments my opportunity to cast my vote in favor of the resolution. Had I been able to obtain transportation to Washington which would have brought me to the Capitol but a few minutes earlier, I would have voted for the resolution declaring us to be at war with Japan.

When the news of the treacherous Japanese attack on Hawaii reached me I was in Los Angeles and immediately made arrangements to obtain a place on the first available east-bound plane. This plane, a TWA stratoliner, left Los Angeles at 6 o'clock Sunday evening and carried me to Indianapolis this morning. I then proceeded via American Airlines to Washington, reaching the Capital Airport at 1:28 Monday afternoon, five minutes ahead of the plane's regularly scheduled arrival.

With me on the plane were my colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman McARDLE, and the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman VINCENT, and through the splendid cooperation of the Metropolitan Police of Washington we reached the Capitol with the greatest possible haste. Our arrival proved to be mere minutes after the voting was concluded.

Although I suffered a personal disappointment in not having an opportunity to add another vote to the all but unanimous support given the resolution by my colleagues, I find great satisfaction in the knowledge that the Congress of the United States, as well as the people of the district I represent and the country generally, are firm in their resolve that our reply to the outrages perpetrated by the Japanese shall be the destruction of the forces that have attacked us.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us for consideration House Joint Resolution 254, a joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

A few moments ago, assembled in this great Hall of the House of Representatives in a solemn joint session, there were present the entire membership of the other body and which also were present the Justices of the Supreme Court and the Cabinet of the President. We listened to a clear, straightforward, and convincing message from the President, which he concluded with a request that the Congress declare that a state of war exists betwene Japan and the United States.

It is a solemn moment in our history. Let us meet the issue in the same direct manner in which it was offered by the President.

Our vote should be unanimous. Our armed forces have been attacked, our island possessions have been fired upon, and our ships have been sunk. All of this from a nation with whom we were at peace.

For me, there is but one course, and that course requires that I answer the appeal of the President in the affirmative and pledge my wholehearted support, personally and officially, to the President during this crisis. This I will do. The American people shall do the same.

Our freedom of speech and expression, our freedom of worship, our freedom from want, and our freedom from fear must and will be preserved, so help us God.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago today I was in France after two battles rejoicing with the men of my command and all others in uniform over the fact that we had just won the greatest of all wars—to end war. I returned a few months later to see for the first time my son, then 6 weeks old, who today, 23 years of age, wears the uniform of his country as part of the great and splendid army we have been training to meet any eventuality. I never thought in those days I would be called on to vote for a declaration of war as I intend to do in a few moments, but such is to be the unanimous decision of a Congress, which has done its best to prepare the United States to defend itself and at the same time has prayed and hoped its desire for peace would be absorbed by others throughout the world, thereby avoiding hostilities.

The conduct of Japan on yesterday serves to illustrate more forcibly than any other way we could devise the mistakes of the past, the needs of the present, and the great and noble accomplishments throughoutout the world which will be our objective in the future. I shall strive hereafter not alone to bring victory to our cause but, more important, to demand that no armistice shall be permitted to stop our onward march to a clean-cut victory, but surrender, and that alone, shall end this war. Our dealings in the future with those who seek peace at our hands must be by those whose hands are clean and above the table. Those representing our cause must be men who know what war is and also know with whom they are dealing. This course, and this alone, will assure the just reward our splendid Army and Navy will deserve when victory is theirs.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, the momentous resolution before the House of Representatives for immediate consideration under suspension of rules, much as it is to be regretted, in my judgment was inevitable. Whether Commodore Perry was right in undertaking to bring to the heathen Nipponese the advantages of civilization, appears in the light of current events questionable.

From my earliest youth I recall the activities of the churches in my nativity, in sending missionaries to the land of Nippon to bring Christianity to all the world in keeping with the teachings of the Master. The degree of success is still questionable in the light of the un-Christian treachery of the most enlightened of their Nation sent to this land of ours under the guise of diplomacy. From about 1909 forward it has been evident that very definitely the action we are about to take would be an inevitable consequence.

The action I will take today, and the vote I will cast in favor of the resolution, might the better been cast during the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, after Japan had launched her undeclared war on China and had bombed the U. S. S. *Panay*. "Sorry, sir! Excus, plees!" was as inadequate then and treacherous as the example brought home to us today.

The President of the United States with his Neutrality Act of 1935, operative, mandating him to impose an embargo when a state of war was found to exist between states, to my dissatisfaction, obviously could not recognize the then state of war existing but divested himself of his "quarantine speech" in Chicago, while under commercial treaty we continued to do "business with Japan as usual." Steel, scrap iron, oil, and gasoline continued to be exported—"business as usual." Throughout the early autumn of this year, we were confronted with the situation of an alleged gasoline shortage to American citizens as represented by Secretary Ickes, while Secretary Hull was still supplying shipments of the American product to Japan. I recall and preserved the cartoon of Secretary Ickes operating an American gasoline station, turning down the American customer, and Secretary Hull operating the pumps at a competing station "business as usual" to Japan.

When during the early months of the Seventy-fifth Congress, Ambassador Saito, after being introduced to Members of Congress by our former colleague, Congressman Wade Hampton Kitchens, of Arkansas, attempted to explain and justify his nation's attack on China as an act of discipline over a little riot at a bridge crossing, his palpable lying was that revolting, that in the presence of two companions I personally attempted something on him. He was seated at the witness table in the committee room where the gathering was held, while we occupied the elevated seats of committee members. From this vantage point I centered my gaze continuously on the back of his head and evolved in my mind constant disagreement with his falsity. He began to squirm and turn about to look whence the hostile reaction came, fawn an affected smile in our direction, stretch his long snake-like neck, and set his slant eyes at an angle, depicting the treachery of the reptile his craning so aptly typified. My companions, knowing what I was about, can bear witness to the reaction of the subject on which it was centered. It was then that I became fully reconciled to the inevitability of the action we are compelled to take today, and I was ready for it then, and deeply regret today that it was not taken then, and before the dire consequences that force it upon us now.

Mr. Speaker, I have frequently found myself in disagreement with the foreign policy of the administration and have so voted in opposition. Now that war has

been both declared and waged upon us by treacherous attack, when the emissaries of the slant-eyed Nippons deceptively sought to allay suspicion until ready to strike in attack, sought to continue conversations to and throughout the very moment and after the attack had been actually made, beggars description. I am therefore prepared and ready to give my country the last full measure of devotion and assistance to the successful prosecution of this war to its effective and successful conclusion, pledging the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the best service of which I am capable. The stirring words of Patrick Henry, "Is life so dear, is peace so sweet, to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I care not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death," thrill me today as when first to grip my fancy in youth; and then supplemented by Stephen Decatur: "My country, may she ever be right; but, right or wrong—my country."

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, under date of November 14, 1941, and by way of setting forth my position on the Senate amendments to the neutrality law, I stated it as my opinion that we were then witnessing a crisis in Japanese and American relations. Although I was so convinced, little did I believe that the break in these relations was to come in so unexpected and treacherous a manner as we now know.

Despite the earnest efforts of our Government to avoid hostilities in the Pacific, the Japanese forces, without warning, have invaded American shores. They have taken numerous American lives and caused great destruction of property. These outrages were committed by a country which, at the very time of their perpetration, was falsely representing itself as desirous of continuing peaceful negotiations.

It is my firm opinion that nothing else that might have happened could have been more effective in convincing America of the dangers confronting it in the world today and of the necessity for complete national unity. This unwarranted Japanese invasion of American soil, located thousands of miles from Japan, is the answer to the questions of many persons who have been heretofore honestly perplexed as to the course that America should follow.

We now know the truth. There is only one course left open to us, unless we wish to surrender. That course is for a united America to strike back hard at the invader and, moreover, to take all the necessary steps to assure ourselves, so far as we can, that no similar outrage shall ever again be perpetrated against us.

With full appreciation of the consequences which will necessarily follow the adoption of this joint resolution, and with a perfectly clear conscience, I find it necessary to vote for it, as it does nothing more than recognize the existence of a situation thrust upon us and which we know exists, much as we would like it to be otherwise.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, America today faces one of the most serious periods in our history with but one decision which can be made. We must speak here in the House of Representatives without a dissenting voice to grant the Government of the United States the powers necessary to avenge the brutal attack made yesterday on our possessions and on the lives of our citizens, both military and civilian. We have not asked for war with Japan; neither have we sought it. We have done everything within our power for 10 years to appease Japan. We are a peaceful Nation, but when a Nation presuming friendship with the United States and professing to honor that friendship attacks not only our life line of vital industrial supplies, but our national as well, we can become as belligerent and as fierce as is necessary to achieve inevitable victory over our treacherous enemy. Mr. Speaker, once before in my lifetime the very foundations upon which the freedom of this Nation is established were threatened with destruction. I am proud to say that in that grave hour I was able to serve my country and my flag. I was able to see at first-hand the ugly side of war. I am not unmindful of that ugly side of this war, neither am I unmindful of the sacrifice which those behind the lines will be called upon to make, but our freedom would be worth nothing to us unless we have the courage to make those sacrifices. Casting a vote in favor of a declaration of war against the Japanese Empire is something I am doing with firm conviction, but with a heavy heart. I have an only son who today is the same age as I was in 1917. He is ready to serve his country in whatever military or naval capacity he is needed. Since the deadly dive bombers of the Japanese Empire dropped their loads of destruction and death on United States territory a number of my friends and constituents have called me seeking advice whether to enlist or await the call under the draft machinery which has been set up by Congress. These people are typical of every citizen in the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. I know that every person in that district, I might even say that everyone in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, will back up the votes that my colleagues and I make today in support of this war resolution. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of this House, that without reservation my constituents feel that no sacrifice is too great to make to achieve a victory over the enemies of the United States of America.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we as representatives of the American people will approve this resolution for a declaration of war as our answer in ringing terms to the dastardly attack on this Nation last Sunday by the warmongering aggregation of Japanese militarists in the name of the Empire of Japan.

Already the flesh and blood of hundreds of American fathers and mothers have been sacrificed through the treachery of a nation who violated all civilized law in attacking this Republic while here in the Nation's Capital spokesmen for both Governments were attempting as peaceful nations to arrive at a mutual understanding of the differences involved.

On October 15, last, I returned to the House of Representatives after a 45-day tour of duty with the Pacific Fleet. During that time I was attached to the staff of Admiral C. C. Kimmel, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, based at Honolulu.

During this tour of duty and in my capacity as a lieutenant in the United States Naval Reserve I was given the opportunity to become personally acquainted with the officers and men of the Pacific Fleet and to observe the United States Navy in all of its splendor. Yesterday the Imperial Government of Japan through its cowardly attack shocked the conscience of nearly every nation and inflicted, we are told, heavy losses on our Pacific Fleet and civilian population in the vicinity of Honolulu.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the injuries inflicted by the Japanese on the Hawaiian Islands last Sunday will be avenged a thousandfold and that history will record that the Japanese Government through its warmongering clique of militarists will pay dearly for their suicidal excursion to our Pacific possessions.

Mr. Speaker, the might and majesty of the Pacific Fleet have since been translated into action while the American people united as they were in the days of 1917–18 are prepared to see this fight through to victory regardless of blood or tears.

This is no time to quibble. Our Nation has been attacked. What are we waiting for?

Let us at once declare war on the Empire of Japan and all other nations who are aiding and abetting this yellow peril to the American way of life that has already murdered in cold blood our own fellow Americans.

Action—not words—are necessary. Forward, America. With God's help we will atone for every American life that has been taken by a rousing American victory.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, recognizing the state of war which Japan has precipitated and giving the President the war powers which were given to President Wilson in 1917, has my wholehearted support. I urge its immediate and unanimous adoption.

I have opposed the steps our country has taken toward war. I have supported the steps our country has taken to prepare and protect itself if war should come to us. I have urged that we should continue our peace efforts at the same time that we continue our defense efforts. I had high hopes for our peace efforts in the Pacific. It is true that I have felt that this effort should have been made long ago. On June 29, 1939, before the war in Europe had started, but while the China-Japanese struggle was in progress, I said on this floor:

> I think we are making a great mistake in trying to determine our possible conduct in a future war in Europe before we determine our present conduct in a present struggle in the Orient. We have let our excitement about what may happen to our remote interests in Europe blind us to what is happening to our immediate interests in the Orient, where our

treaty rights are being violated daily. We should stop arming Japan instead of planning to arm Europe.

If we had followed this course the story of the last 3 years might have been different. I have felt for years that the whole chain of events that have led up to the present world-wide reign of terror and lawlessness began when the Japanese entered Manchuria in 1931 and the democracies of that day failed in their obligations to each other and to the world. I had hoped that the beginnings of a new reign of law and order might come through the restoration of peace and justice in the Orient through the efforts of the very nations which had failed in 1931. I knew that the negotiations between our country and Japan were difficult and that there was a possibility of failure, but I never conceived of the black perfidy of the Japanese war lords, who used the very period of our patient efforts for a friendly settlement to move into a position for attack.

Regardless of what we have done or failed to do in the past, war has come when we were trying for peace. It is our war now. The first news is shocking and discouraging, but if our Navy is as good as our officials have told us it is, the Japanese will soon learn the hard way that treachery and terror will not work with Americans. We can be fooled sometimes, but we do not scare easily, and when our friendship is betrayed we can be terribly tough.

By this vote today America assumes world leadership in a world-wide struggle for a just peace. We will never turn back. We are determined to preserve our freedoms here. We will discuss how to wins, but never whether. Our united loyalty is pledged not to a hatred, not to a man, but to an ideal—to bring peace on earth for man of good will, and to fight for that ideal.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I agree emphatically with the sentiment expressed here today by the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] when he said, "This is a time for action, not words." I simply want to record here my conviction that the Japanese attacks upon America have brought a challenge to America which calls upon us to vote an immediate declaration of war upon Japan in conformity with the President's recommendations and which compels us to devote our full energies, without delay, to the repulse and defeat of the dastardly forces which have struck at us from the darkness of the night in the early hours of a peaceful Sabbath.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I urge this House to unite as one Member in casting a unanimous vote in favor of the declaration of war which the President has rightfully told us has now become an inevitable course of action which must be followed. Let us follow it with all factions and parties marching shoulder to shoulder with grim fortitude so that peace can come more quickly by making victory easier. The full strength of a united and determined America must and will be devoted to crushing those who committed this revolting and treacherous attack upon American soil and American lives.

I have been one who has hoped and prayed that America might be spared the shooting sacrifices of this cruel war. But, as I stated in an open letter to my constituents on November 3, "as God gives me the strength and knowledge, I shall do my best to help conclude the war in such a way as to preserve our American destiny should men or events unhappily force America into the bloody holocaust." The Japanese by their unwarranted and stealthy duplicity made our course clear in the early morning hours of December 7.

While there may be some reason to wish that our administration had pursued a less provocative foreign policy while we were perfecting our own defenses, there is nothing which can remotely justify the jackal attack of the Japanese which was made at the very time their official representatives were presenting protestations of peace to our State Department. Let the Congress and the country, therefore, join today in a mighty and unceasing drive to defeat these forces of evil and to help reshape the world so that once again God's Sabbath can become a day of worship rather than a day of launching crusades of wanton and wicked destruction. By our quick and united action now, let us show the world that our peaceful Republic is not one to be frightened or foiled by disciples of militarism. By resolute and determined action let us today warn all other aggressors that, while America is reluctant to enter war, she is also impossible to stop until her honor and interests are fully vindicated. Mr. Speaker, America seeks no aggrandizement, but she succumbs to no threat of aggression.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart but with a clear conscience and a firm voice that I urge this House to pass the declaration of war now before us with the clear recognition that there is no other honorable course open to us and that nothing must be permitted to delay the day when this task can be completed in victory.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it has come—the war which for so long we have been seeking to avoid. It came with cunning suddenness and terrible force. It came after long negotiations and at a time when representatives of the Imperial Japanese Government, professing friendship and a desire for peace, sat at the counsel table of our own people, discussing methods of averting bloodshed. As the first streak of day fell upon the broad waters of the Pacific, the war planes and the battle craft of the Empire of the Rising Sun roared out on their fateful mission toward our naval base at Pearl Harbor.

The story of death and destruction which have been visited upon the quiet city of Honolulu and upon our defenses is being brought to us in every message which comes from our island possessions. The shock of the first dastardly attack is over and America is now collecting herself. Our flag has been fired upon and our institutions are menaced. Discord and division have left us; and in its stead our people find themselves resolute in the firm, unfaltering determination of protecting our land, our democracy, and our liberty.

This, of course, means force; force to the utmost; force which will crush the Japanese Fleet and drive this pagan power from a Godly world. But America is prepared for this sacrifice and to this end we pledge ourselves and every power and resource of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have prayed God that this day might not come and that this Nation might be spared the blight of war. In this matter we had no alternative, even had we sought to avoid war at the expense of our own honor and decency. The gage of battle has been thrown to us, and we fight for our very existence and that of our homes and our families. In such a struggle we cannot fail.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I have always spoken against resorting to war as a national policy. During the past 5 years, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have most consistently supported the President of the United States in what I believed were those steps best calculated to keep us out of war and at the same time to secure for our country the respect of our international neighbors.

Foreign relations have no mathematical rigidity. Directing a nation through the maze of conditions and situations that are constantly in flux requires a master hand at the helm of government. This we have had. And if the exercise of patience and discretion had received its just reward, we would not now be faced with a state of war.

After the events of yesterday there should be no longer any doubt as to the character of the fight that is being waged against us. A pagan philosophy, championed by the greatest war machine of all time, is sweeping the earth and leveling all the standards of honor and decency by which men have attained to their present stature in the eyes of God.

The question for us to determine here today is whether it is best to rise in defense of our civilization or to permit our Christian philosophy to succumb before the onward march of tyranny; whether it is our duty to try to preserve our precious liberties by fighting back against the murderous onslaught of the invaders or to sue for peace and accept the destiny totalitarianism has in store.

I cannot conceive that any of my people should be in doubt as to my decision. With them I say the liberties we Americans enjoy, the things we love, are so well worth preserving that we are ready to fight to retain them. For "liberty is not only a heritage but a fresh conquest for each generation."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House reads as follows:

Whereas the Imperial Japanese Government has committed unprovoked acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is

hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The adoption of this resolution is the only brave and honorable answer that this House can make to the unprovoked attack made upon us by the naval and air forces of Japan on Sunday morning, December 7, 1941. This premeditated, deliberate, and cowardly attack upon the people of the United States by the assassins and bandits of the Pacific was deadly because it was treacherous and succeeded because it was unexpected.

The attack was planned and carried into execution under the smoke screen of pretended negotiations for a peacable settlement of the differences between this country and Japan. While the Japanese diplomatic representatives in this country were carrying on discussions looking to a peaceable adjustment of the Asiatic situation, the armed forces of Japan stealthily crept to the attack.

Japan has long been a constant threat and menace to the peace of mankind. Her aim is world dominion. If she is permitted to seize the natural resources of Asia—oil, tin, copper, iron, rubber, and other strategic war materials in which that great continent and the islands of the Pacific are rich—and if she becomes the master of the manpower of that vast region, she would control limitless war-making materials and be in command of one-half the population of the globe. Thus armed and equipped for conquest, the Japanese could and would force a black-out of civilization and Christianity throughout the world. If she is permitted to succeed in her godless, overleaping, and limitless ambition, mankind would, for centuries, bow beneath her ruthless might.

The right of self-defense is the first law of nature. The adoption of this resolution is imperative and is demanded in the name of our national defense. The blood of assassinated, butchered American heroes cries to us from the ground. The anguished hearts of their loved ones shall not appeal to us in vain. In the defense of our freedom, in the defense of our national existence, in the defense of our homes and loved ones we shall avenge their deaths. By this declaration we place behind our armed forces on sea, on land, and in the air the marshaled might of our 132,000,000 people. To the ultimate and overwhelming victory of our armed forces we pledge, as did the patriots of old, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

In the words of Stephen Decatur, we say again:

Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong!

This resolution will be adopted as a pledge to our people that our country will remain forever free, and its adoption serves notice on our enemies that we intend to fight until victory overwhelming and complete has crowned our efforts.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for the second time during my service in this House it becomes my painful duty to support a resolution taking the United States into war. I am the only Member still serving in Congress who, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1917, voted for the resolution declaring war against Germany.

Since my childhood I have been against war and oppression, and when the first World War was over I strongly supported the efforts of that great humanitarian, Woodrow Wilson, to bind the nations of the world in a pact to outlaw war. If the politics and personal grudges of some Members of the Senate had not kept the United States from becoming a member of the League of Nations then, we would today find a world free of war. It is so evident now that if the League of Nations had been a potent body the long series of aggressions that have culminated in this war would have never occurred.

I quote from a speech I made on this floor on March 18, 1938:

I am confident today, beyond all doubt, that had the United States joined the League of Nations it would have strengthened and preserved the League in full vigor and effectiveness and we would not have present-day conditions, with all democracies of Europe either destroyed or on the verge of destruction. I still believe that under the terms of the League Covenant we could have precluded the mad rearmament race by close adhesion to and renewal of the provisions of the Washington Arms Conference after the 10-year limit, to the lasting benefit of all civilization. At the conclusion of the Washington Arms Conference the United States felt fairly easy; and it was only our absence from membership in the League that led first Germany, then Italy, and, shortly thereafter, Japan to withdraw from membership in the League. Then trouble began. The plot thickened. Now we have the fruit

I have declared on many occasions that if the United States had entered the League of Nations, due to our tremendous moral and economic power, it would have been possible to prevent war by economic sanctions. When the present conflict is over I hope we shall not make the same mistake in not performing our duty and taking our part in the establishment of a durable peace.

Some Members of Congress and certain sections of the press have permitted themselves to be influenced or blinded, and have refused to see clearly the danger which was confronting our country. Only the shock of an actual attack by these little yellow rats has finally opened their eyes. Now they know that even while bland Japanese liars told typical Japanese lies, posing as emissaries of peace, the war-drunk midgets they represent were seeking their airplanes and ships to attack our outposts.

Those who mislead our people, imposing upon them a propaganda manufactured abroad, attempting to lull them to sleep by charging that no nation had other than friendly feelings for us, may now see what a crime they have been guilty of. They assailed the President; they belittled his every statement. They shouted him down when he spoke of the dangers threatening our Nation, and by every act sought to block his efforts.

I hope that not a single American will again charge that our President was endeavoring to throw us into war. The cable he forwarded last Saturday to the Emperor of Japan, appealing for peace, is characteristic of the humility he showed in previously addressing Hitler and Mussolini and beseeching for peace. It shows how far he would go for peace.

Until a few days ago the appeasers challenged the President to submit the question of war to Congress. Today he did so, and the people, through their duly elected representatives, have shown their will.

I know the hardships, the trials and tribulations, the loss of life, and the great sufferings of war. To embark upon war is a serious step for any nation to take. Still there is nothing for us to do now but to go to war and as one man we must defend our country, its freedom, liberty, and independence. We can do that only by defeating the Axis Powers, by slapping down this presumptuous nation across the Pacific, and by bringing the fear of God to Hitler and Mussolini and all the bloodthirsty, power-seeking, ruthless outlaws surrounding that unholy pair.

And we must not forget that the future shall hold punishment for those who have embarked the world upon a bloody war. Let us not make the mistake we made after the last war, when we heeded the misguided who insisted that Germany had been sufficiently punished. By our own fault and lack of foresight we permitted that country to arm and train and prepare for the present war.

A nation or combination of nations which has tried, by lies, intrigues, subterfuge, and propaganda to mislead us, divide us, and then strike us when we were unprepared is not entitled to lenience. Such a nation should be so completely crushed that a repetition of its dastardly crimes will forever be impossible.

As the President has stated, with the help of God we shall soon demonstrate that treachery and unprovoked murder has its just reward.

Great Britain, Russia, and China are at our side. Those nations will not forget that we fight their battle as well as our own. South America, and in fact all liberty-loving nations of the world, will strive to help us, in our supreme effort to defeat the Axis dictators, to restore democracy, and to bring justice to those who by their crimes have plunged a world into blood and war.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, with the cowardly attack upon our Pacific possessions by the Japanese, there is but one answer—that answer is war. I have opposed what has been called the President's foreign policy because I was convinced it would lead to war. That is water over the dam. Our country has been brutally attacked by a foreign power, so it matters little at present just how it started. It is here, and the only course is to forget our differences for the present. There will be time for argument after we have finished this job with the Japanese and their allies.

To this task we should dedicate all our energies, all our strength, all our wealth, all our wisdom in one great crusade for the cause of those who believe in free institutions and fair play and honor among nations. To the issue of that crusade there can be no doubt, for on that proposition we have a united people who know, no doubt, of the justice of their cause nor question of the integrity of their purpose. There is no defeat for such a people.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is but one answer to the situation which confronts us—the verse of the brilliant Guilford, Conn., poet, Fitz-Green Halleck:

Strike—till the last armed foe expires;
Strike—for your altars and your fires;
Strike—for the green graves of your sires;
God—and your native land.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, through the centuries idealists have dreamed, saints have prayed, and poets have sung that there would come an endless epoch of universal peace, as described by Tennyson:

When the war drum throbs no longer,
And the battle flags are furled,
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world.

That is a beautiful dream, a sublime ideal, but there has been little, if any, change in human nature as the human race has staggered through centuries of recorded and unrecorded time. Until such attributes as avarice, covetousness, greed, envy, jealousy, selfishness, malice, cruelty, inordinate ambition, and lust for glory, power, and wealth are purged from the hearts of people composing the nations of the earth, overnight a covenant may become a rope of sand and a treaty a mere scrap of paper.

After hundreds of years of struggling and battling, suffering and sacrificing, for liberty, democracy, and justice; after 2,000 years of the march of Christianity and teaching of the doctrine of the Prince of Peace, "On earth peace, good will toward men," the things we hold most dear, our priceless liberties, our most cherished institutions, our soil, our citizens, are the object of direct attack by the most brutal, treacherous, ruthless military power that has ever cursed the earth, Adolf Hitler and his bloody alliance with Italy and Japan.

When the tocsin of war was sounded in Europe, many of us thought at first that perhaps it was only another of those European brawls which have occurred, as the eloquent Col. W. C. P. Breckinridge said of fires, "with constantly recurring periodicity." We did not have sufficient imagination to visualize that the slimy sewer rat Hitler could menace the peace and safety of civilization, conquer Continental Europe, and threaten ominously the subjugation or destruction of the remainder of the world. When he made promises of friendship tonight and tomorrow at dawn moved his iron legions, his panzer units and armored tanks, into countries that were following the quiet pursuits of peace; with bombs and torpedoes attacked unsuspecting peoples; destroyed cathedrals and museums of art that represented a thousand years of accumulated culture; slaughtered old men, women, and children, I quickly realized that no nation could be safe and no people could be permanently free until Hitler and his Italian and Japanese military marionettes are rendered utterly impotent and their power is totally destroyed.

The danger to institutions that are the precious heritage of English-speaking peoples in Britain and America was vividly illustrated when, on the same night, Westminster Abby, the symbol of faith, and the House of Commons, the symbol of representative government, were badly damaged by Hitler's bombs. Not only are our institutions menaced by this militant coalition of ruthlessness and murder, but at dawn yesterday, on the holy Sabbath, while our wise and peace-loving Secretary of State was striving to preserve peaceful relations with Japan, while their diplomatic representatives were still holding out delusions of hope that peace might be preserved, the Navy and air force of Japan made an unprovoked, premeditated, treacherous, destructive attack on the land and the armed forces of our country.

In this critical hour, as the representatives of an outraged people, duty requires that we accept the challenge, assert our inherent, God-given right and duty of self-defense, recognize the state of war imposed on us by Japan, and pledge all the resources of America to the winning of the conflict. There can be no alternative. Let it be: "War to the knife, and the knife to the hilt."

In this crisis we must have unity of thought, unity of sentiment, unity of spirit, unity of purpose, unity of action. This is no time for arguments between reactionary and progressive Republicans, between conservative Democrats and New Deal liberals. No, there is no time now for differences between Republicans and Democrats. There is no place in this Republic for any "isms" except pure, unadulterated, undefiled, and unterrified Americanism.

Now has come the time for action;
Lay aside all thought of faction,
Call the roll.

Let us be imbued with more of the spirit that characterized Admiral Farragut, who, a few years after the War between the States, while cruising in the Dardanelles near to the palace of the Sultan of Turkey, sent word to the Sultan that he would like to visit him. The Sultan sent back the message:

I will receive no one unless he be a prince of the blood royal.

That stirred the fighting blood of the old Tennessee admiral, who sent this reply:

Tell the Sultan that I have on board my flagship 600 American citizens. Every one of them is a prince of the blood royal in his own land. We expect to visit him in force immediately.

Needless to say, they received a royal welcome from his Sultanic Majesty. That spirit should permeate the American people until this war ends in complete victory for the forces of light over the forces of darkness; for liberty and democracy over despotism and totalitarianism. There is no room for any form of disloyalty anywhere under the protecting folds of Old Glory. As General Dix said more than four score years ago, "If anyone attempts to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot." In the language immortalized by one of my illustrious predecessors in the House, the beloved Joe C. S. Blackburn, for years the Prince Rupert of debate in this and the other body:

He who dallies is a dastard; he who doubts is damned.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, from now on December 7, 1941, will be known on the calendar of the world as Black Sunday and on the calendar of Japan as the day of its unpardonable transgression.

There is something wrong with a civilization that can produce leaders who, while yet professing peace and a disposition to adjust grievances, commit inhuman, stealthy, dastardly, cowardly acts, such as the Government of Japan visited upon our country on December 7, 1941.

That civilization must perish. There can be no lasting peace so long as such a civilization occupies even a small part of the world. And, Mr. Speaker, that civilization, by the avenging hand of a just God, acting through 130,000,000 American freemen, will perish. Yes, my colleagues, mark my words, December 7, 1941, will be avenged. It will mark the beginning of the end of Japanese civilization based upon stealth, treachery, and deceit.

The whole picture is now clear. Yesterday we were so dazed and shocked by its swiftness, its stealth, its inhumaneness that our minds became stunned and cloudy. It was hard for us to realize that such a thing could happen in a civilized world. Today we see clearly that they lured us on by words of peace, by misleading statements, in order to create an opportunity to stab us in the back. On some tomorrow of the future we will again talk peace with Japan, and when we do we will remember December 7, 1941, and the Japanese peopeople will then begin to realize that the blackness of that Sunday will not out, because we will write into that treaty terms that will live on down through the ages to curb such a people from ever again committing stealthy, vicious, dastardly acts against a peace-loving nation.

Today, December 8, 1941, with a swiftness and unanimity never before witnessed in this Republic, we have answered the challenge thrown out to us by this leprous, treacherous, pagan nation. The President asked the Congress to declare that a state of war existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire and the Congress, like true American freemen, unhesitatingly, and without delay, responded to that request.

And so we are at war, declared in a constitutional way by the Congress of the United States. While we hate war, while this war is not of our choosing, remember we have made our decision and it is now our war and if it is won we have got to do the winning.

The time for talk and bickering and controversy has ended. Action, concerted, unified action, is now the order of the day. To arms, to arms, every man to his task, working and fighting in unity and harmony. That is the price of victory. The slacker will not be tolerated in mill, factory, store, mine, field, office, or home any more than he will be tolerated upon the field of armed conflict. The battlefield now covers not only those places where the roar of the cannon and the zooming of the plane may be heard, but every mill, factory, store, mine, field, office, and home in this Republic. Every man, whether he uses a pen or pick, hammer or plow, is now in the service.

Mr. Speaker, our Republic is safe because we are united and have the will to win. I do not think I ever saw such a transformation. But yesterday we were arguing and bickering and in our national anthem there were a few dissonant sounds; today, thank God, we are together, united, and can sing anything from Yankee Doodle to Dixie without a single discord. Yes; we have unity, the will to win, and a just God, in whom we trust, will give us the victory.

The ides of March once brought a ruthless, ambitious, imperialistic emperor to his death, and marked the beginning of the end of a great empire that had outlived its usefulness.

The 7th of December portends the setting of the Empire of the Rising Sun. May American valor and courage, under the direction of a just God, speed the setting.

Americans, remember December 7, 1941.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been sneakingly assaulted by a coward, stabbed in the back in total abandonment of national honor; yes, struck from behind in the fashion of a serpent by the Empire of Japan.

The property of the United States has been destroyed and the blood of American youth drawn and deposited in the soil of the islands of the Pacific while loving mothers were in peace in homes and churches amid the civilization wrought by the blood of the forefathers of those whose lives were stolen yesterday by the most dastardly attack ever executed by a nation in a civilized age.

Running true to form, the Empire of Japan pursued what she termed negotiations looking to permanent peace between the two Governments while she was preparing her full plans for and during the execution of her attack. No government or man has ever committed a more abandoned outrage. It was an act of stealing the blood of innocent people while their confidence was maintained by declarations of friendship made for the vicious and treacherous purpose of catching them off guard.

A nation so devoid of character must not live; it is destined to perish, yes, perish before the might and power of the people she so unjustly attacked.

This Congress is going to vote for the resolution and make a formal declaration of war against the Empire of Japan. The armed forces of the United States and the people of the United States, with hearts of love for freedom of man, and souls of courage with the strength of steel, are going to crush that Nation and make her pay for property with property, and for blood with blood. He that will live by the sword must die by the sword, and I say to the American people on this crucial day when sorrow envelops our emotional existence, that Japan and her people will pay in blood one-hundredfold for the innocent blood they stole on yesterday.

The courage and determination of a unified people, and thank God for the unity in this House today, will take back to Japan and her people the terror she visited on us yesterday and make her cry aloud for the peace of a Sabbath she shattered with gunfire by the exercise of an unprecedented treachery.

I call on the people of these United States in this dark hour of our national life for unity in thought, purpose, and determination, and for the support of our President and Commander in Chief of our armed forces, in prayer and action, that the right of man to live in a state of freedom and justice may not perish before the forces of cowards who do not feel the impulses of honor.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I can best express my thoughts in the words of Stephen Decatur:

Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

We have done our best to avoid this war with Japan. Now she has asked for it. The only thing we can do is let her have it. By that I mean complete destruction of her war machine. Let us hope and pray that a minimum number of lives will be lost. Let us all work together and each do our part. There must be no politics. United we stand; otherwise we fall. We can and will win.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been struck an insidious, dishonorable, and cowardly blow directed against our fleet, our territory, and our citizens. The perpetrators will find that they have affronted a powerful foe. They will learn that when people accustomed to freedom are assailed they support their Government with every ounce of their strength and endurance. They will find the American people united in a determination to avenge a foul crime and exterminate a foul criminal. There is no disunion in America. The vote on the pending resolution will demonstrate to the world that our President has behind him a united Congress backed by a united public. America aroused will hesitate not an instant and will never rest until the world is rid of the monsters who planned and executed yesterday's dastardly outrage. Japan will rue the day that the fury of peaceful, liberty-loving people was unleashed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote, and on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands the yeas and nays. Those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. A roll call may not be interrupted.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—388

Allen, Ill.	Davis, Ohio	Hobbs
Allen, La.	Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman
Andersen, H. Carl.	Day	Holbrock
	Delaney	Holmes
Anderson, Calif.	Dewey	Hook
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dies	Hope
	Dingell	Houston
Andresen, August H.	Dirksen	Howell
	Disney	Hull
Andrews	Ditter	Hunter
Angell	Domengeaux	Imhoff
Arends	Dondero	Izac
Arnold	Doughton	Jacobsen
Barden	Douglas	Jarman
Barnes	Downs	Jarrett
Barry	Drewry	Jenkins, Ohio
Bates, Ky.	Duncan	Jenks, N. H.
Bates, Mass.	Durham	Jennings
Baumhart	Dworshak	Jensen
Beam	Eaton	Johns
Beckworth	Eberharter	Johnson, Ill.
Beiter	Edmiston	Johnson, Ind.
Bender	Eliot, Mass.	Johnson, Luther A.
Bishop	Elliott, Calif.	
Blackney	Elston	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Bland	Engel	
Bloom	Englebright	Johnson, Okla.
Boehne	Faddis	Johnson, W. Va.
Boggs	Fellows	Jones
Boland	Fenton	Jonkman
Bolton	Fish	Kean
Bonner	Fitzgerald	Kee
Boren	Fitzpatrick	Keefe
Boykin	Flaherty	Kefauver
Bradley, Mich.	Flannagan	Kelley, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Flannery	Kelly, Ill.
Brooks	Fogarty	Kennedy, Martin J.
Brown, Ga.	Folger	
Brown, Ohio	Forand	Kennedy, Michael J.
Bryson	Ford, Miss.	
Buck	Ford, Thomas F.	Keogh
Buckley, N. Y.	Fulmer	Kerr
Bulwinkle	Gamble	Kilburn
Burch	Gathings	Kilday
Burdick	Gavagan	Kinzer
Burgin	Gearhart	Kirwan
Butler	Gehrmann	Kleberg
Byrne	Gerlach	Klein
Byron	Gibson	Knutson
Camp	Gillie	Kocialkowski
Canfield	Gifford	Kopplemann
Cannon, Fla.	Gilchrist	Kramer
Cannon, Mo.	Gillette	Kunkel
Capozzoli	Gore	Lambertson
Carlson	Gossett	Landis
Case, S. Dak.	Graham	Lanham
Casey, Mass.	Granger	Lea
Celler	Grant, Ala.	Leavy
Chapman	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte
Chiperfield	Green	Lesinski
Clark	Guyer	Lewis
Clason	Gwynne	Ludlow
Claypool	Haines	Lynch
Clevenger	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCormack
Cluett		McGehee
Cochran	Hall, Leonard W.	McGranery
Coffee, Nebr.		McGregor
Coffee, Wash.	Halleck	McKeough
Cole, Md.	Hancock	McLaughlin
Collins	Hare	McLean
Colmer	Harness	McMillan
Cooley	Harrington	Maciejewski
Cooper	Harris, Ark.	Maciora
Cope'and	Harris, Va.	Mahon
Courtney	Hart	Manasco
Cox	Harter	Marcantonio
Cravens	Hartley	Martin, Iowa
Crawford	Healey	Martin, Mass.
Creal	Hébert	Mason
Crosser	Heffernan	May
Crowther	Heidinger	Merritt
Cutkin	Hendricks	Meyer, Md.
Cunningham	Hess	Michener
Curtis	Hill, Wash.	Mills, Ark.
D'Alesandro	Hinshaw	Mitchell

Monroney	Rivers	Sumners, Tex.
Moser	Rizley	Sutphin
Mott	Robertson, N. Dak.	Sweeney
Mundt	Robertson, Va.	Taber
Murray	Robsion, Ky.	Talle
Myers, Pa.	Rockefeller	Tarver
Nichols	Rodgers, Pa.	Tenerowicz
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Terry
Norton	Russell	Thom
O'Brien, Mich.	Sabath	Thomas, N. J.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sacks	Thomas, Tex.
O'Connor	Sanders	Thomason
O'Hara	Sasscer	Tibbott
O'Leary	Satterfield	Tinkham
Oliver	Sauthoff	Traynor
O'Neal	Scanlon	Treadway
Osmers	Schuetz	Van Zandt
O'Toole	Schulte	Vinson, Ga.
Pace	Scott	Voorhis, Calif.
Paddock	Secrest	Vorys, Ohio
Patman	Shafer, Mich.	Vreeland
Patrick	Shanley	Wadsworth
Patton	Shannon	Ward
Pearson	Sheppard	Wasielewski
Peterson, Fla.	Sheridan	Weaver
Peterson, Ga.	Short	Weiss
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Sikes	Wene
Pheiffer, William T.	Simpson	West
Pierce	Smith, Maine	Wheichel
Pittenger	Smith, Ohio	Whitten
Plauché	Smith, Pa.	Whittington
Ploeser	Smith, Va.	Wickersham
Plumley	Smith, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Poage	Smith, W. Va.	Williams
Powers	Smith, Wis.	Wilson
Priest	Snyder	Winter
Rabaut	Somers, N. Y.	Wolcott
Ramsay	South	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ramspeck	Sparkman	Wolverton, N. J.
Randolph	Spence	Woodruff, Mich.
Rankin, Miss.	Springer	Woodrum, Va.
Reece, Tenn.	Starnes, Ala.	Worley
Reed, Ill.	Stearns, N. H.	Wright
Reed, N. Y.	Stefan	Young
Rees, Kans.	Stevenson	Youngdahl
Rich	Stratton	Zimmerman
Richards	Sullivan	
	Sumner, Ill.	

NAYS—1

Rankin, Mont.

NOT VOTING—41

Baldwin	Gregory	Robinson, Utah
Bell	Hill, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.
Bennett	Jackson	Rolph
Buckler, Minn.	Johnson, Calif.	Romjue
Carter	Larrabee	Schaefer, Ill.
Cartwright	McArdle	Scrugham
Chenoweth	McIntyre	Steagall
Cole, N. Y.	Maas	Thill
Costello	Magnuson	Tolan
Cullen	Mansfield	Vincent, Ky.
Dickstein	Mills, La.	Walter
Ellis	Murdock	Welch
Ford, Leland M.	Nelson	White
Gale	O'Day	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their own remarks on the resolution just acted upon immediately prior to the roll call.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will that permit one to include in his remarks a telegram from a colleague showing how he would have voted?

The SPEAKER. His own remarks only. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members are unavoidably absent and on their way here. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF WAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 116, and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed unprovoked acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I am not going to object—this is the same declaration that we just passed?

The SPEAKER. The same.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the House passed House Joint Resolution 254 be vacated and that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize Members for call of bills on the District of Columbia Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that a cordon of police and soldiers was thrown around the Capitol Grounds, thereby preventing the taxicab in which I was riding to come within several squares of the House, I reached the floor of the House a few minutes after the roll call on the resolution declaring the existence of a state of war between our Nation and Japan. If I had not been delayed as aforesaid, I would have voted for the resolution.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote today against Japan. Yesterday afternoon I left Washington and drove straight through to Knoxville, Tenn., arriving there at 2:30 this morning without knowing that the Speaker had requested that all Members return immediately. At 7:10 this morning I heard the announcement and began at once a frantic effort to find airplane transportation. After calling Speaker RAYBURN twice from Knoxville I chartered a plane but could not get it off the ground because of Civil Aeronautics Authority orders to ground all civilian pilots. At 10:05 we got clearance, and although we made it in less than 3 hours the vote on the declaration of war against Japan was completed before I could get to the House Chamber. That is how fast democracy works once it is severely shaken.

Before leaving Knoxville I wired the pair Clerk of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Vote me "for" on any declaration of war against Japan and the Axis Powers. Am going to try to make it for the vote. Am chartering plane and leaving here now.

I want it understood that had I arrived a few minutes earlier I would have voted for the resolution.

At this point I want to recall a 1-minute speech which I made on the House floor on Monday, May 5, and which appears in the RECORD of that date at page 3647. I quote it here in full:

JAPAN AND THE AXIS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today's papers carry the headlines quoting Hitler, "We can beat the world." The same papers carry Foreign Minister Matsuoka's insult to the United States by inviting our President to come over and see "the true intentions of Japan."

I believe there is at least a 50–50 chance we are headed for deadly combat with Hitler. In that event Japan is pledged to stab us in the back. We know Japan's true intentions from Manchuria, China, and the *Panay*.

I am ready to give Japan 1 week to withdraw from the Axis, from China, and all Asia. Upon her failure to do that, we should begin at once the process of polishing her into insignificance. [Applause.]

That was more than 7 months ago. Had we taken the initiative then to do the very thing which we must now do defensively, it would have saved many warships and many planes and many lives.

Japan has jabbed a dagger in our back and we must now rise as one to the heights to which we are capable and crush her as she has never been crushed before.

And what is just as important is that after this war we must be a little more realistic and a little less idealistic and see to it that Japan is never able again to do what she has done.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances—weather conditions which delayed the plane I took to Washington—I was unable to reach the Capitol in time to be recorded on the vote on the declaration of war. I want to state for the record that I would have voted "aye" had I been present.

Japan's assault upon our bases in Hawaii and other possessions while her duly accredited representatives were negotiating with our Government will go down in history as one of the most despicable acts committed by any government. I have no doubts that Japan will reap the reward such action deserves.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House upon request of the majority leader, I want to make this statement:

This has been a sad and thrilling day for me. I left the bedside of my wife, who is ill at our home in Kentucky, and flew here today by airplane and reached the door of the House just as the vote was completed. I failed to make it by about 1 minute.

At Cincinnati, Ohio, I was joined by the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN COSTELLO, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman JOSEPH MCARDLE. We reached the airport here at 1:15 p. m., which is about 20 minutes ahead of schedule. We were met there by two motorcycle policemen, and they cleared the road of traffic and led the way to the Capitol. I want to congratulate them on the fine work they did.

I was shocked at the cowardly act of the Japanese, who struck at our forces without warning. Of course, I regret that I failed to reach the House in time to vote, but I am happy that my vote was not needed.

I am sure our Navy is able to handle the situation. The Naval Affairs Committee meets at 10 a. m. tomorrow, and we are putting the finishing touches to some matters that I think will make our armed forces more effective.

The House is to be congratulated on its action today, as the vote shows that we are a united people, and that we are ready to defend ourselves. We have the finest Fleet in the world, and I am certain it will punish severely the cowardly murderers who attacked our unsuspecting people. I have no doubt as to the outcome. I think we are prepared for this fight, and I know our boys will take full revenge for this dastardly act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have been attending public lands hearings with an official congressional committee, in the city of San Francisco and today I sent this wire to the House of Representatives:

Greatly regret inability to attend momentous session today because of distance; on official congressional business. I am very determined America must meet Japanese challenge to utter destruction of Asiatic war lords.

JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Member of Congress.

On Saturday, November 22, a little more than 2 weeks ago today, I reported to my people in Arizona, as follows:

In regard to the Japanese situation I believe there is a much sterner attitude shown by Members of Congress. A number of my colleagues have shown great indignation that we have appeased Japan as much as we have, and that we have furnished Japan oil and scrap material by which she has carried on her war against China during these years, and some of these same men declare openly that in spite of the kindly feeling of the Japanese people toward us, there can be no peace in the Pacific part of the world until the war lords of Japan are knocked about the ears and destroyed. A Member who has been least war-minded with regard to Europe said to me just recently, "Before we do another thing we ought to destroy the Japanese Fleet."

I haven't time to elaborate on these, but in this connection I do recall that it was Japan who flouted the naval limitation agreement of 1922, and who threw overboard the 5–5–3 naval arrangement which they had solemnly agreed to, and I'd be willing to bet any number of hats that the Japs have been building 45,000-ton battleships, while the rest of the world was supposed to be limited to 35,000-ton battleships. The war lords of Japan apparently have a superdose of that racial superiority complex as "sons of heaven," which may have to be eliminated before they can be lived with, in a world as small as this has come to be.

Mr. MCARDLE. Mr. Speaker, my absence today when the House voted on the resolution to declare war on the Government of Japan was due solely to my inability to reach Washington in time for that vote.

Being assured by the leadership of the House there was no important legislation coming up, I decided to take a few days' rest. I went to Florida. It was not until late Sunday that I learned of the unwarranted attack on our ships and shore stations by Japan. As quick as I could arrange transportation I left for Washington. I arrived at 1:20 Monday. The House vote on the war resolution I found was announced at 1:27.

Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that if I had been present I would have voted for the declaration of war. Further, I want to say that so long as I am a Member of Congress during this emergency I will support the recommendations of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and I know that in the end this country will destroy those who have murdered our soldiers and sailors, as well as civilians, at a time when their representatives were conferring with the President and Secretary of State, who sought peace with the Government of Japan.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement that it is the intention tomorrow to bring up the business that was scheduled for consideration today.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 116

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled Senate Joint Resolution 116.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts advise us whether bills on the Private Calendar will be called tomorrow?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is hoped they will be. If not, we will try to make arrangements to call them up on Wednesday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. CHAPMAN), on account of illness.

To Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. CHAPMAN), on account of illness.

To Mrs. NORTON, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement relating to the matter passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 9, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce scheduled for Tuesday, December 9, 1941, has been postponed until next January.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, December 9, 1941, on unfinished business and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. Tuesday, December 9, for consideration of H. R. 6135.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1121. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed amendatory legislation that is needed in connection with the settlement of damage claims and the acquisition of easement rights in connection with the operation of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Fort Hall, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

1122. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the act approved June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 944), as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6189. A bill to amend section 1601 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits against the Federal unemployment tax); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 6190. A bill to provide identification badges for Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6191. A bill to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2127. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of Washington State Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, William J. Bain, president, and John T. Jacobsen, secretary, Seattle, Wash., alleging that Supply, Priorities, and Allocations Board rulings prohibit use of critical material in nondefense areas for all construction not related to defense work or the health and safety of the public; averring that such ruling threatens and deprives millions of workers, skilled and unskilled, of employment in the building industry; asserting that such critical materials as are required for normal construction constitute but a small percentage of the total; declaring that Supply, Priorities, and Allocations Board rulings of October 10, 1941, have inspired hoarding, deception, and cheating; asserting that patriotism and national unity is receiving a telling blow through such rulings; and, therefore, concluding that all congressional Representatives from the Western States be urged to investigate and make a report through appropriate committees on the proper distribution of production of critical materials; that if the committee's investigation should justify it, the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board should be ordered to allocate a reasonable percentage of the critical materials for private construction; stating that the findings and conclusions of aforesaid resolution have been concurred in by chapters of the American Institute of Architects of Oregon, Spokane, Utah, Colorado, and Montana; to the Committee on Rules.

2128. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the United Irish-American Societies of New York, concerning the St. Lawrence waterway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2129. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the State advisory committee of the National Youth Administration for California, objecting to the proposal that appropriations for the National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps in California be reduced; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, fifteenth annual convention, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to adjustment of pay and allowances for Coast Guard service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2131. Also, petition of the American Association of Port Authorities, New Orleans, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 1539, relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2132. Also, petition of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Silver Springs, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor strikes in essential defense industries; to the Committee on Labor.

2133. Also, petition of the United Aircraft Welders of America, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strikes or labor disturbances; to the Committee on Labor.

2134. Also, petition of the Regular Veterans Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6009; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2135. Also, petition of the Patriotic Order of America, Camden, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2136. Also, petition of the Junior O. U. A. M., Hempstead, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1941

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, who knowest our necessities before we ask and our ignorance in asking: Guide Thou our thoughts, we beseech Thee, and direct our way through the gathering shadows into the light of a clearer understanding of Thy purpose for each one of us, that we may, with prompt hand and cheerful heart, do only such things as shall please Thee, as we consecrate ourselves anew to the service of our country.

Help us that we miss not the divine end of life, but inherit more the blessings of Thy discipline; out of Thine eternity calm the dispositions of our souls, as we feel the weight of these troublous times, that we may live bravely, patiently, and with ever increasing faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness in the world of men and of nations. And so unto Thy gracious keeping we commit ourselves this day, and do Thou use each one of us just as Thou wilt, and when and where. We ask it in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 8, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 8, 1941, at 4:10 p. m., eastern standard time, the President approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Murray	White
Doxey	Norris	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPPER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, when the news of Japan's attack was flashed to our people I was in Kansas. I started for Washington as quickly as possible, but regret I could not reach here in time to cast my vote for approval of the President's stand. I would have voted for Senate Joint Resolution 116, introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], if it had been possible for me to reach the Senate in time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have addressed to the President informing him of my whole-hearted support of his program and also advising him that the people of Kansas are unitedly behind him.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 9, 1941.*

HON. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just returned from Kansas, and am glad to assure you that the people of the State are united in support of your stand in the war with Japan. They believe this attack was inspired by Hitler. They feel that you were fully justified in asking Congress to declare a state of war between Japan and the United States. It is a matter of great regret to me that I was unable to reach Washington in time to

register my vote in support of the resolution declaring a state of war to exist between Japan and this Nation. However, I want to assure you of my fullest support and cooperation in steps which may be required to bring the war to a successful conclusion.

This war was promoted by the military regime in Japan, which has been spoiling for a fight for a long time. Now we will see that they get it. The aggressive action of Japan against us was the most unjustifiable attack upon this Nation in all its history. As a nation we have desired only a just peace. But we must now accept the challenge. From now on a united people will stand together against a common enemy. It is the duty of every American citizen, regardless of political differences, to aid the President in every possible manner and to uphold your hands as the Nation's Chief Executive and Commander in Chief of its armed forces until the war is won. Be assured that the people of Kansas will do their part.

It is encouraging and typical of our Nation when challenged that this war is entered with complete unity and with full confidence of ultimate victory. We must and will stay on the job until the justice and right of our cause triumph.

The traditional American spirit is aroused and will carry us forward to complete victory.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 8th instant,

On December 8, 1941, the Vice President signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 135)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations, totaling $9,591,292, for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1942, of which $9,265,992 is to remain available until June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 136)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an emergency supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, for "Emergency fund for the President," amounting to $100,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr AUSTIN:

A petition of sundry citizens of Morrisville, Vt., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which was ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WILEY:

A resolution of Green County (Wis.) Board of Supervisors, favoring the enactment of House bill 5700, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine so as to imitate and resemble butter; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Dane County (Wis.) Board of Supervisors, protesting against adoption of new oleomargarine standards authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolutions of the Lafayette County Taxpayers Association, Jackson County Taxpayers Association, Manitowoc Economic Council, Iowa County Taxpayers Association, Sauk County Taxpayers Association, Juneau County Taxpayers Association, Calumet County Economy Council, Oshkosh County Economy Council, Fond du Lac Economy Council, and Pierce County Taxpayers Association, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring the reduction of nondefense expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of The Polonia Townsend Club, No. 48, favoring the prompt enactment of legislation granting old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the beet-sugar growers of Calumet County, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to renew the existing beet-sugar program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Assessors' Section of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, Madison, Wis., protesting against ratification of the pending treaty with Great Britain exempting certain property from taxation that is used in the prosecution of defense programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution of the annual conference of the Association of Lithuanian Workers, District No. 7, Kenosha, Wis., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to end discrimination against naturalized and noncitizens and to encourage and facilitate the naturalization of noncitizens in the interest of national defense and unity; to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of the Committee on Commerce was submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

H. R. 5111. An act authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency; with amendments (Rept. No. 883).

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS FOR MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 158, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 158), submitted by Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. WHITE) on August 25, 1941, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That in addition to any other clerical assistance to which each may be entitled, the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate shall each be entitled to have a research assistant, to be paid at the rate of $6,000 per annum out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 8, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time; and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2104. A bill to authorize travel on ships at the next higher available first-class rate when accommodations at the lowest first-class rate are not available; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2105. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2106. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the St. Mary's River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., with a view to providing facilities for light-draft navigation; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2107. A bill for the relief of Harriett Goodman; and

S. 2108. A bill for the relief of certain clerks employed in the post office at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2109. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. REYNOLDS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 117, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ADAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 202), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Alva B. Adams, late a Senator from the State of Colorado, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF SERVICE AND FACILITIES OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 203), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Whereas the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. has a monopoly of the telephone business in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the telephone service in the District of Columbia made available by such company is of a poor and unsatisfactory character; and

Whereas it appears that such company in order to obtain high profits has failed or refused to expend the sums required to employ a sufficient number of efficient operators and other personnel and to provide adequate equipment and facilities; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that adequate and efficient telephone service be available in the Nation's Capital: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and of the telephone service in the District of Columbia, including among other things the corporate structure and financial connections of such company, its earnings, employment policies, the compensation paid its employees, and the facilities furnished and services made available by it. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation with such recommendations as it deems advisable for legislation which will result in better telephone service being made available in the District of Columbia, or will result in the rates charged for telephone service being so reduced that they will be commensurate with the poor quality of the service furnished.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed _____ shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. MCNARY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] be assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AGREEMENT FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNOBJECTED-TO MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the routine morning business the Senate proceed to a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ADAMS BY RAYMOND LONERGAN

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the most recent issue of Labor, and referring to our departed colleague and dear friend the late able senior Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Labor National Weekly of December 9, 1941]

LONERGAN'S COMMENT—SENATOR ADAMS' DEATH RECALLS UNUSUAL STORY OF REMARKABLE FAMILY IN PIONEER WEST

(By Raymond Lonergan)

This is the kind of story it would be hard to duplicate in any country outside the United States and some of the self-governing nations of the British Commonwealth, like Canada and Australia.

Seventy years ago three lads, bearing the historic name of Adams, drove a wagon all the way from Wisconsin to the San Luis Valley in southern Colorado.

Alva, not yet 21, held the reins, and beside him sat little Billy, only 9 years old. In the wagon lay the third brother, battling with tuberculosis and surrounded by practically all the worldly possessions of the trio.

When they reached the San Luis Valley, Alva got a job hauling ties for the first railroad in that section. Then he went into business in a tiny hardware store. Everyone liked him and he prospered.

Eventually, he became one of Colorado's leading citizens and served three terms as Governor.

He passed away almost 20 years ago, and soon after his only child, Alva B. Adams, was appointed to the Senate. After serving a short time, he was defeated in the Coolidge landslide. He came back in 1932 for a full term and was reelected in 1938.

Last Monday morning Senator Adams succumbed to a heart attack at his home in Washington.

"Uncle Billy" is still living in Colorado. He'll be 80 next year. He, too, has served three terms in the Governor's chair, and prior to that was in the State legislature for 40 years—a record for State legislative work which has never been equalled, so far as this writer knows.

FAITHFUL TO WORKERS

In all his campaigns Senator Adams was strongly supported by the standard railroad labor organizations and practically all other groups in the Colorado labor movement. He was essentially conservative, but he never failed the workers in a real crisis.

As chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations he became a genuine "watchdog of the Treasury." It is probable he saved Uncle Sam tens of millions of dollars, and yet he never refused money for a worthy cause.

Quiet and unassuming, but with a keen sense of humor, there was nothing spectacular about him. But his ability, sincerity, and tireless industry won him a commanding position in the upper Chamber.

"He was slow to make a promise," said one of his colleagues, "but when he made it he never broke it."

JUST AN EVEN CHANCE

On one occasion during his last campaign he revealed his philosophy of life.

"I have grandchildren. My own time is necessarily getting shorter.

"If the recording angel checks up my books tomorrow and closes them, the balance will show that I have probably had more out of the world than I was entitled to.

"But these boys and girls, in whose welfare I am more interested than I am in my own—what do I want for them?

"I want them to have a world and a government where even though they are stripped of money, or friends, or position, they will have a fair and even chance in the race of life. I only want them to win on their own merits and character; I ask nothing beyond that."

Just another word about the Senator's father, Gov. Alva Adams. He, too, was always fair to the workingman. As Governor of Colorado he signed the first bill making Labor Day a State holiday.

BLOODY STRIKES RECALLED

And in 1904 he led the progressive forces of Colorado in a great battle for the workers' rights. During the previous 2 years a series of strikes swept the mining camps of the State.

Governor Peabody called out the militia, headed by Gen. Sherman Bell. With the aid of an army of thugs recruited by the mine owners, Bell ruthlessly broke the strikes. Miners were beaten and killed. Hundreds were forced on freight trains and dumped outside the borders of the State, without money or food.

RAPE OF THE GOVERNORSHIP

Adams protested and became the Democratic candidate for Governor against Peabody in 1904. He was elected by a fine majority, but the mine owners and the public utilities raised an immense "slush fund" and succeeded in rounding up enough legislators to unseat Adams.

Just as they were about to consummate the nefarious plot, a curious thing happened.

Some of the purchased legislators said they would not vote to seat Peabody unless he agreed to resign at once and thus permit the Republican Lieutenant Governor, Jesse McDonald, to take over the Governor's office.

That curious deal was put over, Adams was unseated; Peabody took the oath of office and immediately resigned and McDonald was sworn in.

Thus Colorado established a record of which it is not particularly proud—it had three Governors in 24 hours.

The conspirators not only desired to have a Governor who would obey their orders, but they were anxious "to pack" the State supreme court. There were two vacancies on the bench and it is a matter of record that Governor McDonald appointed two men selected by the representatives of the railroads and other public utilities "at a midnight conference in a smoke-filled room."

Senator Adams never forgave the crime committed against his father.

"Yet there are those who challenge the sincerity of my fight against corrupt corporation control of the politics and public affairs of this State," he exclaimed a few years ago. "There are some things people don't forget."

ADDRESS PREPARED BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH FOR DELIVERY BEFORE INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "The New American Unity," prepared by him for delivery at the Institute of World Affairs, Riverside, Calif., on December 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WAYNE COY AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Wayne Coy, of the Office for Emergency Management at the Student Convocation, Indiana University on October 30, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY HUGH GRANT ON WAR WITH JAPAN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hugh Grant, former American Minister to Thailand, relative to war with Japan, published in the New York Herald Tribune of December 2, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THEODORE W. NOYES BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF OLDEST INHABITANTS OF THE DISTRICT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Theodore W. Noyes at the seventy-sixth anniversary dinner of the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia on December 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE—ADDRESS BY HOMER C. HOCKETT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Historical Roots of the American Way of Life," delivered by Homer C. Hockett, professor of history, Ohio State University, at Indianapolis, on November 20, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM ERNEST M. BLANCHARD ON BOY SCOUT ACTIVITIES IN NEW JERSEY

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Ernest M. Blanchard, Scout executive of Monmouth Council, Boy Scouts of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY GERALD W. JOHNSON IN BALTIMORE EVENING SUN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Gerald W. Johnson and published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of November 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR WITH JAPAN

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement to the Senate.

Many Members of the Senate, including members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, yesterday asked me for information in reference to the extent and scope of the naval operations that took place last Sunday in and about Hawaii. In view of those inquiries, I conferred with Representative VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, and both of us visited the Navy Department yesterday. As a result of the visit we made to the Department, we learned that if it could be done, and if it seemed wise to do it, a communication would be sent to the chairmen of these respective committees for the purpose of giving to the House and Senate such information as was not incompatible with our national interest. The press, which urgently sought information, was told that information would be forthcoming today.

Admiral Stark later informed us that the Navy was not in a position to give us any information other than that which the President gave to Congress yesterday, and suggested that we defer requesting any further information until after the President on the radio tonight presents such information as he thinks it wise and proper to give to the American people. Therefore, I am not in position to give any official information to the Senate; and I think all Senators ought to wait until the Commander in Chief of the Navy and the Army addresses the American people by radio tonight.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it the Senator's understanding that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Navy, will give the American people tonight a full and frank and detailed account of the damage done to our naval and military resources in the Pacific?

Mr. WALSH. I cannot anticipate what the President will say in his speech tonight; but I think it would be proper for us all to wait and learn just what the President thinks it proper to say under the circumstances and to follow his leadership.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator, and I rather anticipate that the President will do just that; but let me say to the Senator that, as one Member of this body and a humble citizen of this country of ours, it seems to me it is imperative that the American people and their representatives in Congress be fully informed of what has occurred. I can well understand the need of secrecy as to the movement of ships. That is patent to any person, it seems to me; but when a thing is fait accompli, and when, as reported on the floor of the Senate in conversation today, a large part of the Pacific fleet is wiped out and that is fait accompli, the enemy certainly knows it, and the American people and their representatives in Congress ought to know it.

Mr. WALSH. It is extremely important that we should show a united front at this time, at the very beginning of a war that is of momentous consequence to the future of our country; and, in my opinion, we should not show any disposition to direct the Commander in Chief, or to criticize what has been done, or to say what ought to have been done, up to this hour. I still suggest that we wait until we hear from the Commander in Chief, who, I assume, will give us such information as he thinks the American people ought to have and as he thinks will not tend to encourage or give to the enemy any information that they ought not to have. I personally hope that whatever the President says will arouse the American people to a realization that we are now in a real fighting war, and that we must stand unitedly; all Americans must cooperate as one man, and proceed to wage a war that can have but one result—a sweeping and complete victory.

Mr. TOBEY. Again I agree with the Senator; but I point out that only 24 hours before this debacle in the Pacific—for I believe that is what it should be called—the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Frank Knox, sent to the President of the United States a terse, epigrammatic statement, the gist of which was, "The Navy is ready"; and the pride of the American people in their Navy and their confidence in some officials has been terribly hurt in the past 24 hours.

Mr. WALSH. All I can say at this time is that talk and rumors ought to cease now. Work, ceaseless energy, and whole-hearted enthusiasm, and the spirit of sacrifice must immediately be manifested by all the officials of our Government, by the Congress, and by the American people.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Massachusetts has already largely anticipated what I wanted to suggest in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will lay down his arms until tonight, at least, when the President will have an opportunity to speak. It is perfectly possible, however, that there may be some military information that it would not be well to broadcast to the Nation, because of its reaching the enemy.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire appreciates the fact that the President has been frank, and has taken the country into his confidence so far, and he must await authentic and confirmed information. I am willing to trust him to tell us what he thinks we ought to know, and to withhold what for the moment it would not be wise to divulge.

If the Senator from New Hampshire will show the same assiduity in the Departments that he shows on the floor, I am sure he will even be able to get information which the President does not transmit to us, because he has contacts with the Navy and with the Army. If the Senator will show half the industry that he reveals here in contact with the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, I am confident he will get full and complete information, probably not for the purposes of the press, but for his own information as a Senator. I am sure he will be cordially treated, as will every other Senator who may desire to visit the Departments.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not the floor. I am very glad I have not.

Mr. TOBEY. I very largely concur in what the Senator has said; but I desire to ask him a question. Does he not share with me and with many of our colleagues on the floor the feeling that our pride in our Navy and our glory in our Navy and our confidence in the Navy Department and in the Secretary of the Navy by his own utterances have been seriously hurt and impaired?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to criticize the Secretary of the Navy. I assume he is doing the best he can. His background probably has not been what it ought to be. He is not a naval man. His military service was all in the Army, as I understand; but I assume he is doing the best he can.

I have pride in the Navy. I have always been a "big Navy" Member of Congress. I have voted in the Senate every dollar the Navy has asked. Of course, if the Navy has lost one ship or if it has lost one man, the Senator from Texas regrets

it; but that does not restore the ship and that does not restore the man. That does not put them back in the battle front.

Why should we now spend our time worrying about what might have happened? As suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, we have a job before us. It is not a question of searching the records historically. Our task now is to see that whatever Navy we have and whatever Army we have are trained and equipped and put on their toes, and that the American people become aroused to the fact that this war is going to cost something besides money.

I read in the press statements about the O. P. M., and how much the war is going to cost. In this war victory cannot be bought with money. It is going to take blood; it is going to take sacrifice; it is going to take high courage; it is going to take the united support of the American people; and I want them to realize it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it is natural that the feeling of apprehension displayed by the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators should exist at this time. We all share it. But we must remember that the President yesterday indicated very plainly that the situation prior to the declaration by the Congress yesterday was a serious one, and he gave us information of a serious character in the address which he delivered before the joint session. But the important thing now, today, is for us to wait until our Commander in Chief speaks; to accept, for the present at least, whatever he may choose to say to the American people as the proper and appropriate thing to say at this time; to show the world that we are united; that there are no party differences; that there are no differences of opinion now such as those which have existed in the past; that we are in war and are ready to fight; that whatever injury may have been done to our Navy, the job ahead of us is to rehabilitate it and to go forward with greater militancy and a more fervent spirit of victory than ever. So I hope that we may end this discussion by simply closing our lips until we hear from the Commander in Chief, who tonight will address the people of the United States of America, and who, I am sure, will present to us the picture of the situation, what is before us in the way of sacrifice, in the way of necessity for a united front, in the way of unrestricted service to our country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to say just a word in line with what has already been said?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. At a time like this, and after events such as have occurred in recent days, it is perfectly natural that all sorts of rumors should be floating around through the country and finding their way into the press. Up to this time many of these rumors have been unconfirmed. It seems to me, therefore, that here in the Senate, and in the country at large, we should not be hastily induced to express views or to allege facts until we can base our statements upon authentic information; and such information can come only from the various departments of the Government of the United States which have to deal with the situation, or from the President, of course, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. It seems to me that is a rule we should all observe, because any of us may on some day assail someone, based upon some rumor or some headline in a newspaper, or make statements which we think represent facts, and the statements may find their way to places where the impression might be created that we do state facts, when in reality there may not be any facts at all to justify such statements.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has stated exactly the sentiments I entertain.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for merely one suggestion?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask the Senator if what has transpired today, the first day after our declaration of war, does not emphasize the possible and probable advantage of creating some sort of a liaison committee representing the united Congress, for contacts with the President, in some general fashion, an organization somewhat like the Committee on the Conduct of the War during the days of the Civil War. It could very well be a meeting place for satisfying the sense of responsibility which Members of Congress inevitably feel, which may not otherwise be too easily satisfied unless there is some such official instrumentality by way of link between these two branches of our Government.

Mr. WALSH. I personally think that may be desirable; but I still adhere to my previous statement, that no suggestion and no comment should be made until the President speaks tonight.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I am sure that every one in this Chamber is in thorough accord with the statements expressed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and by our leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that is, that in times such as those we now confront there should be full accord, and we should not be unnecessarily critical, at least we should not be unfairly critical, but we should look forward and not backward. However, I think that in view of some of the events which have occurred in the last few days a little constructive criticism would not hurt.

America is now at war. American blood has been shed. Of course, that is an additional reason why we should be temperate in our statements and not unfairly critical of any department of our Government. At the same time, I think that constructive criticism certainly has its place.

In connection with this statement and this preface, I wish to read an editorial which appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Post, entitled "Let Us Start Right." The editorial reads:

[From the Washington Post of December 9, 1941]

LET US START RIGHT

The first flush of bewilderment over the Japanese attack on Hawaii has now passed. In its place there is a consuming rage that the Japanese were able to press home their attack so successfully. For there is no minimizing the devastation wrought. In the space of a few hours Oahu, commonly called the Gibraltar of the Pacific, suffered at least 3,300 casualties. Per capita of population attacked this compares with and in many cases actually exceeds losses from single mass air attacks by the Luftwaffe. Military damage has been only partially revealed. Yet the Navy has apparently lost a battleship, a destroyer, and, for the time required to repair them, many other vessels. Moreover, a considerable number of Army planes have been destroyed or damaged, and Army ground facilities have been wrecked. The toll is appalling, and the question in everybody's mind is: Was there an administrative slip-up, a lack of matériel, or a combination of both, which contributed to the success of the raid?

Supposedly Pearl Harbor ranked with if not ahead of Singapore as the best protected naval base in the world. Navy planes and ships were on 24-hour duty, patrolling incessantly the waters around Oahu. The American public had been led to believe that no invader could come anywhere near the island without being apprehended or without his approach being radioed to the Army air force on Oahu. Assuming an enemy approach by air, the Army was supposed to be able, day or night, to get enough planes into the air fast enough to beat off a mass assault without serious loss. For the Army has been preparing for years for just such an occasion. In joint maneuvers with the Navy the Army has practiced repulsing an invader approaching Oahu by sea and by air from half a dozen directions simultaneously. Such defensive measures emphasize the major reason for the Army's presence on Oahu; that is, to defend Pearl Harbor and the other naval establishments on the island.

To this end the Army, among other things, has ringed Pearl Harbor with fortifications, constructed adjacent Hickam Field, one of our finest and most heavily manned air fields, and, like the Navy in Hawaii, has operated for several years on a war basis. Assuming inadequate or delayed opposition by the Army air force, an enemy air assault on ships at anchor in Pearl Harbor must naturally be devastating, in spite of antiaircraft fire. But, in view of what has happened not only at Pearl Harbor but in the city of Honolulu, the effectiveness of all defensive preparations is now open to question. Among those preparations, as detailed by Joseph Barber, Jr., in his book Hawaii: Restless Rampart, have been blackouts, simulated enemy air raids, dispersal of planes on the ground to minimize damage from bombs, and elaborate precautions by the services and the civilian community to reduce the effectiveness of attack.

Thus Oahu's baptism of fire apparently occurred under conditions long anticipated by the Navy and Army commands. Realization of this fact is spreading. It is destructive of confidence in the efficiency of the armed forces. This may be undeserved, but there is no help for it. In the circumstances, then, it is only fair that the Navy and War Departments take the country into their confidence, so far as is militarily possible. High officials of both services have repeatedly stated that no enemy could achieve such damage as was done by the Japanese. Right now the country is fighting mad. It can take the bad news along with the good that must inevitably come.

Mr. President, that editorial is a bit sharp, a bit harsh, and critical; yet it is a fair editorial, and the criticism is just. The whole country is asking, "How did this happen?" since we had all understood that it simply could not happen to quite such an extent as it seems to have happened.

The few words I want to speak are not to be construed by anyone as an effort to sound a discordant note. I am stronger

today for our Navy and our Army than I was a week ago, because we need them, because they are under fire. But, Mr. President, a mistake was made, apparently—many seem to think so—which has resulted in tremendous damage to a great fortification on which our country has spent millions upon top of multiplied millions of dollars. Our enemies have not destroyed the Gibraltar of the Pacific, but they apparently for the time being have rendered it useless so far as we are concerned. It might as well be, and perhaps is, completely in the possession of the Japanese forces. Such reports have been current; whether they are true I do not know. But, Mr. President, I think it may be, as has been suggested, that the Navy and the Army in Hawaii were simply caught asleep. I do not know whether that be so, but I think, as this editorial states, that the Army and the Navy should take the people into their confidence and state just what did occur so far as it is militarily possible to do so.

I also think, Mr. President, that we ought to profit by this mistake. Things have happened within the past 2 or 3 years which have electrified the imagination of mankind. We know that we are not merely being attacked and assaulted by a bunch of yellow devils; we know that it is not merely the Japanese nation that has attacked us; we know—indeed, everyone knows—that behind it all is, of course, the not unseen hand of the Hitler government of Germany, and we may look, of course, for other things to happen. The same thing that happened in Honolulu could happen, Mr. President, upon the sacred soil of our own continent, the soil of this America, upon which we stand today.

Within striking distance of the eastern seaboard is the island of Martinique, and there is other territory belonging to France, for instance, on the northern coast of South America. Of course, everyone knows that the Vichy government is completely controlled by the Hitler government. Only in this morning's paper was the story carried of the embarrassment, almost the disgrace, of the old Premier of France, when he was forced to apologize to Hitler because a few courageous Frenchmen perhaps had shot and killed some worthless German soldiers. The Premier of France was caused embarrassment and humiliation. As the Vichy government is controlled completely by the Hitler government, therefore we must realize that the forces of that government will operate as near our shores as possible, and it is not beyond the ability of any man to imagine that bombs might be dropped upon our eastern seaboard anywhere from Miami to Maine.

We also know that the Panama Canal might be attacked at any time. We know that such things are likely to happen at any time. It is not a condition for which we have a long period of time to get ready; it is not a situation about which we can think and talk at our leisure.

The time has come for determined, concerted action, and I think prompt and serious consideration should be given by the American Government to the seizure of every piece of soil, not only in the Western Hemisphere but within striking distance of our shores, upon which the German Government might land its airplanes or which its forces might occupy and use as bases for operations.

Mr. President, I think we ought to seize Martinique. I think French Guiana, in South America, should be taken over, as well as every other piece of soil which might afford a landing for an enemy airplane which could do damage to our shores.

We are in war. It is no time to parley. It is no time for dissension. It is time, however, for just criticism, because by just criticism we profit from the mistakes we have made. A mistake has been made. I am willing to wipe it out and forget it and to look forward and make sure that it shall not occur again; and I am anxious that we do the things which are necessary for the protection of the American people, to the end that American blood shall not needlessly be shed.

We are in this war, and must fight it, and we cannot fight it simply by appropriating money to be spent in building great and beautiful bases on islands in the midst of the ocean. We have to take courageous and forward action. Therefore, I read the editorial which was the basis for the few remarks which I made, not in a spirit of unfair criticism, for, I repeat, I am quite willing to forget it all, but because a ghastly mistake has been made, and I hope that we can actually profit by it.

I wish to repeat that I should like to see serious and immediate consideration given to the matter of our country taking absolute charge—and when I say "charge" that is an expression in common parlance which is understood by everybody—of every island of every foot of land which the German Government, the Italian Government, or the Japanese Government might by any manner of means seize upon and use as a base of operations against America.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the people of the United States look out this morning upon a world divided against itself, a world plunged into bloody conflict amid a welter of broken pacts, torn-up treaties, treachery, and brutal deceit. For this we may sorrow. But for our own part, happily, we need not reproach ourselves. As a searchlight stands out against the night, so stands the record of our decent diplomacy, outlined the more sharply by the infamy of our enemies. We have sought peace wherever it was possible. We have sought friendship even where rebuffed; and, above all, under the leadership of our President, Mr. Hull, and Mr. Wallace, we have strengthened the bonds of neighborhood within our own continental community. Now we can enjoy the fruits of that wise and Christian policy. We have lost the friendship only of those nations which were determined to be our enemies; and we have won and kept the friendship of those nations which were open to good will, nations which will now stand as friends in our hour of need.

Let the position of Mexico today give us heartening proof of the righteousness of our diplomatic course. As an enemy, or even as a lukewarm, dubious neutral, Mexico, situated upon our southern flank, could have seriously endangered our strategic position in the conduct of this war. Yet today, Mr. President, Mexico is not hostile. She is not neutral, though without the efforts of this administration in past years she might easily and justifiably have been either. Today at this fateful juncture of history Mexico, thank God, is on our side. Its leaders have already broken diplomatic relations with Japan. I personally believe that a declaration of war will soon follow. Happily I can say that our Government and the Government of Mexico and the military staffs of both nations are now vigilantly and energetically working in the closest possible collaboration in assuring the defense of the west coast, on the shore, on the sea, and in the air. Such cooperation is of incalculable value to the people of my own State of California and other States on the west coast.

Let us then give thanks for this; but let us not be so foolish as to give all the thanks to ourselves. Let us give thanks also, as we rightly should, to the Mexican people and to their farsighted, patient, and patriotic leaders; to their Senate and to their Chamber of Deputies; to President Manuel Avila Camacho; to Ambassador Francisco Castillo Nájera; to Ezequiel Padilla, Secretary for Foreign Affairs; to Eduardo Suarez, Secretary of the Treasury; and to former President Lazaro Cardenas.

It takes two or more to make good neighbors. Let us then express herewith our full and humble gratitude that the good will manifested on the part of our Nation by our President and his aides has been so generously and wisely reciprocated by the statesmen of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. President, a past and a present American solidarity augur well for a future American victory and an ennobled and enlightened destiny for the whole of the New World. The brutal and infamous blitzkrieg of Japan against our possessions in the Pacific Ocean has not weakened my faith in our Navy and its leaders. It has strengthened my determination to do everything in my power to help mobilize all the resources and men of this Nation behind our President and our military forces.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON SERVICE OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the War Department has requested that we give immediate consideration—that is, this afternoon—to its request that the Government be permitted to send our armed forces outside the Western Hemisphere, which up to the present time has been prohibited, and that the members of our armed forces and those who are to be inducted into the armed forces of the United States be retained for a period of 6 months after the termination of the present emergency or emergencies to follow. Therefore, I ask that the joint resolution prepared by the War Department, which I now introduce, be read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) removing restrictions on the use, and terms of service, of units and members of the Army of the United States, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, and of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, insofar as they restrict the territorial use of units and personnel of the Army of the United States, including selective trainees, are suspended during the existence of the present or any future war in which the United States is engaged, and for 6 months thereafter.

SEC. 2. The periods of appointment, enlistment, induction, and service of all members of the Army of the United States, including selective trainees, now or hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States, are extended for the period stated in the preceding section.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in explanation let me invite the attention of Members of the Senate to Public Resolution 96, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, a portion of section 1 of which reads as follows:

Provided, That the members and units of the reserve components of the Army of the United States ordered into active Federal service under this authority shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, section 3 (e), reads as follows:

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under this act shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories and possessions of the United States including the Philippine Islands.

The two paragraphs I have just read from Public Resolution No. 96 and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, section 3, are to be suspended by the provision in the joint resolution which would permit the Government to send members of the armed forces outside the Western Hemisphere, to which, as I mentioned a moment ago, they have heretofore been restricted.

As to the Service Extension Act of 1941, section 2 applies to section 2 of the joint resolution which has just been read by the clerk. I now read section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941:

Provided, That extension of the periods of active military service or training and service in the case of any person subject to the provisions of this section, shall not, without his consent, exceed 18 months in the aggregate; except that whenever the Congress declares that it is in the interests of national defense to further extend such periods of active military service and training and service, such periods may be further extended by the President, in the case of any such persons for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

The 6-month period of duration mentioned in the joint resolution for the service of persons in the armed forces is asked in order that the military authorities in charge may have ample opportunity to disband or disorganize the units which may then be in the service.

Therefore, I ask that the Senate dispense with the usual procedure of having the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that, in accordance with the request of the War Department, it be given immediate consideration.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the distinguished minority leader. Then I shall be glad to yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am very glad to defer to the able Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Am I to understand the purpose of the joint resolution to be, among other things, to authorize the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to send expeditionary forces to other countries—countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, or anywhere—without further action by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The joint resolution lifts the ban upon the use of American armed forces. Under the present law our armed forces may not be sent outside the United States, except to our Territories and possessions.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand what the present law provides; but the inquiry I was directing to the able Senator is, What will be the effect of the joint resolution?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It empowers the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Government, to utilize the armed forces of the Government in any section of the world to which he may deem it proper that they be sent. Of course, such authority is requested in view of the present emergency.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. I simply wanted the information; that is all.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Am I to understand the able Senator's request to be that he desires to have the joint resolution referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If there is objection, I shall be very glad to ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. In that connection, I may advise the Senate that a special meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs has been called for tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock for the consideration of such matters as may be placed before it.

Mr. McNARY. Then the Senator is in no wise asking for immediate consideration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; in view of the fact that the Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. McNARY. I certainly should object. I do not know of any post-haste in connection with this matter. The committee having jurisdiction should consider these very vital issues, which have been before the Congress for a good many weeks. Indeed it is my opinion that the declaration of war passed by the Congress yesterday would probably modify, if not repeal, the inhibitions about which the Senator speaks.

Without expressing my views on the matter—though I do not think I should have any objection—let me say that a matter so important should go to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration and study. On that account I should object to any action being taken at this time on the floor of the Senate. Such action would not conduce to good legislation.

Let me make an inquiry of the able Senator. He mentions the fact that at the present time we may send our troops to the Philippines and to Hawaii. Where does the Senator now contemplate that they should go, in addition to those two countries?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator makes inquiry in regard to my contemplation, I say that I am impressed and imbued with the fact that this country cannot bring about an absolutely complete victory in the impending struggle between the United States and the Japanese merely by the utilization of our naval and air forces, but that ultimately, if we are to bring about the victory which we deserve as a result of the unwarranted, the dastardly, the treacherous and the murderous assault made upon citizens of the United States, the naval and air forces, and the Army in general, as well as matériel, we can expect such victory only by actually sending men of the armed forces of the United States upon the soil of the lands where we may then find those who actually made this dastardly assault.

I say to the Senator preliminarily—and, I may add, extemporaneously—that in order to bring about the victory which we, the American people, in all unity now are determined to accomplish, we may be called upon in an emergency to endeavor to land our soldiers upon the island of Hong Kong, in Indochina, perhaps in Thailand, the Malay States, or Samoa, as well as the islands of Japan; and in all probability we shall be called upon to send troops in the interest of America to the Dutch East Indies, if there the Japanese should succeed in their attempt to become masters of the Netherlands territories.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not expressing any opposition to the objectives contemplated by the joint resolution, but when we have constituted committees to study propositions which should be carefully and deliberately considered, I do not want legislation to be introduced and acted upon on the floor of the Senate without reference to a committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am sure the War Department will not object to the brief delay which will be necessary as the result of a committee meeting, because we have called a meeting for tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. I am not interested in the attitude of the War Department

concerning matters which come before the Senate. I am interested in deliberately making decisions after complete study and exploration of the subjects; and we should maintain that procedure without regard to the wishes of any of the departments of the Government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In view of the Senator's objection, I shall withdraw my request for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being had to the request for immediate consideration, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I desire to announce that there will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

CONSIDERATION OF UNOBJECTED-TO BILLS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Routine morning business is closed. Under the order entered earlier today, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bunker	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Murray	White
Doxey	Norris	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 30) proposing to amend rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as first in order.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) proposing to make rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REHABILITATION OF ANTHRACITE INDUSTRY

The bill (S. 357) to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that at the first available opportunity I shall ask to have Senate bill 357, to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry, considered by the Senate. The bill was reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining, with amendments, on June 5, 1941. The report was unanimous. I give formal notice at this time that I shall ask to have the bill taken up at the first available opportunity.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4837) to safeguard the confidential nature of Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia case records in all types of relief cases, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1355) to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Santee, Congaree, and Cooper Rivers in the counties of Berkeley, Clarendon, Calhoun, Richland, and Orangeburg, S. C., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1358) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for rehabilitation, and for other purposes," approved February 11, 1936, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PREVENTION OF PHOTOGRAPHING AND SKETCHING OF MILITARY RESERVATIONS, ETC.

The bill (S. 1707) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like an explanation. I think this bill came up on a previous occasion during the session, and, as I recall, objection was made to its consideration. I myself have no objection, but some other Senator objected, and I should like to have a statement from the able Senator from North Carolina or some other Senator regarding the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina is not present at the moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that the bill be passed over temporarily until the Senator from North Carolina returns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendments to the bill which have been reported are the amendments which we have discussed heretofore, including third- and fourth-class postmasters.

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I have an amendment to cover the subject of third- and fourth-class postmasters, which I should like to offer in connection with the bill, and which I believe will meet with the approval of both the minority and the majority leaders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "That", it is proposed to strike out "postmasters of the third and fourth classes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "Agency", it is proposed to strike out "as a reward for continuous service heretofore rendered or to be rendered hereafter, shall be granted $100 per annum in addition to their base pay as now or hereafter fixed by law upon the completion of 10 years' service; and an additional $100 per annum upon the completion of an additional 5-year period of service thereafter: *Provided*, That no credit shall be given for service after the fifteenth year of employment: *Provided further*, That in computing an employee's length of service, credit shall be given for substitute service" and to insert, "who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered 10 years or more of continuous service, shall have their base pay as fixed by law increased by $60 per annum; and upon the completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service after January 1, 1942, shall have their base pay as fixed by law increased by an additional $60 per annum. Any such post-office employee who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered less than 10 years' continuous service shall, upon his completion of 10 years' continuous service, have

his base pay as fixed by law increased by $60 per annum; and, upon his completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service thereafter, shall have his base pay as fixed by law increased by an additional $60 per annum. No increase in base pay in excess of $120 shall be given under this act. In computing an employee's length of service for the purposes of this act, credit shall be given for substitute service."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to this committee amendment. I send them to the desk and ask to have them stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 24, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

Any postmaster of the third or fourth class who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered 10 years or more of continuous service shall be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the fourth class; and, upon the completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service after January 1, 1942, shall be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an additional amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the fourth class. Any postmaster of the third or fourth class who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered less than 10 years' continuous service shall, upon his completion of 10 years' continuous service, be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the fourth class; and, upon his completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service thereafter, shall be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an additional amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of the postmasters of the fourth class.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to strike out:

No increase in base pay in excess of $120 shall be given under this act.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

The amounts paid under this act in addition to base pay or basic compensation shall not exceed $120 per annum in any case.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 3, after the word "effect", it is proposed to strike out "July" and insert "January."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill, as amended and passed, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, as amended and passed by the Senate, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That assistant postmasters, supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, watchmen, messengers, laborers in first- and second-class post offices, employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department rendering not less than 5 hours' service per day, employees of the Motor Vehicle Service, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and Village Delivery Service, rural letter carriers, employees of the Railway Mail Service, employees of the Sea Post Service, clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors, and postal employees at the United States Stamped Envelope Agency, who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered 10 years or more of continuous service, shall have their base pay as fixed by law increased by $60 per annum; and upon the completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service after January 1, 1942, shall have their base pay as fixed by law increased by an additional $60 per annum. Any such Post Office employee who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered less than 10 years' continuous service shall, upon his completion of 10 years' continuous service, have his base pay as fixed by law increased by $60 per annum; and, upon his completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service thereafter, shall have his base pay as fixed by law increased by an additional $60 per annum. Any postmaster of the third or fourth class who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered 10 years or more of continuous service shall be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the fourth class; and, upon the completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service after January 1, 1942, shall be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an additional amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the fourth class. Any postmaster of the third or fourth class who, on January 1, 1942, shall have rendered less than 10 years' continuous service shall, upon his completion of 10 years' continuous service, be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the fourth class; and, upon his completion of an additional 5-year period of continuous service thereafter, shall be paid each year, in addition to his basic compensation for such year, an additional amount equal to 5 percent of such basic compensation in the case of postmasters of the third class, and equal to 10 percent of such basic compensation in the case of the postmasters of the fourth class. The amounts paid under this act in addition to base pay or basic compensation shall not exceed $120 per annum in any case. In computing an employee's length of service for the purposes of this act, credit shall be given for substitute service.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect January 1, 1942.

PREVENTION OF PHOTOGRAPHING AND SKETCHING OF MILITARY RESERVATIONS, ETC

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a moment ago Senate bill 1707, Calendar No. 629, was passed over. I understand there is now no objection to the bill, and I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr President, when the bill was reached on the call of the calendar, I objected to its consideration because I remembered that on a former occasion some Senator who was absent at the time the bill was reached today objected to it. That Senator was the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He is here now. I, myself, have no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr President, this bill has been passed over on several calls of the calendar because a similar bill forbidding the photographing of naval establishments has been passed by the Senate and has been sent over to the House. It is made a crime to take photographs under certain conditions and with certain intents and purposes.

The language of this bill is different from the language of the naval bill that forbids the taking of photographs of naval establishments and naval vessels. There is a difference in the definition of the crime. I have been hopeful that the naval bill would be amended in the House so as to insert the word "Army," and have the same general principle of law apply to both services. I have not been able to secure such action. I do not think we ought to delay this matter any longer. Therefore I am content to have the Senate pass this bill and let the House straighten out the matter, and try to have a uniform bill that will cover both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill; but it seems to me it will have an extraordinary effect, because apparently it provides for the imprisonment of any person who takes a photograph anywhere near any reservation, even, or in the waters adjacent thereto, apparently with no specific intent. I cannot find in the bill any intent clause. Apparently, any person who wanders out with a kodak and takes a picture somewhere near a defense establishment may be put in jail. I hope the bill will be modified in the House when it gets there, and perhaps made to accord with the bill to which the able Senator from Massachusetts referred.

I shall not object to the consideration of the bill because of the fact that I think what I have described may be done; but certainly in its present form the bill is extraordinarily all-inclusive.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator has stated the objection of the Naval Committee—that the bill goes too far, and is all-inclusive, and ought to be modified and a better definition inserted. However, I think we ought not longer to

delay legislation on the subject, and that we ought to put the responsibility on the House to cooperate with the Senate and pass a suitable bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1707) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever, except in performance of duty or employment in connection with the national defense, shall knowingly and willfully make any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, copy, or other representation of any navy yard, naval station, or of any military post, fort, camp, station, arsenal, airfield, or other military or naval reservation, or place used for national-defense purposes by the War or Navy Departments, or of any vessel, aircraft, installation, equipment, or other property whatsoever, located within any such post, fort, camp, arsenal, airfield, yard, station, reservation, or place, or in the waters adjacent thereto, or in any defensive sea area established in accordance with law; or whoever, except in performance of duty or employment in connection with the national defense, shall knowingly and willfully make any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, copy, or other representation of any vessel, aircraft, installation, equipment, or other property relating to the national defense being manufactured or under construction or repair for or awaiting delivery to the War or Navy Departments or the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States under any contract or agreement with the United States or such country or otherwise on behalf of the United States or such country, located at the factory, plant, yard, storehouse, or other place of business of any contractor, subcontractor, or other person, or in the waters adjacent to any such place, shall be punished as provided herein.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to permit photographs, sketches, or other representations to be made when, in his opinion, the interests of national defense will not be adversely affected thereby.

SEC. 3. Any person found guilty of a violation of this act shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall apply in the Philippine Islands as well as in all other places within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], I object to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1365) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended, for the purpose of providing vocational training in Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the interest of national defense, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1831) to prohibit the purchase of foreign-grown cotton with public funds was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS

The bill (H. R. 1095) to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian Wars from 1817 to 1898 and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the first of 16 pension bills which are on the calendar. I think this is no time to consider increase of pensions, and I shall have to object to all 16 bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be passed over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the 16 bills referred to by the able Senator from Virginia should be identified. Does he mean to include the private pension bills in his request?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; they are all in a row.

Mr. McNARY. Will not the Senator from Virginia read into the RECORD the numbers of the bills?

Mr. BYRD. I expected that the clerk would read the numbers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the request applies to all the bills on the calendar from No. 707, House bill 1095, to No. 733, House bill 3312, inclusive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood that all of them were to be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar following those passed over.

ACCEPTANCE OF MEDALS AND DECORATIONS BY NAVY PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 1850) to authorize officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, decorations, and presents as have been tendered them by governments of the Western Hemisphere, other than Canada, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That those officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps who have on the date of the approval of this act been tendered medals, orders, decorations, and presents by governments of the Western Hemisphere, other than Canada, in appreciation of services rendered, are hereby authorized to accept them.

WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective as of May 26, 1941, Public Law No. 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(12) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, the farm marketing excess for any crop of wheat for any farm shall not be larger than the amount by which the actual production of such crop of wheat on the farm exceeds the normal production of the farm wheat-acreage allotment, if the producer establishes such actual production to the satisfaction of the Secretary. Where a downward adjustment in the amount of the farm marketing excess is made pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph, the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage as computed upon the farm marketing excess before such adjustment and as computed upon the adjusted farm marketing excess shall be returned to or allowed the producer."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when this bill was called on November 10, I offered an amendment, and I desire to have it considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

"(13) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, the penalty upon wheat shall not apply to that portion of the farm-marketing excess of the 1941 crop for any farm, which was or will be used on the farm where grown as feed for livestock or poultry or as seed. The amount of any penalty paid on that portion of the farm-marketing excess of wheat which was or will be used on the farm where grown as feed for livestock or poultry or as seed shall be returned or allowed the producer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment just agreed to makes necessary further amendment of the bill, and the clerk will state the two amendments which must be made.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "new", strike out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs", and on page 2, line 8, strike out the quotation marks at the end of the line.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF LAND IN MICHIGAN FOR COAST GUARD PURPOSES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221) to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF CRAFT FOR COAST GUARD USE

The bill (H. R. 5509) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase or accept as gifts motorboats, yachts, and similar vessels for Coast Guard use was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SEPULVEDA DAM AND HANSEN DAM

The bill (H. R. 547) authorizing the Secretary of War to execute an easement

deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River."

DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1961) to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional district and circuit judges," approved May 24, 1940, is amended by adding a new subsection "(d)," as follows:

"(d) One for the district of New Jersey."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO KEMMERER, WYO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4932) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 3, line 5, after the word "under", to strike out "such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe" and insert "the applicable mineral land laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEASE OF LAND BY JUPITER, FLA.

The bill (S. 217) to authorize the town of Jupiter, Fla., to lease certain land patented to such town pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the act of July 8, 1926, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That certain land in the town of Jupiter, Fla., designated as blocks Nos. 1 and 23 thereof, patented to such town pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 903), may be leased by such town to any person, partnership, or corporation for use for such purposes and upon such terms and conditions as the town council of such town, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, may deem advisable.

LEASE OF LANDS TO IDAHO FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The bill (S. 828) to increase the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State of Idaho for educational purposes by the act of July 3, 1890, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union," approved July 3, 1890, as reads "be leased for periods of not more than 5 years" is amended to read as follows: "be leased for periods of not more than 10 years."

DORA THOMPSON

The bill (S. 950) for the relief of Dora Thompson, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to (1) rescind the cancelation of homestead entry Great Falls 073861 of Dora Thompson, (2) restore such entry to a pending status, and (3) extend for 3 years from the date of enactment of this act the period during which said Dora Thompson may submit final proof with respect to compliance with residence requirements applicable to such entry.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO SANDOVAL COUNTY, N. MEX.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 673) authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "to the," to insert "tract of public"; and on line 6, after the word "thereon" and the parenthesis, to strike out "in" and insert "containing approximately one and two-tenths acres, located in lot 17"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the county of Sandoval, N. Mex., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tract of public land (including any improvements thereon) containing approximately one and two-tenths acres, located in lot 17, section 31, township 13 north, ange 4 east, New Mexico principal meridian, used as part of the site of the courthouse and courthouse grounds at Bernalillo, N. Mex. The conveyance of such land shall be made upon payment therefor by the county of the appraised value thereof, exclusive of improvements, but not less than $1.25 per acre.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY CO RIGHT-OF-WAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2611) to release all the interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the right-of-way granted to the Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of July 1, 1862, as amended and supplemented, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 4, line 19, after the word "under," to strike out "such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe," and to insert "the applicable mineral laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY CO. CONVEYANCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3193) validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 4, line 6, after the word "under," to strike out "such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe," and insert "the applicable mineral land laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

POSTHUMOUS APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2026) to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotions of certain commissioned officers, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "posthumously" to strike out "promoted" and insert "appointed," and, on page 3, line 4, after the word "War," to insert "or the Secretary of the Navy," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue, or cause to be issued, an appropriate commission in the name of any person who, while in the military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 8, 1939, shall have been duly appointed to a commissioned grade and shall have been unable to accept the appointment to such grade by reason of his death in line of duty; and any such commission shall issue as of the date of such appointment and any such person's name shall be carried upon the records of the War or Navy Department as having served in the grade and branch of the service to which he shall have been thus posthumously appointed, from the date of such appointment to the date of his death.

SEC. 2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue, or cause to be issued, an appropriate appointment and commission in the name of any person who, while in the military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 8, 1939, shall have successfully completed the course at a training school for officers and shall have been recommended for appointment to a commissioned grade by the officer commanding or in charge of such school, and who shall have been unable to receive or accept such appointment by reason of his death in line of duty; and any such posthumous appointment and commission shall issue as of the date of such recommendation, and any such person's name shall be carried upon the records of the appropriate department as having served in the grade and branch of the service to which he shall thus have been appointed from the date of such recommendation to the date of his death.

SEC. 3. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue, or cause to be issued, an appropriate commission in the name of any person who, while in the military or naval service of the United States at

any time after September 8, 1939, shall have been officially recommended for appointment or promotion to a commissioned grade, which recommendation shall have been duly approved by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and who shall have been unable to receive or accept such appointment or promotion by reason of his death in line of duty; and any such posthumous appointment or promotion and commission shall issue as of the date of such approval and such person's name shall be carried upon the records of the War or Navy Department as having served in the grade and branch of the service to which he would have been appointed or promoted by such commission from the date of such approval to the date of his death.

SEC. 4. That no person shall be entitled to receive any bonus, gratuity, pay, or allowance by virtue of any provision of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROCUREMENT BY CONTRACT

The bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (a) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes", approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes", is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7 (a) Any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof, if funds are available therefor and if it is determined by the head of such executive department, establishment, bureau, or office to be in the interest of the Government so to do, may place orders with any other such department, establishment, bureau, or office for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that such requisitioned Federal agency may be in a position to supply, equipped to render, or obtain by contract, and shall pay promptly by check to such Federal agency as may be requisitioned, upon its written request, either in advance or upon the furnishing or performance thereof, all or part of the estimated or actual cost thereof as determined by such department, establishment, bureau, or office as may be requisitioned; but proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the materials, supplies, or equipment furnished, or work or services performed, paid for in advance, shall be made as may be agreed upon by the departments, establishments, bureaus, or offices concerned: *Provided, however*, That if such work or services can be as conveniently or more cheaply performed by private agencies such work shall be let by competitive bids to such private agencies. Bills rendered, or requests for advance payments made, pursuant to any such order, shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment."

WATERS OF REPUBLICAN RIVER—INTERSTATE COMPACT

The bill (S. 1361) granting the consent of Congress to a compact to be entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, Calendar No. 898, House bill 5945, is identical with the bill just reached on the calendar. I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1361 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been waiting for Senate bill 1361, Calendar No. 874, to be reached on the calendar. I was called to the telephone a moment ago, and when I returned I was given to understand that that bill had been reached on the calendar, and that a House bill, similar to the Senate bill, was substituted for the Senate bill, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct. The House bill was passed and the Senate bill was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That action is not in accordance with the wishes of the Senator from Colorado. I desire to ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which House bill 5945, Calendar No. 898, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, personally I should be willing to grant the request, but the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who are interested in the measure, do not appear to be present. I am mistaken. I note that the junior Senator from Nebraska is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I realize that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is out of the Chamber, and that he wants the House bill passed, but I was out of the Chamber when the Senate acted on the bill. We are now on the unanimous-consent calendar, and whether the senior Senator from Nebraska is out of the Chamber or not, I wish to object to the disposition which was made of the measure.

Mr. McNARY. Since the able junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is present, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the House bill was adopted be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] objected to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President. When I rose to speak I observed the temporary absence of the two eminent Senators from Nebraska. I later observed the presence of the junior Senator from Nebraska. He is qualified to take care of the matter. My position is purely negative. I do not object to the request in any way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, would it impair the rights of the Senator from Colorado in any way if his unanimous-consent request were deferred for a few minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. I am perfectly willing to let the matter go over for a while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any Senator, if he so desires, has a right to object to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Colorado, and if objection is heard, the Senator from Colorado has a right to move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the measure was passed, without asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, unless I am granted this courtesy with respect to a matter which is very important to my State—a courtesy which on numerous occasions, to my knowledge, has been extended, without controversy and without delay, to other Senators who have made similar requests, I shall have to enter objection to every bill which may be called hereafter today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no difficulty about this matter. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], thinking that the measure had been disposed of, has temporarily left the Chamber, and I suppose, merely as a matter of courtesy to him, his colleague [Mr. BUTLER] asked that the request be deferred until the senior Senator from Nebraska returned. That, as I understand, is all the junior Senator from Nebraska desires.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, Mr. President, that is all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish the request to be acted on, however, before the call of the calendar is completed.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator may move that the Senate reconsider its action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to make that motion. I wish to have the bill remain on the Consent Calendar, and when it is reconsidered I wish to object to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado can ask for unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed. Of course, he can also object to every bill on the calendar that is called hereafter if he desires to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I withhold any objection until the senior Senator from Nebraska returns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4854) to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Reclamation", to strike out "or other officers of the Bureau of Reclamation" and insert "an assistant commissioner, or the officer in charge of any office, division, district, or project of the Bureau of Reclamation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DESIGNATION OF THANKSGIVING DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, before the name "Thursday", to strike out "last" and insert "fourth."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the House joint resolution merely make the last or the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday, or does it designate it as Thanksgiving Day?

Mr. DANAHER. It designates it as Thanksgiving Day, and, of course, it has no higher status as that day than similar days so named.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand, but it did not appear from the calendar that it had any reference to Thanksgiving. I wanted it identified.

Mr. DANAHER. It does provide for designating the day as Thanksgiving Day.

Mr. TAFT. I have wondered whether there was any Pilgrim authority for making it the fourth Thursday instead of the last. What is the historical basis for Thanksgiving?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, if we are proceeding under the 5-minute rule, I do not wish to enter into an ample discussion of the historical background at this time; but if I may tersely and succinctly inform the Senator on that point, it dates back to 1620, when the Pilgrims, having landed on a rock up in Massachusetts——

Mr. TAFT. My question was directed to the point whether the precedents justified the amendment which has been offered—to make Thanksgiving the fourth instead of the last Thursday. There might be a difference in some years.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Ohio has put his question on a very different basis. He asks whether there is any justification for the proposed amendment. The answer is "yes."

The Senator will recall that in 1940 the President of the United States, at the request, it is said, of certain commercial interests, advanced Thanksgiving Day from its traditional date in the calendar to the third Thursday of November. It was said in some circles that the proximity of Thanksgiving to Christmas was such that people did not have ample opportunity to gear their pocketbooks to their purchasing power. So we found ourselves in 1940, and again in 1941, with some derangement in our holiday system on that account.

In the House of Representatives a great many thought the Congress should fix definitely the last Thursday in November in each year as Thanksgiving Day, and remove it beyond the power of Executive interference. We in the Senate Judiciary Committee thought that, taking into account those 2 years in 7 when the last Thursday might be the last day of the very month of November, we would do better if we fixed the fourth Thursday, which would make it, in 5 out of 7 years, the last Thursday in November, and in the other 2 years would at least remove Thanksgiving Day from so close a proximity to the 1st of December as to make it possible for businessmen to know they were out of the red before they gave thanks. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wondered whether there was any historical basis for the fourth Thursday of the month; whether now we are compromising between the Executive and history?

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that it is a proper subject for serious inquiry. The fourth Thursday is the historical date, and the fourth Thursday is fixed upon in 5 out of 7 years. We make it the fourth rather than the last Thursday simply to have a fixed date, so that everybody will know from now on what day is to be Thanksgiving Day. I think that answers the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution making the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday."

NOTES ACQUIRED BY THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 298) to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board was announced as next in order.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill, and unless there is a satisfactory explanation made of it I shall have to object to its consideration at this time. The Committee on Claims has for some time been considering a request for a very large appropriation to be made to citrus-fruit organizations of Florida. If the bill now reached on the calendar should pass, it would create a precedent according to which it would be only fair to grant to the citrus-fruit organizations the same relief that is granted by this bill, for I think the facts in both cases are practically identical.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware object to the present consideration of the measure?

Mr. HUGHES. Let me say that the old Farm Board made loans and took notes for the loans in both instances to which I referred, and later on——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say that the matter seems to be a controversial one, and I think it ought to go over, and if the Senator will permit me I myself shall object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HUGHES. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection the bill will be passed over.

OPERATION OF PLANTS FOR THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the measure?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, did I hear an objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the colloquy which occurred yesterday in connection with this matter, Mr. President, the bill should be passed over.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the Senator from Virginia to object. I simply wanted to know.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a very important measure. It cannot be considered under the 5-minute-debate rule, and I understood it was not to be considered. It certainly is not a proper bill to be considered on the unanimous-consent calendar, even though Senators may favor the bill. There ought to be full consideration of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that objection is made to the present consideration of the bill, and it will be passed over.

LABOR DISPUTES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 683) to expedite the national-defense program by providing a method for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries without resort to hasty strikes and lock-outs, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

USE OF CAMERAS IN PANAMA CANAL ZONE

The bill (S. 1986) to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, and so forth, in areas of the Canal Zone, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that House bill 5876, Calendar No. 897, is an identical measure. Is there objection to substituting the House bill for the Senate bill, and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5876) to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, and so forth, in areas of the Canal Zone, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1986 will be indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF PANAMA CANAL GENERAL RETIREMENT LAW

The bill (S. 2014) to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that House bill 4871, Calendar No. 896, is similar to Senate bill 2014. Is there objection to substituting the House bill for the Senate bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4871) to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CANAL ZONE CODE WITH RESPECT TO TRIAL OF JOINT DEFENDANTS, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 527) to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCORPORATION OF THE UNION CHURCH OF THE CANAL ZONE

The bill (H. R. 528) to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have had scant time to examine the bill. Is there present any member of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals other than the present occupant of the chair who can explain the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So far as the Chair knows, there is not.

Mr. DANAHER. I know that the present occupant of the chair could give the bill full explanation were he on the Senate floor, and there are a few questions that I think ought to be asked about the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF THE CANAL ZONE CODE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGES

The bill (H. R. 529) to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to mortgages was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUNISHMENT OF PERSONS UNLAWFULLY RETURNING TO CANAL ZONE AFTER DEPORTATION—ENFORCEMENT OF RULES OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Canal Zone Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS IN STRICKEN AREAS

The bill (S. 2076) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third itme, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress hereby determines that due to unfavorable weather conditions and insect damage a serious crop failure of cotton, tobacco, and hay and other forage crops has occurred in many States; that it is essential to the national defense and public welfare that every means be taken to keep farmers on the land and to maintain maximum production of farm commodities; and that the provisions of this act are necessary for such purposes and for the relief of distress among the farm population in such stricken areas.

(b) The Congress further determines that substantial amounts of the sums which have heretofore been appropriated for making parity payments will not be needed for making such payments; and it hereby directs that so much of the money appropriated in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, for the purpose of making parity payments as is not used for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury to offset the appropriations made pursuant to the authority of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) In the case of any producer of cotton or tobacco on whose farm the acreage planted to such commodity in 1941 did not exceed the farm-acreage allotment for 1941 under the agricultural conservation program and who establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Agriculture that, because of drought, excessive rainfall, boll-weevil infestation, or other uncontrollable natural cause, his actual production of such commodity in 1941 was less than 50 percent of the normal production of such planted acreage, the Secretary is authorized and directed, out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 5, to make a payment to such producer in an amount equal to (1) the difference between the actual production of such planted acreage and one-half of the normal production of such planted acreage times (2) the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year beginning in 1941.

(b) Payments under this section shall be divided between owners, operators, tenants, and other persons interested in the crop in the same proportion that they were entitled to share in the crop or its proceeds.

(c) When used in this section, terms which are defined in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall have the same meaning as when used in such act, as amended.

SEC. 3. In the case of any area with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture determines (a) that by reason of drought in 1941 the condition of pastures or the production of hay and other forage crops used in such area to sustain dairy cows is such as to threaten to result in a substantial reduction in the production of milk in such area or to result in the reduction by dairy farmers in such area of their foundation herds, and (b) that milk and other dairy products produced in such area are required for the purposes of "An act to promote the defense of the United States," or needed for other defense purposes, he is authorized, out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 5, to pay, or to make grants to dairy farmers in such area to enable them to pay, the cost of baling and charges for the transportation into such area of needed hay, grain, cottonseed meal, beet pulp, or other feeds used to sustain dairy cows.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities and personnel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to carry out the provisions of this act, and to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for its purposes.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted for a moment. What happened to Calendar No. 886, Senate bill 2076?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed.

Mr. McNARY. It was passed while my attention was distracted. I ask unanimous consent that it be restored to the Calendar.

Mr. SMITH. I object. Under the 5-minute rule——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that unless the bill is restored to the Calendar the 5-minute rule is not applicable to it. It has already been passed, without objection. The Chair heard no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the clerk was proceeding with great haste. My attention was directed to another matter by a Senator. I wish to offer an amendment to the bill which should be discussed. I do not believe that a bill of such importance, setting up an entirely new system of relief, should be passed under a unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair assure the Senator from Oregon that it was not the intention of the Chair to proceed with such haste that any Senator would not have the fullest opportunity to object to any bill to which he desired to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that when the bill was called and the Chair announced that, without objection it was passed, the attention of the Senator from Oregon was temporarily diverted to another matter, it seems to me the bill ought to be restored to the Calendar. I doubt whether a bill of this type should be passed without some discussion.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope I may have unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

This bill was drafted by the agricultural interests of the entire country. A meeting was called, for which I was not responsible, and when the question involved had ben thoroughly discussed it was found that certain States in the Union had suffered greatly from climatic disasters and insect pests. My State suffered. Louisiana suffered. Various other States suffered beyond the conception of those who do not know anything about the situation. In New York there was a complete failure of the crop of feed for the cattle. There was the threat that the great section of the milk and dairy products industry would have to go out of business and allow its milk cows to be sold or slaughtered.

The matter was brought before our committee, and after full discussion we called in the drafting clerk, and a bill was drafted which it was thought would provide relief. Two hundred and twelve million dollars had been appropriated for parity payments, but, because of the rise in prices the 1941 parity payments will be negligible. Those who were interested said, "Inasmuch as that money has already been appropriated, why can we

not utilize it as a direct appropriation to liquidate this relief for us, and have the amount left over covered into the Treasury?"

I know how severe has been the suffering. My section of the country was terribly stricken. I know what the Congress has done for storm sufferers and sufferers from insect pests in the West and in other places. This bill was drafted in good faith, and I was asked to present it and try to secure its passage by the Senate. A reading of the bill will disclose that it is very simple. It gives relief to those whom we need in our defense, now that the war is on us.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. We appropriated $212,000,000 to be used for parity payments to producers of various agricultural products, under the basic provisions of the Agricultural Act.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Do I correctly understand that the bill would divert whatever is necessary of the $212,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. Apparently the Senator has not read the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is impossible to read a bill on the call of the calendar when a question is raised about it.

Mr. SMITH. The bill provides that whatever portion of the parity payments to any given industry is not used for parity payments may be used to liquidate the proposed relief.

Mr. BARKLEY. When is it to be determined whether there would be anything left of the $212,000,000 appropriated for parity payments? Who is to determine it, and when is it to be determined?

Mr. SMITH. As the Senator knows, the parity payments for 1941 are made in January, February, and March of 1942, after the crop has been ascertained.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a rule we have made special appropriations to aid certain groups of our people who have been damaged or injured by disaster of one kind or another. I do not recall that we have ever before used a general appropriation in order to pay special compensation for the benefit of all classes which come within the purview of the law.

Mr. SMITH. That is not contemplated. The amount available to the producers of each of the several articles who receive parity payments would depend upon the amount which was not used for such payments. For example, if there were $60,000,000 for parity payments to the producers of wheat, and the price of wheat were such that only $1,000,000 were used, $59,000,000 would be available for the relief of wheat producers.

I know that the impression has been current that I am pleading for the South and for cotton. According to the testimony given, the people of New York are suffering just as much as we are.

Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from Kentucky has said, let me say that this group of farmers is trying to save an appropriation by saying, "The money has already been appropriated. It will not be used. Let us use it to liquidate the relief you give us." That is all.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not care to go into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the bill. It offends the rule. I try to follow the rules of procedure of the Senate. The Senator from South Carolina has referred to cotton. No one has helped the cotton farmers more than has the Senator from Oregon.

This bill applies to a particular section of the country. If it were a bill of general application, the situation might be different. I think I could apply the objectives of the bill to very many sections of the country—indeed, to the whole Nation.

I want to deal kindly with the farmers, but not in the way proposed by the bill. If we should follow the suggested course, I am sure that we would never reach the point where the money would be available. For many years we have applied a program to fit such cases. I do not want to see a departure from it. I feel sure that the bill would never reach its destination.

I wish to help the Senator. I do not wish to advise him, because he probably would not accept my advice. However, I am sincere when I say that my interest in agriculture is very deep and certain.

I am sure that the bill does not look in the right direction. I am sure that it would establish a precedent which could not be followed. It would embarrass future legislation. To pass it at this time by unanimous consent is certainly not in accord with the consideration which should be given to such an important proposal. It was only because of the fact that my attention was distracted for a moment that the bill was passed. I know what the rule is. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be restored to the calendar. Otherwise I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, which would be just as effective as the other method.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I prefer to have the Senator move to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not making a unanimous-consent request. I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be restored to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 886, Senate bill 2076?

Mr. McNARY. I object to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon objects.

WATERS OF REPUBLICAN RIVER—INTERSTATE COMPACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 874, which is Senate bill 1361.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator from Colorado that Calendar No. 898, House bill 5945, was the measure which was passed, having been substituted for Calendar No. 874, Senate bill 1361. It was House bill 5945 on which the Senate took action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Calendar No. 898 is the bill to which I desire to refer, but we have not yet reached that bill on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent it was substituted for Calendar No. 874, Senate bill 1361, which was indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that we revert to Calendar No. 874 and to the substitution which was made for the bill bearing that calendar number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Colorado to ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar Nos. 874 and 898.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 874, Senate bill 1361, the Chair will state to the Senator from Colorado, has been indefinitely postponed by unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is why I want to revert to the bill bearing that calendar number, so that I can object to the action taken by the Senate. I desire to object to the action which was taken on Calendar No. 874 and the action taken on Calendar No. 898.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in indefinitely postponing Calendar No. 874, Senate bill 1361, be vacated, and at the same time asks unanimous consent that the action by which the Senate passed Calendar No. 898, House bill 5945, be vacated. Has the Chair correctly stated the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the clerk will read Calendar No. 874, Senate bill 1361, by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact to be entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr President, of course it is quite evident that there will not be any objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado. I assumed he was here when action was taken upon the House bill, but I readily consent to having it restored to the calendar.

I should like to call the attention of the Chair and the Senate to Calendar No. 874, which is Senate bill 1361, and to the other bill, House bill 5945, which has passed the House of Representatives, both of which would have the same effect. It would be perfectly idle to pass the Senate bill and send it to the House, when the House has passed a similar bill which is now on the Senate Calendar.

We shall never get anywhere by following such parliamentary procedure. The Senate should take up the House bill, as I think the Senator from Colorado will concede. I will not try to have the bill passed by unanimous consent; I concede that controversy would ensue which would take more time than we could well devote to the matter now. However, I do insist that what we should take up is the House bill, because that is the only way by which to reach a conclusion of the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado and those who are in favor of the Senate bill will have no objection to taking up the House bill if it is agreed to strike from the House bill section 2, on page 11.

Mr. NORRIS. I would not consent to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that is the difference between us.

Mr. NORRIS. But when we take up the House bill the Senator will have a perfect right to make a motion to accomplish the change he suggests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado will object to the provision referred to; and when the bill comes up in the regular way we can act upon it in accordance with the wishes of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. But the House bill is the only one the Senate should consider, because, out of courtesy to the House, and in view of the parliamentary situation, in order to reach a conclusion the two Houses must be brought together. We cannot do so if we pass separate bills in each case.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and this body cannot get the two Houses of Congress together. We had better pass the bill we want and let the matter be settled in conference between the two Houses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill may be taken up, subject to having any amendment offered.

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if the Senate bill were substituted for the House bill, it would have to go to conference.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to object to the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill; and if the Senator from Nebraska insists upon that action being taken now, I object to consideration of Calendar No. 874, Senate bill 1361, and that will dispose of the whole matter, I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

PAYMENTS FOR CROPS ACQUIRED UNDER NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2077) amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation-program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "as", at the end of the line, to insert the word "landlords,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso under the head "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources, Department of Agriculture" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 144, 77th Cong., approved July 1, 1941), is amended to read as follows: *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1940 and 1941 carried out farming operations as landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who complied with the terms and conditions of the 1940 and 1941 agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers, and wherever in either of such years the acquisition of title to, or lease of, any farm for use in the national-defense program caused the producers to lose their interest in the crops planted thereon, or the proceeds thereof, prior to the time of harvest, the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers on such farm in such year shall be entitled to apply for and receive the payments which they would have received under the agricultural conservation program for such year if they had been permitted to retain their interest in such crops, or the proceeds thereof, to the extent that it does not clearly appear that in connection with such acquisition full compensation was made for the failure to receive such payments."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LANDS IN OKLAHOMA FOR CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5095) to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That any person duly enrolled as a member of an Indian tribe who received in pursuance of a tribal treaty or agreement with the United States an allotment of land which, by the terms of said treaty or agreement was exempted from taxation, restricted against alienation, or which by the terms of any act of Congress was continued under the supervision of the United States during the minority of such allottee, and from which land the restrictions have or have not been removed, and any such enrolled member of an Indian tribe having restricted money in the custody and control of the United States, prior to April 26, 1931, and who was required or permitted to pay any Federal income tax on such lands or on the rents, royalties, or other gains arising from such lands during such restricted or tax-exempt period or on income from such restricted funds while in the custody or control of the United States, or on income from any allotment during the minority of the allottee, or any such person who has been erroneously or illegally taxed by reason of not having claimed or received the benefit of any deductions or exemptions permitted by law, and who would be entitled under this or previous acts or rulings of the Treasury Department in similar Indian cases to a refund of the taxes so illegally or erroneously collected, but for the fact that he failed to file a claim for such refund within the time prescribed by law, shall be allowed 2 years after the approval of this act within which to file such claim, and if otherwise entitled thereto he may recover such taxes in the same manner and to the same extent as if such claims for refund had been theretofore duly filed as required by law, it not being the policy of the Government to invoke or plead a statute of limitations to escape the obligations of agreement solemnly entered into with its Indian wards, or prior to April 26, 1931, to exact for its own use and benefit an income tax from them while their property continued under the supervision of the United States and/or during the minority of any such allottee: *Provided, however,* That in the case of the death of a member of an Indian tribe his heirs who succeeded to his allotment of lands be permitted to file claims and recover refunds in the same manner as duly enrolled member of an Indian tribe: *Provided further,* That in the case of the death of any enrolled member of an Indian tribe any such illegal taxes paid by him or on his account may in like manner be claimed and recovered by the person or persons who would have received such money had it constituted a part of his estate at the time of his death.

That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are modified for the purpose, and only for the purpose, of carrying into effect the provisions hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapho Tribes of Indians; and to carry out certain obligations to certain enrolled Indians, under tribal agreement."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The bill (S. 2047) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon the nomination of the Board, are hereby authorized to appoint a director of public welfare, which position is hereby authorized and created, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall be charged, subject to its general supervision, with the executive and administrative duties provided for in this act. The director shall be a person of such training, experience, and capacity as will especially qualify him or her to discharge the duties of the office. The director of public welfare may be discharged by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia upon recommendation of the Board. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, upon the nomination of the Board, to appoint such personnel as may be

necessary for the efficient performance of the duties of the Board: *Provided, however,* That all employees of the Board, except the director, shall be appointed in accordance with and be subject to the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States,' approved January 16, 1883, as amended (U. S. C. T. 5, secs. 638, et seq.), and the rules and regulations made in pursuance thereof in the same manner as members in the classified civil service of the United States, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, however, being authorized in their discretion to give preference to residents of the District of Columbia. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to confer a competitive civil-service status upon those employees performing services for the Board on the effective date of this act who are citizens of the United States and who, within 6 months after the effective date of this act, are certified by the Commissioners, upon recommendation of the Board, (a) as having been appointed from among the highest available eligibles from an appropriate register of the Civil Service Commission or (b) as having rendered active service for the Board prior to the effective date of this act, and who qualify in such appropriate noncompetitive examinations as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, except that as to employees engaged in work in which the Federal Government shares the expense, the Board of Public Welfare shall prescribe such conditions for eligibility to enter appropriate noncompetitive examinations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission as shall conform to the Federal acts providing for Federal financial participation and to rules and regulations of the Federal agencies administering such acts. Any employee of the Board who fails to meet these requirements or who fails to take or pass the noncompetitive examination prescribed by the Commission, or who is not certified by the Commissioners, may continue to serve for a period of not more than 30 days after the establishment of appropriate registers.

PREVENTION OF SALE OF UNWHOLESOME FOOD IN THE DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 5694) to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AVIATION EDUCATION IN HIGH SCHOOLS

The bill (H. R. 5476) to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTRODUCTION OF CONTRABAND INTO PENAL INSTITUTIONS

The bill (H. R. 2297) to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPUTY CLERKS OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

The bill (H. R. 5377) to amend section 111, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEFENSE WORKS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1963) authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TAFT. I may say that the bill purports to deal with the loan to the District of Columbia of $6,000,000 out of the Lanham Act money. In the first place, there is no Lanham Act money left, as I understand. Another bill on this subject is being considered now, or will be considered shortly, by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I believe this bill should go over until the questions involved can be determined, so that the various pieces of legislation coming to different committees can be linked together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4365) to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GERRY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

The bill (S. 1240) designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth Saturday in September of each year is hereby designated and shall hereafter be known as American Indian Day.

SEC. 2. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, as a memorial to the aborigines of this Nation and their contributions to the establishment and maintenance of this Nation.

SEC. 3. The President is also requested to communicate this declaration, by proclamation or otherwise, to the governors of the several States, and request them to take such action as they may deem advisable in order to bring about observance of such day.

REIMBURSEMENT OF INDIANS FOR TAXES PAID

The bill (S. 1412) to amend the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted land, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., ch. 315, 3d sess.), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read:

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to reimburse Indian allottees, or Indian heirs or Indian devisees of allottees, for all taxes paid, including penalties and interest, on so much of their allotted lands as have been patented in fee prior to the expiration of the period of trust without application by or consent of the patentee: *Provided,* That if the Indian allottee, or his or her Indian heirs or Indian devisees, have by their own act accepted such patent, no reimbursement shall be made for taxes paid, including penalties and interest, subsequent to acceptance of the patent: *Provided further,* That the fact of such acceptance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

"In any case in which a claim against a State, county, or political subdivision thereof, for taxes collected upon such lands during the trust period has been reduced to judgment and such judgment remains unsatisfied in whole or in part, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, upon reimbursement by him to the Indian of the amount of taxes including penalties and interest paid thereon, and upon payment by the judgment debtor of the costs of the suit, to cause such judgment to be released: *Provided further,* That in any case, upon submission of adequate proof, the claims for taxes paid by or on behalf of the patentee or his Indian heirs or Indian devisees have been satisfied, in whole or in part, by the State, county, or political subdivision thereof, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse the State, county, or political subdivision for such amounts as may have been paid by them."

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $95,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Any appropriations made pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

MANCHESTER BAND OF POMO INDIANS

The bill (S. 1927) to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to all valid existing rights and claims, lot 15, section 1, township 12 north, range 17 west, Mount Diablo meridian, California, being part of the public lands of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, withdrawn from entry, sale, or other disposition and set aside as an addition to the Manchester Rancheria in California, for the exclusive use and benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians residing thereon.

WILLARD R. CENTERWALL

The bill (S. 2011) for the relief of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the official accounts of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency, for disallowances in the amounts of $26.82 and $11.53 under certificates of settlement of accounts by the General Accounting Office Nos. G-108840-Ind and H-5451-Ind dated December 1, 1938, and June 5, 1940, respectively.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to refund out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated any payments made by the said Willard R. Centerwall on account of the disallowances in question.

APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES TO CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the

United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 3, after line 23, to insert:

The Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of practice and procedure with respect to appeals authorized by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the pending bill appears to relate to an important subject, having to do with appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals. Unless it is explained thoroughly and clearly, I shall object to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of explanation, on objection of the Senator from Oregon, the bill will be passed over.

PRESENTATION OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO THOMAS ORGO

The bill (S. 1943) to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Thomas Orgo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present a Distinguished Service Cross, together with the appropriate rosette to be worn in lieu thereof, to Thomas Orgo, formerly a second lieutenant, Ninety-sixth Company, Sixth Regiment, United States Marines, who distinguished himself by his extraordinary heroism in repeatedly performing acts of bravery and leadership above and beyond the call of duty, under heavy enemy fire, during his service with the American Expeditionary Force in France in the year 1918.

NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

The bill (S. 1957) to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts the naval procurement fund, and there is authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this fund: *Provided*, That thereafter expenditures may be made from the naval procurement fund for material (other than material for stock) and for personal and contractual services under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *Provided further*, That no expenditure shall be incurred under the naval procurement fund, which is not properly chargeable to available funds under a naval appropriation, and the naval procurement fund shall be promptly reimbursed from the appropriate naval appropriations for all expenditures properly chargeable thereto on the basis of transfer and counterwarrants prepared in the Navy Department and certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by a duly authorized representative of the Navy: *Provided further*, That such warrants when signed by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be entered in the appropriation accounts as of the fiscal year in which the expenditures were made and without revision by any officer of the Government; any adjustments between accounts subsequently found necessary in the audit and settlement of the accounts by the General Accounting Office shall be made as of current dates on the basis of new transfer and counterwarrants: *Provided further*, That the naval supply account fund shall be hereafter designated as the naval stock fund: *Provided further*, That the Paymaster General of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the naval procurement fund for payment any existing obligations under the naval stock fund which do not represent the acquisition of materials for stock: *And provided further*, That hereafter the naval stock fund shall be charged with the cost of transporting material purchased free on board cars or on wharf or free alongside vessels at points specified in contract to activities to which initial delivery is to be made only when the contract on which the material is being procured is drawn under that fund so that the issue price of the material may include the transportation charged to the appropriation under which each contract is drawn or to the corresponding current appropriation as may be available.

FRANCIS HOWARD ROBINSON

The bill (S. 1974) for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $246.20 to reimburse Francis Howard Robinson, radioman first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the fire in Government quarters occupied by him at United States naval radio station, Astoria, Oreg., on September 22, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY NAVAL FORCES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1994) to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by naval forces in foreign countries, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendments were, in section 1, page 1, line 6, after the words "Secretary of", to insert "War and the Secretary of"; in line 7, after the word "Navy", to strike out "is" and insert "are"; in line 9, before the word "Navy", to insert "Army"; in the same line after the words "Marine Corps", to insert "as the case may be"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "by", to strike out "naval", and insert "Army, Navy,"; so as to make the section read:

That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, and for the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to appoint a Claims Commission or Commissions, composed of officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, to consider, adjust, determine, and make payments in final settlement of bona fide claims on account of damages caused by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces, or individual members thereof, in a foreign country or possession thereof, including places located therein which are under the temporary or permanent jurisdiction of the United States, to the property, public or private, or the persons of inhabitants of such foreign countries, where the amount of such claim does not exceed $1,000: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by such Commissions unless presented within 1 year from the date of the accrual of said claim: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such Commissions under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, at the beginning of line 19, to insert "as to Navy and Marine Corps claims, and out of such appropriation for the Military Establishment as may be determined by the Secretary of War as to the Army claims", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. All payments in settlement of claims under section 1 of this act shall be made out of the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel", as to Navy and Marine Corps claims, and out of such appropriation for the Military Establishment as may be determined by the Secretary of War as to Army claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, in line 2, after the words "Secretary of", to insert "War and the Secretary of"; and in the same line, after the word "Navy", to insert "respectively", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. This act shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing consideration, adjustment, determination, and payment of claims by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries."

DISTRIBUTION, PROMOTION, AND RETIREMENT OF LINE OFFICERS OF NAVY

The bill (S. 1995) to amend the act approved June 23, 1938, entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 953), is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Selection boards to recommend brigadier generals of the line for promotion to major general shall be composed of officers of the permanent grade of major general on the active list of the Marine Corps to the extent that such officers are deemed available for this duty by the Secretary of the Navy, and the remainder of the board shall be composed of rear admirals on the active list of the line of the Navy, not restricted by law to the performance of shore duty only."

NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT, CALIFORNIA

The bill (S. 2028) to amend section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to au-

thorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), so as to transfer the administration of the Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, to the Commandant, Twelfth Naval District, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), is hereby amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That such land shall be used only as a naval supply depot and for no other purpose, and such depot shall be a part of the Naval Operating Base, San Francisco, and shall be so administered by the Commandant, Twelfth Naval District:".

EMPLOYMENT ON PUBLIC WORKS IN HAWAII

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2086) to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of United States in the Territory of Hawaii, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, authority is hereby granted for the employment of nationals of the United States upon any public work carried on in the Territory of Hawaii by the Government of the United States, whether the work is done by contract or otherwise.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I merely desire to observe that is a very important bill in view of recent happenings in Hawaii. I hope the Senate will take favorable action, as I know it will, on the bill, and that the House will also act on it very promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCOUNTS OF MARINE CORPS DISBURSING OFFICERS

The bill (S. 2087) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps after the date of actual receipt at headquarters, United States Marine Corps, and before transmitting the same to the General Accounting Office, as limited by section 12 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 209), as amended, is hereby extended from 20 to 60 days. In time of war or national emergency and for a period of 18 months after such war or emergency shall have ceased to exist, the time for examination of such monthly accounts is hereby extended from 60 to 90 days.

AIRCRAFT FLIGHT RATIONS

The bill (S. 2088) to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter there may be furnished to officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps, while actually engaged in flight operations, an aircraft flight ration in kind, chargeable to the proper Navy or Marine Corps appropriation, which flight ration shall be supplementary to any ration or subsistence allowance now granted to such personnel: *Provided*, That no part of an aircraft flight ration shall be furnished without cost to any person in a travel status or to any person to whom a per diem allowance is granted in lieu of actual subsistence.

EXTENSION OF NAVAL COMMISSARY STORE PRIVILEGES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2090) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to such other persons as may be specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs without amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the title of the bill seems to indicate that the measure has some reference to fiscal policy or an appropriation bill. The able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is present. I do not know what is the purpose of the bill, and I make inquiry of him.

Mr. WALSH. This bill relates to the commissary stores of the Navy. Should the bill be enacted into law, the Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to extend the privileges of the commissary stores at naval stations and post exchanges outside continental limits of the United States or in Alaska to such other persons as he may designate. Under the present law the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to establish commissary stores outside the continental limits of the United States and the law prescribes who may purchase supplies at such commissary stores. At no time has there been authority to sell to the contractors or employees of contractors. In the expansion program of the Navy this bill would permit, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, contractors and employees of contractors to enjoy the benefit of commissary stores where there are no other facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That such part of the Act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 768; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 533), as amended, which provides "That hereafter such stores as the Secretary of the Navy may designate may be procured and sold to officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the widows of such officers and enlisted men; and to civilian officers and employees of the United States at naval stations and post exchanges beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe," is hereby further amended to read "That hereafter such stores as the Secretary of the Navy may designate may be procured and sold to officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the widows of such officers and enlisted men; to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to such other persons as may be specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, at naval stations and post exchanges beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe."

NAVAL MINE DEPOT RESERVATION, YORKTOWN, VA.

The bill (H. R. 2799) authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the naval mine depot reservation at Yorktown, Va., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES, RETIRED OFFICERS OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS ON ACTIVE DUTY

The bill (H. R. 3149) providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

ADVANCEMENT ON RETIRED LIST OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1630) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the line of the United States Navy and Marine Corps, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "all," to strike out "line"; on line 4, after the numerals "1938," to insert "and all staff officers of the Navy who have been or shall be retired on or subsequent to that date; and in line 6, after the word "who," to strike out "had" and insert "have", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, retired prior to June 23, 1938, and all staff officers of the Navy who have been or shall be retired on or subsequent to that date, who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, and who have not been advanced on the retired list under any other provision of law, shall be advanced on the retired list to the rank of the next higher grade with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement: *Provided*, That no increased retired pay shall be held to accrue to any such officer prior to the date of approval of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps."

INVESTIGATION OF GASOLINE AND FUEL OIL SHORTAGES

The resolution (S. Res. 189) submitted by Mr. MALONEY November 10, 1941, and

reported from the Committee on Commerce December 8, 1941, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee established pursuant to S. Res. 156, agreed to August 28, 1941, is authorized, in connection with its investigation under such resolution with respect to gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products, to include solid fuels, and to obtain such information as the committee deems desirable with respect to the development, production, distribution, utilization, transportation, and handling of such solid fuels with a view to determining the most effective means that may be employed for insuring an adequate supply of solid fuels for national-defense purposes without undue hardship to business enterprises and consumers generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER—INTERSTATE COMPACT

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion that the Senate consider Calendar No. 898, House bill 5945, granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move to proceed to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not see the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the Chamber at the moment, but before he left I talked with him and he told me that it would be agreeable to him to take up the bill today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the Senator from Colorado has been endeavoring to get in touch with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado entered the Chamber.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Colorado is now in the Chamber, and I inquire if it would be agreeable if I make the motion now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been unable to find the Senator from Wyoming, and I know he is very much interested in the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand he is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot locate him at the moment.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose I make a motion now to take up the bill with the understanding that it will not be considered today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That will be agreeable.

Mr. NORRIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, the title of which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the motion, if agreed to, would make the bill the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be the effect if the motion of the Senator from Nebraska were agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. I understand it is agreeable not to consider the bill today but it will be the first thing to come before the Senate tomorrow after the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Carmody, of New York, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Grant to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read several nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 10, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 9, 1941:

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

First Lt. Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, Field Artillery (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1937.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be colonels with rank from December 1, 1941

Lt. Col. Frederic Granville Munson, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

×Lt. Col. Carl Herndon Seals, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

×Lt. Col. Gordon Handy McCoy, Field Artillery (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

×Lt. Col. Robert Boyd Cole, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Milton Hager Taulbee, Field Artillery.

Lt. Col. Sidney Glenn Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. George Clinton Donaldson, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Joseph Hamilton Davidson, Infantry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

Lt. Col. Russell Henry Brennan, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Edwin Lankford Kirtley, United States Army, with rank from October 25, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Lewis A. McLean to be postmaster at Livingston, Ala., in place of L. A. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

Henry Leland Cummins to be postmaster at Opp, Ala., in place of H. L. Cummins. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

ARKANSAS

Hal P. Johnson to be postmaster at Hatfield, Ark., in place of H. P. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

CALIFORNIA

Ellen Clark Martin to be postmaster at Beaumont, Calif., in place of E. C. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Richard G. Power to be postmaster at Colusa, Calif., in place of R. G. Power. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

Harry Ross King to be postmaster at Corona Del Mar, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Patrick D. Lucey, Jr., to be postmaster at Crockett, Calif., in place of P. D. Lucey, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Ward Robertson to be postmaster at Delano, Calif., in place of Ward Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Clarence R. Pierce to be postmaster at Gridley, Calif., in place of C. R. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Emilio C. Ortega to be postmaster at Ventura, Calif., in place of E. C. Ortega. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

COLORADO

Mary A. Morrison to be postmaster at Climax, Colo., in place of M. A. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Clarence Patterson to be postmaster at Steamboat Springs, Colo., in place of Clarence Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

CONNECTICUT

Paul Louis Hebert to be postmaster at Somersville, Conn., in place of P. L. Hebert. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

FLORIDA

James A. Williams to be postmaster at Alachua, Fla., in place of J. A. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Alonzo W. Sias to be postmaster at Clewiston, Fla., in place of A. W. Sias. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Mae B. Wells to be postmaster at Lawtey, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Thomas J. West to be postmaster at Riviera, Fla., in place of T. J. West. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

GEORGIA

Judson Leland Cooper to be postmaster at Pelham, Ga., in place of H. L. Wingate, resigned.

IDAHO

Walter W. Volkmer to be postmaster at Marsing, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lillian H. Witherspoon to be postmaster at New Meadows, Idaho, in place of Lee Highley, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Jerome J. A. Borkovec to be postmaster at Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. A. Borkovec. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1941.

Gladys V. Rosson to be postmaster at Makanda, Ill., in place of W. R. Presley, transferred.

INDIANA

Ralph W. Wright to be postmaster at North Manchester, Ind., in place of John Isenbarger. Incumbent's commission expired July 10, 1939.

Herbert Craig to be postmaster at Rising Sun, Ind., in place of A. H. Henschen, deceased.

IOWA

Kenneth F. Baldridge to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Iowa, in place of K. F. Baldridge. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1941.

Charles M. Robertson to be postmaster at Hubbard, Iowa, in place of O. T. Newgaard, removed.

Clyde B. Richardson to be postmaster at Keosauqua, Iowa, in place of C. B. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1941.

Jeannette L. Eggert to be postmaster at Miles, Iowa, in place of J. F. Muhl, transferred.

KANSAS

Blanche Jacobs to be postmaster at Gorham, Kans., in place of Blanche Jacobs. Incumbent's commission expired August 6, 1941.

Orren P. Young to be postmaster at Westphalia, Kans., in place of W. J. Schulte, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Jacob Rene Harris to be postmaster at Taylorsville, Ky., in place of W. T. Smith, transferred.

Willie A. Roberts to be postmaster at Versailles, Ky., in place of A. W. Howard, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Edward J. LeBlanc to be postmaster at Abbeville, La., in place of E. J. LeBlanc. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Emily D. Straughan to be postmaster at Colfax, La., in place of E. D. Straughan. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Surry Dupree Hunter to be postmaster at Coushatta, La., in place of S. D. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

John Allen to be postmaster at Denham Springs, La., in place of John Allen. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1941.

Wesley K. Ferguson to be postmaster at Leesville, La., in place of W. K. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

MAINE

Everett F. Larrabee to be postmaster at Bridgton, Maine, in place of M. D. Woolley, deceased.

Lester E. Goud to be postmaster at Topsham, Maine, in place of L. E. Goud. Incumbent's commission expired March 17, 1940.

MARYLAND

Agnes C. Rafferty to be postmaster at Cockeysville, Md., in place of A. C. Rafferty. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

James H. Dunty to be postmaster at Fullerton, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

MASSACHUSETTS

Marjorie N. Bowman to be postmaster at Cataumet, Mass., in place of M. N. Bowman. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1941.

Harold A. Daley to be postmaster at Hamilton, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Alice M. Lincoln to be postmaster at Raynham, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

MICHIGAN

Charles E. Kinney to be postmaster at Fruitport, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Bessie Lois O'Brien to be postmaster at Manton, Mich., in place of P. F. Nieuwkoop, resigned.

Hilda Webber to be postmaster at Trenary, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Bernice M. Young to be postmaster at Twining, Mich., in place of B. M. Young. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

John W. Corrigan to be postmaster at Union Pier, Mich., in place of J. W. Corrigan. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

Leon B. Akins to be postmaster at Vassar, Mich., in place of A. E. Streeter, resigned.

Iva Conrad to be postmaster at Vernon, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Rex J. Tuttle to be postmaster at Walled Lake, Mich., in place of R. J. Tuttle. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

Ernest A. Dickson to be postmaster at Watersmeet, Mich., in place of E. A. Dickson. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

MINNESOTA

Leonard N. Riley to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Minn., in place of L. N. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

Della C. Underdahl to be postmaster at Frost, Minn., in place of D. C. Underdahl. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Eva A. Weed to be postmaster at Garvin, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

John C. Myers to be postmaster at Green Isle, Minn., in place of J. C. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Mary A. Culhane to be postmaster at Rushford, Minn., in place of M. A. Culhane. Incumbent's commission expired July 29, 1941.

John M. Lambert to be postmaster at Two Harbors, Minn., in place of J. M. Lambert. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Alphonse J. Koelzer to be postmaster at Waterville, Minn., in place of A. J. Koelzer. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

MISSISSIPPI

William C. Bourland to be postmaster at Fulton, Miss., in place of W. C. Bourland. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

William J. Pettyjohn to be postmaster at Marks, Miss., in place of W. J. Pettyjohn. Incumbent's commission expired August 4, 1941.

MISSOURI

William T. Scott to be postmaster at Centerville, Mo., in place of W. T. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

William H. Fleahman to be postmaster at Jonesburg, Mo., in place of W. H. Fleahman. Incumbent's commission expired August 5, 1941.

Joseph F. Suellentrop to be postmaster at Linn, Mo., in place of J. F. Suellentrop. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Edna B. Wood to be postmaster at Nixa, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

John T. Stouffer to be postmaster at Triplett, Mo., in place of T. G. White, resigned.

Christian E. Kleck to be postmaster at Wheatland, Mo., in place of C. E. Kleck. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

MONTANA

Bertha V. Powers to be postmaster at Neihart, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEBRASKA

Fred Hlavac to be postmaster at Brainard, Nebr., in place of Fred Hlavac. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Nels L. Nelson to be postmaster at Lynch, Nebr., in place of N. L. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Donald W. Flory to be postmaster at St. Edward, Nebr., in place of D. W. Flory. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1941.

NEVADA

Walter B. Collins to be postmaster at Austin, Nev., in place of W. B. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

Pete Petersen to be postmaster at Reno, Nev., in place of Pete Petersen. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1941.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles B. Weeks to be postmaster at Chocorua, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

Sarah V. Dickerson to be postmaster at Denville, N. J., in place of S. V. Dickerson. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

John P. Leonard to be postmaster at Elizabeth, N. J., in place of J. P. Leonard. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

Vincent J. Tuite to be postmaster at Harrison, N. J., in place of V. J. Tuite. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Verna A. Cox to be postmaster at Magnolia, N. J., in place of J. F. Bigley, removed.

Murray Elman to be postmaster at Millburn, N. J., in place of W. D. Hayes, removed.

Ethel Light to be postmaster at South Vineland, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Kemp C. Wetmore to be postmaster at Tuckerton, N. J., in place of K. C. Wetmore. Incumbent's commission expired August 10, 1941.

NEW YORK

John H. Otten to be postmaster at Blauvelt, N. Y., in place of J. H. Otten. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1941.

William L. Bergner to be postmaster at Callicoon, N. Y., in place of W. L. Bergner. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1941.

Gus Di Savino to be postmaster at Chadwicks, N. Y., in place of G. Di Savino. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Cornelius J. O'Connell to be postmaster at Chestertown, N. Y., in place of C. J. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Walter A. Soule to be postmaster at Minoa, N. Y., in place of W. A. Soule. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Bernard E. Ryan to be postmaster at Mohawk, N. Y., in place of C. L. Prince, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Galusha Pullium to be postmaster at Andrews, N. C., in place of Galusha Pullium. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Matt A. Elmore to be postmaster at Dover, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Rudolph A. Guyton to be postmaster at Glen Raven, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Mary Jane Bell to be postmaster at Pomona, N. C., in place of M. J. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Nelson R. Hunsucker to be postmaster at Winterville, N. C., in place of N. R. Hunsucker. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

NORTH DAKOTA

Margaret F. Scouton to be postmaster at Inkster, N. Dak., in place of M. F. Scouton. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

Ruth Cooper to be postmaster at Parshall, N. Dak., in place of Ruth Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired May 13, 1939.

Arlene D. Sand to be postmaster at San Haven, N. Dak., in place of A. D. Sand. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

OHIO

John H. Glick to be postmaster at Bascom, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lillian M. Weber to be postmaster at Blue Ash, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Mayme E. Puterbaugh to be postmaster at Centerville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Reuel H. Johns to be postmaster at Diamond, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Leon R. Noble to be postmaster at East Liberty, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Roy K. Myers to be postmaster at Greentown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

William H. Hesselbart to be postmaster at Lindsey, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

James B. Hagerty to be postmaster at Mingo Junction, Ohio, in place of R. L. Hagerty, deceased.

Albert Daman to be postmaster at Napoleon, Ohio, in place of Albert Daman. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Mabel F. Robinson to be postmaster at South Park, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

OKLAHOMA

Logan E. Lentz to be postmaster at Ames, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Walter P. Dunwoody to be postmaster at Bareville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Emilie D. Hunt to be postmaster at Dingmans Ferry, Pa., in place of I. B. Middaugh, removed.

Violet M. Burrell to be postmaster at Indianola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Jewett Shirm to be postmaster at Montoursville, Pa., in place of A. O. Shafer, deceased.

Margaret M. Ryan to be postmaster at Oreland, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Samuel F. Snyder to be postmaster at Paxinos, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Park C. Shank, Jr., to be postmaster at Peach Bottom, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

William A. Donovan to be postmaster at Sutersville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lewis E. Hatch to be postmaster at Whitemarsh, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

PUERTO RICO

Angel Ramirez to be postmaster at Adjuntas, P. R., in place of J. A. Rivera, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

John J. O'Connor to be postmaster at Ashton, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carrie May Mitchum to be postmaster at Bonneau, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Manning S. Bennett to be postmaster at Folly Beach, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

TENNESSEE

Lizzie Norman to be postmaster at Adams, Tenn., in place of R. D. Murphey, transferred.

Thomas Henry Rutledge to be postmaster at Collierville, Tenn., in place of D. B. Hill, resigned.

William Walter Eledge, Sr., to be postmaster at Englewood, Tenn., in place of W. W. Eledge, Sr. Incumbent's commission expired July 27, 1941.

Bessie T. Queener to be postmaster at Jacksboro, Tenn., in place of B. T. Queener. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1941.

Martha S. Williams to be postmaster at Lucy, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Amy G. Sylar to be postmaster at Ooltewah, Tenn., in place of A. G. Sylar. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

William F. English to be postmaster at Pulaski, Tenn., in place of W. F. English. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Alexander J. Kennedy to be postmaster at Vonore, Tenn., in place of N. I. Williams, resigned.

TEXAS

Samuel M. Compton to be postmaster at Celeste, Tex., in place of S. M. Compton. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Ernest J. Banta to be postmaster at Medina, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

William McGonagle Irby to be postmaster at Texon, Tex., in place of J. E. Kimsey, resigned.

VIRGINIA

William A. Coates to be postmaster at Arlington, Va., in place of W. A. Coates Incumbent's commission expired July 8, 1941.

Gouverneur W. Marchant to be postmaster at Woodberry Forest, Va., in place of M. A. Walker, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Inez G. Spencer to be postmaster at Creston, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Chester R. Knight to be postmaster at Orchards, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Harry A. Mykrantz to be postmaster at Twisp, Wash., in place of H. A. Mykrantz. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer G Rose to be postmaster at Caretta, W. Va., in place of E. G. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

Nona G. Marcum to be postmaster at Ceredo, W. Va., in place of N. G. Marcum. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

Maymie C. Ballard to be postmaster at Danville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Donald Crum to be postmaster at Delbarton, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Mary Kathalene McIntyre to be postmaster at Marmet, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Earl E. Bennett to be postmaster at New Cumberland, W. Va., in place of E. E. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

Hattie L. Dillon to be postmaster at Smithers, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Oliver L. Green to be postmaster at Sophia, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lamar L. Spangler to be postmaster at Union, W. Va., in place of H. S. Ellison, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Lila Robie Baker to be postmaster at Danbury, Wis., in place of L. R. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

Roberta B. Kessler to be postmaster at South Wayne, Wis., in place of R. B. Kessler. Incumbent's commission expired July 29, 1941.

Arthur B. Roemer to be postmaster at Tigerton, Wis., in place of A. B. Roemer. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1941.

WYOMING

Ella M. Sullivan to be postmaster at Evansville, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Robert W. Macy to be postmaster at Moorcroft, Wyo., in place of R. W. Macy. Incumbent's commission expired August 4, 1941.

Alfred J. Johnson to be postmaster at Ranchester, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 9, 1941:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

John M. Carmody to be a member, United States Maritime Commission for unexpired term of 6 years from September 26, 1940.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert Grant to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

POSTMASTERS

OHIO

John I. Miller, Van Wert.

TENNESSEE

Hugh E. Davenport, Crossville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the Holy Bible. What history, what grandeur, and what a symphony of hope. It is humanity's sob over sin and failure; upon its immortal pages the Master has written His moving compassion:

The new was in the old concealed
And the old was by the new revealed.

O, Thou Lawgiver, Prophet, and Teacher, who has come down the high-

ways of history, supplant our ambition to rule by a passion to serve, discovering deeper, richer meanings in the life and ministry of the gospel of our Lord. As we are being exposed to odious perils and thrust into a ghastly conflict, grant that the love of truth, the power of justice, and the refuge of prayer may arm us when assaulted by dark temptation; against these the black arts of evil can never prevail. Every sin that blasts, every inspiration that saves, testifies to the righteousness of Almighty God. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2093. An act to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 165, relative to certain service men; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 1916, to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5074. An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3019) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385)," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Navy.
Department of the Treasury.
Department of War.
United States Board of Tax Appeals.
United States Civil Service Commission.
Federal Security Agency, Food and Drug Administration.
Federal Security Agency, Office of Education.
Federal Works Agency, Public Roads Administration.
Federal Works Agency, Work Projects Administration.
Office of Production Management, Executive Office of the President.

SIGNING OF WAR RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, December 8, 1941, he did on that day sign the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

CIVILIAN YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE, COUNTY OF MANATEE, FLA.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4993) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Sarasota Pass, and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 12, after "military," insert "or naval."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what connection does this bridge have with national defense?

Mr. CHAPMAN. This bill is to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida. The House passed the bill with a provision that no toll or other charge shall be levied against any military vehicle owned by the United States Government. The Senate has amended the bill so as to include all naval vehicles within that exemption from tolls or other charges.

Mr. RICH. Who is responsible for building the bridge?

Mr. CHAPMAN. This is merely the extension of a bill that has been approved by the Congress before.

Mr. RICH. Who furnishes the money to build this bridge?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Government does not furnish any of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, this bill is the same as it passed the House except that naval vehicles are exempted from tolls or other charges?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The bill includes an exemption for naval vehicles as well as military vehicles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted an indefinite leave of absence to take effect January 5, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted an indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the city's request, I arrived last Sunday morning in San Francisco expecting to accompany a special committee due from Washington to officially visit Hetch Hetchy. At noon, came the first heartrending news of what happened in Hawaii, so I left by first available plane, hoping to reach Washington in time to emphatically vote "yes" for the declaration of war against Japan.

The plane arrived here yesterday at 2 o'clock, an amazing flight, but still half an hour late to vote. On the plane were also Representative CARTER, of California, MAGNUSON, of Washington, and THILL, of Wisconsin.

My record will show a consistent policy in an earnest endeavor to save our country the tragedy of war and at the same time supporting every measure for national preparedness.

I have done all within my power to keep this country out of war, but no red-blooded American, solicitous of our Nation's safety, in the face of ruthless attack, made at a time when our Government was continuing its efforts in behalf of friendly relations, could do otherwise but vote to protect it. Because of this situation, I would have welcomed the opportunity to have voted for the resolution had not circumstances over which I had no control, prevented me from being here.

The bombs dropped on Pearl Harbor have but one meaning. War has been forced on us and I shall loyally and steadfastly do all in my power to avenge this outrageous and wanton assault on our peace and honor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PROTECTION AGAINST AIR RAIDS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I, like some of my colleagues from California, have just returned. I should like to make this statement. The people of California are not as jittery as some of the reports would indicate. They are taking this thing like real Americans. They are disappointed, however, in some of the things that have happened. The universal question out there is, where were our listeners, where were all the devices for listening in, where were our patrols, and how did the Japanese get within the lines to do the damage that they apparently have done throughout our possessions in the Pacific Ocean? The people in California are naturally concerned about what will happen in California, and they hope that immediate steps will be taken so that there will be patrols so that no plane can come within range of California.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in the December 16, 1941, issue of Look magazine by Lewis Browne entitled "Anti-Semitism in the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to use this time to say that I had just arrived at the House when the doors were being opened after the adjournment. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" on the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair for the majority leader, who happens in this instance to be myself, to make a brief statement for the RECORD, because such a statement might be of concern to Members on both sides of the aisle, and it is a statement which, I think, in all fairness, the majority leader should make.

Of course, the vote yesterday was unexpected. No one expected such a dastardly deed to be committed against our country as the one committed by Japan. Many Members were away on official business, and it was also understood that there was no important legislation coming up on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday. This was entirely unexpected, and Members who were some distance away and unable to get back would have been here to vote if it had been humanly possible. Some were Members on the Democratic side and some were Members on the Republican side, and some wired me and wired the Speaker and the minority leader that they were hastening back as quickly as possible.

I make this statement in justice to all Members on both sides of the aisle who were away and making every effort to get back here to vote on the resolution that was adopted yesterday with the knowledge that this brief statement should be a satisfactory explanation to the people of their districts showing that their Representatives were doing everything they could to be back here to vote on the resolution yesterday afternoon.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I left Washington last Saturday night for California and when within about 1 hour of Oakland, my home, I received word that the Japanese had attacked Pearl Harbor. The plane proceeded to the Oakland airport. I immediately got out of the plane, went to the ticket office and bought a return ticket for Washington. The next plane, however, did not leave for 2 hours. I came back over the most direct route and missed the roll call by a few minutes. Had I been here I would have voted for the resolution.

A number of my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL], were on the plane with me. Thanks to the Metropolitan Police Department we made the trip from the Washington Airport to the Capitol with dispatch and thanks to the American Airlines we came in a few minutes ahead of time, but still we missed the roll call.

In the brief time I was in California after this attack on Pearl Harbor, the question asked me was, what were our defenders doing out there that the Japanese could come in and make such a dastardly attack. This, Mr. Speaker, is a question I hope will be satisfactorily answered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have received a radiogram from five Members of Congress who were in Trinidad on their way to the United States from an inspection trip. These Members heard news of the Japanese attack and were speeding home to vote. They arrived in New York City last night but the House had voted several hours previously. The radiogram from Trinidad was signed by Messrs. MAAS of Minnesota, COLE of New York, BALDWIN of New York, GALE of Minnesota, and HILL of Colorado. They desire to be recorded as in favor of the declaration of war against Japan.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DINGELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of the proceedings of today, and after other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, in a time like this it behooves every Member to keep his feet on the ground. In a time like this no man can accomplish anything by condemning, without knowing the facts.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have but a minute. In a time like this it is the patriotic duty of every American, and especially every Congressman, to be guarded in his words, in order not to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

CORRECTING MISTAKES IN PLOWING

Only very recently have we learned that from the time the moldboard plow was invented we have been plowing the wrong way on millions of acres of land. We have been turning cover crops, green-manuring crops, and the stubble or residues of crops completely upside down in preparing land for the next crop or in getting vegetable matter incorporated with the soil. It is quite proper, of course, to get land ready for the next crop and to incorporate organic matter with the mineral soil, but it isn't necessary always to plow under every vestige of vegetation and so dispose of its protective effect. We have learned recently that the proper thing to do is to plow in such a way as to leave at least a portion of the vegetative matter on top to hold the soil by checking the flow of wind and water.

Consider, for example, the results of the cooperative research work of the Soil Conservation Service and the agricultural experiment station at Lincoln, Nebr., on this matter of leaving part of the stubble on top, versus clean plowing. It has been found that the former practice—the "stubble-mulch" method—saves a very large part of the rainfall as compared with the complete turn-under system. Also better yields have resulted and, what is most encouraging, farmers have been rapidly adopting the new system.

In the Nebraska area bladed and winged types of plows have been developed for stubble-mulch farming. These run about 3 to 5 inches under the surface in such a way as to loosen the soil without turning under all of the crop residues or stubble. The vegetative residues remaining on top serve as a mulch to prevent erosion, reduce evaporation, and favor intake and storage of rainfall. It is an interesting fact that within the last year some 20 new plows or adaptations of plows have been developed to fit this new way of handling cropland. Farmers have made some of these, conservation specialists some, and implement manufacturers have made some.

On September 20, this year, at a plowing contest held in Iowa, straight plowing and clean plowing were among the points rated for successful performance. There, in the presence of some 20,000 spectators, plowers were rewarded, in part, for carrying out the best job of doing the worst thing for the land—that is, for land subject to erosion. In contrast, another plowing contest held a little later, October 8, 1941, in Wisconsin, included contour plowing among the points listed for meritorious performance.

But we are learning; we are beginning to move. When I attended a soil-conservation rally this past summer at Red Oak, Montgomery County, Iowa, where the Soil Conservation Service has been using a C. C. C. camp for conducting soil-conservation demonstrations, I was told that 3 years previously not one row of corn was purposefully planted on the contour, while this year 50 percent of all the corn rows in this important corn-producing county, in the heart of the Corn Belt, were planted on the contour to prevent erosion and to conserve rainfall. Many contoured fields of corn that I saw late this year in various parts of Iowa and Nebraska produced a fourth more, two-thirds more, or twice as much as noncontoured land of the same variety in neighboring fields on the same kind of land.

PROGRESS

I started to tell about the national program for conserving soil and rainfall. Throughout the country, cooperating with farmers and using C. C. C., W. P. A., and other kinds of labor, the Service has established since the fall of 1933 more than 700 soil- and water-conservation demonstration projects in areas where soil erosion, excessive run-off of rainfall, and related difficulties have been serious problems. Results have been generally successful; the work has proved popular everywhere.

The basic policy adopted in the beginning of this program has involved the treatment of every acre of land of entire farms, ranches, or watersheds—every field, pasture, and wood lot—according to its individual needs, by using all known practical measures of control and prevention that fit the varied types of land, the climate, and the local type of farming. The job for the Nation as a whole is a highly complicated one for various reasons. In the first place, the land itself varies widely in its physical aspects of soil, slope, degree of erosion, and susceptibility to erosion, and, further, because these numerous land types vary greatly in crop adaptability. Moreover, climatic variations exert a powerful influence, and the farmer himself and his debts, taxes, area of good land, location, and labor supply all bear upon what can be done.

Out in the district you represent, Mr. Chairman [Representative MARTIN F. SMITH, Grays Harbor County, southwestern Washington], the protection of stream banks is one of the most important types of erosion-control work being carried on. Here the alluvial lands along many of your streams, as the Wenatchee and Satsop, have been suffering severely from accelerated bank erosion that seemingly has been caused by increased run-off due to the removal of so much of the forest from the watersheds. These lands are highly productive and splendidly adapted to dairying and the production of commercial vegetable and legume seed. The community cannot afford to lose any of this land. The supply is limited and, once the land is gone, it can't be recovered.

On looking over the work in that locality only a few weeks ago, I found that the various bank stabilization practices are proving highly effective, especially the planting of willows, the establishment of special kinds of barriers at critical points, and the occasional cutting of short stretches of new channel through obstructive sandbars, as at John Zak's place on the Wynoochee. I was particularly surprised to see on both the Satsop and the Wynoochee that wire cables anchored through strategic points in front of cutting banks were collecting from the rivers great levees of logs which, in turn, were causing the piling up of gravel to form highly effective protective barriers. Here the destructive force of the river itself has been skillfully turned to combat its own depredations against productive land.

The demonstrations throughout the country have been at least sufficiently successful to build up a general and increasing demand for control and prevention of erosion and increased utilization of rainfall, all of which fit perfectly into a completely coordinated national program for all-out erosion control, silt control, conservation and utilization of water on the land and along the streams; protection of rivers; safeguarding of cities and farms along stream courses; and protection of harbors, lakes, ditches, and valley lands.

DEMOCRACY AT WORK ON THE LAND

And this has led to another thing, a step beyond the soil and water conservation demonstration. It has led to the soil conservation district movement. The rapid development of soil conservation districts in the United States has been, I think, the most significant movement pertaining to agricultural land that has ever taken place anywhere in the world.

When the Department of Agriculture, a little more than 4 years ago, painstakingly prepared a model or suggestive soil conservation districts act to be submitted to the States for whatever value it might have toward the development of State legislation suitable for speeding conservation, I personally felt that real progress would be made if three or four States should pass such a law within 3 or 4 years.

What has surprised me, and many others who have kept up with the districts movement, is that 42 States have adopted such an act within 4 years. Maine and Vermont have adopted it; and Georgia, New York, California, Florida, Washington, Ohio, and most of the other States—all but 6 of them.

And here is another surprising thing: In the last 4 years, farmers and ranchers in 40 States, from Vermont to California, already have gone into their voting places and created by their own action more than 625 soil conservation districts. These districts now embrace approximately 370,000,000 acres of land and more than 2,000,000 farm families live in them.

Approximately a hundred of the districts, all of which were set up by vote of the people themselves, have been increased in size since their formation, through petition of the surrounding farmers. A few weeks ago I visited a soil conservation district in southeastern Nebraska—the Turkey Creek District—which had been enlarged 28 times since its establishment, by 28 separate petitions of groups of neighboring farmers. The district started out with 62,000 acres. It had grown to 235,000 acres when I was there—grown by choice of the people themselves through their own petitions in the true American way.

Things like this don't happen among free civilized people without deep-seated conviction. I learned first hand what the cause was: It was the work which the erosion specialists had done to help the farmers. This work had proved successful. Soil and rainfall had been conserved with practical farm measures. Crop yields had increased and farm income had gone up as the result. Farmers told me that the measures applied on their lands, which they showed me out in their own fields, had benefited both their land and their income.

That was the source of the ferment in the minds of farmers—hundreds of farmers operating thousands of acres—which had created Turkey Creek District by their own vote and enlarged it, not to twice, but to nearly four times its size within the brief period of approximately 2 years. In the beginning someone had denied the forthright purpose of the proposed district—ugly rumors had spread around to the effect that the Federal Government was preparing to move in and take over complete management and operation of the farms. A meeting called to establish the district broke up in confusion. But afterward—and this is the kind of thing that blazes the trail of human progress—determined farmers went into operating districts of other localities and learned for themselves the truth. They came back, called another meeting, and told their neighbors what they had seen, not what someone had told them. Not long after that the district was established by an almost unanimous vote of the local farmers.

These districts are cooperative, democratic organizations of farm people, dedicated to the conservation of soil and water, grass and forests. Actually, they are groups of farmers banded together legally in a well-defined community in order to obtain the help of one another and of various governmental agencies in keeping their soil from washing and blowing, in conserving rainfall, protecting the grazing plants of the range, and keeping forests permanently productive. These people are interested in protecting the uplands and lowlands and the headwaters and intermediate streams, while you, as I have already pointed out, are seeking to protect the trunk streams, the people living along them, the adjacent properties,

For "Salaries, Court of Claims, 1942," $1,518.

For "Probation system, United States courts, 1942," $7,075.

In all, the judiciary, $11,618.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS

For "Salaries and expenses, Office for Emergency Management, 1942," $13,012.

For "Salaries and expenses, Board of Tax Appeals, 1942," $4,400.

For "Salaries and expenses, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, 1942," $9,553.

For "Federal Power Commission, 1942," $20,000.

For "Salaries, General Accounting Office, 1942," $185,747.

For "Salaries and expenses, National Archives, 1942," $11,382.

For "Salaries, National Labor Relations Board, 1942," $20,310.

For "Salaries and expenses, National Mediation Board, 1942," $2,273.

For "Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board, National Mediation Board, 1942," $3,090.

For "General expenses, Smithsonian Institution, 1942," $4,144.

For "Preservation of collections, Smithsonian Institution, 1942," $9,398.

For "Salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, 1942," $642,125.

For "Salaries, Office of Administrator, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $1,737.

For "Salaries, Division of Personnel Supervision and Management, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $2,343.

For "Salaries, Chief Clerk's Division, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $450.

For "Salaries, Office of General Counsel, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $8,802.

For "Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $26,315.

For "Salaries, Office of Education, 1942," $4,848.

For "Salaries and expenses, vocational education, Office of Education, 1942," $3,188.

For "Salaries and expenses, vocational rehabilitation, Office of Education, 1942," $1,280.

For "Cooperative vocational rehabilitation, residents of the District of Columbia, Office of Education, 1942," $600.

For "Salaries, Freedmen's Hospital, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $8,105.

For "Salaries, Office of Surgeon General, Public Health Service, 1942," $1,605.

For "Pay of other employees, Public Health Service, 1942," $3,493.

For "Pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, 1942," $47,400.

For "Disease and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service, 1942," $3,260.

For "Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $12,605.

For "Selecting, testing, and placement, defense workers, Social Security Board (national defense), 1942," $12,445.

In all, Executive Office and Independent Establishments, $1,063,910.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of Agriculture, 1942," $4,555.

For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $22,860.

For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $2,620.

For "Salaries and expenses, library, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $215.

For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Experiment Stations, 1942," $2,684.

For "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $6,300.

For "Salaries and expenses, Extension Service, 1942," $7,925.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1942," $29,610.

For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, 1942," $2,125.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, 1942," $117,935.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Dairy Industry, 1942," $7,172.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, 1942," $35,426.

For "Salaries and expenses, Forest Service, 1942," $161,221.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, 1942," $9,533.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, 1942," $49,667.

For "White Pine blister-rust control, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $7,560.

For "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1942," $47,388.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Home Economics, 1942," $3,485.

For "Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act, 1942," $6,765.

For "Beltsville Research Center, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $1,245.

In all, Department of Agriculture, $526,291.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of Commerce, 1942," $905.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942," $3,230.

For "Field Office Service, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1942," $2,395.

For "Customs statistics, Department of Commerce, 1942," $635.

For "Salaries and expenses, Social Security Act, Bureau of the Census, 1942," $360.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, 1942," $42,825.

For "Operation and administration, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $2,225.

For "Testing, Inspection, and Information Service, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $8,195.

For "Research and development, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $8,945.

For "Standards for commerce, National Bureau of Standards, 1942," $1,166.

For "Magnetic and seismological work, Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1942," $295.

For "Salaries, Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1942," $10,910.

For "Salaries, Patent Office, 1942," $30,565.

For "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, 1942," $45,280.

For "Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, 1942," $3,645.

In all, Department of Commerce, $161,576.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For "Salaries, Office of Secretary of the Interior, 1942," $5,000.

For "Salaries, Office of Solicitor, Department of the Interior, 1942," $4,797.

For "Salaries, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, 1942," $1,325.

For "Expenses, Commission of Fine Arts, 1942," $45.

For "United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, Department of the Interior, 1942," $1,425.

For "Salaries, General Land Office, 1942," $14,000.

For "Salaries and expenses of Land Offices, 1942," $1,000.

For "Prevention of fires on public domain in Alaska, 1942," $300.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1942," $5,000.

For "Expenses of organizing Indian corporations, etc., 1942," $650.

For "Administration of Indian forests, 1942," $4,710.

For "Expenses, Sale of timber (reimbursable), 1942," $1,790.

For "Obtaining employment for Indians, 1942," $500.

For "Agriculture and stock raising among Indians, 1942," $7,000.

For "Indian school support, 1942," $26,525.

For "Indian boarding schools, 1942," $15,355.

For "Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes, 1942," $1,335.

For "Education of natives of Alaska, 1941–43," $3,980.

For "Conservation of health among Indians, 1942," $23,705.

For "Administration of Indian property, 1942," $25,000.

For "Construction, etc., buildings and utilities, Indian Service," $1,455.

For "Geological Survey, 1942," $23,980.

For "Salaries and expenses, National Capital Parks, 1942," $3,000.

For "Salaries and expenses, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1942," $9,915.

For "Contingent expenses, Territory of Alaska, 1942," $165.

For "Wagon roads, bridges, and trails, Alaska (receipt limitation)," $1,000.

For "Salaries and expenses, government of the Virgin Islands, 1942," $1,000.

In all, Department of the Interior, $183,957.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For "Salaries, Administrative Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $7,000.

For "Salaries, Tax Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $6,000.

For "Salaries, Claims Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $3,500.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Prisons, 1942," $2,500.

For "Protecting interests of the United States in customs matters, 1942," $1,300.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bond and Spirits Division, Department of Justice, 1942," $1,700.

For "Examination of judicial offices, 1942," $600.

For "Salaries and expenses, veterans' insurance litigation, Department of Justice, 1942," $5,000.

For "Salaries and expenses of District Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice, 1942," $24,000.

For "Penitentiaries and Reformatories, Maintenance, 1942," $26,800.

For "Medical center for Federal prisoners, maintenance, 1942," $2,300.

For "Federal jails and correctional institutions, maintenance, 1942," $13,900.

For "Prison camps, maintenance, 1942," $1,800.

For "Medical and hospital service, penal institutions, 1942," $4,200.

In all, Department of Justice, $100,600.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For "Salaries and expenses, Division of Public Contracts, Department of Labor, 1942," $3,195.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1942," $3,590.

For "Occupational outlook survey, Bureau of Labor Statistics (national defense), 1942," $1,480.

For "Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, 1942," $3,825.

For "Salaries and expenses, child-labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act, Children's Bureau, 1942," $2,723.

For "Salaries and expenses, maternal and child welfare, Social Security Act, Children's Bureau, 1942," $6,332.

For "Salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau, 1942," $895.

In all, Department of Labor, $22,040.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

For "Salaries, Office of Postmaster General, 1942," $1,585.

For "Salaries, Office of First Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $6,565.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, no one has been more critical in the past than I have of the Army and the lack of preparedness. I just want to say that this is no time for us to beef or squawk. It is time to shut up and to show that we can take it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARTWRIGHT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. I am in receipt of a telegram from the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EDWIN M. SCHAEFER, who had leave of absence from the House because of illness. The telegram, dated December 8, reads as follows:

> Illness prevents my attendance today. Can you request House to permit you to make statement that I am in full accord with recommendations of President and, if possible to be present, would vote for resolution.
>
> EDWIN C. SCHAEFER,
> *Member of Congress.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two communications that I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. O'CONNELL

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, another former Member of the House of Representatives has gone to his eternal reward. On last Saturday Dr. John M. O'Connell, of Westerly, R. I., succumbed to an illness which has sapped his strength for the last few years.

Dr. O'Connell served in the House of Representatives from 1932 to 1938. Many of you remember him and will be sorry that the world has lost a truly fine character.

Dr. O'Connell was born in Westerly, R. I., in August 1872. He attended the public schools there and, after graduation from Philadelphia Dental College, he returned to Westerly, where he lived and practiced medicine until his decease.

He was a member of the Knights of Columbus, the Elks, American Legion, and many other professional, social, and political organizations.

Always showing a keen interest in the affairs of his town and State, Dr. O'Connell in 1928 became a candidate for the Rhode Island General Assembly as a Democratic candidate for representative. He was elected to the State house of representatives, in which office he served for two terms, distinguishing himself as an honest and able legislator.

At the expiration of his term in that office, he became a candidate for Congress from the Second Rhode Island District. He was elected to serve in the Seventy-third Congress, and served continuously through the Seventy-fifth Congress, when he retired from public life because of failing health.

During his term of office in the House of Representatives, he was a consistent supporter of the President, and his term of office was outstanding because of his close watch on the interests of the people whom he represented. He set a high standard for congressional service in keeping with his previous record of service in public, professional, and private life.

To know him was to respect him, and Westerly and the State of Rhode Island mourn his passing, and into the eternal keeping of the Creator we commend his spirit.

TOO MUCH TALK

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include excerpts from a communication addressed to me by the Executive Department of the United States, relative to the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZED LABOR AND THE WAR

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by including a statement from Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ATTITUDE OF ISOLATIONISTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, after what has happened, this is now certain: The America First Committee isolationists should apologize to President Roosevelt. They always challenged that he was violating his campaign pledges. What will they now say that America is attacked?

Our belated preparation and mobilization for war was due in part to what some of the isolationists inside the House and outside the House have said and their influence on public opinion. Roosevelt warned the Nation time and time again that continental distances are myths and that oceans are mere ribbons of water and are no ramparts of defense. He was scoffed at and laughed at by some isolationists in Congress and many out of Congress. We who insisted upon building up our defense and voting billions for strengthening and augmenting the Army and the Navy were called warmongers by some of the more rabid isolationists. Time has proven the President was right. Time has proven that those of us who voted to amend the Neutrality Act were right.

Thank goodness we have a man like President Roosevelt as our Commander in Chief. His logic, his brilliance of mind, his sincerity, his facility of expression, his uncanny insight into events to come will lead us to victory.

I am sure erstwhile isolationists in Congress will willingly follow his leadership. They will not cherish their old delusions in any new form. We are now united, and united we stand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article on the political history of Edgefield County, S. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, after voting on all legislation, including $8,000,000,000 additional for national defense last week, and being advised that nothing controversial would be taken up early this week, I left for my home on Saturday night. On reaching Columbia, Mo., having learned of the situation, I drove hurriedly to St. Louis, but was unable to secure transportation to enable me to get

back in time for the vote yesterday. Had I been there, I would, of course, have voted for the declaration of war.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was absent in the far West on official business when news of the treacherous Japanese attack came to me by radio. I immediately started for the nearest airport, took a plane for Washington, and arrived at the Capitol in less than 20 hours after the news was received, but too late to express my views in registering my emphatic "aye" on the vote for a declaration of war against Japan, and here wish to make it of record.

I have this year served approximately 1 month as a Reserve officer in antiaircraft artillery training camps. To those who have been so critical of the supposed failure of the antiaircraft artillery batteries to protect the Hawaiian coast line from Japanese bombers and have demanded punishment of responsible officers, let me say that they doubtless did as well as could be expected with the scanty equipment now available. Production of proper matériel is now under way and at an early date we should have proper equipment for our antiaircraft forces. If any criticism is to be made, it should principally be directed against those American commercial agencies that furnished the Japanese forces with the American-invented and American-made fire-control apparatus, bombsights, radio echo detectors, and gyroscopic steering devices, with which the invading planes seem to have been equipped.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

[Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have voted since I came here on the 20th of June for every measure offered for defense. I have seen and heard votes in opposition to what I felt was the wise thing to do, but I want to say to every person who may be referred to as an isolationist and others here that I have never seen a finer display of patriotism than that shown on this floor of the House yesterday.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina, who just preceded me, for his very splendid spirit of patriotism so conducive to unity. The question before us now is not, and never has been, What end do we seek? but How best shall we arrive at that end? Japan has made this decision for us. We must now support our Commander in Chief.

I can best express my thought in the words of Stephen Decatur:

> Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong!

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, all I can do is speculate on what happened at Hawaii day before yesterday. I would, however, like to draw attention to the fact that these surprises are likely to happen every day this war continues. We have bitter surprises in store for us. The best-armed people in the world cannot prevent destruction of vital objectives by modern weapons, and there is no use criticizing the Army or the Navy. It looks bad, it is true; but I think they were on the job. They could not be everywhere at the same time, nor were they justified in taking wartime steps, since we were at peace in the Pacific.

I bring this thought to you: Suppose a Japanese aircraft carrier had been sighted last week in the Caroline Islands, for instance. What would have been done to the Chief of Operations or the commander of the fleet if he had ordered that carrier sunk when the peace emissaries of Japan were sitting here in the White House? He would have been accused of bringing this country into war. So let us wait and see before we condemn unheard the officers and men of the Navy and the Army. Before this war is over I predict not all the surprises will be on the side of the enemy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Wayne Coy at the students' convention at Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., on October 30, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article that appeared in the Oregonian of November 30, 1941, entitled "Blueprint of an Empire."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two topics, and in each to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System on November 23 last on the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two separate topics and to include therein some resolutions from the rural electrification cooperative associations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THIS IS NO TIME FOR DISCORD

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to the Members of this House to hear the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a moment ago, criticizing Members whom he termed isolationists, or others who have not agreed with him in the past.

This is no time for criticism, this is no time for crimination or recrimination; this is a time for solidarity, a time for all true Americans to stand together.

Do not forget that Robert E. Lee, the great leader of the Confederacy, was opposed to the Civil War in the beginning. Do not forget that the outstanding hero of the World War was a conscientious objector when the war began. Do not forget that it is not going to be the lip loyalists, the wordy warriors, the long-distance patriots, the curbstone heroes who are going to fight and win this war; it is going to be fought and won by the red-blooded Americans whom you and I represent.

I resent any Member's rising on the floor of this House and attempting to stir discord and dissension among our people during this critical hour.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 7, 1941, when Japan made its attack upon the United States, I was en route by airplane from Washington, D. C., to Seattle, Wash., to hold public hearings in that city for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in connection with the administration of the lend-lease program. I received my first official word of the attack upon arriving at the Seattle Airport at 5 p. m. on that day. I took the first available airplane back to Washington, D. C., leaving Paine Field, Snohomish County, Wash., that evening shortly after 7:30 p. m., arriving in Washington, D. C., at 5:15 p. m., Monday, December 8, the vote on the war

resolution having passed the House at 1:27 p. m. that same afternoon.

I want the RECORD to show that if it had been possible for me to be present that I would have voted for a declaration of war against Japan. I shall support our Commander in Chief in every way possible to bring about the complete and final destruction of the Japanese war machine. Never in the history of our country has there been such a diabolical and treacherous plot perpetrated upon our people. America stands united today knowing that victory shall be ours.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, December 11, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a message to the President.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WENE]?

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when the vote was taken, the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN] was absent. He was in California at the time on official business of the Special Committee to Investigate Defense Migration. He took a train back to Washington as soon as he could get one, but, of course, was unable to arrive here in time for the vote. I want to make that statement in explanation of his absence yesterday.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

FINANCING OF WAR DEBT WITHOUT INTEREST

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, through the use of the Government's $23,000,000,000 in gold and the use of the facilities of the Federal Reserve Banking System, the war debt can be financed without interest charge. I suggest to those who are considering this matter that they consider not paying interest on this increased debt, thereby saving the Government 50 percent of the cost, since it costs the Government on an average of $2 for every $1 borrowed by the time it is paid with interest.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOBBS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the committee appointed by the Speaker to accompany the body of Senator Adams to its final resting place in Colorado. The funeral services were conducted in Pueblo last Thursday. I decided to remain a day or two longer in Colorado.

I received word late Sunday afternoon of Japan's attack and that a war resolution would be presented to the House Monday. I consulted the regular air schedules and found that by taking the first plane available I would not be able to get here until Monday night. I then made arrangements for a special plane. I left Denver at 8 o'clock Monday morning and arrived in Washington at 3:30 o'clock yesterday afternoon, 2 hours after the vote was taken.

Had I been present I would have voted in favor of the resolution providing for a declaration of war against Japan.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative business in order on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to speak for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF ENLISTMENTS IN THE NAVY IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2093) to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before I respond to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not think it amiss for me to say that I thoroughly endorse the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and those of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. This is no time to rock the boat. If the Navy has suffered casualties at Pearl Harbor, there is but one sensible thing to do, buckle up our belts and make a more determined effort that we win the war that much sooner.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course there is a lot of interest, as there should be. I should like to ask my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a question. If he sees fit to answer it, if he thinks the question should be answered, I hope and know he will answer it.

I do not know what the losses are, but does the gentleman believe that losses should be disclosed to the public prior to the time it would be in the interest of the Nation to do so?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It would be a most serious thing for the Secretary of the Navy or the Chief of Operations, or even the President of the United States to disclose at any time any information giving the results of an engagement, and by that act furnish information to the enemy. Therefore, I sincerely trust that the House will have confidence in the men who are charged with this responsibility. I feel sure that the President, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Operations will acquaint the country with information, not only in regard to Pearl Harbor but in regard to every other matter at the proper time, without giving information which will be of benefit to the enemy.

Yesterday I called at the Secretary's office to ask Secretary Knox in regard to what was being published in the newspapers. The Secretary said he could not disclose anything. I asked Admiral Stark, and he said that he could not disclose anything. So all I know is what I have read in the newspapers. However, I have confidence that the American public will be acquainted at the proper time

with what has happened and what casualties occur, not only at Pearl Harbor, but in any other engagement that may take place. Therefore, I trust this House will keep its feet on the ground and not begin to get excited.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the gentleman, who is chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, made the statement he did. If I may summarize it in a few words, the gentleman feels that information should not be made public prior to a time when it will not interfere with the safety of the naval units, the safety of our Army, if such a situation arose, or the safety of our Nation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Congress cannot fight this war. The House of Representatives cannot fight it. We must leave it to the military and the Navy to fight it. They must have the privilege without criticism of deciding when to make public information for the benefit of the American people. At the same time, they must guard against keeping information which the public should know. That is a most delicate position to occupy. The Navy Department must not get the country in the position the British Government was in after the Battle of Jutland. It is a hair-splitting proposition. Let those men who are giving their lives and who will sacrifice their lives determine it.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I join in the caution that the gentleman has expressed, but that would not preclude the possibility of a congressional investigation in executive session by the distinguished committee headed by our friend the gentleman from Georgia, to ascertain what conditions prevailed in order that we might avoid a recurrence.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Committee on Naval Affairs has requested Admiral Stark and Secretary Knox to come before the committee tomorrow, and I am satisfied they will do so. They will divulge confidentially what information they think proper to give.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill. It applies to 213,600 enlisted men who enlisted prior to August 18, 1941. In August of this year we passed a bill which provided that every man who enlisted after that date entered into a contract with the Navy that he could be held during the period of emergency or during the period of a state of war, so all enlistments from August 18 down to date have been taken care of.

This bill applies to enlistments prior to August 18, 1941, and simply means that these boys who have enlisted in the Navy are given the opportunity to reenlist within 24 hours. If they do so, then they draw a bonus as provided in the law of August 18, 1941, a bonus of $200, $400, or $600. If they do not enlist, on account of the emergency or on account of a state of war they can be kept in the Navy.

Under the law today, you cannot hold an enlisted man beyond his period of enlistment, even though the country is at war. Therefore, we have corrected that situation by providing that during a war or during a period of national emergency we can freeze these enlistments if any man refuses to reenlist, but if he offers to enlist for a time not exceeding 4 years, a 1-year, 2-year, 3-year, of 4-year period of enlistment, the Government gives him a bonus of $200, $400, or $600.

Now, this is all that the bill does and it is absolutely necessary that we have a law of this kind and yesterday it was passed immediately by the Senate. It was unanimously approved by the Naval Affairs Committee this morning after a complete hearing and explanation by the Navy Department.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not see the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee here——

Mr. MAY. I am here.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is already the law as far as the Army is concerned.

Mr. MAY. But the Military Affairs Committee this morning, in the consideration of a bill on the subject, directed me to report, and I have already dropped in the box, a bill which would authorize the expansion and extension of the privilege to the Navy, because——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are very grateful to the gentleman for such generosity in helping out the Navy, but we are on the deck ourselves right now.

Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not think the gentleman is quite correct, and I am sure the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is interested in the matter. Our bill refers specifically to selective service trainees.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia This does not apply tc that.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thought the gentleman might want to know that the Navy might take selective trainees, and in the event of the passage of the bill there will be no restrictions on enlistments of selective service trainees who want to go into the Navy, hemispherically or otherwise.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the law today, there is no restriction as to hemispheric service so far as the Navy is concerned, and it is to be hoped we can get all the volunteers, since what has happened at Pearl Harbor, that may be desired without taking any from the selectee group. The record of enlistments yesterday was the highest in the history of the country after the declaration of war

Mr. MAY Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I want to say to the gentleman that there was no desire on the part of the House Military Affairs Committee to usurp the jurisdiction of his committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I understand that.

Mr. MAY. On the contrary, we avoided doing anything of that sort.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I know that.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the gentleman will be glad to know that he can still secure recruits from the selective-service trainees under that bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and, of course, we have that authority today under the general draft act.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I recall, there was a bill somewhat similar to this that passed the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On August 18; yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is this the same bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; that bill was passed and is now Public Law No. 215, passed on August 18. That bill dealt with enlistments from August 18 down to date and on into future days. This bill deals with retroactive matters as to enlistments made 2 or 3 years ago and prior to August 18. It does the same thing retroactively that we have done from August 18 down to date.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. So the two bills together, if this is passed, will provide simply a reenlistment bonus for members of the Navy, no matter when they enlisted.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right, exactly.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. But all of them, both under the former bill and under this one, will be kept in the service during the period of the emergency.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. By the passage of this bill; yes. If this bill does not become law, then any member of this group of 213,000 whose enlistment expires might say to the skipper of a ship, "My contract is out; now give me my discharge papers," and he could walk out. There is no law on the statute books to hold him. Now we offer him an inducement to reenlist immediately, and if he does not reenlist, then we say, "Your service to the country becomes your first duty and therefore we cannot dispense with your services and we will be compelled to hold you 6 months after the war or after the national emergency has expired."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does that provision in this resolution apply both to those who enlisted prior to and after August 18?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It is a very fine bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this measure applicable to new enlistments?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The other bill is applicable to new enlistments. This bill only deals with old enlistments.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I could not hear everything that the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has said. Possibly I am repeating. Yester-

day we passed a resolution, the effect of which is a declaration of war. When the Congress has declared war, does not the President, without additional legislation, have sufficient power to deal with the Army and the Navy to the end that the objectives named in the war resolution shall be attained?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He does not, as far as the Navy is concerned. When a man enlisted for 2 years or 3 years, and his term of enlistment, say, expires on the 8th of December, the President, even though we are in the state of war, cannot hold him for any service without a statute.

Mr. MICHENER. That is a very broad assertion.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. If it is correct——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And that is the reason this bill is here.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is correct, then the statute laws of the country are not suspended in favor of the emergency powers inherent in the war resolution—that is, the Chief Executive is authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan, and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not going into that, but let the gentleman's mind run back to the history of the Civil War. We all know that the enlistment was called first for 90 days, and right on the eve of a battle a man could leave the battlefield and you could not keep him from doing so, if he wanted to, at the end of that time. The same situation exists as far as the law is concerned in the Navy, and we are seeking to correct it.

Mr. MICHENER. But in the Civil War there was no declaration of war by the Congress. Inasmuch as there was no declaration of war by the Congress, the President had no additional powers given him by a declaration of war. That was a defensive war on the part of the Government. The Constitution gave the President certain powers which he exercised.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may be true; but, nevertheless, I am correct in saying that if you do not have this statute a boy could leave the fleet tomorrow, even though we are in a state of war, if his enlistment has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. I shall vote for the gentleman's bill. I have much faith in the Naval Affairs Committee and its chairman. However, I do not want to establish a precedent by passing a law of this kind unless it is necessary and that might minimize the powers which I think the resolution of yesterday gives to the President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman permit me to point out, if I may, what I believe to be a very serious inconsistency which may arise in the military forces of the country, if this bill goes through, in view of the plans of the War Department, as already indicated by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, for the holding in the Army service of all men now in it for the duration of the war, regardless of the expiration time of their respective enlistments, without the payment of any bonus. The gentleman from Georgia suggests in this bill that if a Navy man held in——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; not if he is held in; but if he volunteers, he gets a bonus. What we are driving at is to have a fixed period of enlistment, and not have the fleet undermanned when the emergency expires.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am in sympathy with that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If we had the proposition the gentleman is talking about, then the condition would arise that after the emergency expires there would be no contract or time period of enlistment, and we might become overmanned in 24 hours, because you would not have a contract with the men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I continue for a moment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I still think that the gentleman does not quite understand the point that I am trying to make. Under this proposal, that is, the proposal of the Committee on Naval Affairs, when a blue jacket's term of enlistment comes to an end, the Navy will say to that blue jacket: If you volunteer to stay in——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For a period of years and make a new contract.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; make a new contract, we will pay you a bonus. If he declines to do that, then you hold him for an indefinite period of years, or so long as the state of war exists.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Legislation is going to be proposed to this House holding in the military service all of the men now in it for the duration of the war.

That is the sound thing to do for both services, but legislation which is coming from the Military Affairs Committee, as I understand it—and they were kind enough to let me listen to their discussion this morning—proposes that men in the Army, regulars, enlisted for 3 years under contract, just like a bluejacket, may be held in the Army as long as the war lasts, and no bonus will be offered to them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The weakness of the gentleman's position and the weakness of the position of the Military Affairs Committee is that it is imperative that we have a fixed contract.

Mr. WADSWORTH. So has the Regular Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not by any means; have a fixed contract for a period of time in order to man the ships. Otherwise we would hold them for the duration of the war; but if you get it upon that basis, then the Navy would only be manned as long as the duration of the war, because you have not any fixed contract.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman realize that the enlistment period of 3 years in the Army is just as much a contract with the War Department as enlistment in the Navy of a naval man?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is true.

Mr. MAY. Does it not follow that if this bill is passed as it is, and there is no amendment to the Military Affairs Committee bill, there will be discrimination between the Army men of the land forces and the naval volunteer?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. The Army pays a bonus just like the Navy does. Both pay a bonus when a man reenlists. It is a reenlistment gratuity, or bonus, or whatever you call it.

Mr. MAY. This is not reenlistment. This is a continuance of service.

Mr. IZAC. Therefore if you continue him in service for less than the regular enlistment he does not get that, but he can ship over for 1 year or 2 years or 3 years in both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not under this bill.

Mr. IZAC. I do not know what bill the gentleman contemplates presenting, but it will certainly apply to both services, that we can keep them in for the duration of the war.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that the reason the Department has recommended this is because of the difficulties after the last war in maintaining the personnel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is it exactly. After the World War we had enlistments for the duration of the war, and what happened? Here was a great Navy, and the enlistments all expired at one time, and you had nobody to man the ships. We are trying to make a definite contract and say to a man, "If you reenlist and stay for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years we will enter into a contract, and we will give you certain things that we applied in the law of August 18, 1941."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Inasmuch as the House Military Affairs Committee is meeting again tomorrow morning on this particular subject, and I am sure the gentleman's committee will likely be in session also, does he not think that in order that we might figure out as between both services something that would not be discriminatory? We are both very friendly and cooperative.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, we are.

Mr. MAY. That we might figure out some amendment to our act or to your act or to one or the other that would not constitute a discrimination.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There will be no conflict, because the objectives are entirely separate and distinct. What the Navy is driving at is definite contracts,

What the Army is driving at is national emergency. That is all. It is a big difference.

Mr. MAY. They will be continued during the period of war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in time of war all enlistments in the Regular Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and in the reserve components thereof as applicable, may be extended by the Secretary of the Navy for such additional time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided*, That al. men whose terms of enlistment are extended in accordance with the provisions of this act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the government of the Navy: *Provided further*, That men detained in service in accordance with this act shall, unless they voluntarily extend their enlistments, be discharged not later than 6 months after the termination of the condition which originally authorized their detention.

SEC. 2. In time of war that portion of section 1422 of the Revised Statutes (18 Stat. 484; 34 U. S C. 201) which reads as follows: "All persons who shall be so detained beyond their terms of enlistment or who shall, after the termination of their enlistment, voluntarily reenter to serve until the return to an Atlantic or Pacific port of the vessel to which they belong, and their regular discharge therefrom, shall receive for the time during which they are so detained, or shall so serve beyond their original terms of enlistment an addition to one-fourth of their former pay," shall be suspended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION—DEFENSE PUBLIC WORKS AND EQUIPMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5800) authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill and what it provides?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, I wish to say that it will be my purpose not only on this bill, but on all measures presented by the Committee on the District of Columbia to explain the provisions of the proposals which we bring to this House. In connection with the specific question which the gentleman asked, the purpose of this legislation is to permit the District of Columbia to participate in the benefits of the so-called Lanham Act. The Congress has appropriated $150,000,000, and that has become available. Due to the defense activities which have centered certainly to a great degree in Washington, D. C., there is immediate need for certain projects, and the funds cannot be secured without the authorization contained in this bill.

I shall propose, and have already sent to the desk, an amendment to change the amount in the bill found on page 2, line 2, from $6,000,000 to $2,500,000.

I do this after consultation with the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I hope the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], is on the floor for he wholly concurs in the amendment and asks that it be inserted. There is only money available, I am informed, to the extent of about $2,300,000 for needed projects which have already been set up in the District of Columbia for certain types of defense activities, notably sewers, roads, and the like.

Mr. SPRINGER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia if it is not true that the House has already appropriated $6,000,000 for the use of the District of Columbia in the present fiscal year?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is absolutely true. We also know that we have appropriated certain sums of money for national defense, but we will be called on to do it over and over and over again. Certainly here in the District of Columbia the added defense burdens which cause this bill have not been of the making of the residents of the District. They rise from the defense program which is concentrated in Washington, D. C. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has a statement to make on this particular point.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask just one additional question at this point?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. If this bill should be passed, it would carry an appropriation of $2,500,000. This will make about $8,500,000 appropriated from the Federal Treasury during the present fiscal year for use in the District of Columbia. Is that not correct?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman from West Virginia will yield, I would be glad to answer the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I gladly yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I want to say with reference to this particular measure that it provides $2,500,000 of funds to come from the appropriation already made with reference to community facilities or public works in congested areas of national defense. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in conjunction with the chairman and other members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and in conjunction with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the corporation counsel, had a hearing on this particular matter.

The money authorized in this bill has only an incidental connection with the District of Columbia, and from it the District of Columbia will not profit.

The purpose of this expenditure is threefold: First, to provide certain water and sewer connections at Bolling Field where we are told that there may be a flood next spring unless these facilities are provided. Second, it makes similar provision for the new War Department Building and some of its ancillary and adjacent structures and agencies. These are strictly national-defense matters that have practically no relationship to the District of Columbia except that these necessary extensions can be made by tying them on to the District of Columbia facilities. As a matter of fact there is no appropriation here in essence for the District of Columbia, but simply the allocation of $2,500,000 of funds heretofore provided for just such purposes in congested national-defense areas; and by reason of the fact that the original appropriation was authorized from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Committee on the District of Columbia came before our committee; and the showing was very clear and conclusive. Our committee did not yield to the $6,000,000 request but did yield to the $2,500,000 request by reason of the fact that it came primarily within the purposes of the act we have passed. They are quite essential and should be completed with speed.

This money is to provide facilities in congested areas of national defense that are vitally important to this Capitol and to the country, and for which provision should be made at once. They have only a distant connection with the District of Columbia.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wish to thank the gentleman for the explanation which has been made of the bill by the Chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee and also by the Chairman of the District of Columbia Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have read in the press during the last several days that bills would soon come before this House providing for additional funds from the Federal Treasury for needed improvements in the District of Columbia. I am informed that this money is to be used in sewer extensions, and water-improvement extensions, and possibly some for needed public buildings, such as additions to Gallinger Hospital. I do not want to be understood as opposing needed improvements in the District of Columbia, but I am tired of having them begging Congress on one hand for money from the Federal Treasury and opposing on the other hand every move made by Congress to level tax rates in Washington with the various States.

I am of the opinion that the District of Columbia should have some help on some of its problems, especially those that may arise as a result of this present emergency. I am not unmindful, however,

that the State of Indiana has immense problems which arise out of this present emergency also, and yet Indiana bears her share of the tax burden before coming to Congress for help. Indiana only comes to Congress for help after she has levied taxes comparable with the various States.

The District of Columbia has not done that, and she does not intend to do it if her businessmen and large corporations can cajole and browbeat Congress into donating them the money.

This House passed H. R. 5558 a few weeks ago to level the gasoline-tax rate in the District with the rest of this United States, and we were considerate of the District, as we did not undertake to raise it to the average of the States, which is 4.4 cents. We recognized that this District had been a pampered baby so long that we should not equalize them too fast. However, I notice that the District of Columbia subcommittee of the Senate is holding up this bill, undertaking to avoid passing it on the ground that priorities cannot be secured in order to construct the Whitehurst plan. This is not the end of the story. Planning for improvement in the District of Columbia goes merrily on without regard to priority necessity.

It is argued before the Senate Committee that H. R. 5558 should not be passed now as street work is not absolutely necessary in the District of Columbia and that we should struggle on with our snarled traffic problem, taking human lives, until the present emergency is over. Why not do the same with sewer- and water-extension improvements? They are not needed to save human life, but only to provide needed conveniences, while the Whitehurst plan is needed to stop traffic murder. The Whitehurst plan or some other street-improvement program is needed more than these other improvements and comes under the category of defense necessities. War material, Army supplies, Army truck convoys, and other defense material are constantly passing over the streets of Washington. Their congested condition delays their free passage. This added defense traffic in Washington further clogs traffic and takes additional human lives. Why is there opposition to the street program, when it is more necessary than additional sewers and water mains?

I will tell you why. It is because it is proposed to have the Federal Government provide the money for the sewers and water mains and proposed public buildings in the District of Columbia, and as to the street program it is proposed to raise the gasoline-tax rate not even to the average of the States, and have the District pay for the street program itself. The plain English answer to this puzzling question is that the District of Columbia will crawl behind defense priorities or anything else to avoid having its taxes even remotely approach the local tax burden my State and yours bear. The District would prefer to have its traffic muddle remain as it is, add to its traffic murder list daily, than to even help pay for the solution itself.

There is no reason why H. R. 5558 should be longer delayed in the Senate because of this bugaboo of defense priorities. Captain Whitehurst advised our District Committee, and I am informed has so advised the Senate District Committee, that no question of priorities, labor problems, or anything else will hinder the progress of his program if and when the money is provided. What is the Senate waiting for?

I do not oppose helping the District of Columbia when it has done as much toward raising taxes as Indiana, Texas, West Virginia, Ohio, Arkansas, Tennessee, and the average of the other States have done. Until a proper gasoline tax is provided in the District of Columbia as provided in H. R. 5558, I shall oppose every appropriation of funds from the Federal Treasury for the District of Columbia. There is a question of fairness urging me on, and I hope that other Members of this body who voted for H. R. 5558 will join me in this movement. Not one more cent for the District of Columbia from the Federal Treasury until H. R. 5558 is passed.

We have helped this District long enough. However, where items are so provided which are for our own defense, we must recognize the same. It must cooperate so far as I am concerned, or hoe its own row. That is what Indiana has to do. Do you think for one minute that Congress would heed an appeal for help in our road problem caused by this emergency if we did not have a proper tax of our own? Congress would not permit us to raid the Federal Treasury for State road purposes, if we had practically no road tax of our own.

There is no justification for the Senate subcommittee hiding behind the excuse of defense priorities in holding up H. R. 5558. We threshed out all of those questions over here, and passed this bill by an overwhelming majority. If the District expects any further help from this House it should level its tax rate. If it does not do that, then let us withhold any further assistance of any kind from the Federal Treasury.

I realize that this money, which is proposed to be used for sewer or water-main extension is to be appropriated from funds provided by the Lanham Act which is also available to the various States. However, the principle involved is the one I have just stated.

The District of Columbia is not paying a tax rate comparable to the States and is continually fighting to avoid it. The Lanham Act funds should supplement local needs and not be used as an excuse to saddle local problems on the Federal Government; nor be used as an excuse to avoid a just share of a local tax burden.

Members of this House, let us join in a program of no appropriations to the District of Columbia from any Federal funds until the District of Columbia consents to a leveling of the local tax rate with that of the various States. It has been said by certain public officials that if the District of Columbia wants anything, "if she howls loud enough and long enough she will get them." Give them an opportunity to "howl" for the thing that is just or hoe their own row. If residents want to persist in "howling" for an unfair advantage in gasoline tax, then abandon them to their own tax resources.

This will result in saving millions of dollars to the Federal taxpayer, and be a genuine service to our constituents. At the same time it is dealing justly with the District of Columbia by asking them to bear a like share of local taxes as compared to our constituents, before coming to the Federal Government for a donation.

Mr. Speaker, I will not object since this item is considered a defense item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (herein called the "Commissioners") are hereby authorized to accept advancements for the District of Columbia from the Federal Works Administrator (herein called the "Administrator"), and the Administrator, under and subject to the provisions of the act of June 28, 1941 (Public, No. 137, 77th Cong.), is authorized to advance the sum of $6,000,000, or any part thereof, in addition to any sums heretofore advanced to the District of Columbia, out of funds authorized by law for the Administrator, for the acquisition, purchase, construction, establishment, and development of defense public works and equipment, and all sums so advanced shall be deposited in full with the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The sum authorized by section 1 hereof, or any part thereof, shall, when advanced, be available to the Commissioners for the acquisition by dedication, purchase, or condemnation of the fee-simple title to improved or unimproved land, or rights or easements in land, for the public uses authorized by this act; for the demolition of structures, buildings, and improvements on lands or interests in land acquired under this act; for the construction of buildings, water facilities, sewer facilities, highways, fire-alarm extensions, and other public works, including materials and labor, heating, lighting, elevators, plumbing, landscaping, and all other appurtenances, and the purchase and installation of pipe lines, machinery, furniture, equipment, apparatus, and any and all other expenditures necessary for or incident to the complete construction and equipment for use of the aforesaid buildings, plants, and facilities; and for the making of surveys and the preparation of plans, designs, estimates, models, and specifications; and for architectural, engineering, and other professional services and other technical and administrative personnel without reference to the civil-service requirements, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed three passenger vehicles; for the rental of such office facilities as may in the opinion of the Commissioners be necessary; for the purchase of supplies, equipment, periodicals, books of reference, and postage.

SEC. 3. The Federal Works Administrator shall be repaid such portion as may be determined by the President of any moneys advanced under section 1 of this act in annual installments over a period of not to exceed 25 years, with interest thereon beginning July 1, 1942, for the period of amortization: *Provided,* That such interest is to be based upon the average rate of interest paid upon obligations of the United States Government for the 2 fiscal years next preceding June 30, 1941, such rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further,*

That such sums as may be necessary for the reimbursement herein required of the District of Columbia, and for the payment of interest, shall be included in the annual estimates of the Commissioners, the first reimbursement to be made on July 1, 1943: *And provided further*, That whenever the District of Columbia is under obligation by virtue of the provisions of section 4 of Public Act No. 284, Seventy-first Congress, and section 3 of Public Act No. 746, Seventy-fifth Congress, reimbursement under those acts shall be not less than $700,000 in any one fiscal year.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make reimbursement to the Administrator under section 3 hereof for water projects and highway projects, respectively, from the water fund and the gas-tax fund of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners shall submit with their annual estimates to the Congress a report of their activities and expenditures under section 1 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the following language: "for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed three passenger vehicles."

Page 3, line 8, change the semicolon after the word "necessary" to a period, and strike out the remainder of section 2.

Page 3, line 14, strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "ten."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 1, line 2, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SERVICE OF MEMBERS OF ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD BEYOND TERM OF ENLISTMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 165) to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization, to make the following correction, namely: On page 2, line 12, of the engrossed bill, strike out the word "therein" and in lieu thereof insert the word "herein."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5 OF ACT ESTABLISHING BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5893), to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926, be, and the same is hereby amended, to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon the nomination of the Board, are hereby authorized to appoint a Director of Public Welfare, which position is hereby authorized and created, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall be charged, subject to its general supervision, with the executive and administrative duties provided for in this act. The Director shall be a person of such training, experience, and capacity as will especially qualify him or her to discharge the duties of the office. The Director of Public Welfare may be discharged by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia upon recommendation of the Board. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, upon the nomination of the Board, to appoint such personnel as may be necessary for the efficient performance of the duties of the Board: *Provided, however*, That all employees of the Board, except the Director, shall be appointed in accordance with and be subject to the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States,' approved January 16, 1883, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 638 et seq.), and the rules and regulations made in pursuance thereof in the same manner as members in the classified civil service of the United States, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, however, being authorized in their discretion to give preference to residents of the District of Columbia. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to confer a competitive civil-service status upon those employees performing services for the Board on the effective date of this act who are citizens of the United States and who, within 6 months after the effective date of this act, are certified by the Commissioners, upon recommendation of the Board (a) as having been appointed from among the highest available eligibles from an appropriate register of the Civil Service Commission, or (b) as having rendered active service for the Board prior to the effective date of this act, and who qualify in such appropriate noncompetitive examinations as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, except that as to employees engaged in work in which the Federal Government shares the expense, the Board of Public Welfare shall prescribe such conditions for eligibility to enter appropriate noncompetitive examinations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission as shall conform to the Federal acts providing for Federal financial participation and to rules and regulations of the Federal agencies administering such acts. Any employee of the Board who fails to meet these requirements or who fails to take or pass the noncompetitive examination prescribed by the Commission, or who is not certified by the Commissioners, may continue to serve for a period of not more than 30 days after the establishment of appropriate registers."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to provide a merit system for employees of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia. Such a system is essential since under existing laws Federal grants for aid in social work can only be made when the funds are to be administered by employees appointed under and protected by a merit system. The Federal social agencies have threatened to withhold aid from the District unless these employees are brought under a merit system.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCLOSURE OF CHARACTER OF CHARITABLE, BENEVOLENT, PATRIOTIC SOLICITATIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 5881, to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; to provide for regulation and control within the District of Columbia of such solicitations; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this act; to authorize appropriations therefor; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act, divided into the following sections and subsections, may be cited as the "District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act."

SECTION 1. As used in this act—

The term "Commissioners" shall mean the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, sitting as a board.

The term "organization" shall be construed to include any and every type of organization, incorporated or unincorporated, without limitation.

The term "registrant" shall mean the holder of a valid certificate of registration duly issued under the terms of this act.

SEC. 2. No person, firm, organization, association, or corporation shall solicit directly or indirectly or through the agency of others, on his own or its behalf or on behalf of any firm, organization, association, or corporation, money, donations, property, or financial assistance of any kind or shall lend, lease, sell, or offer to lend, lease, or sell, any article, service, publication, ticket, subscription, or any other thing on the actual or implied plea that the proceeds from such solicitation, or any part thereof, are for charitable, civic, patriotic, benevolent, religious, educational, or philanthropic purposes, unless such person, firm, organization, association, or corporation shall first have filed a registration statement with the Commissioners and shall have received from the Commissioners a certificate of registration.

SEC. 3. Application for said certificate of registration and said registration shall be made upon such form or forms as shall be furnished by the Commissioners and shall contain full and complete information as to the purposes of the organization; distribution of the moneys; personnel, including officers and directors and employees; salaries or commissions paid or to be paid; the particular purpose for which the solicitation is being made; and, such other information as the Commissioners may require; and every such application and statement shall be signed and verified.

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of such verified application and statement, the Commissioners shall cause an investigation to be made to determine whether or not the statements contained in the application are true, accurate, and complete, and whether or not the applicant and the officers and directors thereof, are persons of good character. In the course of such investigation, the Commissioners are authorized to require the submission of books and records and shall have the right to inspect any and all premises used or occupied by the applicant.

SEC. 5. No certificate of registration shall be issued by the Commissioners unless the Commissioners find that the statements in the application for registration are true, complete, and accurate; that the officers and directors are persons of good character; that the activities (including the application of its funds) will tend substantially to further a worthy object or purpose, free from any element of private gain other than reasonable compensation for services rendered, and, in addition, that said activities will be in nowise inimical to the public welfare, safety, or morals of the community; and the Commissioners are authorized to hold public hearings before refusing any application. Any applicant whose application has been refused following hearing, shall have the right of appeal to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, in —— days.

SEC. 6. Holders of certificates of registration shall be required to file reports with the Commissioners at least once a year. If there is any change in any of the material facts stated in the registration statement, a report shall be filed with the Commissioners within 30 days after such change.

SEC. 7. The fee for such registration shall be ——, payable upon the issuance of the certificate of registration.

SEC. 8. Neither the fact that a registration statement for a solicitation has been filed or is in effect, nor that a certificate of registration has been issued, shall be deemed a finding by the Commissioners that the registration statement is true and accurate on its face and that it does not contain an untrue statement of facts, or omits to state a material fact, or to be held to mean that the Commissioners have in any way passed upon the merits of or given approval to such solicitation. It shall be unlawful to make or cause to be made any representation contrary to the provisions of this section, or to advertise the fact of registration: *Provided, however,* That the registration may use these words: "Registered under the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act, which registration does not necessarily constitute approval or endorsement."

SEC. 9. None of the provisions of this act shall apply or in any way be construed to require registration or certificate of registration where the solicitation, appeal, offer for sale, or selling is to be conducted exclusively by and between members of an organization that is to be the beneficiary in whole or in part, of the proceeds thereof, or where solicitation is made at the instance of the United States or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. If the Commissioners have probable cause to believe that an untrue statement or misrepresentation of any kind or a concealment of any material fact was made in the application for registration, or in any report as provided in section 6, the Commissioners may proceed to suspend the certificate of registration previously issued. After such suspension the Commissioners shall hold a public hearing after written notice to the registrant, and upon a finding adverse to the registrant shall revoke the said certificate of registration. There shall be a right of appeal from said revocation in the same manner as provided in section 5 herein.

SEC. 11. The Commissioners are hereby authorized and empowered to administer and enforce the provisions of this act and to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations which may be necessary to carry out said provisions. Such employees of the government of the District of Columbia as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act shall be assigned to the duties hereunder without additional compensation.

SEC. 12. The Commissioners shall appoint an advisory committee consisting of the residents of the District of Columbia to aid and advise the Commissioners in the enforcement of this act. This committee shall be known as the "Charities Advisory Committee" and the members thereof shall serve without compensation: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the committee may be an employee of the Board of Public Welfare and may receive compensation as such secretary. This advisory committee shall consist of not more than nine members.

SEC. 13. Any person, organization, firm, or corporation violating any of the provisions of this act shall be liable to a fine or penalty of not more than ————.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 15. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, such sum as may be necessary to meet any and all expenses incident to administering this act.

SEC. 16. The provisions of this act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 7, after the word "in" insert the word "thirty."

Page 4, line 14, after the word "be" insert "$5."

Page 6, line 21, after the word "than" insert "$300 or ninety days."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this measure sponsored by our colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is to provide through a system of registration and permits for the regulation and control within the District of Columbia of all solicitations and appeals to raise funds for charitable or patriotic purposes. The bill is designed to correct abuses which exist. The Commissioners believe that persons desiring to contribute funds for worthy purposes should be assured of the authority of the individual or organization making such solicitation. This legislation is designed to extend protection both to bona fide organizations and contributors.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 6003, to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938, be amended by inserting between the first and second sentences the following: "The said Zoning Commission shall also have power to promulgate regulations to require, with respect to buildings erected subsequent to the promulgation of such regulations, that facilities be provided and maintained either on the same lot with any such building, or on the same lot with any such building or elsewhere, for the parking of automobiles and motor vehicles of the owners, occupants, tenants, patrons, and customers of such building, and of the businesses, trades, and professions conducted therein."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there are four bills which I now present, of which this is the first, dealing with certain traffic problems in the District of Columbia. The purpose of this measure is to aid in relieving traffic congestion in the streets of our National Capital and to provide additional parking facilities by giving our Zoning Commission Authority to require buildings that are to be erected in the future to provide parking facilities for the tenants or the occupants of such building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the gentleman, is there anything further in the proposal to take care of the present condition?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have other measures which I believe would further attempt to solve this problem. The committee is also going into a full study of the need for other legislation. I appreciate the inquiry of the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKING FACILITIES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6004), to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District

of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any office building is hereafter erected in the District of Columbia by the United States Government, or any department, agency, or establishment thereof, or any corporation, all of the stock of which is owned or controlled by the United States Government, space readily accessible to such building shall be provided and maintained for the parking of automobiles and motor vehicles of 20 percent of the persons employed in such building.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "of", insert "not less than 10 percent or more than."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in further reference to the matter which the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] brings to the attention of the House, may I say that the purpose of this bill is also to relieve parking conditions in Washington by requiring that whenever an office building is hereafter erected in the District of Columbia by the Federal Government or any agency thereof, parking space shall be provided for the cars of not less than 10 percent of the persons who are to be employed in any such building.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That specifically covers Federal construction?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right, for any agency.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the gentleman any bills there that would take care of the local construction?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have bills dealing with this situation in certain manner. I am coming to them right now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The only reason I ask the question right now is the possibility of amending the gentleman's presentation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I appreciate the interest of my friend.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKING OF VEHICLES UPON PUBLIC OR PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6162) to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful to park, store, or leave any vehicle of any kind, whether attended or not, or for the owner of any vehicle of any kind to allow, permit, or suffer the same to be parked, stored, or left, whether attended or not, upon any public or private property in the District of Columbia, other than public highways, without the consent of the owner of such public or private property, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and their designated agent or agents, are authorized to remove and impound any vehicle parked, stored, or left in violation of this act and to keep the same impounded until the owner thereof, or other duly authorized person, shall deposit collateral for his appearance in court to answer for such violation the amount of such collateral to be fixed by the Commissioners in an amount not to exceed $25. Whoever violates the provisions of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $25. Prosecutions for violations of the provisions of this section shall be in the police court of the District of Columbia upon information filed by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants. In any prosecution under this section, proof that a vehicle was parked, stored, or left on public or private property shall be prima facie evidence that the vehicle was so parked, stored, or left without the consent of the owner of such public or private property.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to interfere with the exclusive charge and control committed to the Federal Works Administrator, acting through the Commissioner of Public Buildings, over the public buildings and property of the United States in the District of Columbia or any other officer charged with the custody and control of property of the United States in the District of Columbia and such officers with respect to such property, under their respective jurisdiction and control are hereby authorized and empowered to make and enforce all regulations for the parking of vehicles upon the property of the United States in the District of Columbia (other than public highways), the violation of which shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in this act and all prosecutions for the violations thereof shall be upon information filed by the United States attorney in the police court of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. Should any provisions of this act be declared by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, the validity of the act as a whole or any part thereof, other than the part declared to be unconstitutional or invalid, shall not be affected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this measure is to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District without the consent of the owner of such property. At the present time a condition exists which practically amounts to a nuisance in the District of Columbia. Persons are using vacant lots for the parking of automobiles. This practice is being abused to the point of becoming an annoyance to the neighbors. Cars are also parked at gasoline stations and parking lots during the hours they are closed, and sometimes remain there after the stations or lots open for business the next day without the consent of the property owners. Cars have even been parked on school property in the District of Columbia. This measure gives the Commissioners the authority to impound such vehicles.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBWAYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 248) to direct the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Public Utilities Commission is hereby authorized to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic.

The Utilities Commission is hereby empowered to call upon any agencies of the United States Government for assistance in making this survey.

The Utilities Commission shall make a report to Congress on the result of the survey not later than February 15, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "is" and insert "are."

Line 5, strike out "an investigation and" and insert "a preliminary."

Line 8, after "The", insert "Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "is" and insert "are."

Line 4, after "The", insert "Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the."

Line 6, strike out "February" and insert "March."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this joint resolution is to direct the District Commissioners and the Public Utilities Commission to make a preliminary investigation to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways within the District of Columbia. In view of the rapid and pronounced increase in population in Washington in recent months, there is an immediate need for a more complete study of the methods of moving traffic within this jurisdiction.

The original resolution introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO] called for a full investigation by the Public Utilities Commission. The committee in its judgment included the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. We feel also that by calling on Federal governmental agencies we shall receive such aid and information as to make it possible by March 15 to bring a report back to this House of what is actually needed and whether funds should be provided for a more detailed investiga-

tion of this subject—or ultimately to have subways here.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic."

VAGRANCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5757) to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, lines 10 and 11, strike out ", 3, and 9" and insert "or 3."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this is simply a corrective amendment and does not go to the body of this very important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the District of Columbia business for today.

COAST GUARD STATION BUILDING, TWO RIVERS, WIS.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 20 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1916) to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis., is authorized and directed to make the following changes:

(1) In line 5 of the engrossed bill, strike out the numerals "1284" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "1248"; and

(2) In the title of the engrossed bill, strike out the numerals "1284" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "1248."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Hartford Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS AT WARTIME RATES FOR OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN DISABLED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6009) to provide pensions at various rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes, and immediately consider the same.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (c), paragraph I, of part II, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any veteran otherwise entitled to pension under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law shall be entitled to receive the rate of pension provided in part I of this regulation, if the disability resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, or (2) while engaged in extra-hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) while the United States is engaged in war.

"The dependents of any deceased veteran, whose death resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty as described in this subparagraph, otherwise entitled to pension under the provisions of part II of this regulation or the general pension law, shall be entitled to pension at the rates provided for service-connected death-compensation benefits for dependents of World War veterans by section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 472b), or, if barred by the insurance limitations thereof, the rates provided by paragraph IV of part I, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended."

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, which are necessary to carry out its purposes.

SEC. 3 The provisions of this act shall also apply to disability or death occurring prior to the effective date of this act, but payments authorized by this act shall not be made for any period prior to the date of enactment, or the date of receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the benefits thereof, whichever is the later date.

This act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I certainly shall not object, will the gentleman explain to the membership of the House the provisions of the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to; and I have a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, also a letter from the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, also a letter from the Fleet Reserve Association, all of whom have supported this measure 100 percent, and I ask unanimous consent that these letters may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., December 1, 1941.

The Honorable JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, House Committee on Invalid Pensions,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LESINSKI: I am taking the liberty of again emphasizing the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States relative to H. R. 6009, which has been reported favorably by your committee. It is our understanding this bill would provide wartime rates for service-connected disabilities incurred by members of our armed services under certain conditions and to the dependents of those who lose their lives under those conditions.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars believe H. R. 6009 will grant increased relief to thousands who are now on the disability rolls and will bring under its provisions many of the present members of our armed services who are losing their lives or incurring permanent injuries as the result of armed conflict or extra hazardous service which closely simulates actual warfare.

We understand there may be some opposition to H. R. 6009 because it does not provide full wartime rates to all disabled peacetime soldiers. We recognize the fact that H. R. 6009 may not cover all peacetime disabilities, but on the other hand it does increase the opportunities for peacetime soldiers to receive wartime rates and takes nothing away from the others. We believe this bill may properly be considered as emergency legislation and for that reason we have wholeheartedly endorsed H. R. 6009 and believe that any tinkering with the bill might result in failure of approval somewhere along the line.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has endorsed a program of 90 percent of wartime rates for all disabled peacetime soldiers, and has sponsored bills to this effect, one of which has already passed the Senate. It is identified as S. 415. If there is opposition to H. R. 6009, because it is not broad enough, may we suggest that an ideal solution would be for Congress to enact both H. R. 6009 and S. 415. We sincerely hope the House will agree with our viewpoint and support H. R. 6009 as reported by your committee, in order that the dependents of those who were lost on the *Reuben James* and the *Greer* and those who are being killed in the large-scale maneuvers will not be denied this additional protection.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
OF THE WORLD WAR,
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1941.

Re: H. R. 6009.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Invalid Pensions, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LESINSKI: Because the bill recently favorably reported to the House of Representatives by your committee, H. R. 6009, would provide pensions at wartime rates for those American defenders who might become disabled in any future war in which the United States might become engaged—in addition to providing wartime rates of pensions for those who become disabled as a direct result of armed conflict, or while engaged in extra-hazardous service—and for the dependents of those who die from such

causes, it is, as I stated at the hearings, of more potential importance to America's disabled defenders, past, present, and future, than any veteran bill which has been before the Congress for many years.

H. R. 6009 is essentially emergency legislation and should be regarded as a very important factor in the Nation's defense program. It would, for the first time, provide uniformity as to the rates of pensions payable for disabilities incurred during any war, past or future, as well as to disabilities incurred as the result of armed conflict, or while engaged in extra-hazardous service, not incurred during any war, and for the dependents of those who die from such causes.

There may be those who would maintain that such wartime rates should also be extended as to other regulars and selectees who may have become disabled under other conditions than those set forth in the bill. That is another question, which certainly merits the consideration of Congress, and, in that connection, the D. A. V. urged that your committee also favorably report S. 415, already passed by the Senate, to increase the pensions of the so-called peacetime veterans from 75 to 90 percent of wartime rates.

We still believe that S. 415 should also receive favorable action by your committee and by this session of Congress, but we do not believe that any advocacy for more liberal and equitable pensions for the so-called peacetime veterans should be permitted to jeopardize the proposed legislation on behalf of wartime veterans and their dependents, as would be provided for by the enactment of H. R. 6009.

In other words, we consider the provisions of H. R. 6009 to be so important in maintaining and building up the morale of America's defenders, particularly during this emergency period, that no other considerations, however worthy, should be permitted to interfere with, or possibly to jeopardize, the chances for immediate passage of H. R. 6009 by the two Houses of Congress and its anticipated approval by the President.

Because of these factors, we are hopeful that it may be found feasible for your committee to call H. R. 6009 up for consideration on the House floor just as expeditiously as possible, with the hope that it can then immediately thereafter be favorably considered by the Senate Committee on Pensions and by the Senate itself before the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Your sympathetic interest on behalf of America's disabled defenders of past and future wars, and their dependents, as manifested by the committee's unanimous endorsement of the provisions of H. R. 6009 is indeed much appreciated and, although it will not affect any of the members of the D. A. V., who are already entitled to wartime rates for disabilities incurred in World War I, the D. A. V. strongly favors the immediate passage of H. R. 6009 because of its close connection to America's national-defense program.

With kindest regards, I am,
Very respectfully yours,
MILLARD W. RICE,
National Service Director,
Disabled American Veterans
of the World War.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1941.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Urgency demands this style of letter in preference to a personal interview with you on this subject. The Committee on Invalid Pensions, Hon. John Lesinski, chairman, has favorably reported H. R. 6009, after 2 days of hearings, during which the major veteran and service representatives presented the views of their organizations.

The Fleet Reserve Association, whose membership is composed of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, whole-heartedly supported H. R. 6009 during the hearings, and urged that the bill be reported without amendment. The same endorsement was given by the representatives of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans.

Administration endorsement has been obtained on the bill, along with Budget clearance. If its scope is broadened by amendment, to cover all peacetime Regulars and their dependents, the chances are that administration approval would be withdrawn, and the passage or approval of a meritorious measure will be placed in jeopardy.

From the viewpoint of the men of the Navy alone, H. R. 6009 will bring immediate relief to dependents or veterans of the following peacetime incidents:

1. Military occupations in China, the Philippines, Venezuela, Haiti, and Vera Cruz, Mex.

2. The bombing by Japanese airmen and sinking of the U. S. S. *Panay*.

3. All submarine disasters of recent years, particularly the U. S. S. *O–9*, and the U. S. S. *Squalus*.

4. More recently, the torpedoing of the U. S. S. *Greer* and the U. S. S. *Reuben James*.

5. The *Shenandoah*, *Akron*, and *Macon* dirigible disasters.

6. All aviation crashes, both in time of peace and during the present emergency.

7. Turret disasters of the years gone by, powder explosions, fireroom and boiler explosions, would all be classed as extra-hazardous duty.

These, and many other hazardous classifications would come under the bill, not to mention similar incidents that may occur under present conditions, and then, in the event of a declaration of war, the higher pension rates would apply in all cases.

Passage of H. R. 6009 would strengthen the morale of the men of the Navy now engaged in operations simulating war on the high seas.

Those falling within the classifications mentioned above, should not have their chances jeopardized of obtaining World War parity on pension benefits, by further extension at this time of other classes of peacetime Regulars whom we all hope will obtain relief ultimately, but not at the expense of jeopardizing the passage of such a meritorious measure as H. R. 6009.

Therefore, the Fleet Reservation Association expresses the earnest hope that you will support H. R. 6009, without amendment, and by so doing, support also the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, Hon. John Lesinski, and his entire committee.

Very respectfully,
CHARLES E. LOFGREN,
National Secretary,
Fleet Reserve Association.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been some misunderstanding about the purposes of this measure and to clear up that situation I am reading a telegram received yesterday from Mr. Jack Kyle, national adjutant, Regular Veterans' Association:

If war is declared the effective date should be December 7. This to preclude post-war controversies over pension legislation.

Mr. Kyle talked to me this morning, and he withdrew all of his objections, and has joined in the hope that this bill be passed.

I also want to bring to the attention of the House the report accompanying this measure, which is House Report No. 1449, which explains in detail the provisions of this bill. There is also a full explanation in the report in regard to the rates of pensions the veterans of the Regular Establishment are now receiving. The Regular establishment, which is composed of our Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps, had their pensions raised from 45 to 75 percent generally of the World War rates about 2 years ago. This session the House passed H. R. 1030, which is now on the Senate Calendar, and which raises the pensions of the widows, dependent children, and parents of the members of the Regular Establishments, from 45 to 75 percent generally of World War rates, if the veteran died of a service-connected disability. If that bill is enacted into law those rates will be applicable to dependents of peacetime veterans whose service was rendered under conditions that would not make them eligible under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. In brief, is not this the situation as brought up by this bill, H. R. 6009? It brings the members of the armed forces of the United States, and their dependents, who are injured or killed in line of duty, following the declaration of war of yesterday, up to the rates presently being paid to veterans of the World War and their dependents.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. And in addition to that, will it not also take care of the widows and the dependents of the men who were killed on the *Panay*, or in submarine and aircraft disasters, or under conditions simulating war?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. And this bill comes here with the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is right.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. And it has been recommended by the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the War Department and the Navy Department, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LESINSKI. That is correct; it has a green light.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. And considerable hearings were held by the gentleman's committee on this subject.

Mr. LESINSKI. It has been under study for 1 year, and I would like to make this explanation of the measure.

There are approximately 37,000 veterans of the Regular Establishment on the pension rolls, and a large number of them will benefit by the provisions of this bill because their injuries were received in armed conflict or while engaged in extra hazardous service. In reference to the explanation which the gentleman has just made, I may say that this bill covers the following classes:

First. Those injured as a direct result of armed conflict.

Second. Those engaged in extra hazardous service, including conditions simulating war. This takes care of anyone who has been injured in maneuvers or who may have been on the *Reuben James* or the *Greer*, or in submarine and aircraft disasters or as the result of injuries incurred in connection with the operation of other mechanized instruments of war.

Third. This is the most important one and covers those who are injured or die

while the United States is engaged in war.

In other words, this covers everybody from December 7 on in the present war and any future wars we may engage in.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana Mr. Speaker, I feel that our chairman has made a very splendid explanation of this bill, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 344, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 588, an act to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the act and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the act shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the act for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the act and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire time now?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends to January 1, 1947, the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments and grants and other aid to agricultural producers, and we on this side of the House have no disposition to fight the soil-conservation program. I do not know of anyone here that does. We feel that the Department has done an efficient job, has done something worth while for the farmer, and that the payment to the farmer for doing that work is no gift, but that it is something that he has done for agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I notice that the resolution in line 5 on page 1, calls for a grant of permanent authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments to agricultural producers, and so forth. That seems to me too broad. I think the rule should be amended so as to strike out the word "permanent" because the bill merely extends the Soil Conservation Act until January 1, 1947.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, of course, the rule puts in order the Senate bill which did make that authority permanent. As the gentleman knows, the committee has offered a substitute to merely extend the time for 5 years, but the rule puts in order the Senate bill, which did make it permanent.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we should be very, very careful now what legislation we pass, owing to the fact that yesterday we declared war on the Imperial Government of Japan. It is going to be necessary for each and every Member of Congress from now on to do that which is going to be for the best interest of America, not only of one class but of every class of our people, and we must preserve, protect and defend our American Constitution and our American form of government and our country. In order to do that, it is necessary in my judgment to take a different attitude in this House from what we have taken heretofore. It has been my policy and plan to be as conservative as I possibly could in the operation of the Government. I expect to continue that policy and to use every effort and ingenuity at my command to further the interest of this Government in the prosecution of the war against anyone whom we deem to be our enemy at home or abroad. That is the most difficult question that I have to make a statement about here today—when I say at home and abroad, because, I made up my mind that under no conditions or circumstances would I vote for war against any nation in Asia or Europe at this particular time, because it is not our duty to try to rule the world because of the fact that I realize that eventually it might mean our downfall, unless we were a united country; but circumstances were such on Sunday that Japan attacked us, and it puts me and you in a different position. I was hoping that such a thing as that would never happen, but it has befallen us. When I picked up this morning's Post I saw an article that we are to spend $150,000,000,000 for victory.

If that is going to be the cost of victory, we will have to spend it and I will help to do as much. But it is not the mere question of spending $150,000,000,000 if we are going to make this Nation secure. It is how we spend the money; it is a question of conserving every dollar we can in order that every dollar we spend will eventually and ultimately do the thing that we want to do, and that is to attain victory for the American people. Let us be prudent and spend only necessary dollars; do not waste them. Let us plug the leaks. That is your duty and that is mine, and these bills that are coming before the House now, even though they are for agriculture or for labor or for any other particular class of people, we should carefully scan, and keep our eye on the expenditure of every penny. If we want to make our Navy as large as we expect to build it, if we want to maintain that army of 2,000,000 or 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 men in order to accomplish the things that we are now set out to do, as to which we have now turned our faces toward the sun that shines eternally in the heavens and that will carry us to ultimate victory—the sun is honesty, integrity, and frugality—then it is our duty in my judgment and from yesterday's action that we do everything we can to eliminate any and all unnecessary expense of the Government. We should consolidate our departments and make every nail secure that we drive in the ship of state, and build correctly every boat and every tank and every bit of powder we manufacture for the destruction of those that would destroy us. We must meet fire with fire. We must be prepared to meet each blow with a heavier blow. We must have harmony and all put our shoulder to the wheel and roll it along. It must not wobble or make any unnecessary tracks but the wheel must run true and straight. If we have unnecessary waste, extravagance, or incompetence, then eliminate it at once. We must have men in all branches of Government that are competent and efficient and it is the duty of the President to clean house of the politician and the Communists and "reds" who think of themselves and the overthrow of our Government. We want 100-percent Americans at the helm of our Government from now on if we would gain victory from our enemies. America must be united. America must be vigilant, we must be alert and give of our all to the end that it will be our Government first and our country at all times.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that he may be allowed to speak out of order?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, when war was declared yesterday I believe all Members of Congress, whether they were interventionists or noninterventionists, decided the time was past for debate and that they would unite behind the President and behind the administration in the conduct of the war, in order that we might be victorious at the earliest possible moment. That same degree of unity exists not only in the Congress but throughout the United States.

It was most unfortunate and deplorable that a Member of this House, without naming names, rose here today and stated that the noninterventionists should apologize to the President. I want to go on record as one noninterventionist, and I think speaking for all of them in the House and for 90,000,000 more in the country, that they have nothing whatever to apologize for for urging their honest convictions in the

American way to keep out of foreign wars.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks he is doing the situation any good now?

Mr. FISH. I think when I get through you will agree with me. I stand for 100-percent unity, for unity on both sides based on fairness and equality and not 50-percent unity based on apologies and recriminations. I hope no Member of Congress will get up and make a statement similar to that again, because if he does there will be a hundred Members of Congress who will take the floor and restate their views and their convictions, which they have upheld honestly and fearlessly as free American citizens for the last 3 years. That is all I propose to say. If we are to have real, worth-while unity, and not fake or lip-service unity, we must unite wholeheartedly for one purpose, and one purpose alone, and that is to win the final victory.

I have served in one war and expect to serve in another. I think I know something about war that even some of the Members who never put on a uniform do not know. There is only one objective in war, one objective from the day you put on a uniform and take up a rifle, drill and train to shoot that rifle. That objective is success in battle in order to win the war. There is no other objective. I gave my promise yesterday and speaking for other noninterventionists, that we would support the President and the administration to win through to victory. That is exactly what we propose to do, just as loyally as any interventionists or anybody else in America.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. From now on it seems to me the Congress should eliminate all politics, but that inefficiency should be eliminated also if we are going to win the war.

Mr. FISH. You are right, we should not stop freedom of speech on the conduct of the war as it goes along. That happens in Parliament and in the English press every day.

What I am talking about is very simple. We are all united and being united, let us go forward shoulder to shoulder. No one has to apologize for the past, interventionist or noninterventionist. The destiny and very existence of America is at stake. We are all Americans before we are Democrats or Republicans, and as Americans we are united back of the President to bring victory to the armed forces of the United States.

I took this time to speak on another and entirely different issue. Almost 20 years ago I introduced in the House of Representatives the so-called Zionist resolution, for a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine, in order to erect there a homeland where persecuted Jews of central Europe could find a refuge and home of their own. In the past 20 years these Jewish people, mostly from Germany, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Russia, through their own tireless efforts, and financial contributions made by Americans of Jewish and non-Jewish origin, have built up parts of Palestine into flourishing centers and prosperous farms.

My resolution was passed almost unanimously. It was signed by the President of the United States and became the law. It was similar to the Balfour resolution, and in reality was the American counterpart. I sponsored it in the House and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge sponsored it in the Senate. Our resolutions crossed, and mine eventually went through and was signed by the President.

I have always been proud of the fact and of my part in establishing this homeland. Since then some 400,000 Jews have found a home and place of refuge there.

Today the Jewish people in that Holy Land are asking for an army of their own, for a Jewish army to protect that homeland, to fight under British high command but as a separate unit and identity. Just as we have loaned money through lend-lease bills to the Poles and the Czechs and others, I think it is highly proper that we should furnish supplies and arms for a Jewish army in Palestine. Let them volunteer, and let us provide them with an opportunity to fight.

These Jewish people, who have more at stake in this war than any other people in the world, who have suffered more, who have been the victims of barbarous treatment in Eastern Europe, who have been outlawed and discriminated against on account of their race and religion, who have been deprived of their economic and civic rights and by inhuman and brutal persecution by the Nazis forced back in the poverty and misery of the ghetto or into concentration camps, should have the unquestioned right to fight.

Let us give them that opportunity without delay. Let us give them some of our lend-lease money as we have given it to the Poles, the Czechs, the Free French, and the Greeks. Let them have an army in Palestine of 50,000 or even 100,000, with American lend-lease money with which to obtain equipment and guns. Let them have a Jewish military unit under their own flag, under the Star of David, and manned and officered by their own people.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] has already introduced a resolution to carry this purpose into effect of providing lend-lease money and defense articles for a Jewish army in Palestine.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. I want to make an observation here to the gentleman from New York. I hope the gentleman from New York does not mean Americans of Jewish extraction. We want to take our responsibility in the American Army and fight.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is quite correct. I am glad the gentleman injected that remark, because I already discussed that with him today. The people of Jewish origin naturally will serve and are serving in our armed forces the same as all other citizens. However, the Jewish people in Palestine are in the same category as the Czechs, Poles, and others who want to defend their own country; and I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in accord with that proposal.

Mr. SACKS. Yes. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. For the gentleman's information, of the million men we now have in our Army it is reported that over 100,000 are Americans of Jewish faith. This is their land.

Mr. FISH. That is true and has always been so. Americans of Jewish origin fought gallantly in the last World War in our armed forces.

Mr. SACKS. But those who live in Palestine want an army of their own, and so far Britain has refused to permit such an army to be raised and equipped. That is the one the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. FISH. Precisely. That is what the gentleman is in favor of and what I am urging as the author of the Zionist resolution adopted by Congress in 1922.

Mr. SACKS. That is right.

Mr. FISH. And I think that war material should be furnished under the Lease-Lend Act to equip a Jewish army to fight in Palestine or elsewhere in the Near East.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL].

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, the headlines carry the news that hostile planes are near, that the west coast is in confusion, that black-outs and air-raid alarms were ordered by military authorities. This brought the war close to the west coast. Today Army authorities said enemy planes were operating off the California shores.

The latest news on the radio is to the effect that enemy aircraft are operating off New York City. Some reports indicate that interceptor planes have taken off from New York City to meet the enemy aircraft. Reports indicate that air-raid alarms have sounded in New York City.

This all brings to mind just one thing, that we are in for a long, hard struggle ahead. We Americans must face this trial, this catastrophe of war as sturdy Americans. From present indications it appears that this Nation will be at war for 5 or perhaps 10 years before exhaustion sets in and before peace offers will begin to be made. This is no time for levity, this is no time for crimination or recrimination; it is a time for serious thought. We must gird ourselves for battle. We must tighten our belts and bend every effort to bring about ultimate victory for the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Building in Washington to many people stands as a symbol of our democratic system of government. We have taken great pride in illuminating this splendid structure at night and I think none of us ever tires of looking at it. After listening to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL] has just said and the rumor that is around, however, I wonder how wise it is to keep the Capitol dome illuminated night after night. I just wish to draw this very practical suggestion to this honorable body—that probably the Architect of the Capitol may think it advisable to turn off the lights, on the Capitol Building until such time as peace may again come to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois yields back one-half minute.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 8½ minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for one to stand here today and talk about an agricultural bill so political in nature. I cannot resist trying in the short time at my disposal to bring out some facts in connection with the agricultural program of the present administration.

I personally do not believe in either the domestic or foreign agricultural program of the administration; and I am willing to defend my position at any time, at any place, anywhere, and with anyone. The sad part of the picture today is that such an important bill, a bill carrying $500,000,000 is brought before us with but 1 hour for consideration—only 1 hour in which to discuss a program that has been in operation for several years and one that has many, many defects. It seems that during all that time they have not been able to find out that the bill is based on neither common sense nor justice.

I want to call the attention of the House today and particularly of the Committee on Agriculture to the fact that if we are not very careful we are going to find that the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House will go down in history as having done more for agriculture than the Committee on Agriculture itself.

We have in this bill today the continuation of a policy of legislation for the few at the expense of the many. I do not like to have to stand up here and say these things. But let us take last year. The acting chairman of the Rules Committee and his great State of Illinois, that has such productive, fertile land, went to the United States Treasury to get 11 percent of its farm income; and also one district in one State had to go to the United States Treasury last year to get $17,000,000 for the farmers of his district. This was possible under a system of agricultural legislation that is not based on common sense. The fertility of the land in that district or the fertility of the land of the farms of this country is not being maintained on 1 farm out of 10, though the money is obtained under the guise of soil conservation. This money is being obtained year after year under a nice-sounding name, but it is not maintaining the fertility of our soil.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman does not want to infer that any particular Member of the House went to the Treasury to get money to give out to his constituents?

Mr. MURRAY. No. What I am trying to say is that we have a small group, represented by a very small number of States, that is getting the larger percentage of this money. I am not making any personal references to anyone.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Assuming that this bill is defeated does the gentleman think this soil-conservation program will end? He stated it contained an appropriation for $500,000,000. Suppose it is defeated, will this be the end of the soil-conservation program?

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand, on December 31 this year it is supposed to go back to the States, but there are not many States that have made the necessary arrangements. There is not a man on the floor of this House who believes in an agricultural program more than I do, but I do not believe in the agricultural program we have had because there is not a Member of this House who can stand up here and say that it is based on common sense or common justice. It legislates for 25 percent of agriculture and leaves the rest of the farmers to shift for themselves.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has made reference to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], and the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] as being able to get these large sums for their constituents out of the Treasury. For instance, he says the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] got $17,000,000 for his district last year alone. I do not think the gentleman should cast aspersions upon these Members. He should give them credit. Their districts undoubtedly will give them a great deal of credit. The fact that they are able to "bring home the bacon" will not be a handicap to them.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not casting aspersions on anyone, and I am not saying anything here that I have not said to all these gentlemen before I stood up here. There is no reflection on them at all. I just do this to show how unfair the program really is. It is the only way I know how to do it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman will admit that up in Wisconsin, where he has those beautiful lakes, where the farmers about 9 months out of the year go fishing and hunting and riding, they probably do not need as many benefits as some of the others.

Mr. MURRAY. The State of Wisconsin gets 4 percent; some States get 1 percent; some States as high as 22 percent of their income right out of the United States Treasury. And your State got 11 percent in 1940, though you are supposed to have some of the richest, most fertile, productive land in the world.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Does the gentleman consider this is a defense measure? Today we hear much said about cutting down nondefense expenditures. In view of the fact that the farmer is being so ably taken care of in the recently adopted price-control measure, does not the gentleman think this is a good place to cut down nondefense expenditures?

Mr. MURRAY. I will answer that by saying I am willing to forget all the mistakes of the past, personally. May I say the only things that make any country a great country is the fact that it has a large area of rich, productive, fertile land, as we have in this country. That is the only reason we are a great country. Now, as I said, I am willing to forget all the mistakes we have made in the past if I could be assured that we would adopt a program based on common sense and on common justice.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. To get this matter cleared up about money going to the various districts, is it not a fact that so much money is going to certain districts and certain States because of the type of administration that this law is having rather than what the individual Members are doing?

Mr. MURRAY. Fundamentally the formula is wrong, because it only goes mostly to the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has been said here this morning, and it has been said in other quarters, that now, since the unprovoked assault on this Nation by Japan, no legislation such as that passed by the House against strikes is longer necessary, that everybody is going to be patriotic, and that we are not going to have any more labor disturbances.

In order that your minds may be disabused, I want to tell you about a case that exists today, that exists at this

moment, and that is preventing the manufacture of propellers for your airplanes that are so sorely needed.

The well-known Nash-Kelvinator Corporation, automobile manufacturers in Lansing, Mich., are under a contract with the Government, both the Army and the Navy, for the manufacture of propellers. In order to carry out that contract they are engaged in the construction of a large factory at Lansing. Since November 12, of this year, work on the installation of certain equipment of that building has been stopped, and stopped for this reason: It was stopped because the American Federation of Labor unions notified the company that their installation of certain materials would not be made because that material had been prefabricated by a C. I. O. outfit in some other factory.

That was the condition prevalent throughout the Nation until Saturday. Everybody assumed that that condition would clear up. I say to you that that condition exists today; it exists at this moment. I have talked with the O. P. M. airplane division, and they have advised me that the situation, as far as they are concerned, is hopeless, and that there is nothing they can do about it. As far as we are advised up to this time, there is no prospect of proceeding with the construction of that building so vitally needed for the construction of propellers.

I hold in my hand the correspondence on that subject. I have a letter here signed by the representatives of the Carpenters and Joiners Union, of the Sheet Metal Workers Union, and of the International Hod Carriers Union—all American Federation of Labor—dated on November 12, advising the Nash-Kelvinator Corporation that that material should not be installed in that building by their men.

I have another letter from an American Federation of Labor union to the company, dated November 15, in which they state that all future electrical fixtures must be manufactured in an American Federation of Labor factory and bear the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers' label before they may be installed.

I have a letter from one of these unions dated as late as December 3 which not only confirms that condition but concludes with this ominous threat, and do not forget that they are talking about your manufacturer of propellers, and you cannot have airplanes unless you have propellers.

This letter says:

> Further, that if you try to install any Congress of Industrial Organizations sheet-metal prefabricated parts, all of the American Federation of Labor crafts at present working at the propeller plant will walk off the job immediately.

The question I ask again is, What are we going to do about those conditions? You cannot fight a war without equipment, you cannot fight it without planes, and you cannot have planes without propellers; yet that condition exists at this moment, when enemy planes are attacking both the Atlantic and Pacific shores of this Nation, and we are unable to do anything about it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Who wrote those letters?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I read you the signatures.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I did not get them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Sheet Metal Workers, the Carpenters, and the Hod Carriers Unions of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has a report ever been made to William Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, about that situation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know. But it has been in progress for a month and it is inconceivable that he should be ignorant of the facts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know whether he has had that information or not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman at this particular hour care to comment on what his opinion is of what is likely to happen in the other body on the bill which we passed here the other day?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am happy to say that a discussion on the matter took place in the Senate yesterday, and I was assured both on and off the floor that hearings would be held by the Labor Committee this week, and that a bill would be presented to the Senate next week, presumably under the title of the House bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on the consideration of this rule. As has been explained, the bill grants authority for the continuation of the soil-conservation plan for another 5 years.

We have heard so much here today and will hear so much about the terrible tragedy that visited this country in the small hours of Sunday morning that I feel inclined to make some comment myself thereon.

The gentleman from Virginia has just commented on the strike situation. I do not know how others may feel about it. I know there is a movement on foot now that we are in the war to the effect that there will not be any necessity for labor legislation, that everybody is going to be patriotic enough in this hour of the Nation's stress to do the right thing, but I am just wondering, if that be true, what harm any legislation could do. If everybody is going to go along and cooperate patriotically, then, of course, there would be no necessity for such a law, but if there were such a law, it would not do anybody any harm.

I wonder if the American people yet appreciate the fact that we are engaged in a death struggle for the survival of this Nation and its institutions. As far as I am concerned, I have taken the position ever since the repeal of the neutrality law that we are in a state of war.

I wonder how many of us still think we have engaged upon a picnic that will be over in a few days. We are not fighting Japan alone. In my opinion, we should have included in the declaration of war yesterday all of the Axis Powers, and I wonder if it would not have been more appropriate to have declared war against Germany, the instigator of this cowardly, dastardly attack upon our Nation than to declare war upon Japan alone, because we must realize that that cowardly attack was fostered by Germany. It was conceived in Berlin and will, no doubt, be carried out by all of the Axis Powers.

We are in a war unto the death and the sooner the American people realize this, the sooner the American laborers, the sooner the American Congress, the sooner the American capitalists realize this the sooner we will be able to achieve that ultimate victory that we all hope for. I hope the American people will no longer be deluded. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that when the facts are made public, it will be disclosed that we suffered a major tragedy on Sunday and that the casualty list is going to be great, indeed, and that our material losses were greater than we now suspect, but it is up to us to relegate everything else to the background and prepare for a long-drawn-out war and making whatever sacrifice is necessary.

I hope I will never again hear from this floor or from any other Government official the thought advocated that we can go on and win this war and at the same time carry on with the social progress we have made. We have got to do one of two things. We have either got to make up our minds that we are going to make whatever sacrifice is necessary or else play the role in this great tragedy of World No. 2 that was played by France.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill S. 588, with Mr. MILLS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], I believe the soil-conservation program is one of the best programs we have had in connection with our whole agricultural problem. I believe this program will pay more dividends than any other program we have had in operation under the present administration.

In fact, I do not know of anyone opposing the extension of the Soil Conservation Act. We listened with a great deal of interest to our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. I am sure he does not really oppose this bill. In fact, in his State and in every other State of the Union they are taking advantage of this program and building up their soil where in the past, in a great many instances, they have been destroying their soil.

Let me just refer to the South, where our major crop is cotton, which we have planted throughout all these years.

The soil has been so depleted that our people have been called upon to spend thousands and thousands of dollars annually for fertilizer in the hope of producing a fair cotton crop. It may be of interest to you to know that today, because of what we have done during the past few years under this program, we have been able to increase our production from, perhaps, 150 pounds of lint cotton per acre, in a great many instances, to 500 pounds to the acre. This has enabled these farmers to place their other lands into other crops, diversifying so as to be able to become self-sustaining.

Now, may I state the purposes of this bill, S. 588, as it came over from the Senate was to extend for an indefinite period the Soil Conservation Act. Our Committee on Agriculture, in considering this matter and taking into consideration the fact that a number of States have passed proper laws to take over this program, believed that the act should be extended for a period of 5 years to enable other States to pass the necessary legislation to carry on the program with the hope that by this time the States may be able to take over the program and have it operated under the States.

The committee in considering this bill, realizing the emergency and because of the information we had received from the Department of Agriculture and realizing that, perhaps, at this time we could not give consideration to a major farm bill, decided that the 85-percent loan program, the bottom which we put under these farm products, should also be extended, and that was taken care of for 3 years by an amendment to this bill. At the time we considered this bill the Banking and Currency Committee was considering the price-fixing bill. We heard much about placing a ceiling on all commodities and products. We had in mind that the thing that should be done was the placing of a bottom rather than a ceiling, as far as agriculture is concerned. I realize that manufacturers and those who are in a position to do so can easily keep their price up to the ceiling, but I call to the attention of this House that under the leeway we have in the price-fixing bill there is no way on the face of the earth that the farmer can actually keep his price up to the ceiling. Therefore we placed in the bill a 100-percent loan instead of 85 percent. The Secretary of Agriculture said it would not permit him to operate his program, because of the opposition on the part of those who feed cattle and poultry, and so forth, and because of a guaranty from the President of a 100-percent parity by an appropriation if an appropriation is needed to bring prices up to parity. We decided to offer an amendment to simply extend the 85-percent loan for 3 years during the emergency, and we will offer that as a substitute for the committee amendment. There are two things this bill will do. It will extend the soil-conservation program for 5 years and extend the 85-percent loan for 3 years.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I understand the necessity for this legislation under existing law it is that unless some such legislation is passed on December 31 of this year our soil conservation will have to end because the law terminates at that time.

Mr. FULMER. That is right, and for the further reason that a great many States have not passed necessary laws to take this program over.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think it is highly important that it be extended, because the soil-conservation program has been of great benefit.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is partly in error. Existing law provides that next year the administration of the law shall be turned over to the States, and the grants of this $500,000,000 shall be made to the States, so that the law would not terminate.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It would terminate in part, as I understand it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A good many States are not able and have not yet passed an enabling act, so the law would still continue.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Yes; it would.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman speaks about 85 percent value. Would the gentleman question my figures when I say that that applies to less than 25 percent of our crops?

Mr. FULMER. Yes; I challenge the gentleman's statement and refer him to the record.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. PACE. I just want to comment that under the Steagall bill it is 85 percent protection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the amendment entirely do away with the 100-percent parity payment?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that brings it back to the 85 percent?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The bill just extends the soil-conservation program for 5 years?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And extends the parity payment at 85 percent for 3 years?

Mr. FULMER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman for the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, further answering the gentleman from Kentucky, this bill does not extend the law, because the law will extend itself. If this bill is not passed, the States will take over the administration of the Soil Conservation Act under grants from the Federal Treasury. This bill simply provides that the administration of the Soil Conservation Act shall be continued by the Federal Government for the next 5 years. I want to make that clear for the reason that the Soil Conservation Act would not terminate if this bill were not passed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But the present law would terminate and the administration of it would not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, the Federal law would not terminate, but its administration would be turned over to the States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As far as the Federal Government administering the law is concerned——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That would terminate; yes, but the grants would be made to the States from the $500,000,000 fund.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But many States would not be in a position to avail themselves of the benefits?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Twenty-three States have passed enabling acts. They would be in a position to go ahead. There is necessity and need for the passage of this legislation, without question.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I assume that this conservation business has reasonably progressed so far now that in the future it would not cost so much? If we vote for a 5-year extension, is it the opinion of the gentleman that the outlay would be about the same, or is there chance to economize somewhat?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, we are all for conserving our soil. Unfortunately, the Soil Conservation Act is no longer a soil conservation act. The policy was changed 3 years ago so that the farmers were paid more for planting soil-depleting crops than they were for planting soil-conserving crops. I would like to see the policy changed so that our farmers would receive the most money for planting soil conserving crops, to actually conserve the soil, rather than to

get large payments for planting soil-depleting crops.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But can the gentleman answer that? Is there any program that directs itself toward economy in this extension?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, I do not think so. But I really believe, further answering the gentleman's question, and I think I speak for the farmers of Minnesota, they are willing to make sacrifices any time in the interest of the safety of our Nation. I think the day will come, by force of necessity, when appropriations for this purpose and for carrying out of other social activities of the administration and for a thousand and one other worth-while things in this country will have to come to an end. Farmers are willing to make sacrifices. I am satisfied that the farmers of Minnesota will make those sacrifices if they are called upon to do so when other groups in the United States are included with them for curtailments?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am tremendously interested in the conservation and building up of the soil of our country. I was much disturbed to hear the gentleman say that larger payments are being made for planting soil-depleting crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why is that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under the act as it was originally written, larger payments were made to those who planted legumes and other soil-conserving crops.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not believe that applies to Iowa.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That applies to every State in the Union.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, I think the gentleman is in error. We do not get paid for raising more corn in Iowa, and that is our greatest soil-depleting crop. The farmer gets paid there for turning it into clover or possibly alfalfa.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. You get paid a larger payment for the corn that you produce upon the allotted acreage. There should not be any payments for planting soil-depleting crops. What they should pay a man for is planting soil-conserving crops, rather than soil-depleting crops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I was interested in what the gentleman said about the day arriving when we would be required to discontinue some of these programs to which the gentleman referred. That sounds very good, but when are we going to start? Let me ask the gentleman this question: If he has that thought in mind, then why should we extend this act until 1946 or 1947? Why not go along for 1 year and see whether the time the gentleman speaks of might arrive then?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am willing to go along with the gentleman and make it 1 year. But let me say there is another place where we can save at least $50,000,000. That is, stop all these propaganda agencies from sending out and having printed at tremendous cost tens of thousands of tons of literature, New Deal propaganda that is being sent out to the American people that is absolutely wasted money, and taking away from our national-defense effort.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman knows in that respect that more literature comes out of the Department of Agriculture than any other two Government agencies.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And I am willing to stop that. I think it should be stopped.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is the gentleman a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I am.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is the second bill that has come from the committee where the chairman has taken the floor and told us that in view of the information that came from the Department concerning the legislation certain action should be taken. Does not the gentleman feel the Committee on Agriculture owes it to the House to put in the report the letter from the Department so that some of us can see just exactly how the Department feels about it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That might be very advisable. The Department itself has recommended this act to be extended as is proposed in this bill because they want to continue the administration of it another 5 years, rather than have it go to the States.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this the act that has something to do with soil erosion?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. This is soil conservation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has brought up the point that this extends it to 1947, and that is true. After all, Congress has control of the purse strings and we vote annual appropriations for carrying out the purposes of this program.

Mr. COCHRAN. But try to withhold any appropriations if it goes to 1946.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say in conclusion that the fallacy of our entire farm program is this: To make it a success we must take money out of the United States Treasury. Once the money stops flowing from the United States Treasury to the farmers of the country, they will have no farm program.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. What would be our condition if we did not extend this law? I ask this question for the reason that at the last session of the Missouri Legislature a bill was introduced to provide that Missouri would go along with this national act.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. I am sure it does not pertain to the Pacific Northwest, that those who plant soil-conservation crops get less money than those who plant for the feeding crops.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will look up the figures he will find that the smallest payments are made to those who plant soil-conserving crops, and that the ones who get the large payments are those who plant wheat, cotton, corn, and tobacco. These receive large parity payments in addition to soil-conservation benefits.

Mr. PIERCE. I am sure that is not so in the wheat area.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It certainly is. But, as I stated before, the time is probably coming during this very critical emergency when large sums will be needed for national defense, and we shall have to eliminate many of these worth-while things. I think the farmers of the country are just as patriotic as any other group of citizens. They are willing to forego benefits and make a sacrifice in the interest of the general welfare and for the safety of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it was my happy privilege at the recent special session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held at Miami, Fla., on November 13, 1941, to present to that fine gathering Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, whose address was one of the outstanding features of the convention. Dr. Bennett described somewhat in detail the important and valuable work of the Soil Conservation Service, and I believe that his remarks will prove interesting and informative to all the Members of the House and are pertinent to the pending bill.

His address reads as follows:

SOME RELATIONS OF SOIL CONSERVATION TO RIVERS AND HARBORS

(Address of Dr. H. H. Bennett, Chief, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, at special session of National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Miami, Fla., November 13, 1941)

Those of us engaged in the national program of conserving soil and water feel that our aims are intimately related to the objectives of the Rivers and Harbors Congress. We believe that conservation work upstream—up in the fields and pastures and woodlots where gather the waters that feed the great rivers downstream—is an inseparable part of the whole big program of making the wisest possible use of our water and land resources.

Primarily we work to conserve productive soil, man's most basic resource, the one destructible resource that is utterly indispen-

sable to the welfare of all of us. In order to control erosion, the great waster of productive soil, we must control the rainfall that produces most of the erosion. Even in controlling wind erosion it is necessary to handle surface waters so that every possible drop is brought into use for producing vegetation that holds the soil against the wind.

Water is controlled by intercepting run-off with various measures such as contouring, strip-cropping, terracing, and planting grass, trees, and shrubs on land too steep to plow. This means that the first job of the soil conservationist working with farmers, ranchers, woodland operators, and all who use the land, is to store in the reservoir of the soil as much of the rainfall as possible. Water stored in the soil not only is conserved for use by the crops and trees and the livestock that support our national economy but is prevented from running off immediately into streams to pile up floods and drop troublesome silt.

Conservation of soil is inseparably tied in with the utility of rivers and channels and reservoirs of all kinds. Such work keeps soil material out of streams and harbors, and out of reservoirs and canals—holds it up on the land where it belongs.

EXTENT OF EROSION

The enormity of erosion damage is truly dismal, but it is necessary, I think, to bring the figures out in the open. It is my belief the Nation hasn't yet come to understand the full significance of the losses. Everyone should know more about them, because, over the long run, national security depends on conserving what we have left of our productive soil. Conservation of productive soil surely is national defense. I have thought this and publicly proclaimed it for decades. I understand, of course, that first things come first—that in this time of critical need we must turn our every effort to the task of strengthening our military bulwarks. And let me add that we in the Soil Conservation Service are aiding the defense program in every way we can. We are assisting in the national program of increasing production of vital foods for defense, we are aiding in the protection of the grounds of military posts from soil washing and dust, we are helping with drainage operations and with protection of water supplies, we are handling an important share of the appraising and purchasing of land for military purposes, and we are assisting farmers displaced by such purchases to find homes elsewhere.

But I hope we can—and I think and believe we can—continue with unabated vigor this other vital thing—this conservation of productive soil, without which no nation or civilization has ever survived.

Here is what has happened to us—and not enough of us have realized it:

1. Approximately 100,000,000 acres of formerly productive cropland have been ruined for any further practical cultivation. Much of it has been so gullied and slashed to pieces it is impossible to plow it. We can do little or nothing with most of this ravaged land except to get some of it back into trees or grass; it has been abandoned by farmers and is generally being left to whatever benefits nature can provide. And those deeply washed portions that still could be plowed for the most part are too unproductive for practical use.

2. From a second 100,000,000 acres of once-productive cropland all or most of the more productive layer of topsoil has been washed off. Tens of thousands of hard-working farmers are virtually bankrupt farmers on bankrupt land. Most of them have little or no chance to make a satisfactory living whether farm prices are up or down.

3. And the same process of wasteful erosion is under way on still another 100,000,000 acres of land.

I am still talking about cropland and have not included the vast area of western range where overgrazing and other wasteful practices have wrought serious damage to many millions of acres and to the regional reservoirs, irrigation ditches, and streams.

A disturbing thing about this prodigious waste of land is that most of the damage has taken place within little more than a hundred years. This seems a very short time to me personally, because most of the damage has taken place since my father was born in 1833—within the lives of two people, one of them still living.

AMERICA HOLDS RECORD FOR SOIL WASTE

No other race, civilized or barbaric, has wasted productive agricultural land so rapidly as we Americans. I say this will full knowledge that great civilizations have been effaced from the earth because of soil erosion.

I am not making this assertion out of thin air. We have looked into the effects of erosion in some of the older parts of the world; we have surveyed the ancient lands extending across North Africa and on across the region known as the "cradle of the human race" into the country east of the Euphrates. Dr. W. C. Lowdermilk, of our Service, had completed this survey just as World War No. 2 broke. He found great areas of land ruined by erosion—land that formerly supported dense populations. In places not only was the land stripped of its topsoil and horribly gullied, but the subsoil had washed off to bedrock. Archaeologists, working in those regions of devastated land, often have to dig deeply to reach the tops of the buildings of the dead cities they seek to study, as at Babylon, Khorsabad, and Antioch. At Antioch, Syria, where St. Paul struggled so valiantly to gain recognition for the Christian religion, it was necessary to dig down 18 feet in parts of the city to reach the magnificent structures of marble that the Apostle knew.

Had to dig through what? They had to dig through accumulations of the products of soil erosion—the very substance of the land that made it possible to build the cities, wasted and misplaced by the action of water and wind.

The land is gone. The people are gone. Great civilizations have disappeared from the earth: Babylonia, Assyria, and others. The remnants of the peoples of those wasted areas put up very weak resistance, as you recall, in the battles and threats of battles of recent months. And still the people of those civilizations used their lands for centuries on centuries—for thousands of years, while we in America have used up within a single century enough good land to support nations. And the devastation is still going on.

GOOD LAND LIMITED

According to our surveys and measurements of the extent of erosion, we have left, out of our original vast stores of productive soil, only 462,000,000 acres of really good land. This is all we have—all we have in cultivation now, plus all that can be brought into cultivation through practicable methods of irrigation and drainage.

Again I am talking about cropland—good cropland. And I haven't finished my statement. Here is what every citizen who has any real interest in the permanency of American agriculture—in the permanency of our Nation—should know:

Of this remaining area of 462,000,000 acres of cultivated and potentially cultivable good land all but 130,000,000 acres is subject to the very same process of wasteful erosion that already has ruined or sorely damaged an area of once productive land more than five times the size of the State of Iowa.

This will be enough land if we save all of it. But to save it from now on we must provide and maintain adequate measures for the control and prevention of erosion on more than three-fourths of all the land we till. And for much of the other fourth, good farming practices—drainage, crop rotations, etc., must be provided and maintained.

And all this we can do if we will. I say this because it has been proved, I am convinced, on enough land to enable us to feel assured the way has been blazed. And the problem can be met in a way that will prove profitable to the individual who uses the land, as well as to the community and Nation as a whole.

Unfortunately erosion is still getting ahead of us faster than farmers and ranchers, and all the private and public agencies helping them have been able to apply measures of control and prevention. We still are ruining—that is, we still are permitting to be ruined—in the neighborhood of a million acres of land every year. The annual direct and indirect cost of erosion has been estimated at $3,844,000,000 a year.

But we are now gaining on the wasteful process. So, I repeat: We can meet the problem. And I want to add that we must meet the problem, whatever the cost.

RATE OF SOIL AND WATER LOSS

At this point I want to make reference to a few of the thousands of measurements of soil and water losses that have been made and to give some examples of the effects of erosion, the way we go about meeting the problem, and some of the results.

The Chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Clapp, already has given you some typical examples of measured rates of soil and water losses under different types of land use that show how tremendously these rates are accelerated by stripping off nature's protective cover of vegetation. Let me add another illustration from the more than 100,000 quantitative measurements of soil and water losses that have been made under thousands of different conditions.

These few measurements that I will give you are representative of many millions of acres. They were made at the soil- and water-conservation experiment station near Zanesville, Ohio, on farm land typical of that locality and neighboring portions of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky. (This is not far from the community whence hails your vice president, the Honorable Robert T. Secrest.)

From land used continuously for corn, 95 tons of soil per acre are washed off in an average year along with 42 percent of all the precipitation (rainfall and melted snow) lost as immediate run-off. This means that under this type of land use (more properly, land abuse) the original depth of the topsoil (7 inches) would be removed in about 11 or 12 years. It also means that instead of having all of the average annual rainfall of 40 inches for crop use, probably 75 to 80 percent of it is lost as run-off, evaporation, and percolation.

But, on another piece of land—same soil, same slope, same size, same rainfall—planted to grass instead of corn the annual losses have been at the rate of only 0.02 ton of soil per acre and 5 percent of the rainfall.

Thus, under continuous corn cultivation, topsoil is lost at a rate 4,750 times more rapidly than under grass and 8 times more rainfall is lost as run-off. At the slow rate of soil loss under such a protective cover as grass, it would take around 40,000 years to wash off the topsoil—and probably in the meantime an adequate depth of topsoil would be reestablished from the subsurface materials.

The average yield of corn from normally treated land of the locality still retaining a fair depth of topsoil is about 35 to 40 bushels an acre, as against only about 7 to 10 bushels an acre from the corresponding exposed subsoil.

SEDIMENTATION OF RIVERS, RESERVOIRS, HARBORS

Let's glance at the matter of obstructive accumulations of erosion-produced silt in all kinds of water channels and receptacles.

whether they be rivers, harbors, reservoirs, or just ditches. Perhaps it would be as well to start by mentioning the findings of the survey of reservoir sedimentation made by the Soil Conservation Service, since it gives an inkling of what is going on in the way of costly erosion of croplands and rangelands.

This survey has shown that out of more than 12,000 reservoirs built in this country around 2,000 already have been filled to the top of the dam with the products of erosion. Approximately 2,500 other reservoirs, built at a cost of about $250,000,000, are not yet filled but are silting at the rate of at least 2 percent a year. If better control is not provided at the sources of the silt, these 2,500 reservoirs will be filled or rendered practically useless in less than 50 years. When we consider the fact that more than $1,000,000,000 worth of new reservoirs are under construction in the United States in 1941, this consideration is something to be concerned about.

All this huge quantity of silt comes from soil erosion, some from comparatively slow geological erosion and some—the greater bulk—from accelerated erosion on unprotected fields, overgrazed pastures and ranges, and rapidly cutting stream banks, and highway embankments. Measurements of rates of soil losses on agricultural lands under various types of use indicate that some 3,000,000,000 tons of soil are stripped from these lands annually, most of it the result of accelerated erosion. Millions of tons of eroded soil reach the oceans every year—probably close to a billion tons. But the greater part is stranded temporarily or permanently along the lower sides of fields, in thousands of stream channels, in reservoirs, in lakes, and ditches. Other huge quantities are laid down over fertile bottom lands as unwanted fine material or as water-assorted sand of relatively low productivity.

Soil surveys by Federal and State soil technicians have shown that the greater part of the once-productive alluvial lands along the lesser streams of the vast Piedmont area of the Southeast have been so covered with eroded soil and the channels so clogged with the same kind of material that they are no longer cultivable and are mostly covered with a swampy growth of willow, alder, blackberry, rushes, and cattails. Overflows have been greatly accelerated and in some instances malarial hazards have developed.

It would be interesting to have an accurate determination of formerly navigable streams that have become too clogged with erosion debris for any further navigation. We know of a great many instances of this nature, but we do not have anything near the complete story.

On my trips about the country inspecting the progress of the soil-conservation program I am constantly running into silting and silted reservoirs, ditches, and stream channels. Under the program of the Soil Conservation Service some 46 Civilian Conservation Corps camps have been engaged for 7 years in drainage improvements. This work, for the most part, has had to do with the cleaning out of silted drainage ditches. Some 70,000,000 cubic yards of washed-in soil material have been taken out of such ditches under this program, and the work can be said to have made scarcely more than a start, so enormous is the problem ahead. The material removed from these ditches is about the equivalent of the topsoil of 2,500 forty-acre farms.

Some drainage districts have been ruined by erosion. In one, in northern Mississippi, two-thirds of all the ditches have been filled with the products of erosion and the others nearly filled. Six years ago the district was abandoned, although the bonds were not to have been paid off until 1942.

THE BURIAL OF COLMA CREEK

Three weeks ago I saw an interesting example of the relation of water erosion to sedimentation along Colma Creek in south San Francisco, Calif. Here I found that such land abuses as downhill cultivation, fields left bare of protective vegetation in winter, overgrazing, neglected gullying, and sale of topsoil for lawns and flower gardens in urban areas have contributed to a very severe erosion problem in the trucking, hog raising, and dairying hill country of San Mateo County. Many gullies, starting as trivial washes that could easily have been controlled, have cut down into soft, sandy understrata that erode almost like melting sugar. Erosion of roadside cuts and fills also has contributed enormous quantities of silt, mainly in the form of sand.

In less than 50 years the land along Colma Creek has been covered and re-covered by annual sedimentation to an accumulated depth of more than 25 feet, according to observation of those who have long lived along its course. During the past 8 years, I was told, approximately $400,000 has been spent by south San Francisco in handling the floods and sand that spread over the stream bottoms year after year I saw a ditch that had been cut through the sand deposit to a depth of about 12 feet as a means of passing on sand and flood flows. This job alone, I was told, cost around $235,000. And still sand flows out of the expanding sore spots upstream into the ditch and over park areas and baseball fields.

At one time barges are said to have carried hay up Colma Creek to the Charles Lux ranch about a mile from San Francisco Bay. No boat of any kind could go up there now. Furthermore the bay itself is shoaling about the mouth of the creek.

Highway and county officials are providing about $100,000 for the maintenance of erosion-control installations and plantings along the new Junipera Serra Boulevard that crosses eight drainages leading into Colma Creek. The Soil Conservation Service has been asked to install eight risers for silting basins above the embankment of this highway to stop the silt now passing beneath the boulevard.

Much erosion-control work is being carried on by the San Mateo soil-conservation district in its cooperation with farmers and dairymen operating on the watershed of Colma Creek. It will be interesting to observe the control effects of these operations. I suspect it may eventually cost in the neighborhood of a million and a half to $2,000,000 to handle this problem of erosion and silting within the limits of this one diminutive part of the Nation.

GULLIES MEET THE PACIFIC

It was here, about 10 miles south of the Golden Gate, that I saw a monster gully that began in a cabbage patch and now empties in the Pacific. This gapping chasm seems to be even deeper than what we had supposed was the deepest man-made gully in the United States—Providence Cave, of Stewart County, Ga

While I was in California I was told that, following the severe erosion experienced in several of the southern counties during the early part of this year, a number of farmers had requested that assessments on their lands be reduced because of the erosion damage, particularly damage to productive valley lands by overdeposits of erosion debris. This was in one of the richest agricultural counties of the State A member of the board of supervisors of that county told me that they were striving to get a soil-conservation district established, and that when this was done, the county would, in all probability, be ready to put in $100,000 annually to help with the erosion problem

Sedimentation surveys of the municipal water-supply reservoir at High Point, N. C., made in 1934, before the erosion-control demonstration program on its watershed started, and again in 1938, after the conservation work closed down, revealed that the average annual silt deposition in the reservoir had dropped to 24 percent less than it was before the conservation work was done. The annual loss of storage was reduced from 0.77 to 0.59 percent and the net soil loss from the entire drainage area from 0.93 to 0.71 ton per acre, as measured by the amount of sediment entering the reservoir. This reduction took place even though there was an equal number of intense storms and slightly higher run-off after the 1934 survey. This accomplishment seems even more impressive when it is considered that only 35 percent of the total acreage in this watershed was placed under erosion control.

Studies of water purification at High Point and 21 other towns in the North Carolina Piedmont have shown that a reduction of 25 to 30 percent in the silt burden of the streams would result in a saving of $7 per million gallons of water treated. This would result in a benefit of $94,500 annually to these towns.

POWER LOST BY RESERVOIR SILTING

During the first 9 months of 1941, in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama, electric current lost due to depletion of storage capacity by sedimentation had an estimated value of more than $250,000. Silting surveys conducted by S. C. S. in these four Southern States show that water storage capacities of major power reservoirs have been reduced by about 370,000 acre-feet in the last 25 years. All these reservoirs are located in areas of intensive farming, and the silting is the result of erosion of farm lands in these watersheds.

There are hundreds of reservoir storage sites in this region which might be developed, at great cost, but if the present rate of silting continues the region eventually will be faced with a severe shortage of water-storage possibilities. With the adoption of adequate conservation measures, silting can be reduced to a fraction of present rates.

NATIONAL CONSERVATION

Coming now to the national program for conservation of soil and water started in the fall of 1933, I want to touch briefly on the general nature and scope of the work.

We were late in getting this program under way—too late for some localities in various parts of the country. Some communities were pretty well depleted of good land and farmers who once made a living had mostly moved out. The north central part of Fairfield County, S. C., is one such community. The Lickskillet section in southwestern Georgia is another; and Neri in the West Cross Timbers of Texas another. The hilly section up north of Marion, Ala., some of the country lying to the north of Ocoee, Tenn., scattered areas in the rougher sections along the Des Moines River in southeastern Iowa, and portions of the watershed of the Puerco River, N. Mex., are other localities which were permitted to go too far. Little further practical use can be made of these erosion-scoured lands except for forestry and grazing.

Not only had no attempt been made by the Federal Government to get under way a completely coordinated erosion-control and water-conservation program on the crop and grazing lands of the Nation, but very little had been done in the field of soil-conservation research until the erosion experiment stations got under way about 1930. Even the important control structure, the field terrace, which was in use as early as 1830 in parts of South Carolina, was not subjected to the scrutiny of research until a hundred years later. No one knew until about 1933 that field terraces should never have a gradient exceeding 6 inches in a linear distance of 100 feet and on highly erodible lands not to exceed a fall of about two or three inches in 100 feet.

For "Salaries, Office of Second Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $6,100.

For "Salaries, Office of Third Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $10,905.

For "Salaries, Office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, 1942," $3,730.

For "Salaries, Office of Purchasing Agent, 1942," $395.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts, 1942," $1,590.

For "Post office inspectors, salaries, 1942," $20,050.

For "Railroad Transportation and Mail Messenger Service, 1942," $585.

For "Railway Mail Service, salaries, 1942," $17,450.

For "Operating force for public buildings, Post Office Department, 1942," $211,730.

In all, Post Office Department, $280,685.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For "Salaries, Department of State, 1942," $30,320.

For "Passport agencies, Department of State, 1942," $1,245.

For "International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada, 1942," $577.

For "Salaries and expenses, International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, 1942," $400.

In all, Department of State, $32,542.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

For "Salaries and expenses, Foreign Exchange Control, 1942," $3,075.

For "Salaries, Division of Research and Statistics, Treasury Department, 1942," $2,045.

For "Salaries, Division of Personnel, Treasury Department, 1942," $1,070.

For "Salaries, Office of Chief Clerk, Treasury Department, 1942," $2,600.

For "Salaries, operating force, Treasury Department Buildings, 1942," $6,600.

For "Salaries, Division of Printing, Treasury Department, 1942," $1,755.

For "Salaries, Bureau of Accounts, Treasury Department, 1942," $4,850.

For "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Public Debt, 1942," $21,365.

For "Salaries, Office of Treasurer of United States, 1942," $16,835.

For "Collecting the revenue from customs, 1942," $250,855.

For "Salaries, Office of Comptroller of the Currency, 1942," $2,220.

For "Collecting the internal revenue, 1942," $377,975.

For "Salaries and expenses, Processing Tax Board of Review, 1942," $840.

For "Salaries, Secret Service Division, 1942," $405.

For "Salaries, Office of Director of the Mint, 1942," $1,480.

For "Salaries and expenses, Mints and Assay Offices, 1942," $4,855.

In all, Treasury Department, $698,825.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For "Executive Office, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $955.

For "Purchasing Division, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,140.

For "Department of Inspections, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $5,435.

For "Poundmaster, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $225.

For "District Buildings, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,455.

For "Assessor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $5,595.

For "Collector, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $700.

For "Auditor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,930.

For "Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, District of Columbia, 1942," $40.

For "Chief Clerk, Engineer Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $555.

For "Municipal Architect, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $950.

For "Department of Insurance, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $620.

For "Surveyor, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $375.

For "Commission on Mental Health, District of Columbia, 1942," $188.

For "Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole, District of Columbia, 1942," $315.

For "Administrative expenses, compensation to injured employees in the District of Columbia, 1942," $1,005.

For "Register of Wills, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,513.

For "Recorder of Deeds, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,466.

For "Motor vehicles, District of Columbia, 1942," $95.

For "Free Public Library, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $6,560.

For "Collection and disposal of refuse, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,315.

For "Public schools, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $23,760.

For "Metropolitan Police, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,995.

For "Fire Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $45.

For "Health Department, general administration, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,302.

For "Health Department, medical services, District of Columbia, 1942," $5,650.

For "Health Department, laboratories, District of Columbia, 1942," $650.

For "Health Department, inspections, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,465.

For "Tuberculosis, Sanatoria, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $10,163.

For "Gallinger Municipal Hospital, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $3,105.

For "Juvenile court, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,390.

For "Municipal court, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $1,005.

For "Division of Child Welfare, detention of children, District of Columbia, 1942," $345.

For "Workhouse and reformatory, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $10,403.

For "District Training School, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,920.

For "Industrial Home School for Colored Children, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $810.

For "Municipal Lodging House, District of Columbia, 1942," $135.

For "Temporary Home for Former Soldiers and Sailors, District of Columbia, 1942," $135.

For "Transportation of indigent nonresident persons, District of Columbia, 1942," $165.

For "Militia, District of Columbia, 1942," $525.

For "Public parks, salaries, District of Columbia, 1942," $7,355.

In all, District of Columbia, exclusive of highway and water funds, $108,755.

Highway fund, gasoline tax and motor-vehicle fees: For "Department of Vehicles and Traffic, salaries, highway fund, District of Columbia, 1942," $2,535; and for "Trees and parkings, salaries, highway fund, District of Columbia, 1942," $540; in all, $3,075, to be paid wholly out of the special fund created by the act entitled "An act to provide a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924 (43 Stat. 106), and the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937.

Water service: For "Washington Aqueduct, District of Columbia, 1942," $4,185, to be paid wholly out of the revenues of the Water Department of the District of Columbia.

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942.

In all, District of Columbia, including highway and water funds, $116,015.

In all, title V, $3,236,327.

The restrictions contained in appropriations or affecting appropriations or other funds available during the fiscal year 1942 limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services or for other purposes are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the increases in compensation under said act of August 1, 1941, and said Executive Orders No. 8842 and No. 8882: *Provided*, That all appropriations and funds, including the appropriations herein made, available during the fiscal year 1942 for the payment of salaries of civilian officers and employees who are subject to the provisions of said act of August 1, 1941, and said Executive Orders No. 8842 and No. 8882, shall be available from and including October 1, 1941, for the payment of within-grade salary advancements as of October 1, 1941, or any subsequent date on which such officers and employees became, or will become, eligible for such advancements in accordance with said act and Executive orders: *Provided further*, That the head of any department, establishment, or agency is hereby authorized to allocate from the sum herein appropriated under any appropriation title administered by him to any subappropriation included under such title such amount as he may determine to be necessary to meet expenditures for within-grade salary advancements in accordance with the provisions of said act or Executive orders.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The first section of title VI carries a provision for restoring Mr. David Lasser, one-time president of the Workers Alliance, to the good grace of this great Government, so that he might come back on the pay roll. When I first read the provision I thought of that old song, Will You Love Me in December As You Did in May? Of course, that is a little short of the distance—by 1 month—but I am wondering whether or not this Congress, after it removed David Lasser from the pay roll in June, proposes to restore him in December. He appeared before the committee and made a case, after a fashion. Representative FLANNAGAN appeared in his behalf and Representative VOORHIS, of California, sent a memorandum to the committee in his behalf. Mr. Millard W. Rice, a representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appeared in his behalf. It should be stated, however, that Mr. Rice appeared as an individual and not as a representative of the V. F. W. or the D. A. V. He frankly informed the committee that he did not recall the number of the chapter of the D. A. V. to which Mr. Lasser belonged; that he knew little about Mr. Lasser; that he had no regular contact with him; and that for the most part his information was obtained around a lunch table in the Senate restaurant.

Mr. Lasser in his statement to the committee indicated that he had spent several months contacting Members of Congress after his separation from the Federal service, in which he was holding a position in the W. P. A. at a salary of $4,400 per year. It is, however, singular to me that, since I was an author of the amendment whereby Mr. Lasser was separated from the Federal roll, that he at no time contacted me or called my office.

Now, let us turn to the basic case against Mr. Lasser. I admitted in June that it was rare procedure to remove an

My record will show a consistent policy in an earnest endeavor to save our country the tragedy of war and at the same time supporting every measure for national preparedness.

I have done all within my power to keep this country out of war, but no red-blooded American, solicitous of our Nation's safety, in the face of ruthless attack, made at a time when our Government was continuing its efforts in behalf of friendly relations, could do otherwise but vote to protect it. Because of this situation, I would have welcomed the opportunity to have voted for the resolution had not circumstances over which I had no control, prevented me from being here.

The bombs dropped on Pearl Harbor have but one meaning. War has been forced on us and I shall loyally and steadfastly do all in my power to avenge this outrageous and wanton assault on our peace and honor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PROTECTION AGAINST AIR RAIDS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I, like some of my colleagues from California, have just returned. I should like to make this statement. The people of California are not as jittery as some of the reports would indicate. They are taking this thing like real Americans. They are disappointed, however, in some of the things that have happened. The universal question out there is, where were our listeners, where were all the devices for listening in, where were our patrols, and how did the Japanese get within the lines to do the damage that they apparently have done throughout our possessions in the Pacific Ocean? The people in California are naturally concerned about what will happen in California, and they hope that immediate steps will be taken so that there will be patrols so that no plane can come within range of California.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared in the December 16, 1941, issue of Look magazine by Lewis Browne entitled "Anti-Semitism in the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to use this time to say that I had just arrived at the House when the doors were being opened after the adjournment. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" on the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAGNUSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair for the majority leader, who happens in this instance to be myself, to make a brief statement for the RECORD, because such a statement might be of concern to Members on both sides of the aisle, and it is a statement which, I think, in all fairness, the majority leader should make.

Of course, the vote yesterday was unexpected. No one expected such a dastardly deed to be committed against our country as the one committed by Japan. Many Members were away on official business, and it was also understood that there was no important legislation coming up on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday. This was entirely unexpected, and Members who were some distance away and unable to get back would have been here to vote if it had been humanly possible. Some were Members on the Democratic side and some were Members on the Republican side, and some wired me and wired the Speaker and the minority leader that they were hastening back as quickly as possible.

I make this statement in justice to all Members on both sides of the aisle who were away and making every effort to get back here to vote on the resolution that was adopted yesterday with the knowledge that this brief statement should be a satisfactory explanation to the people of their districts showing that their Representatives were doing everything they could to be back here to vote on the resolution yesterday afternoon.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I left Washington last Saturday night for California and when within about 1 hour of Oakland, my home, I received word that the Japanese had attacked Pearl Harbor. The plane proceeded to the Oakland airport. I immediately got out of the plane, went to the ticket office and bought a return ticket for Washington. The next plane, however, did not leave for 2 hours. I came back over the most direct route and missed the roll call by a few minutes. Had I been here I would have voted for the resolution.

A number of my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL], were on the plane with me. Thanks to the Metropolitan Police Department we made the trip from the Washington Airport to the Capitol with dispatch and thanks to the American Airlines we came in a few minutes ahead of time, but still we missed the roll call.

In the brief time I was in California after this attack on Pearl Harbor, the question asked me was, what were our defenders doing out there that the Japanese could come in and make such a dastardly attack. This, Mr. Speaker, is a question I hope will be satisfactorily answered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have received a radiogram from five Members of Congress who were in Trinidad on their way to the United States from an inspection trip. These Members heard news of the Japanese attack and were speeding home to vote. They arrived in New York City last night but the House had voted several hours previously. The radiogram from Trinidad was signed by Messrs. MAAS of Minnesota, COLE of New York, BALDWIN of New York, GALE of Minnesota, and HILL of Colorado. They desire to be recorded as in favor of the declaration of war against Japan.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DINGELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of the proceedings of today, and after other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, in a time like this it behooves every Member to keep his feet on the ground. In a time like this no man can accomplish anything by condemning, without knowing the facts.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I have but a minute. In a time like this it is the patriotic duty of every American, and especially every Congressman, to be guarded in his words, in order not to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

CORRECTING MISTAKES IN PLOWING

Only very recently have we learned that from the time the moldboard plow was invented we have been plowing the wrong way on millions of acres of land. We have been turning cover crops, green-manuring crops, and the stubble or residues of crops completely upside down in preparing land for the next crop or in getting vegetable matter incorporated with the soil. It is quite proper, of course, to get land ready for the next crop and to incorporate organic matter with the mineral soil, but it isn't necessary always to plow under every vestige of vegetation and so dispose of its protective effect. We have learned recently that the proper thing to do is to plow in such a way as to leave at least a portion of the vegetative matter on top to hold the soil by checking the flow of wind and water.

Consider, for example, the results of the cooperative research work of the Soil Conservation Service and the agricultural experiment station at Lincoln, Nebr., on this matter of leaving part of the stubble on top, versus clean plowing. It has been found that the former practice—the "stubble-mulch" method—saves a very large part of the rainfall as compared with the complete turn-under system. Also better yields have resulted and, what is most encouraging, farmers have been rapidly adopting the new system.

In the Nebraska area bladed and winged types of plows have been developed for stubble-mulch farming. These run about 3 to 5 inches under the surface in such a way as to loosen the soil without turning under all of the crop residues or stubble. The vegetative residues remaining on top serve as a mulch to prevent erosion, reduce evaporation, and favor intake and storage of rainfall. It is an interesting fact that within the last year some 20 new plows or adaptations of plows have been developed to fit this new way of handling cropland. Farmers have made some of these, conservation specialists some, and implement manufacturers have made some.

On September 20, this year, at a plowing contest held in Iowa, straight plowing and clean plowing were among the points rated for successful performance. There, in the presence of some 20,000 spectators, plowers were rewarded, in part, for carrying out the best job of doing the worst thing for the land—that is, for land subject to erosion. In contrast, another plowing contest held a little later, October 8, 1941, in Wisconsin, included contour plowing among the points listed for meritorious performance.

But we are learning; we are beginning to move. When I attended a soil-conservation rally this past summer at Red Oak, Montgomery County, Iowa, where the Soil Conservation Service has been using a C. C. C. camp for conducting soil-conservation demonstrations, I was told that 3 years previously not one row of corn was purposefully planted on the contour, while this year 50 percent of all the corn rows in this important corn-producing county, in the heart of the Corn Belt, were planted on the contour to prevent erosion and to conserve rainfall. Many contoured fields of corn that I saw late this year in various parts of Iowa and Nebraska produced a fourth more, two-thirds more, or twice as much as noncontoured land of the same variety in neighboring fields on the same kind of land.

PROGRESS

I started to tell about the national program for conserving soil and rainfall. Throughout the country, cooperating with farmers and using C. C. C., W. P. A., and other kinds of labor, the Service has established since the fall of 1933 more than 700 soil- and water-conservation demonstration projects in areas where soil erosion, excessive run-off of rainfall, and related difficulties have been serious problems. Results have been generally successful; the work has proved popular everywhere.

The basic policy adopted in the beginning of this program has involved the treatment of every acre of land of entire farms, ranches, or watersheds—every field, pasture, and wood lot—according to its individual needs, by using all known practical measures of control and prevention that fit the varied types of land, the climate, and the local type of farming. The job for the Nation as a whole is a highly complicated one for various reasons. In the first place, the land itself varies widely in its physical aspects of soil, slope, degree of erosion, and susceptibility to erosion, and, further, because these numerous land types vary greatly in crop adaptability. Moreover, climatic variations exert a powerful influence, and the farmer himself and his debts, taxes, area of good land, location, and labor supply all bear upon what can be done.

Out in the district you represent, Mr. Chairman [Representative MARTIN F. SMITH, Grays Harbor County, southwestern Washington], the protection of stream banks is one of the most important types of erosion-control work being carried on. Here the alluvial lands along many of your streams, as the Wenatchee and Satsop, have been suffering severely from accelerated bank erosion that seemingly has been caused by increased run-off due to the removal of so much of the forest from the watersheds. These lands are highly productive and splendidly adapted to dairying and the production of commercial vegetable and legume seed. The community cannot afford to lose any of this land. The supply is limited and, once the land is gone, it can't be recovered.

On looking over the work in that locality only a few weeks ago, I found that the various bank stabilization practices are proving highly effective, especially the planting of willows, the establishment of special kinds of barriers at critical points, and the occasional cutting of short stretches of new channel through obstructive sandbars, as at John Zak's place on the Wynoochee. I was particularly surprised to see on both the Satsop and the Wynoochee that wire cables anchored through strategic points in front of cutting banks were collecting from the rivers great levees of logs which, in turn, were causing the piling up of gravel to form highly effective protective barriers. Here the destructive force of the river itself has been skillfully turned to combat its own depredations against productive land.

The demonstrations throughout the country have been at least sufficiently successful to build up a general and increasing demand for control and prevention of erosion and increased utilization of rainfall, all of which fit perfectly into a completely coordinated national program for all-out erosion control, silt control, conservation and utilization of water on the land and along the streams; protection of rivers; safeguarding of cities and farms along stream courses; and protection of harbors, lakes, ditches, and valley lands.

DEMOCRACY AT WORK ON THE LAND

And this has led to another thing, a step beyond the soil and water conservation demonstration. It has led to the soil conservation district movement. The rapid development of soil conservation districts in the United States has been, I think, the most significant movement pertaining to agricultural land that has ever taken place anywhere in the world.

When the Department of Agriculture, a little more than 4 years ago, painstakingly prepared a model or suggestive soil conservation districts act to be submitted to the States for whatever value it might have toward the development of State legislation suitable for speeding conservation, I personally felt that real progress would be made if three or four States should pass such a law within 3 or 4 years.

What has surprised me, and many others who have kept up with the districts movement, is that 42 States have adopted such an act within 4 years. Maine and Vermont have adopted it; and Georgia, New York, California, Florida, Washington, Ohio, and most of the other States—all but 6 of them.

And here is another surprising thing: In the last 4 years, farmers and ranchers in 40 States, from Vermont to California, already have gone into their voting places and created by their own action more than 625 soil conservation districts. These districts now embrace approximately 370,000,000 acres of land and more than 2,000,000 farm families live in them.

Approximately a hundred of the districts, all of which were set up by vote of the people themselves, have been increased in size since their formation, through petition of the surrounding farmers. A few weeks ago I visited a soil conservation district in southeastern Nebraska—the Turkey Creek District—which had been enlarged 28 times since its establishment, by 28 separate petitions of groups of neighboring farmers. The district started out with 62,000 acres. It had grown to 235,000 acres when I was there—grown by choice of the people themselves through their own petitions in the true American way.

Things like this don't happen among free civilized people without deep-seated conviction. I learned first hand what the cause was: It was the work which the erosion specialists had done to help the farmers. This work had proved successful. Soil and rainfall had been conserved with practical farm measures. Crop yields had increased and farm income had gone up as the result. Farmers told me that the measures applied on their lands, which they showed me out in their own fields, had benefited both their land and their income.

That was the source of the ferment in the minds of farmers—hundreds of farmers operating thousands of acres—which had created Turkey Creek District by their own vote and enlarged it, not to twice, but to nearly four times its size within the brief period of approximately 2 years. In the beginning someone had denied the forthright purpose of the proposed district—ugly rumors had spread around to the effect that the Federal Government was preparing to move in and take over complete management and operation of the farms. A meeting called to establish the district broke up in confusion. But afterward—and this is the kind of thing that blazes the trail of human progress—determined farmers went into operating districts of other localities and learned for themselves the truth. They came back, called another meeting, and told their neighbors what they had seen, not what someone had told them. Not long after that the district was established by an almost unanimous vote of the local farmers.

These districts are cooperative, democratic organizations of farm people, dedicated to the conservation of soil and water, grass and forests. Actually, they are groups of farmers banded together legally in a well-defined community in order to obtain the help of one another and of various governmental agencies in keeping their soil from washing and blowing, in conserving rainfall, protecting the grazing plants of the range, and keeping forests permanently productive. These people are interested in protecting the uplands and lowlands and the headwaters and intermediate streams, while you, as I have already pointed out, are seeking to protect the trunk streams, the people living along them, the adjacent properties,

and the harbors for downstream and along the coast.

ALLIED FOR WATERSHED PROTECTION

You have a potentially powerful ally in these farmers and ranchers who are slowing down the rush of rain water and snow water from the ridges to the river. I know of various small streams where flood heights already have been very markedly reduced as the result of soil and water conservation. The South Palouse River of Washington is an example. On this stream floods apparently have been controlled and the original perennial flow that had ceased for years has been at least partly reestablished.

If this can be accomplished along enough of the little streams, flood flows in the large rivers should be reduced in some degree and the flow of silt into all of them should be greatly diminished.

And farmers and ranchers are finding that in achieving conservation of soil and water they are in better shape, with safer lands, protected forests, better pastures, reclaimed gullies, and more soil moisture conserved for growing crops. Not the least important benefit from this work has been that people operating in soil-conservation districts have learned anew the old lesson that in unity there is strength—that many people working together can accomplish deeds impossible by separate individual effort.

I believe the time has come when we should think of flood control, not as one line of work, nor of soil conservation as another line of work, nor of silt prevention and forest protection as other lines. We should think of these as interrelated parts of a bigger field—of watershed protection. We should plan these activities together and carry them out together—carefully coordinated to accomplish the greatest benefits for everyone concerned.

I believe it is unnecessary for me to attempt any explanation of the advantages of teamwork like that. It is sufficient merely to point out that everyone in a watershed participates and everyone stands to benefit from a complete watershed-protection program. Farmers all down the drainage ways—all the way from ridge crests to the mouths of rivers—are benefited in various ways. People in towns benefit in other ways: Flood dangers are reduced; silting of harbors, reservoirs, channels, and bottomlands is greatly retarded; wildlife and forests are improved.

A complete watershed-conservation program involves almost everyone who owns or uses land—millions of people, millions of acres. It benefits virtually every one of these, and everyone plays a part in the work—downstream dwellers and upstreams dwellers and people who do not live on streams at all.

Public opinion is strong for programs that benefit the majority of the people. All the individuals and groups who are interested in various phases of watershed management have a common purpose—whether they are conserving soil, protecting forests, reducing siltation, or controlling floods. Here is an opportunity for teamwork—for all people to unite in plans and purposes to bring about sound, practical, efficient use of our basic resources of soil and water. Here is a job of education, of planning, of action, by individuals and by groups, to challenge our imagination and abilities to the utmost.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am the newest member on the Committee of Agriculture of the House and am very much interested in agriculture. You perhaps know that the committee gave this bill thorough consideration. This is a good bill. This will extend the Soil Conservation Service for 5 years and the A. A. A. payments for 3 years.

You and I know that care of the soil requires much thought, time, and work. Farmers who benefit under this program do not get money for nothing. These payments are not doles. These soil-conservation payments are earned by contour plowing and terracing and approved methods of soil conservation; furthermore, the farmers have to reduce their acreage in order to receive the benefits. I am sure you all realize that the farmers of the Nation feed and clothe not only themselves but all those engaged in industry, all our soldiers, and all the citizens of our country. The farmers represent about 40 percent of the Nation's population, and they produce the food to feed everyone, and yet the farmers receive only 13 percent of the national income. I hope every Member will vote for this resolution. It is one of the best bills that has been before us.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand that as a legislator the gentleman likes to take money out of the Treasury for 22 percent of the farmers of this country year after year? Does he try to say it is wise legislation to pay benefits to the few at the expense of the many?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If 40 percent of the people are getting it, yes; because the farmers are the ones, after all, who sustain the life of this Nation. They produce what we are all after; that is, something to put into our stomachs and something to wear on our backs.

Mr. MURRAY. What percentage of the farmers get this money?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Possibly a fair percentage of the total.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that 25 percent of the so-called farmers are getting around 75 percent of the money and that in many places the actual farmers do not get this money?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think that those who receive it work for it and earn what they receive.

Mr. MURRAY. Those are the ones who do not get it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. They work for it and earn it.

Mr. MURRAY. The big operators are the ones who get the money, while the so-called family sized farmer does not get a great deal of this money.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I cannot quite agree with that. I am for the family size farmer.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman has not looked at the book. We have a big, thick volume in the committee that shows that a comparatively few receive checks of from $1,000 to $7,600.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. We have somewhat restricted those amounts. I may say that those who work will get it and it will be in proportion to the amount of work they put in.

Those who howl at the prices farmers are receiving, listen to me. During the other war wheat was $2.50, while today it is $1 per bushel; cotton was 42 cents, yet today it is 16 cents per pound; and bear this in mind, too, that these prices today are considerably higher than we have been receiving the past few years. If anyone thinks our farmers are overpaid, then remember this: The average daily earning of the farmers down in my area is $1.08. The farmers' wives and children work for nothing except their board and clothes, and not much of that. After all, we have plenty of northerners there each winter. The prices paid by the consumer are not reflected in the prices received by the farmers.

I represent the one-gallows farmers who eat some of the cheese produced from the State represented by the gentleman from Wisconsin and some of the crackers made in the city represented by my colleague from St. Louis.

I came from the short-grass country. If any of you think our farmers are overpaid, come down to Oklahoma and follow in the furrow, or ride the tractor with the heat and dust boiling up around you from morn till dark, or perhaps when the sand is blowing 30 miles an hour. Let the flying ants, smut, and grease get smeared over your face and in your hair. Get down on your knees and pull seven or eight hundred pounds of bolls a day. I have done it, and I know the trials and tribulations of a little farmer.

Bear in mind that the farmers have no 40-hour week. Neither do they receive any social-security rewards nor any unemployment-compensation benefits.

Yes; and our farmers furnish more than their share of the boys in the defense factories and in the armies.

The farmers have filled the bins. We will need and I hope we will use a lot of this surplus. Every time someone talks about the surplus, then Wall Street knocks farm prices down several points.

One more thought and I will close, and that is the fact that when this emergency is over there will be thousands returning to the soil for a livelihood, and those who do not return will be directly or indirectly dependent upon the soil.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief announcement that the bills on the Private Calendar will be called tomorrow, and I shall ask unanimous consent later that this may be done. I wanted to make this announcement at this time to Members who are interested in that calendar.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question of the young, new Member who recently took his seat. I would like to have him take a trip through the beautiful Shenandoah Valley and note the farms that those wealthy city people, who also get this money, have down there. I would then ask him if he thought such people are really entitled to receive this so-called aid.

I have no objection to the real and needy farmers receiving this remuneration. Even in my section the real farm-

ers are not the only ones getting it. Of course, it is argued that we must take them all in, or the conservation plan fails of its purpose. Must we continue indefinitely these raids on the Treasury?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat one more thing before the House today and that is this: If we are not just a little careful about this agricultural legislation, the future will show that the Banking and Currency Committee of this House is doing more constructive work for the farmers of this country than this bill will ever give. We are following legislation for the few at the expense of the many. We subsidize only three crops of consequence and let the 75 to 80 percent of the producers take their chances. We protect the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I believe the gentleman will agree that there came out of the Committee on Agriculture the measure that provided for 85 percent loans, which has perhaps been more beneficial to those commodities of which we have a surplus than any other. That did not come out of the Banking and Currency Committee, it came out of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, I will answer the gentleman by saying this, and I request him to dispute it if it is not a fact: All these crops that we have been spending money to control all these years are just the ones that give us the embarrassing surpluses today. We have over a billion bushels of wheat in the country today. We have spent milions of dollars holding down the production of wheat. Then we have cotton, and you have no idea of the amount of money we have poured into the cotton business. The Banking and Currency Committee put the floor under all crops for which an increase has been asked by Mr. Wickard. They did not try to pick out two or three crops.

Mr. PACE. Well, how much?

Mr. MURRAY. Around $2,000,000,000 during the last 8 years for cotton and the cotton States. Here we are appropriating $500,000,000 a year, and we are subsidizing largely crops that are soil-depleting. We are losing $15 a bale right today in order to get rid of cotton after we paid out money for raising or not raising it. Does this make sense? I say that is not based on common sense, it is not based on common justice, and we cannot continually come to the United States Treasury and expect to get money for crops that are depleting our soil and get the funds in the name of soil conservation.

Here is a $500,000,000 bill, and we have only a few minutes of debate on it. As far as I am concerned, without any intention of being egotistic, there is nothing I would like better than to stand up here and discuss this matter fully, with Members from either side of the aisle, in an effort to analyze the situation. It is fundamentally wrong to continually appropriate money for the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman says we are depleting our soil by planting certain crops. If the gentleman knows anything about agriculture, he knows that the yield of cotton, wheat, corn, and all these other commodities has increased under this program and the statistics of the Department of Agriculture will bear that out. Another thing, when the gentleman talks about cotton, I remind the gentleman that by establishing the cotton farmers of the South we are able to buy your butter and cheese that you have been fussing about all these years. If you do not want to help cotton, then do not ask the people of the country to help the dairy industry in Wisconsin, because that is what we do when we get the money to buy your products.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not want to get excited. Nor do I wish to be misled by any controversy about any one crop. When I feel the need of more agricultural information I shall be pleased to consult the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman ought to give truthful statements then.

Mr. MURRAY. He always does; and I hereby challenge you to show where he has not done so. The political agriculturists are so used to having people believe their bedtime stories that they think they can fool the public forever. The gentleman will just follow the rules of the House. It is not necessary to make anything up about the lopsided agricultural program fostered by the gentleman from Missouri. It is an unfair, uneconomic, cross-purpose scheme, more interested in conserving the New Deal than it is the soil of this country. As far as the cotton and these oleo and butter businesses are concerned, we will attend to that next session. Dairy farmers also have to furnish money for the oleo business, you know.

May I say once more, if the committee wants to continue to pass this kind of unfair legislation, if it wants to let the Banking and Currency Committee put a floor under agriculture in this country, let them go ahead and do it. We can contrive schemes for only a few crops, but the House will fall in time. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has been the leader in broadening the base on the agricultural products to be benefited.

I will ask a few questions. Has the crop-control program of the administration controlled production? We started out a few years ago and we were going to control production. Did we? The largest number of acres that have ever been controlled in the Nation in 1 year is 34,000,000, yet in the last few years we have added 74,000,000 acres to the farms of our country. Was anything controlled? Yes; acreage on certain crops was reduced and yields increased by gifts of fertilizer or by improved seed.

As far as that control of acreage is concerned, it just did not amount to anything at all, so that is water over the dam, and there is no use talking about it. It was just one more vision. We lost our foreign cotton market largely through the agricultural program, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I think we are losing sight of one real fact, that is, I believe the soil-conservation program has been one of the biggest factors in our national-defense program today. It has taught the farmers of America to conserve their soil, and to be able to produce two blades of grass where one grew before. Our illustrious Vice President, the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, former Secretary of Agriculture, must have had in mind the national-defense program when he inaugurated the present program. The farmers now can go full steam ahead and produce double for our program in this war. Surpluses? In this national emergency and in this hour of peril, we may thank God that we have these surpluses. I think we should continue the soil-conservation program in the interest of the farmers of America, who are building up their soil in the interest of national defense. They will feed America during this war, and food is as necessary as bullets.

We talk about the payments we say that the farmer is getting paid to conserve his soil. I think it is one of the finest and best investments this country has ever put into effect. As the dark days ahead come, we shall see that the farmer of America will well repay to this Nation that which this Nation has given to him. It will be one of the real factors in the national-defense program, and this soil-conservation program should be extended.

We are doing nothing more or less for the farmer than what the tariff did for the manufacturer. We are just giving to the farmer what the manufacturer got under the tariff.

Labor and agriculture will cooperate in this hour of need, but you must remember that we must also cooperate with them and do nothing that will bring about any strained relations. I hope this bill will pass unanimously.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret to see my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture criticize the Triple A program. I well recall that when 1933 came along and this administration came into power farmers were broke from one end of the country to the other—farmers, merchants, bankers, and all. We started with the idea that mill-processed commodities should yield to the producer the cost of production. We collected from the processor the difference between the market value and the production cost. The process was supposed to collect it

from the consumer. The plan worked admirably for wheat and cotton, and we were making real progress when the Court held the processing tax unconstitutional. Then we came back with the Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which has worked well. It has helped thousands. I do not know how my friend from Wisconsin figures out that just a few get all the benefits. That is not true in Oregon. Our farmers are prospering in all the great Northwest, as they are in the cotton lands and in the dairy lands.

This program has brought prosperity to our country. There have been wrongs committed, there is no doubt, but this law should at this time be renewed for 5 years. If we do not extend it the whole structure will come down. You cannot afford to destroy the farm program in this hour of peril. This bill should pass without a question, and I hope there will not be a dissenting vote. If the program comes to an end, then what? It would mean throwing the responsibility back upon the States. Very few of the States are prepared with laws to enforce the act. It is a national problem and should never be attempted on a State basis.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, we have this same old debate about three times every session. Members stand here and say that farm benefits are for one against the many. This is not true. The farmers of this country are not asking for a thing except to be put on a par with all the other industries. They do not want anything but that, and they have never asked anything but that—that is all. They are not asking for tariffs, like the manufacturers.

My good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] spoke about some farms over here in the Shenandoah Valley. What do the people that own the mansions along Cape Cod Bay get out of tariffs? What do the millionaires all over the country get out of the customs duties? The farmers do not want anything but parity; they want equal treatment with others, and some of you people say that they should not have it. You think that they are not entitled to be on a par with other people.

The facts are that the farmers are not getting much of this money. The spread between the farm and the dinner table is something immense. The farmers get only from 35 to 45 cents on your dollar, and the manufacturers and distributors are getting the balance of it. Still, you people in opposition stand here and say the farmers are at fault in regard to the high cost of living when the other fellows are getting the money. This is ridiculous when you look at the known facts.

They talk about the big surplus that now exists. You ought to thank God that there is a surplus in such things as corn and cotton at a time when you are about to enter a long and cruel war, because this surplus of food is what will support your armies, both here and in Europe. Food always supports the Army. The old saying that armies march upon their bellies is true.

I remember when I was a boy studying eighth-grade American history, reading how Columbus and those who followed him went to the East Indies for spices. Do you know what spices were used for? Simply to preserve food and history shows that the production and preservation of food has been the foundation of advanced civilization.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Just one little short question.

Mr. GILCHRIST. All right.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand from the gentleman that the fundamental purpose of this bill is to enrich the farmer or to enrich the soil—which?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I will say to the gentleman that if he cannot distinguish between an enrichment of the farmer and the enrichment of the farmers' soil, then I cannot answer him because it is impossible to enlighten the gentleman if he cannot see that the two things are about the same, and that the enrichment of the land owned by the farmer inures to the farmer himself.

Something was said in this debate about the closing of the exchanges. My good friend from Michigan talked about that. Why, I can remember when previous to the present farm-loan program the exchanges were open and corn would sell for about 30 cents a bushel at the time immediately after the farmers were husking the corn, and then the speculators got it on the exchanges and the prices went up to 50 and 60 cents before another crop came into being. Now, under the loan program which this bill supplements, the farmers are able to make that spread themselves and it does not cost the people that eat cornmuffins anything more. You are paying no more for your corn products than you would without the closing of the exchanges.

When we know that parity on corn today is about 80 cents and that the last paper I saw from my district put the farm price at about 60 cents, that you would not object to a bill which seeks to restore parity to farmers by allowing them to receive parity and conservation payments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time simply to call attention to the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee placed a ceiling on agricultural prices, whereas the Committee on Agriculture has been endeavoring to place a floor under agricultural prices.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Not right now; I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. A good many people think that prices of agricultural commodities are getting out of sight. Most farm prices are below parity. Taking the prices as of October 15, and the 10-year average between 1919 and 1929, the prices today are much lower on most commodities than they were during that period. Further, that 10-year period covered a severe depression in agriculture. Agriculture has not been on its feet since the first World War.

This also should be borne in mind. The value of all farm lands and buildings in the United States in 1940 was $1,000,000,000 less than in 1910, which more or less reflects the plight of agriculture during the last 20 years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. This bill extends the Soil Conservation Act for 5 years. I think it is fair and reasonable to continue the act during this emergency.

Second, it continues the existing 85 percent of parity loan program for 3 years, if the committee amendment, which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will offer, is adopted.

The bill at present provides for 100 percent loans. I opposed that change because I felt it was for the best interest of agriculture to protect the present 85 percent program. I was glad the committee reversed its action and will now report the amendment to continue the 85 percent loan program for 3 years. I think this is fair and reasonable. Certainly this loan program is needed in connection with such commodities as wheat and cotton and some of the other surplus commodities which have no foreign market at the present time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I take these 2 minutes to suggest that, in my opinion, this Soil Conservation Act needs a good working over. I call particular attention to the fact that it has worked inequitably insofar as the ordinary average farmer is concerned. After all, as a practical matter the act was intended to be of assistance to the farmer as well as to provide for the better protection of the soil generally. The Government saw fit to make these grants to the farmer if he elected to come within its provisions.

The difficulty is that too much of the money goes to the big operators. Surely, there is something wrong when the Government provides for an appropriation of a half billion dollars and then pays about 80 percent of it to approximately 20 percent of the farm operators. Furthermore, the farmer is paid to conserve the soil so it will produce more crop, and then the allotment is on an acreage and not on a normal-yield basis.

Mr. Chairman, my plea is to do a little more for the small operator, the family-sized farm operator, and less to the big operator who creates the surplus when there is one.

One thing more, Mr. Chairman, this House passed a bill several weeks ago that would permit the farmer having excess wheat to compute it on the normal-yield basis instead of the acreage basis. It is equitable and fair. And yet that

measure has been tied up in another body for several weeks with no consideration having been given it. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture could do well by approving this bill, if that is what it takes to get further action on it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding many of the things that have been said in this debate, we must all realize in this serious hour that the farmers of the United States are very close to the first line of our national defense. We need not argue and debate about any surplus of food today. We are at war. Our sailors and our soldiers—all of our fighting men—must be fed. I predict that you will all be very happy that we have farmers who are producing corn, wheat, hogs, beef, and other things to feed our fighting forces and our civilian population. We should be happy that we have these farmers who have and will continue to raise those things which will clothe and keep warm our people. So the question of surplus food here today is out of order. In war food is a very important item.

This is merely a bill to extend our soil conservation program and to give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to continue payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes of the domestic allotment act. The farmers in my district are not so much satisfied with all parts of the legislation. But they want to conserve soil. They would like to see the item on payments based on the average normal yield basis rather than on the basis of acreage. They are opposed to having any large percentage of the payments given to the big operators and I join them in urging the Department to make some changes in the rules in order that more of the funds go to the operators of the so-called family-sized farm. I hope legislation introduced to this effect will be eventually passed, but in the meantime I am sure that this House will pass this legislation in order that there will be no interruption in our farm program which is, in my opinion, now linked up very closely to our efforts to win this war.

The farmers in my State—Nebraska—are among the most patriotic people of our land and I assure you that they can be depended upon to give a real account of themselves now and whenever the Nation calls.

Mr. Chairman, you can depend upon every farmer and farm woman in my district to give their every energy toward helping our Government in this time of need. They are ready now and you can depend upon it that if the Almighty will bless us again with moisture and favorable weather they will raise the food our Army and Navy and our civilian population will need so badly as these terrible war days progress.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this is an extension of legislation which was passed early in the year 1936, after the Supreme Court had declared the original Triple A Act invalid. It was a difficult proposition at that time to know in what direction we should go in working out a national farm program, and the Congress at that time made a wise decision when it determined to base the program on soil conservation. That has been the basis of the farm program since that time. It is true that not all of the money that is paid out necessarily goes for soil conservation, and it is true, as has been said this afternoon, that the producer of crops which are soil-depleting get a larger percentage of the money than do the producers of crops which are soil-conserving.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Briefly.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to ask if it is not a fact that the farmers are not paid for producing crops but rather they are paid for reducing the production of such soil-depleting crops.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is what I was coming to. The producers of soil-depleting crops are paid under this program for reducing their acreage of soil-depleting crops and increasing their acreage of soil-conserving crops. In addition, there are other payments made for carrying out certain soil-conserving practices.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am sorry; I cannot yield at this time. When we first passed the act in 1936 it was not known just how far Congress could go in working out a Federal agricultural program after the Supreme Court decision, and for that reason it was provided that on January 1, 1938, this program should be administered by the States. Some of the States passed legislation to take it over, and others did not, and because they did not we extended the program for 4 years, from January 1, 1938, as a national program. That 4-year period has expired, and today we have under consideration the extension of the program for another 5 years as a national rather than as a State program. Although some of the States have passed legislation to take over the program, a majority of them have not, and it would mean of course that the program would have to be dropped as to those States or that they would have to call special sessions of their legislatures to enact enabling legislation to continue the program in them. Personally I don't think this program can ever be administered as a State program. A soil-conservation program is national in its scope, and must be administered as a national program. Our committee has not, as did the Senate, made this indefinitely a national program. We were willing to let it be tried out for another 5 years and then see if we wanted to continue it permanently as a national program, or turn it over to the States. That is the question we are voting on today—whether it shall be extended for 5 years.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would the gentleman have any objection to making the program continue for only 3 years, to coincide with the 85 percent parity amendment?

Mr. HOPE. I cannot say that I will have any objection, but on the other hand I see no reason why we should not extend it for the 5-year period. We considered that in the committee and it was the almost unanimous decision of the committee at that time.

Mr. BATES of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am sorry. My time is very limited.

This bill provides for extension of the provision for loans on basic commodities at 85 percent of parity. In the bill before you the figure is 100 percent of parity, but a committee amendment will be offered to make it 85 percent.

Perhaps we can overdo this matter of trying to put the national-defense angle into everything that comes before us in the way of legislation, but I certainly believe the continuation of this program is very important to national defense. The organization set up under the soil-conservation program is the basis of administration for all Federal agricultural activities dealing with production. Under this program there have been set up State and local committees which furnish today a most effective avenue by which the agricultural angle of national defense can be brought down to individual farmers in every community in the United States. Farmers today are being asked to play a most important part in defense and I am proud to say that the farmers of this country have cooperated more fully and have done their part to a greater extent in carrying out the national-defense program than any other branch of industry or any other group of our population.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I have the capacity to comprehend some of the statements that have been made. Three or four gentlemen have stated they thought it was about time to cut out this and that and the other with regard to agriculture. Is it true that Members of this House do not regard agriculture as part of the defense program? Is it true or could it be true that you do not think that food for the troops is just as important as bullets or uniforms? I am afraid we are headed for a long war. It seems to me you would be anxious to set up a program that would conserve and build up the soil in order that you would know that regardless of how long the struggle lasts the farmers of this Nation will be in a position to produce food not only to supply the boys in the ranks, not only to supply the 135,000,000 people of this country, but, if need be, to supply th se who are allied with us and who are not so fortunate in production. I do not get it, that now is the time to cut this out; let the land wash away; let the soil become depleted; place it beyond the power and capacity of the American farmer to produce for those who must fight the battles of this Nation. Where does that thought come from at this hour? Certainly this is the most critical day we have faced since the country was founded. It seems

to me most anything will be said here to misrepresent the facts or to damn the program. One Member, I am sure, unintentionally and in an unguarded moment, made the statement that after the Government had put millions into cotton it was today paying $15 a bale to get rid of it. It is not doing any such thing. The average cost of every bale of cotton which the United States Government owns is 13 cents, and in order to supply cotton to Canada, our neighbor to the north, in order to meet the cheap price of cotton produced in Brazil, it is reducing the price of cotton from 17 cents to 13½ cents to Canada, and it is not costing the United States Government one single dime. It is simply reducing its profit.

The statement was made here that the little farmer was getting nothing out of the program. Do not overlook the fact that by a special act of this Congress, for which many of you voted, we have set up a special program, that when a man's payments are small his percentage is increased. If his payment is not more than $20 it is increased by 40 percent. If his payment is from $20 to $40, it is increased 20 percent, and so on. I challenge the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], or anybody else to introduce legislation to increase those payments, and I think he will find a most receptive attitude on the part of the Committee on Agriculture. But I think it is wrong to misrepresent the facts and try to damn this program by statements that are not true. I hope the day will come when every Member of this House can go down on the farm, back in Illinois and everywhere else, and walk in the furrow with the farmer, and find out what he is doing, and what this program means to him.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman talks about an increase of 40 percent for the $20 payment. Even that is only an increase of $8, or a total of $28. That does not compare very well with those who are still getting the big money out of it.

For instance, even with what the gentleman has said, does he realize now that even in view of that, 80 percent of this money goes to less than 20 percent of the operators?

Mr. PACE. It might be that John Smith gets $1,000, but in my country if John Smith gets $1,000 he probably has 10 or 15 families on the farm. The law says that in such a case the payments shall be distributed among these in exactly the same ratio in which they participate in the crop; and the record will show that in the end John Smith probably gets $50 or $75, or the same amount every other family on the farm did that participated in growing the crop. That brings it down from 80 percent to a very small percent.

Are we going to say that a man who has a large farm shall not participate? Are you going to say that if a man has 1,000 acres he is not an American, and cannot participate in this program? We have already limited him. He cannot get so very much money under the present law, and if we reduce his payments too low he would not cooperate in the program, which would be very unfortunate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PACE. Let me proceed. This program does three things: It pays the farmer for planting soil-building crops; it pays a farmer for not planting soil-depleting crops; and it pays a farmer for engaging in what is called soil-building practices, the building of terraces, filling ditches, contour plowing, improving the soil, getting it ready if you please for the very condition we face at this particular hour. It is beyond me how anybody can get on this floor and intimate that the time has now come, when we have reached the hour we have all feared and worked to be ready for, that the time has now come when we should stop and break down agriculture.

The bill does one other thing, it continues for 3 years the 85-percent loans. I do not believe this provision is going to cost very much, if anything. For illustration, the new cotton crop has been gathered—11,500,000 bales, and only about 1,000,000 bales of cotton have gone into the loan. And of the cotton of previous crops under loan the farmers have paid off these loans on several million bales during the last few months. No doubt the same is true as to wheat, corn, and the other commodities.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. The gentleman states that the 85-percent-loan program is continued for a period of 3 years.

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. Does the bill also carry the 49-percent wheat penalty?

Mr. PACE. The 49-percent wheat penalty was not a 1-year proposition. Get this straight, the 49-percent wheat penalty is now permanent legislation. The law states that the penalty shall be 50 percent of the loan. If the loan happens to be 50 cents the penalty would be 25 cents. If the loan is $1 the penalty will be 50 cents. That applies to all these commodities, corn, wheat, rice, cotton, and tobacco.

Mr. HARNESS. I mean is it specifically dealt with in the legislation now before us?

Mr. PACE. It does not touch the question of penalty.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the question of penalties, they apply only in the year in which the crop is marketed.

Mr. PACE. And only in the years when marketing quotas have not been disapproved by the producers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The other day in the Price Control Act we saw fit to place agricultural commodities.

Mr. PACE. Yes, that is right.

Mr. DONDERO. But we did not place in that bill the cost of the things the farmers must buy.

Mr. PACE. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. The reason I wanted a top in the price-fixing bill of 115 percent instead of 110 was that we are putting a bottom under farm prices of 85 percent of parity. To be fair then we should put the top at 15 percent above parity. I do not think that many people would ever get 115 percent, but it was suggested in the hope that with the market fluctuating above and below parity the final result would be 100-percent parity.

These extensions will merely extend the present law and I hope it meets with the unanimous approval of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g), is amended by striking out subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g).

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h), is amended (1) by striking out subsection (a); and (2) by striking out, in subsection (b), "Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, title 16, sec. 590 (h) (a)) is amended (a) by striking out 'January 1, 1942' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1947', and (b) by striking out 'December 31, 1941' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1946.'

"SEC. 2. The paragraph numbered (10) of the act entitled 'An act relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended', approved May 26, 1941, is amended—

"(a) By striking out '1941 crop' and inserting in lieu thereof '1941, 1942, and 1943 crops';

"(b) By striking out 'for the marketing year beginning in 1941' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such crop is harvested'; and

"(c) By inserting before the semicolon at the end of subdivision (a) of such paragraph the following: 'beginning in 1941 in the case of the 1941 crop, and at the rate of 100 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing years beginning in 1942 and 1943, respectively, in the case of the 1942 and 1943 crops'."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the committee I wish to offer a substitute for the amendment printed in the bill S. 588 and ask unanimous consent to withdraw the committee amendment just read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allot-

ment Act (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, title 16, sec. 590 (h) (a)) is amended (a) by striking out 'January 1, 1942,' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1947,' and (b) striking out 'December 31, 1941' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1946.'

"SEC. 2. The paragraph numbered (10) of the act entitled 'An act relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended,' approved May 26, 1941, is amended—

"(a) By striking out the words and figures '1941 crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, or tobacco' and inserting '1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.'

"(b) By striking out 'for the marketing year beginning in 1941' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such crop is harvested'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and for other purposes."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, as previously stated, this amendment is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment for the sole purpose of extending the parity loans on a basis of 85 percent instead of 100 percent as proposed in the original amendment. I believe the bill has been fully discussed and will need no further explanation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I note in the amendment just read that the commodity peanuts has been inserted. When was that change made?

Mr. FULMER. I may say to the gentleman that the other day when we asked the committee to come down to go into this matter for the purpose of agreeing on a substitute amendment, which I have offered, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], member of the committee, stated that he had talked with the various members and there was no opposition, and it was understood that peanuts would be included in the amendment. If the gentleman wants any explanation, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be in position to give further explanation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas, was it agreed that peanuts be put in the bill?

Mr. HOPE. I know of no meeting at which that was agreed to. The gentleman from Georgia spoke to me about it, and I assume he spoke to other members of the committee. There is no agreement that I know of. The gentleman from Georgia did speak to me about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think it proper to put peanuts in this bill?

Mr. HOPE. I would like to have the gentleman from Georgia explain the amendment.

Mr. PACE. It has been put under the quota system since the law was passed, and it is simply adding "peanuts" in there. Frankly, I understood it was agreeable to the gentleman. I did not catch the gentleman from Minnesota until this morning, and I talked with him about it at that time.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. A moment ago the gentleman from Nebraska said this substitute was being offered for the reason that the amendment itself was hastily considered. Now we have on the floor of the House another suggestion being offered to insert "peanuts" when the committee itself gave no consideration to that matter. I wonder what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has to say about a matter of this kind, which involves a half billion dollars of public money each year.

Mr. FULMER. May I answer the gentleman by stating the amendment carried in the bill was considered thoroughly, and agreed upon by the committee? After this agreement the committee was called together in regular session, and the amendment that we are substituting for the original amendment was thoroughly considered and agreed to. That is the way the Committee on Agriculture considered the entire matter.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But the gentleman from Nebraska said that the original amendment was hastily considered and that this amendment was being offered as a substitute for that reason. If we are considering legislation that will cost the people a half billion dollars a year, we would like to feel that the measure has been properly considered.

Mr. FULMER. I will state to the gentleman that the amendment has been properly considered. In fact, all bills coming from the Agriculture Committee are properly considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time in order to clear up a misapprehension that might possibly exist in some one's mind if he were to read in today's RECORD the answer of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST], to the rather simple question which I asked him a few moments ago.

Let me say at the outset I am in full sympathy with the proposed legislation and intend to support it. I do not want the gentleman from Iowa to have the impression that my support is based on any mistaken theory or assumption, or that I am unaware as to the real objectives of the soil-conservation program. In all of the discussions that have taken place on the subject of aid to agriculture under the heading of soil conservation, as found in the original act, there is not and never has been the slightest suggestion that these payments are intended to be in the nature of "relief" payments to farmers. I direct the gentleman's attention to the original act itself, which is entitled "Soil Conservation," and has for its purpose two distinct things, namely, soil conservation and the protection of soil from the effects of erosion.

In the very purposes specified in the act itself, they are enumerated as—

(1) Preservation and improvement of soil fertility, (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of natural resources, and (4) protection of rivers and harbors against the result of soil erosion.

Those are the purposes enumerated in the law, and you will not find any place in the law a statement that the purpose of this legislation is to provide mere relief for farmers. So when I asked the gentleman the question that I did ask him I was merely seeking to bring out the fact that the fundamental objective of this legislation is to restore and maintain soil fertility rather than to provide mere subsidies for farmers. I intended to demonstrate that cash benefits to the farmer under this plan are earned. I think it is very proper legislation to be continued. Such benefits as may accrue to the farmer as the result of the payments which he receives either from producing crops that add to the fertility of the soil or by failing to raise crops that deplete the soil, or as a result of complying with certain approved soil practices, are merely incidental and cannot be considered to be primary objectives of the act. The fundamental purpose of the act is to provide continuity for the program of permanent improvement of the soil of the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULMER. May I state to the gentleman that the farmer earns every dollar under this program that he gets by building up the soil, the ditches, by using certain fertilizer in order to increase the productivity of the soil, and so forth. It is not a gift or a subsidy in any manner whatsoever.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what my observation has been through the operation of this program and that is why I intend to support it. I do not want the farmers of America who receive checks under this program to be stigmatized, as they have been inferentially at least by some of the arguments, as the recipients of relief checks. They are aids to the farmers of America to assist them in the process of conserving the soil of the farms of America. The farmer does not get a check unless he complies with this program and contributes to it. For this work he is entitled to our consideration and commendation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his explanation of the question he asked me. There never was a time since I have been on earth that I stigmatized any farmer. There never has been a time in my speech here that I stated that the bill is for relief of the farmer, as far as that part of it is concerned, not the slightest suggestion of that kind.

I do say, however, that if my good friend from Wisconsin owns a farm and conserves the soil on it, he does get a benefit from that conservation of soil because it is yet his farm, and insofar as it is a better farm he is helped by the program. That is just exactly what my answer to his question implied.

Mr. KEEFE. I accept the gentleman's apology; that is all right.

Mr. GILCHRIST. It is not an apology; it is a simple statement of fact.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. By the same token, the whole country is helped because we conserve the soil.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Certainly. The farmers of this country are getting only about 12 percent of the income, and they represent 30 percent of the population. We want parity. We do not ask for anything else.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have read a number of times statements by various economists that although the Civil War was exceedingly destructive to the South, the great loss from soil erosion and neglect during those years far exceeded the visible destruction of the hour that might have been made. There are today places in the South where fields that were fertile enough to produce crops in the sixties after a neglect of 4 years sprang up in sagebrush and bramble bushes, and these fields have not had a plow in them from that day to this because the 4 years of erosion destroyed permanently the fertility of the soil or reduced it to such a low ebb that rehabilitation was impractical.

Some say that since we have so much use for money elsewhere this is a time to slow down on soil conservation. I take directly the opposite view.

When I was down home men came to me telling me that they had 200 acres, that their boys were in the Army, that they had asked that they be deferred as farm assistants but were refused; and that by reason of their age and health and inability to get help they were going to be badly neglected in the coming year's crop. What will they do if there is no soil-conservation payments? Do you think these farmers under those circumstances, who are now short of help by reason of their sons being in the Army or subject to draft before the next crop, will go out themselves and make this expenditure on the soil-building crops to be planted, when they have not the time to put in the crops for which they may receive a higher price?

As long as this war lasts, whether it is 1 year or 4 years, without the soil-conservation program in continuation you are going to find when you get back home to the soil that a great portion of the havoc I have described as occurring during the War between the States will have happened.

Again, we see high prices for labor in every form of defense. Do you think a farmer can obtain the labor to raise the necessary amount of crops for market and in addition voluntarily use any soil-building crops at all, in view of that scarcity of help?

So, I take absolutely the other extreme, that it is far more important for the duration of this war, whatever its duration, that the soil-conservation program be extended, much more so now than the time when we first initiated it. If the soil, the basis of all wealth, is preserved the country will build back all other property losses sustained.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department of the United States discovered many years ago that the production and processing of food is an essential war industry. The records are very clear on that point.

My remarks a little while ago, in which I spoke about God Almighty condemning us for some of our extravagance, I might expand a little bit in this way. I have a very deep conviction that the laws of the universe and the economic laws of this country and the world at large are so designed that there is no way we can escape our economic sins of commission and omission. Certainly we have undertaken a job which on today's price level is going to cost us no less than $150,000,000,000, and I think you can get lots of thoughtful men to agree with you that the objective pegs are now set in the direction of $300,000,000,000.

It seems to me that we must look at the program as one under planned economy, which is certainly what we are heading into. When we set the pegs to close the commodity exchanges for the specific purpose of preventing price rises in food and agricultural commodities—mind you, I said in order to prevent price rises, not in order to arrest the decline in the market—and we do that under a planned economy—because the order came out of O. E. M., the Price Administration Division, to close these exchanges this morning—and at the same time proceed to enact into law a 5-year program which I understand calls upon the Treasury to disburse a minimum of $2,500,000,000 in order to support the same group which would have been supported by the private markets had you not exercised deflationary control over the exchanges and did you not fix the price at a point where that recipient group could not be equitably supported, we are undertaking a planned economy which, I believe, works at cross purposes. Of course, we all know that if we jerked the commodity credit loans from under farm products, the whole market would collapse. But we could put more horse sense in the program and relieve the public Treasury of a bit of burden.

The other day I voted against the price-control bill. I voted against it in committee, because I felt then that the thing was set up on a hay-wire basis. I told the chairman of our committee that insofar as I was concerned, in lieu of the fact there were no other controls in sight that I could see no other objectives, other than agriculture, I would support writing into that bill a 150 percent of parity before the Price Administrator could exercise control over those prices of agricultural commodities, and I did that on the basis of what I considered straight thinking because in that case you certainly would have had no reason for coming in here with a bill of this kind.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Excuse me just a minute.

Let us take this question of supplying food for the Army. Where are these armies to operate? Is there any man on this floor that would take the position that our men will not operate throughout the Latin American countries? What about the food supplies down there? Do we propose to ship food from the United States to our troops operating in the Argentine and in Brazil? Are you going to take the position that our men will not be in those areas protecting the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine?

I do not intend to take that position. I have notified the people throughout my district weeks ago to prepare themselves that their sons might be forced to operate in that area in the defense of the United States. I have no doubt about that.

Now we have an empire in which we produce food that runs from Hudsons Bay to Tierra del Fuego. There is no question about that. So I am not uneasy about the supply of food for our forces and everybody, I think, who is well informed on this subject knows that the Treasury of the United States is looking forward to the time when we will export millions of tons of food from the Western Hemisphere to other parts of the world in order to feed them, either during the war or subsequent to the war.

Now here is a bill that deals with five crops, and I certainly do not want to promote a fight between the Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Agriculture. There is no sense in a fight between those two committees, but the Banking and Currency Committee did take the position, under the leadership of some of our good Democratic friends, and I supported it, to bring into this concept some crops other than those five basic crops.

I want to say to my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] that in my opinion—and this is rather blunt talk I am going to use—the five basic crops have dominated the Department of Agriculture and the Committee on Agriculture for too many years. Had the same prayer been prayed in the name of all agriculture and had all crops been covered, I would not have made the remark I just now made. Now I can understand why the five so-called basic crops dominated the situation. They were in power; they were in the saddle then, they are in the saddle now; they will probably remain in the saddle; but if you want to know a little bit more about what I refer to, look at the receipts of the people of my State and compare those total receipts with the receipts of States that had crops classified as basic located in them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman also feels, does he not that the five basic crops are the problem crops and that is the reason

they have received more attention than some of the other crops and commodities which have not been in such distress?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would only agree that the five basic crops were problem crops, but not all the problem crops by any means, because my concept of this agricultural situation since 1920, when the prices broke—and they have never come back to the proper level since—all agricultural crops have been virtually problem crops, and I think we went along for too long a period thinking too much in terms of the five basic crops only, and that is where the Gore amendment in the banking and currency bill came into operation. That amendment I supported. And we will have to go along for some time on these loans. But some day we may find ourselves in a position where the Treasury cannot possibly support the large appropriations. The hour has arrived when we can no longer defer serious consideration of these large Treasury burdens. Unless we do, some day the public will break our political necks.

[Here the gavel fell]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in subparagraph (a) of section 2 of the committee amendment, the last three words "tobacco and peanuts" be stricken and in lieu thereof there be inserted the words "and tobacco."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and in favor of the pending bill.

The bill does not involve a continuance of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, nor does it involve the amount of appropriations authorized to be made. The act passed in 1936 provided that until the States undertook the administration of the Soil Conservation Act the functions would be discharged by the Secretary of Agriculture.

About 23 States have now passed enabling legislation, and all that section 1 of the pending bill does is to provide that for the next 5 years, as during the past 5 years, the functions under the Soil Conservation Act may be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The second section of the bill provides for loans, for 2 years following 1941, of 85-percent parity. I have heard no substantial objections to either of the two proposals in the bill, and I trust that they may be unanimously adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I favor agricultural aid to all producers. I am a little bit surprised that some of those who do not produce the major crops are criticizing it. I have favored legislation for the dairy and farming interests of the country. The dairy States are protected by a tariff of 14 cents a pound on butter. Cheese is also protected. We have appropriated around $200,000,000 to buy other surplus commodities. We have provided loans on butter. I have supported aid to the dairy States on all occasions.

I know that a tariff will not benefit the wheat grower nor will a tariff benefit the cotton grower or any other grower that produces exportable crops. The purpose of the pending legislation is to give these producers of surplus crops the equivalent benefit of the tariff which does protect many producers of other agricultural commodities in this country.

Something has been said as to the amount of these payments and the large operators. Let the record speak for itself. I speak from a report covering the 1938 agricultural conservation program, and according to that report, of the $420,000,000 that was paid for soil conservation in that year, there went to the producers receiving less than $1,000, 92.24 percent of all the payments. There went to those receiving less than $500, 83.80 percent of all of the payments. Under the terms of the act, before any payments are made to any producers there are set aside approximately forty or fifty million dollars to increase the payments of all producers receiving less than $200. Only a small part of the entire proceeds of the $500,000,000 annually goes to the so-called owners of large farms in the United States. As a matter of fact, less than 8 percent of the soil-conservation appropriations goes to the larger producers of the country, and less than 1 percent of the total number of producers in this country are the large producers.

Mr. Chairman, under the act, payments are made directly to the tenants and to the sharecroppers. There may be 100 tenants on the plantation. The landlord gets only 1 check. The other 99 checks go directly to the tenants and sharecroppers. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, in an effort to aid the sharecropper and the small producer, has leaned over backward. In my judgment, while this legislation is not perfect, inasmuch as the Agricultural Adjustment Act was declared, so far as processing taxes are concerned, void by the Supreme Court, it represents the best we can get for agriculture at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe for the past 8 years the farmers producing the so-called major crops, and other crops, have been given more nearly a square deal than the farmers of the Nation have been given since the War between the States. While this legislation may not be perfect, sympathetic as I am with all agricultural interests, whether dairy or not, I believe the present legislation will provide for a continuance of the best and most favorable program that Congress has even adopted for the farmers of the Nation. I trust that the amendment will be overwhelmingly adopted.

In extending, permit me to say that farmers ask no special favors. We only ask for justice. We know that since the War between the States high tariffs have discriminated against cotton growers. Unable to repeal the tariff we have advocated parity and soil conservation payments as the equivalents of the tariff. We have secured for cotton and cotton products and for wheat and wheat products export subsidies especially in 1940.

PAYMENTS LIMITED

The number of payees in 1938 receiving payments less than $1,000 and over $500 is 99.72 percent of the total number of payees. All of the payments under the Soil Conservation Act for the year 1938 accruing to those receiving less than a thousand dollars aggregated 92.24 percent of the net payments.

Under leave granted I include the following statement of estimated net payments and number of payees by size groups furnished me by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for 1938, as follows, to wit:

1938 agricultural conservation program—Estimated net payments and number of payees by size groups

Range of group	Net payments			Number of payees		
	Amount	Percent	Cumulative percent	Number	Percent	Cumulative percent
0 to $20	$12,918,000	3.08	3.08	1,252,186	23.94	23.94
$20.01 to $40	35,719,000	8.51	11.59	1,182,387	22.60	46.54
$40.01 to $60	42,217,000	10.06	21.65	842,247	16.10	62.64
$60.01 to $100	71,352,000	17.00	38.65	889,413	17.00	79.64
$100.01 to $150	56,749,000	13.52	52.17	453,812	8.67	88.31
$150.01 to $200	43,939,000	10.47	62.64	251,770	4.81	93.12
$200.01 to $300	45,117,000	10.75	73.39	181,312	3.47	96.59
$300.01 to $400	26,954,000	6.42	79.81	77,789	1.49	98.08
$400.01 to $500	16,728,000	3.99	83.80	37,662	.72	98.80
$500.01 to $1,000	35,424,000	8.44	92.24	47,893	.92	99.72
$1,000.01 to $2,000	16,273,000	3.88	96.12	11,059	.21	99.93
$2,000.01 to $3,000	5,142,000	1.22	97.34	2,103	.039	99.969
$3,000.01 to $4,000	2,557,000	.61	97.95	749	.014	99.983
$4,000.01 to $5,000	1,626,000	.39	98.34	372	.007	99.990
$5,000.01 to $10,000	3,127,000	.75	99.09	429	.008	99.998
Over $10,000	3,800,000	.91	100.00	141	.002	100.00
Total	419,642,000	100.00		5,231,324	100.00	

All farmers should be treated alike. There are those who complain about payments to the large land owners. They are limited now to $10,000 and as to soil conservation payments have been so limited since 1939. The number receiving such payments for soil conservation, as I have pointed out, is exceedingly small. The payments cover cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and wheat. There were many who received much larger payments than $10,000 under the sugar program, which is a separate program.

After all, a large plantation is nothing more or less than an aggregation of small farms. If the owner of a large

plantation is denied benefits it means that his tenants and sharecroppers will be denied participation in the program, for a large owner would not go into the program unless he received the benefits. Thus an amendment to eliminate large payments would defeat the very purpose of helping the small grower and sharecropper.

There are other benefits in addition to the allotment of thirty to fifty million dollars for sharecroppers and small growers whose payments are under $200 before allotments are made to other growers. From 5 to 15 acres are set apart as a reserve under existing law for small farmers before any allotments are made. Under existing law there must be an allotment of 5 acres to every sharecropper.

Again, if the landlord changes from tenants to wages crops he may be denied any benefits. It would be just as logical for the gentleman who favors eliminating large payments to offer an amendment to the tariff act to provide that no manufacturer would benefit from tariff in excess of a certain amount. After all, soil conservation and parities are the tariff in reverse.

I believe in justice to all agricultural products. I want to be fair to the major and to the minor crops. I want to be fair to industry. We recently had before us the price-fixing bill. It is now pending in the Senate. I favored the Baruch plan; it covered both labor and commodities. I, therefore, supported the Baruch plan. The bill as passed by the House, however, did not cover labor. Agricultural commodities had not soared in prices. They are still around the amount of the commodity loans, and it occurred to me that a bill confined largely to limiting commodity prices was not in order at the time the price-fixing bill was considered by the House. I was impressed that the Steagall bill would provide ceilings for agricultural products without providing limitations upon labor. Price control would have been limited to agricultural products. I did not denounce Leon Henderson or the Price Administration. There is no occasion for name calling. I saw no reason for the licensing provisions. I favored voluntary cooperation. I thought that there should be an appeal from the decision of the Administrator with respect to prices and with respect to licenses. It is unthinkable to me that a fair price could be fixed on any commodity without the price of labor being considered. Factory wages are now 352 percent of the 1910–14 period or factory wages are 352 percent of parity. Factory wages thus have risen 250 percent in 25 years as compared with the rise of farm prices of only 39 percent. Wages have risen six and a half times more than agricultural prices since the parity period. There should be prices for all or prices for none. Prices should not be limited to agricultural products.

I should like to point out that under the soil-conservation program in 1940 there were 162,473 applications in Wisconsin and that the estimated gross payments aggregated $11,950,686. At the same time, the payments in South Carolina aggregated for the same year $9,401,206, while in Minnesota for the same year they aggregated $20,063,356, and in Mississippi the aggregate amount was $16,928,330. But that is not the whole story. The dairy farmers of Wisconsin not only received soil-conservation payments, but butter, as I have stated, is protected by a tariff. There are practically no imports now. Loans have been repeatedly made on butter. Wisconsin is a cheese State. Loans have been made on cheese. In addition, Wisconsin is the recipient of the surplus-commodities appropriations. Milk has been bought and distributed among the poor. It is difficult to cover all agricultural products in one bill, but with a tariff on butter, with a tariff on cheese, with soil-conservation benefits, with loans and with benefits from the surplus commodities appropriations no State has been more generously benefited under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt than Wisconsin. A tariff on wheat and a tariff on short cotton is ineffective.

PRICES FOR COTTON

From time to time bills have been introduced under the agricultural adjustment program stipulating that no cotton shall be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation or under the agricultural adjustment program unless the price of seven-eighths inch Middling cotton is 30 cents a pound or unless such average price is equal to or in excess of the parity price of cotton.

I am afraid of such bills. In the first place, if we undertake to fix a price for cotton, the bill will be subject to amendment. There are more consumers than there are producers; the price will be fixed below the price of production.

Again, the spokesmen for cotton growers cannot expect legislation to promote the interests of cotton growers unless they at the same time cooperate in the passage of legislation to aid the growers of wheat and corn. Any legislation with respect to cotton must be coupled with legislation that will provide for comparable relief for wheat and corn, otherwise it will be impossible to secure the passage of such legislation. I accord to others the same benefit I advocate for my State.

USE OF FOREIGN COTTON

Legislation has been proposed that no funds appropriated by Congress shall be used to purchase any article containing cotton unless such cotton was grown in the United States. This has always been the policy of the Government. During the existing emergency and under the good-neighbor policy there have been exceptions. I think the exceptions were a mistake. Sometimes foreign cottons are purchased. The growers of cotton cannot in one breath consistently maintain that they are discriminated against under the tariff and in the next breath object to imports from other countries. Those who demand the right to grow and to export must concede the right to import.

The point with respect to imports is that some foreign cottons are of a different grade and staple from domestic cottons. They are used for purposes for which the better grades of American staples cannot be used. If we demand that manufacturers agree to the repeal of the tariff, we must concede that the manufacturers should be able to import cottons of grades and staples that are inferior to domestic cotton if it will promote the interests of the manufacturers. I advocate a tariff for all or a tariff for none.

EXPORT SUBSIDIES

Again, legislation has been proposed that any duty or levy collected or paid under the Tariff Act of 1930 shall be refunded if an amount equal to the sum of the value plus the import duties is used by the importer or assignee to purchase and export surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States. This provision virtually amounts to a repeal of the high tariffs on manufactures. I have always opposed unjust and high tariffs. We are face to face, however, with a condition and not a theory. It is impossible, in view of the high tariffs obtaining throughout the world, to obtain a repeal of these tariffs. Legislators and statesmen must be practical. If we are unable to secure the repeal of the tariff, we should not thereby confine ourselves to denouncing manufacturers, to criticizing the Government under which we live, but we should devote our talents to securing comparable legislation for cotton and other growers.

I may say in this connection that parity for cotton, corn, and wheat growers is nothing more nor less than the tariff in reverse; however, under the program that obtains while appropriations for parities are authorized they must be made at each session of the Congress. I have repeatedly urged that permanent legislation to provide for permanent parities should be passed by Congress. I have spoken on the floor in favor of such legislation and have urged committees to report such legislation. I introduced a bill (H. R. 9764) on May 14, 1940, to provide for applying customs receipts to attain parity prices for, and to encourage the export of, agricultural commodities. I regret that the Committee on Agriculture of the House did not report the bill. However, the spokesmen for cotton did not give up. Since 1933 parities in one form or another have been obtained on the theory that the growers of cotton and other exportable crops should be reimbursed from duties on imports. Unable to repeal the tariff, the representatives of the cotton, corn, and wheat belts secured the passage of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. While the act as to processing taxes was declared void this section of the act continues in full force and effect. It is now used as a basis for subsidies. In other words for some time import duties have been used for the benefit of cotton growers. While not repealing the tariff, the present administration has provided soil-conservation payments and parity payments to give to the cotton, corn, and wheat growers the equivalent of the benefits accorded to manufacturers under the tariff. It is easy to criticize, it is difficult to construct.

KIND WORDS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

I would like to say a few kind words for agriculture in behalf of the administration. For the past 8 years cotton and

other agricultural products of which we produce an exportable surplus have received at the hands of the administration more equitable and more just treatment than at any time since the War between the States. The program is not perfect but cotton, wheat, and corn growers during the program have more nearly prospered for 8 years than they have at any other comparable period since the War between the States.

The growth of cotton in other countries during recent years and especially in Brazil has increased. The probability is such increases would have been made without the agricultural adjustment program. We have lost world markets not because of the agricultural adjustment program, but because of the tariff walls in all countries, including our own. I have, therefore, supported at every opportunity provision for continuing the growing of as much cotton as can be profitably grown in the United States and I have supported programs for export subsidies on cotton and wheat. Such subsidies have been provided for and I think most successfully. We had, as I have stated, export subsidies in 1939 and 1940 under which 6,000,000 bales of cotton were exported. We now have an export subsidy in force on exports of cotton and cotton manufactures to Canada. Wheat has also enjoyed export subsidies.

Cottonseed is an important byproduct of cotton. Cottonseed oil is used for many purposes. Cottonseed meal and hulls are used for feeding cattle. Foreign oils compete with cottonseed oil in the American market. We oppose the tariff as cotton growers because we must buy in a protected market and sell in a free market, but as cotton growers we advocate the tariff to protect cotton growers from foreign oils in competition with cottonseed oil just as the manufacturers of cotton goods insist upon a tariff to protect them from foreign manufacturers. Nevertheless, the spokesmen for cottonseed products were not content with denunciation; they were not content with merely opposing. They have secured the benefits of tariffs whenever and wherever possible to prevent the importation of foreign oils, and they have been partially successful. All of the tariffs requested were not obtained, but some protection has been afforded.

I opposed the Tariff Act of 1930. I voted against it. I was satisfied it would pass. I, therefore, advocated and secured the passage of an act to prohibit the importation of cottons 1⅛ inches and longer from foreign countries that compete with American staple cottons in the domestic market. Unable to prevent the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930, at all opportunities I have cooperated with the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the passage of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act and in the passage of the Agricultural and Domestic Allotment Act to secure for the cotton growers of the South and for other growers of agricultural products of which we produce an exportable surplus the benefits of the tariff in reverse.

The term "subsidy" does not disturb me. The tariff after all is nothing more nor less than a subsidy to manufacturers. I have always advocated a reasonable tariff on all imports. I feel that those who sell in our markets should contribute to the support of our Government. I have opposed iniquitously high tariffs to prevent all competition. I have joined with those who have exploded the arguments that the tariff after all is for the benefit of the American laborer. The automobile industry in the United States grew and prospered without the benefit of a tariff. The American worker is generally more efficient than the foreign worker. If the American farm laborer is more efficient than the foreign farm laborer so is the American textile worker.

I believe generally in the law of supply and demand. I believe in international trade. I will continue to urge that protective and unjust tariffs be repealed, but until agriculture and manufactures are accorded just and equal treatment under the law I shall continue at every opportunity to cooperate to secure for cotton growers and for the growers of other agricultural commodities the equivalents of the benefits accorded to manufacturers. In a word, so long as the tariff obtains I shall advocate and support a tariff in reverse for agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise at this time to say that possibly I misspoke when I spoke about cotton export subsidies. I want to explain that in fairness to everyone here, including myself. I do not want the RECORD to infer that I would make a statement that I did not think was right. When I said that the present administration is spending $15 a bale to get rid of cotton, I did not mean to say that the Government lost any money on the process, because the market price of cotton is higher than it was when the Government made the loan. The Government has about 13 cents per pound in that cotton. The market is about 16 cents and something now, and they are selling the cotton for about 13 cents, or $15 a bale less than the market price. We are evidently selling cotton for $15 per bale less than the market price. You can come to your own conclusion as to whether we are losing or making money. And with all due respect to my colleague from Georgia, if I said there was $15,000,000 a bale loss, I am sure that he knew that I meant only $15 a bale.

Now, if this agriculture picture is so rosy, why can we expect our southern friends to come up here soon and ask us for between fifty and one hundred and forty million dollars because there is distress in the Southern States? After 10 years of cotton prices that were not much over half what they were the 10 years before. They would not have to come and ask for that money if agricultural prices had been satisfactory the past 10 years.

I would like to read a few of the farm incomes. We will start with my colleague from Georgia. This shows that after 10 years of the more abundant life the average farm income in Georgia in 1940 was only $778 plus $113 obtained from the United States Treasury. In other words, they got 15 percent of their income out of the United States Treasury. Is the gentleman from Georgia satisfied with this average farm income for the farmers of his State?

As far as Mississippi is concerned, I would take it that our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] says things are going pretty well down there. I have been wondering what kind of farmers they have in Mississippi if they can be satisfied with $505 cash income, including the $112, or 22 percent, of their income out of the United States Treasury. Can the gentleman from Mississippi really be content to have the farmers of his State have only a $505 average income in 1940? I would think that sometimes it might be like the man down in Mississippi who sent me one of his weekly papers when he was promoting a man for office. There was a banner on the top of the paper which said, "Let us quit milking the United States Treasury and start milking our cows." That is what we do in Wisconsin.

Let us take the State of Alabama. Last year it had $499 cash income and $112 of it out of the United States Treasury, or 22 percent. After 10 years control of the House of Representatives are you not easily satisfied if you are content to have an average farm income of $499? Many of our States only have 1, 2, 3, or 4 percent of their income from the United States Treasury.

I am in favor of raising the farm income of these people in these Southern States, but I do say to you once more that we cannot continue subsidizing, putting this money into two or three crops and letting the rest of agriculture take whatever happens to come to them as they travel along life's pathway.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I am wondering if the gentleman could advise the House how these $215 or $450 a year incomes of the farmers in Mississippi or Alabama compare with the capital investment of an industry in his district or with the income of an average automobile laborer or a factory laborer, during the last 6 months?

Mr. MURRAY. The average cash farm income of the farmers of the United States in 1940 was $1,396. An average of $125 per farm was obtained from the United States Treasury. The average labor income was about the same.

Mr. GREEN. But I am speaking of those which you recited.

Mr. MURRAY. The average United States farm income in 1940, as I have said, is $1,396, just about the same as the average factory worker who belongs to the union. But, of course, the farmer, as you know, gets many things that the factory worker does not get, and the factory worker gets many things that the farmer does not get. As far as States like Wisconsin are concerned, where we have real farm incomes, like $1,690 in 1940, that little check that they get of $66 does not have much to do with their profits or losses. Every day I am more convinced that Senator BANKHEAD was

correct when he said, "Get something for what you raise and you will not have to get it out of the United States Treasury." Of course, you cannot control the farmers as well as you could if they have to come to the Agricultural Department and beg for part of their income.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee substitute amendment offered by the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. The earth is the source of practically all wealth, and the soil is the basic source of practically all food. We have been called upon during this war emergency to conserve our food supplies, to conserve everything of usable value. The Secretary of Agriculture has been called upon by the consuming public of America to produce food and conserve the soil. Congress anticipates that he should do that. He has made a recommendation for the passage of this legislation because it will conserve and preserve the producing qualities of the soil of our country. He believed this in the interest of production of food and fiber for the American people during this war period. I believe we should look with favor upon the amendment as recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, supported by the Secretary of Agriculture.

We have recently passed a price-control bill, hoping that prices may not go beyond reason on various of the basic commodities that we are going to consume during this war. After all, the source of supply and demand is the real law which controls prices. However, those of you from the industrial centers would do well to remember that if you have an abundant supply of food products from the soil, then the price which your workers will pay for this food will be cheaper. The way to make that come about is to support the conservation program, as has been recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

After all, I think it is about time the farmers of this Nation should have at least a little break. It has been well recited by the gentleman who preceded me as to the income of the average farmer of the South. I do not believe it runs as high as an average of $400 a year. Suppose that same farmer wants to have his chimney rebuilt, he pays $12 a day to the mason who comes there to rebuild the chimney. I am glad to see the mason get that wage. Suppose he wants to rebuild his barn, he pays a carpenter $12 a day to go there and repair his barn or his home. That organized laborer is protected in obtaining that wage.

I voted for those labor laws. I want to see the laboring man obtain high prices for his labor.

How about industry during the past several months, Mr. Chairman? Is not industry making enormous profits? They had it lean back in 1932 and 1933, but things are better with them now, and they are, many of them, making enormous profits. Let them thrive; that is all right. At the same time let us lighten the burden on the shoulders of the farmers of this Nation. Let them have at least a little break in production and fair prices and some of the things of life.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The gentleman will recall that the other day we had the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture before us, and we learned one thing from him—that the Dust Bowl of the country had learned how to get rich out of the interest on its debts.

Mr. GREEN. Soil-conservation continuance will go a long way toward preventing that farmer from going into bankruptcy through indebtedness, past and future. Many farmers in my district could not pay their local taxes were it not for soil conservation benefit payments. I hope the committee will approve this recommendation of the House Committee on Agriculture and continue the soil conservation benefits program.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, we have had a great deal of debate on the bill and the amendment. It is getting late and a great many Members desire to retire from the Chamber. I am hoping we may have some understanding about further debate on this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. That means on the entire bill?

Mr. FULMER. Yes; the committee amendment that I offered.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to modify his request and make it 30 minutes. After all we are dealing with $500,000,000.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment on the desk on which I wish to be heard.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wanted to speak on another matter.

Mr. FULMER. I shall have to object to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would be willing to wait until afterward. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent at this time to address the House for 5 minutes at the close of business today?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would have to submit that request in the House.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I see five Members on their feet. I modify my request and now ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes with the last 5 minutes reserved to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to identify the Members who have requested time and recognize them.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to this debate there came to me the thought as to just how many Members discussing this particular bill today actually came from the farm to this House, and just how many of you, my friends, here today have spent the better part of their lives trying to secure a living on the farm? Several of you men own farms but how many of you have worked on those farms and depended on the income for your family's and your livelihood?

I am going to address you from the viewpoint of a man who knows what it is to make both ends—expenses and receipts—on the farm meet.

May I paint a little picture for you?

In the first place, I do not claim that this Soil Conservation Act is a cure-all. It has helped conserve the fertility in our soil. It has also helped, in my opinion, in keeping many a farmer on his farm and off of W. P. A. Let me take you back in thought to 1918. I recall the high prices of that time and recall the terrific beating we took later in the fall of 1920, when our corn fell suddenly from $1.50 a bushel to 31 cents. I recall the following good years through the last part of the twenties, the gradual sloughing off after October 1929. Yes; I remember thirty-two; corn was used for fuel by many of us that winter. I remember also thirty-four and thirty-six, when droughts wiped us out almost entirely in western Minnesota, as it did other huge portions of the Midwest. We must have good prices for our crops in good years to make up for the poor crops that are bound to come ever so often.

One point I want to bring out here today is this: There seems to be a general opinion among many Members in the House that farmers are waxing rich upon these soil-conservation payments. I cannot today recall a single farmer friend of mine whose income has depended upon farming the last 10 years who can even be called well-to-do.

Is it no more than fair, fellow Members and Mr. Chairman, for a farmer to expect from the operation of a farm into which for years he has put just as much capital as the average small businessman puts into his store—is it not legitimate for that man to expect at least 5 percent on his investment for 16 hours' work a day? Our hours on the home farm the past 15 years have averaged 12 hours per day at least, and not the present union scale of 8 hours. An 8-hour day to farmers would almost mean a half holiday. It is a common practice for my neighboring farmers to sit up through the nights with a lantern taking care of the newly arrived pigs, calves, lambs, and this and that; and yet they must be on deck at 5 o'clock in the morning to milk or do chores, so that they can start out to the fields at 7. In my district farmers are fortunate if they can finish their chores by 8 at night and sit down and read the newspaper. The women work until 9 or later. On a farm their work is truly never done.

Our farmers enjoy working when they can see ahead of them a little profit from their labors so that their children can go to high school or perhaps to college. They like a new automobile ever so often, just as you and I want one every year if possible. Farm women like decent, up-to-date clothes just as much as your wives do. Farm women want their children to go to school shod with good shoes and clothed with neat, warm clothes. Oh, yes; the farmers of this Nation want

only one thing—an even break with others in accordance with the principles of our Constitution.

Give us—I say "us" because farming is my profession—parity prices for what we produce and the taxes we will pay back to the Treasury and the new business we will create will reimburse the Nation 10 times over for the amounts spent for soil conservation. You know as well as I do that prosperity starts from the farm. Mr. Chairman, I know that none of you begrudge us personally making 2½ percent on our investment back on the home farm in Minnesota this year or making 1½ percent on that investment the previous 2 years. That does not allow us a nickel in interest on the money invested. Every industrialist figures interest, depreciation, and all possible future costs. We have no control as farmers over what we can ask for our products. It takes a war, unfortunately, to bring parity prices to the farmer. Some of you call these soil-conservation payments a raid on the Treasury. I for one am not backing up at all in holding out my hand to take this payment as long as I am producing food for the bulk of you Members at a loss. You want to pay your own way, do you not? For years you have not been doing so. The farmers of this Nation the past 10 years have been shortchanged in income, as compared with the previous 10 years, at least twenty billions of dollars.

Why do farmers receive soil-conservation payments? Simply because they have done certain things which will guarantee a food supply for the rest of the Nation. Why do we receive parity payments? Just because we want to do our part in solving the farm problem and have held down our production of certain crops. We have raised legumes instead to give you men and women butter and cream and your children milk. Yes; to give you pork, poultry, and beef.

I resent the farmer being held up as a chiseler and Treasury raider. Suppose, my friends, that the farmer decided to do a John L. Lewis, force a closed shop, and tell you, "We want our share of the national income in return for the food we produce for the rest of the Nation." What a howl would go up.

The farmer will never strike. We will always feed you, so have no fear. We will feed the starving peoples of the rest of the world in future years.

Please concede to agriculture, however, a square deal. We concede a square deal, plus at least 10 percent, to industry. Give parity to the farmer and this war is half won. The labor situation for next year on the farms of America looks very bad. Every man on the farms of America will work overtime next year. They will not ask for time and a half—no; nor double wages for the many hours of Sunday work. Just give us a decent, living price for our grains and livestock. A great supply of food in return will back up our soldiers and sailors wherever they may have to go. Agriculture wants to do its part, and will.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, we are considering a bill that passed the Senate with all after the enacting clause stricken out, an amendment to the Senate bill being added by the House committee. There is also provision to amend the title.

I looked up the record to find out what happened in the Senate when this bill passed on May 15. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent without one word being said about the provisions of the bill. What does the Senate bill provide? The Senate bill made this act permanent. The House bill extends the time for 5 years.

I would like to vote for this bill and will provided it is amended to extending the act 1 year. I appeal to the committee to offer such an amendment. There is no better friend of the farmer in the House than is the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN], yet he told us a few minutes ago that the time was coming when we will have to stop or reduce Federal aid such as this, or words to that effect. The time may come when we will have to take away some of the benefits we are extending the farmer and the benefits we are extending city people in order to meet the payments that are necessary in connection with the prosecution of this war. If this bill goes to conference with this amendment in it, we do not know what will come back. On the one hand, you have the Senate unanimously providing for a permanent law. On the other hand, you have the House providing for an extension of 5 years. So why not provide for a 1-year extension.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman understands that the law is permanent. The only question is whether it shall remain under Federal control until the States are ready to take it over or it shall go to the States now. It is not a question of the law being extended. The law is permanent now.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, the gentleman indicates this is going to carry on for evermore. I asked the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] if this law had anything to do with soil erosion. He said "No, that is another law." But when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] read the statute a few minutes ago, one of the sections of the law he read referred to soil erosion. It happened that I was sitting in a committee the other day in which a Government official having to do with this act was testifying. It was stated that this was the most popular act affecting agriculture on the statute books. I asked him what they were doing for the farmer that made it so popular and this is what that official told me. He said that if a farmer had the posts and the wire the Government would build his fence for him. Where do you improve your soil by building a farmer's fence? I asked that Government official if the big job was not to show the farmer how to stop soil erosion and he said "Yes."

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] just stated that when the farmer builds a chimney he has to pay a bricklayer $1.50 an hour. I wonder if, under the terms of this law, the farmer has the bricks and the mortar, they will build his chimney for him? If they would build a fence they might as well build a chimney for him. In any event if soil erosion is the principal benefit under one section of the law, let them confine their work to showing the farmer how to stop soil erosion and not build fences for him simply because he has the posts and the wire. The official really said they would dig the holes and string the wire for the farmer.

I repeat, I will vote for the bill if the committee will offer an amendment to make it 1 year. In my opinion, before you get through, and after the bill goes to the Senate and to conference, you will vote on a conference report and you will have the Senate bill before you rather than the House bill, unless it is so late the Senate agrees to the House amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Line 6, section 1, of the substitute amendment to the committee amendment, after the word "thereof", strike out "January 1, 1947" and insert "January 1, 1944"; and in line 8, after the word "thereof", strike out "December 31, 1946" and insert "December 31, 1944."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from Missouri had to say here about the extension of this for 2 years. He suggested 1 year. I would be very glad to extend it for 2 years. As was stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, I am qualified to speak because I have a farm of my own. I direct the operation of it. Though I cannot do the physical work on it, however, I direct it myself, and I am also a businessman with a manufacturing concern on my hands. I have never taken a dollar of this money for conservation. I even cannot agree with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who says that this is not relief. We cannot give a farmer some money and have him take it and not give the Government anything back except to promise that he will try to better himself through getting the money, and not call it relief. I never thought that I could do it.

I said to the farmers in my district and I say it to the farmers of the Nation at this time, "Take this borrowed money that is being given to you because for every dollar you get now you are going to pay back $2 in taxes. The only thing to do is to take it." I could not take it myself, because I know many farmers who have taken it and they have mortgages on their farms. I do not know whether that is the result of it or not, but I do know that is true.

There has been a good deal of coercion among the farmers to get them to adopt this policy. One man left word with a man who works for me on my farm. He

told me if I did not let him measure my farm he was going to measure it anyway. Of course, I told the man on the farm to go right up and see him at once and tell him that if he measured my farm without my permission it would be quite a while before he would measure another. That is the situation that confronts us.

The farm problem is not solved by handing out relief checks or giving money to the farmers. That may be one way of keeping them pacified, like putting people on W. P. A. or handing out money for relief. But the real way to help the farmer is to have business successful so that the men who are employed in the factories will have the money to purchase the products of the farm. When you do this, you will not have any farm problem. That is what we have to do. We have manufacturing concerns that are today paying good wages to their men, so that they are able to go out and purchase the products of the farm.

I was interested in what my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], had to say with reference to the $200,000,000 that has been appropriated for the dairy industry. You would not have had to do that if you had not lowered the tariff twice on cheese during the last 8 years. When we have a lower tariff, of course it affects the imports of this country. During the first 6 months of this year we imported over $400,000,000 worth of competitive farm products from foreign countries and exported only about half that much.

They say that the trade treaties bring about good will. We have been furnishing scrap iron to Japan for the last 4 or 5 years establishing trade and good will, and of course it is coming back in good will now in the form of bombs and bullets to kill our people. I do not say that is going to happen in every instance, but that is the kind of good will you get when you have to buy it.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] spoke about the enormous profits business is making at the present time. I say very frankly that unless something is done for the small business man in this country within the next 60 or 90 days, a large percentage of them are going out of business because they can get no materials to operate their plants, on account of priorities.

That is the situation that confronts us. I think if we extend this program for 2 years we have done our duty to the farmers of this country. If the farmer ever had a friend he has one in me, because I was born and raised in the country and I know the farmers' problems. I am operating a farm at the present time, and although I do not get anything out of the Government for doing it, I want the other farmers to take what they can get, but I think they ought to be willing to take their chances on a 2-year program instead of a 5-year program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested by one or two of the speakers this afternoon, that payments to farmers to conserve their own soil, were regarded as being for the purpose of conserving the soil of this country and not considered as being of assistance to the farmer. The Soil Conservation Act was passed before I became a Member of this body, but I believe that since it was enacted when farm prices were extremely low, that it was expected the payments would be of assistance to the farmers of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the manner, in part at least, as to how it works out. In 1939, for example, the appropriation for soil conservation was about a half billion dollars. There were, according to figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture, 5,756,240 operators on the program. Let us see how the funds were divided: 1,426,000, or about 25 percent of those farmers got payments of $20 or less; 1,278,000 more got less than $40 each; according to these figures before me, 78 percent of all these farmers got less than $100 each. Put it another way, 50 percent of the farmers got about $42,000,000, and it took a little more than that amount to pay for administering the act. About 80 percent of this money went to about 20 percent who are the big operators and who are the ones who create the surpluses you talk so much about.

Mr. Chairman, I have made the effort, a number of times, to give the man who operates the family sized farm a better chance. I have tried, on the floor of this House, to limit the payments to $1,000 to any one individual, firm, or corporation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of the little encouragement that I seemed to get from the gentleman of the majority party and member of the committee, I am going to again introduce a bill to limit the soil-conservation payments to $1,000 and to provide for a little more equitable deal for the small operator. I trust that the gentleman from Georgia will support these proposals, both in the committee as well as on the floor of the House. Then I want the committee to do another thing. I have pending before that committee a bill that would permit the farmer having excess wheat, to feed it to his livestock and poultry without the payment of the 49-cent penalty. Why in the world the committee, in view of all circumstances, does not recommend that measure, is something that I cannot understand. The bill has been before the committee for 5 months. Why not get some action on it?

Mr. Chairman, we passed a measure in this House some time ago that would permit the farmer having excess wheat to compute it on the normal-yield basis. Even that bill is smothered in another body. Will not the members of the House committee take a little interest by asking that it be given the consideration to which it is entitled?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political matter at all. Why should not those on the majority side of the House who have charge of this legislation and who are members of the Committee on Agriculture, at least, give consideration to the amendments I have mentioned? Mr. Chairman, the whole problem needs working over. I know we cannot do it here today. We pay money to improve soil so as to make two blades of grass where one grew before, and then we limit the amount of acreage upon which it is permitted to grow.

Here we are this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, talking about limiting our acreage and crop production and penalties for overproduction. The Secretary of Agriculture has told us that we are going to need to produce more. I believe he is right in that respect. It is a pretty good time to do a little bit of thinking before we give consideration to limitation and regulation of our farm crops.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, may I suggest that the farmers are just as patriotic and just as anxious to do their part as any other group. And you will find them doing it, too. They can be depended upon to do the right thing. But so long as you use taxpayers' money by the millions they do not have, to build monuments in St. Louis and other places, or to construct scenic highways from Virginia to New Orleans, it is pretty difficult to explain to the farmer that he is not entitled to payments that are granted under this program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

The gentleman referred to this bill as a relief bill for farmers. I am sure if the gentleman has listened to the debate this afternoon, he will realize he has misstated the facts in that the farmers earn every dollar paid to them under this plan in connection with soil-building practices. There is no subsidy or relief in this bill.

Then the gentleman referred to the condition of the small business people of this country. Practically all my life before coming to the Congress I was engaged in general mercantile and banking business, and I may say to the gentleman that one of the great troubles with the small business concerns of this country who are largely located in small villages or in the rural areas of the country is brought about by the small or meager income of the agricultural group of this country. Out of all my experience in life, I have found that when farmers are prosperous with a fair price being paid for their products, the small business people and all other business people, including the wage earners of this country, all of whom are dependent on a prosperous agriculture, which means increased purchasing power, are prosperous.

The gentleman offers an amendment to cut the 5-year extension 2 years. May I state that the Senate sent the bill over to the House with a provision providing for an indefinite extension. The soil-conservation program has been running for about 5 or 6 years. It was hoped in this time the States would pass the necessary legislation to take care of this program, but only about 20 States up to

this time have passed necessary legislation to do the job. My committee, as previously stated, has offered an amendment cutting out the indefinite period and proposing an extension of only 5 years with the hope that the States will pass necessary legislation during this time, although I doubt seriously whether or not they will. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FULMER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. The gentleman made the statement that my amendment cuts this down to 1 year. Did the gentleman listen to what was stated in the amendment or did the gentleman understand it was 1 year or 2 years?

Mr. FULMER. I understood the amendment cut it down to 2 years.

Mr. JOHNS. The gentleman said 1 year.

Mr. FULMER. And I may say to the gentleman that if your amendment is voted up that the Congress will be called upon to do the same thing they are doing today at the end of the 3 years because I realize the States will not be in a position to take over the program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS) there were—ayes 14, noes 71.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee will rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 588, and pursuant to House Resolution 344 he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Soil Conservation Act and include certain remarks by Dr. Bennett, Chief of the Soil Conservation Department of the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert in the RECORD a letter and an editorial from the Boston Sunday Post entitled "The Gentle Commoner." The subject of the editorial is a man we all respect and admire, our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief speech by the commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon by the inclusion of certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects, and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative business I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is entitled to recognition for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his motion?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

ADJOURNMENT

The question was taken and the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 10, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce scheduled for Tuesday, December 9, 1941, has been postponed until next January.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1123. A letter from the Executive Assistant, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of the president, Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1124. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of the Intracoastal Waterway, Charleston, S. C., to St. Johns River, Fla., with a view to constructing an anchorage basin at Beaufort, S. C., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 8, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1125. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1126. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of the Louisiana-Texas Intracoastal Waterway, Plaquemine-Morgan City route, and Bayou Lafourche, La., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted June 8, 1938, and March 26, 1940, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted March 29, 1937, and July 5, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1127. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers, consisting of one item, recommended for disposition, October 16, 1941, by the Office of Production Management, Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1128. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of papers, consisting of 742 items, from those recommended to him for disposition, August 11, 1941, by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1129. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition dated August 4, 1941, September 26, 1941, and October 6, 1941, by the Department of War; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1130. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers, consisting of 18 items, recommended to him for disposition, August 27, 1941, by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1131. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers, consisting of 17 items, recommended to him for disposition, June 12, 1941, by the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1132. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the Department of War; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1133. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1134. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers for disposition by him from the Department of War; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1135. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the Department of War; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1136. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by him from the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1137. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by him from the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1138. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of photographic negatives recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1139. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of aerial roll nitrate film recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1140. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of motion-picture film recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1141. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of photographic negatives recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1142. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of motion-picture film recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1143. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, consisting of 13 items, from those recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1144. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, consisting of three items, recommended to him for disposition by the United States Board of Tax Appeals; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1145. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers, consisting of two items, recommended to him for disposition by the United States Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1146. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the United States Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1147. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1148. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1149. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by him from the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1150. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of a list of papers for disposition by him from the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1151. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposition by him from the Public Roads Administration, Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library: Senate Joint Resolution 80. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6143) for the relief of Ernest H. West, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 6192. A bill to amend section 2800 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6193. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Herman Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 6194. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6195. A bill removing restrictions on the use, and terms of service, of units and members of the land and naval forces of the United States, including selective trainees of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6196. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 6197. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accelerate the extension and consolidation of national forests by the purchase of forested lands under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. Res. 381. Resolution granting a gratuity to Edna Ramsay; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Maryland:

H. R. 6198. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 6199. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Loucresia Sanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6200. A bill for the relief of Herman Urban; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 6201. A bill for the relief of Chet Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2137. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of the crew of the steamer *J. M. Davis*, requesting passage of House bill 5446; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2138. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Rev. A. C. Locke and other citizens of New Bethlehem, Pa., urging support of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2139. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Local No. 1845, Maywood, Calif., protesting against further taxation on low incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2140. Also, petition of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Local No. 1845, Maywood, Calif., protesting against antistrike legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

2141. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the South Gate Methodist Church, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2142. Also, petition of the General Welfare Federation, Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2143. Also, petition of the State Council of Young Men's Republican Clubs, of Massachusetts, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to federalized social security and unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1941

The Very Reverend Z[illegible]Barney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Most Holy and Eternal God, Father of all mankind, who givest unto us, Thy children, those things which we ourselves know not how to ask save as we are taught of Thee: Make of our hearts treasuries of devotion unto Thee, that, somehow, from the hard syllables of life, we may learn to weave words fraught with the mystic,

conquering power of freedom, so essential to our world.

Help us to realize that in the narrowing bonds of needful toil, among the misunderstandings of ordinary-minded folk, the Master was set to learn His great secret, that life for each and every one of us stands in sorest need of having its lowliness exalted, its common things transfigured by a high and holy purpose. So may every citizen respond to his country's call, doing with his might whatever his hands find to do, dedicating his all in humbleness of heart to the service of his country and his God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 9, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2093) to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to, each without amendment, the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 165) to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment, those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization; and

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1916) to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1284, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4993. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass and across Longboat Pass, County of Manatee, State of Florida; and

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5900. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5881. An act to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; to provide for regulation and control within the District of Columbia of such solicitations; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this act; to authorize appropriations therefor; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

H. R. 6003. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938;

H. R. 6004. An act to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extrahazardous service, or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6163. An act to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; and

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, ENGINEER SERVICE, ARMY (S. Doc. No. 144)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an emergency supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $5,000,000, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, for the War Department, for "Engineer Service, Army" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 143)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two emergency supplemental estimates of appropriations, totaling $63,282,685, for the military activities of the War Department, fiscal year 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—WATER SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 138)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $130,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—HIGHWAYS (S. Doc. No. 137)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $1,911,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION, SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE (S. Doc. No. 139)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $25,000,000, for the Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 141)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $2,500,000, together with draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (S. Doc. No. 140)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $100,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR DEFENSE HOUSING (S. Doc. No. 145)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $185,000,000, for defense housing (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT: DEFENSE HOUSING (S. Doc. No. 142)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an emergency supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to $100,000,000, for "Emergency funds for the President," for defense housing, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISTRIBUTION OF NATURAL AND MANUFACTURED GAS (S. Doc. No. 122)

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 177 (submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE and agreed to October 9, 1941), a statement showing the prices charged to residential customers for gas service in all cities of 50,000 population or more in the United States, and stating that "A similar statement for the smaller cities and communities having gas service, which is also required by the resolution, is now being completed and will be forthcoming at an early date" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions of several citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of the so-called Smith labor bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Jackson County, Kans., praying for the prompt enactment of legislation to provide an adequate and uniform old-age pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Kiwanis Clubs of the Capital district, assembled at Washington, D. C., favoring the reduction of nonessential governmental expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A paper in the nature of a petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Easton, Md., praying for the enactment of pending labor legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NATIONAL UNITY AND ATTITUDE OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have here a copy of a telegram from Admiral Richard E. Byrd addressed to Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O. I have always considered Richard E. Byrd to be a great American and a great scientist, and I think this telegram and the statements it contains should have a large effect on labor measures now under discussion. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of
Industrial Organizations,
Statler Hotel, Detroit, Mich.:

Greetings to you and through you to all members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Allow me to extend to your convention my most enthusiastic congratulations on the magnificent resolution it passed last Tuesday calling for national unity behind our Government. Let me assure you that this resolution has received and deserves the warm approval of the vast majority of your fellow citizens.

I trust that the many friends I have in your organization justifies the liberty I take in thus addressing your convention. My interest in labor unions started when I was a young man taking a post-graduate course in college on the subject of history of labor. I learned then of the injustice and even cruelty that for a hundred years beset the path of the workers of the world.

Therein lies my sympathy for labor's long struggle for justice, and so this message is sent you in the spirit of friendship. Permit me to say to you with all the emphasis of which I am capable that we can lose our democracy without an invasion by an armed force because the tyranny idea is very contagious. It is spread by economic confusion, which can result in this Nation from the disruption of national and international trade caused by the war.

Only by super unity can we avoid this economic chaos which enabled fascism to invade Italy from within and nazi-ism to invade Germany. If we should suffer such collapse from disunity, the Atlantic Ocean as a protection from invasion by the Nazi idea would shrink to the size of the Mississippi River.

Last Tuesday's resolution shows the great patriotism of the members of your congress, which I know all of you possess. It shows that liberty and this democracy are very precious to you. It shows that your members will sacrifice or even fight to the death to preserve them. Your country needs you now as it never needed you before. Our chosen leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt, is your sincere and loyal friend. And I know that you will do as all Americans must do to save our liberty—unite behind him with sweat and sacrifice and an unconquerable morale.

RICHARD E. BYRD.

JURISDICTION OF ARMY ENGINEERS OVER FEDERAL WATERWAYS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated December 5, 1941, which I received from Mr. James B. Doak, chairman, legislative committee of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society, together with an accompanying resolution adopted by the board of governors of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society on November 14, 1941, and I ask the resolution and the accompanying letter be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT OF PHILADELPHIA
MARITIME SOCIETY,
December 5, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: The enclosed resolution of the board of governors of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society is submitted for your consideration in connection with Senate bill 1539, an act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.

It is the opinion of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society that this bill now before the House of Representatives Committee on Military Affairs, placing an additional waterway under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, is in its effect detrimental to the program of river and harbor improvement which has been and is being carried out by the United States Army engineers. The splendid work of the United States Army engineers in river and harbor improvement and control of Federal waterways has been outstanding. It is submitted that the jurisdiction of the United States Army engineers should not be encroached upon or limited by legislation such as Senate bill 1539, or similar legislation. If this legislation is felt to be necessary, provision should be made to insure the present jurisdiction of the United States Army engineers.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES B. DOAK,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Enclosure.

Whereas the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society is an organization of men who are engaged in or associated with maritime businesses and activities in the port of Philadelphia and the other Delaware River ports of Camden, Chester, and Wilmington; and

Whereas the members and the board of governors of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society have long been familiar with, appreciative of, and interested in the splendid work of the United States Army engineers in river and harbor improvements not only in the Delaware River but throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the United States Army engineers have been performing an efficient, thorough service in their administration of river and harbor improvement, waterway control, planning, and study which is brilliant and able and which has met the problems of maritime interests and others with knowledge and understanding; and

Whereas it is the reasoned judgment of the board of governors of the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society that Senate bill 1539 (entitled "An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933" by including under that act the Cumberland River, its tributaries, and the Cumberland River Basin), passed by the Senate on September 19, 1941, and referred to the House of Representatives Committee on Military Affairs is undesirable and detrimental to the best interests of the country to the extent that it limits, curtails, encroaches upon, or interferes with the powers, authority, or jurisdiction of the United States Army engineers over this waterway or any other of which it is a tributary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society, by its board of governors, records its opposition: (1) to Senate bill 1539, entitled "An act to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act" now before the House of Representatives Committee on Military Affairs, as being detrimental to the public interest and opposed to efficient administrative control of Federal waterways to the extent that it encroaches upon, limits, or in any way interferes with the control, powers, and authority now exercised by the United States Army engineers over this and other waterways; and (2) to any legislation which is designed to or has the effect of limiting, supplanting, or encroaching upon the present jurisdiction of the United States Army engineers over Federal waterways.

Further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, and to the Congressmen whose districts include or are contiguous to Delaware River ports.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

S 2049. A bill to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 884); and

H. R. 5007. A bill to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 885).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1486. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Murray, Jr., a patent to certain land; without amendment (Rept. No. 886); and

S. 1696. A bill for the relief of Bessie Walden; without amendment (Rept. No. 887).

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 4 OF REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief report from the Special Committee to Investigate the national-defense program. The committee held an executive session this morning for the purpose of determining how the committee could best contribute to the defense of the Nation.

The committee never has investigated, and it still believes that it should not investigate, military and naval strategy or tactics. Such matters should be handled strictly by the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the Congress.

From its inception the special committee has concerned itself with the nonmilitary aspects of the defense program—that is to say, with seeing to it that the defense articles which the Army and Navy have determined that they need are produced in a minimum of time at a minimum of cost and with as little disruption of the civilian economy as possible.

During the 8 months in which the special committee has operated, it has noted and called attention to many things which have adversely affected production, particularly the failure to increase the production of strategic materials soon enough and fast enough, and the failure to utilize in the defense program the existing facilities of the intermediate and small manufacturing establishments. By its action, the special committee believes that it has forced a greater attention to these problems; it believes that the various defense agencies are giving now more adequate attention to them; but it believes also that it is necessary to continue a constant watch for the purpose of assuring that such problems are met head-on and solved.

The special committee has no doubt of the ability of the United States to win this war. It is simply a question of when and at what cost the war will be won, but that is a most important question. The committee is determined the war should not continue weeks or months longer because of the failure to get the production which we need as soon as possible. An unnecessary prolongation of war, caused by failure to produce as fast, efficiently, and economically as possible, would cause an unnecessary loss of life and property.

There were present at the meeting of the committee this morning 9 of the 10 members, and it was the unanimous opinion that what I have outlined should be the continuing policy of the committee.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 9, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States; and

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON SERVICE OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on yesterday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 117, providing for lifting the restriction upon the service of our armed forces. Under the present law the members of the Army may not be called upon to serve outside the Western Hemisphere, our Territories, and insular possessions, including the islands of the Philippines. The joint resolution would remove that restriction.

Likewise the joint resolution provides for the "freezing" the enlistment period of the men now in the armed forces and those who may serve in the future so as to cover the period of the present war and duration thereafter of 6 months. The purpose is to give the Army authorities an opportunity to liquidate, disband, and discharge the members of the armed forces.

Mr. President, the joint resolution was referred by the Chair to the Committee on Military Affairs. As a result of the urgency of the legislation of which I speak, a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs was called for yesterday afternoon at 2:30. At that meeting 17 of the 18 members constituting the Committee on Military Affairs were present in person. Only one member was absent, and his absence was attributable to the fact that he happened to be detained on official business. The joint resolution having been considered yesterday afternoon by the Committee on Military Affairs, the committee unanimously voted to report it favorably to the Senate.

Therefore, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) removing restrictions on the use and terms of service of units and members of the Army of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 888) thereon.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the committee, and I respectfully request that the clerk read it to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, as amended, and of Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended, insofar as they restrict the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, are suspended during the existence of any war in which the United States is engaged, and during the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war.

SEC. 2. The periods of service, training, and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of all members of the Army of the United States now or hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States are extended for the period stated in the preceding section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from terminating such periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission at an earlier date in any case.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a comma and the following: "And shall include persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at this juncture I desire to read the report submitted by the committee to accompany the joint resolution:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred Senate Joint Resolution 117, removing restrictions on the use, and terms of service, of units and members of the Army of the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommend that it do pass.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, as amended, and of Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended, insofar as they restrict the Territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, are suspended during the existence of any war in which the United States is engaged, and during the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war."

In explanation of Public, No. 98, Seventy-sixth Congress, I bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the provision, as I have mentioned, that the members and units of reserve components of the Army of the United States ordered into active Federal service under this authority shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere, except in the territory and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

I likewise a moment ago referred to Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, subsection (e) of which reads:

Persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under this act shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

This act refers to selective-service selectees. The one which I previously mentioned refers to the reserve components.

Section 2—

I am now reading from the substitute reported by the Committee on Military Affairs—

The periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of all members of the Army of the United States now or hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States are extended for the period stated in the preceding section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from terminating such periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission at an earlier date in any case.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a comma and the following:

"And shall include persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended."

In order that the Members of the Senate may have a clear understanding of section 3, which I just read from the report of the Committee on Military Affairs, I may say that section 1 of the National Defense Act as amended to January 1, 1940, in reference to the Army of the United States, reads as follows:

That the Army of the United States shall consist of the Regular Army, the National Guard of the United States, the National Guard while in the service of the United States, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Organized Reserves, and the Enlisted Reserve Corps.

The committee recommended that immediately following the words "Enlisted Reserve Corps" there should be inserted the words:

And shall include persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under Public, No. 783—

To which I have previously referred—

Seventy-sixth Congress.

That is the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

I read further from the report:

The first section of the joint resolution suspends during the existence of any war, and during the 6 months immediately following any war, the provisions of present law which impose restrictions with respect to the territory within which certain units and members of the military forces of the United States may be employed. Section 3 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 provides that persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under that act shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands. Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress,

contains a similar provision with respect to members and units of the National Guard and other reserve components ordered into active service under that resolution. It is obvious that the efficient prosecution of the war requires the removal of these restrictions. That is the purpose of this section. It is important that it be enacted immediately.

Section 2 extends the period of service during wartime, and for 6 months thereafter, of persons in the Army of the United States. In other words, it freezes them in for the duration of the war, and for an additional 6 months to provide for terminating their service in an orderly manner. Similar legislation has already been passed by the Senate with respect to persons in the naval service.

This has reference to the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, which was enacted a few days ago.

The report continues:

Section 3 amends the definition of the Army of the United States which is now contained in section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended—

To which I have previously referred—

so as to make it clear that persons heretofore or hereafter inducted into the land forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 are members of the Army of the United States.

I specifically call this to the attention of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in view of the fact that he raised this point yesterday before the committee. As some question has been raised about this matter, it is deemed advisable to clarify it at this time.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LODGE. I appreciate the Senator's calling my attention to that provision in the measure, and I should like to state that the language which he read provides for what I had in mind. I think Members of the Senate would be surprised to be told that up until today selectees were not members of the Army of the United States, and this language would make them members of the "big team," which I am sure is what should be done.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very glad I had the privilege of yielding to the Senator, for it provides me with the opportunity of thanking him for the suggestion he made, which I assure him was appreciated by all the members of the committee, as he knows, he having been present yesterday when we considered this matter.

The Senator will recall that in the consideration of that point the members of the committee, all of whom were present with the exception of one, designated the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and myself, as chairman of the whole committee, as a subcommittee to meet with the draftsmen, to remove several kinks in the joint resolution as originally introduced, and we endeavored, as best we could, to employ language which would meet the suggestion of the able Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad to learn that the language employed has met with his approval.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I note that the language describing the time limit for the exercise of the authority to send the Army anywhere in the world has been changed from the original draft. I may add I am glad it has been changed. The original draft suspended the previous prohibition "during the existence of the present or any future war in which the United States is engaged."

I called that matter to the attention of the able chairman of the committee yesterday. It seemed to me that that was needlessly broad authority. It seemed to me that if we took care of one war at a time it would rather suffice, under the circumstances.

Now I wish to inquire precisely what the substitute language means. The substitute says, in effect, that we can send the Army anywhere in the world "during the existence of any war in which the United States is engaged." I desire to know what it means when it says "any war in which the United States is engaged." Are we engaged in any war at the present time except the war with Japan?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I recall with appreciation that the able senior Senator from Michigan yesterday brought to my attention, as he has just called to the attention of the Senate, the verbiage of the original Joint Resolution 117, and in view of that, the changes which he had in mind were accomplished before our committee and its designated subcommittee yesterday in arriving finally at a conclusion in regard to the draft which has just been read at the desk.

In my opinion, the language means that if we become involved in another war, that is to say, a war with another nation, during the continuation and existence of the present war, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, the President, will have authority to send our armed forces to any part or portion of the world as he may deem fit or proper for the security of the American Nation and for the best interests of our Government. Under this language, as the Senator knows, the Chief Executive of the United States, the Commander in Chief, would have the right to send our armed forces to any portion of the world—to Asia, to Europe, to European Asia, to Indochina, to Australia, or to any other point he and our military authorities might deem proper for the protection of the interests of the American Government, and he would have the right to designate the procedure to be followed in our desire and aim to bring the present war to a successful conclusion. If during the present war we should declare war upon some other country than Japan, or if some other country should declare war upon us and we should retaliate by a declaration of war, then the language would fit precisely the situation existing at that time, as it does in the present emergency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me interrupt the Senator at this point, because the language which he has just used differs from the language of the joint resolution. The Senator has just said that if we become engaged in another declared war the joint resolution will apply. But the joint resolution provides that its provisions will apply during the existence of any war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In which the United States is a participant.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And in which war the United States has been aggressed upon, or when some other nation has issued a declaration of war against us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well. I want to know whether the distinguished chairman of the committee is willing to have the joint resolution read the way his speech reads, and whether he would object to inserting the word "declared" before the word "war", so that the language will read "are suspended during the existence of any declared war in which the United States is engaged"?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Personally, I would object, for the reason that war might momentarily be launched against the United States of America before we could formally make a declaration of war. In that instance our armed forces and our Chief Executive would be somewhat hampered and perhaps embarrassed if the Senator's suggestion were adopted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think the Senator's statement is borne out by the record of the past week, in which a declaration of war was effected within 1 hour after the Executive sought it; and I respectfully submit to the Senator that the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, still retains certain responsibilities which it cannot shirk and should not delegate in respect to the identification of a state of war. I respectfully suggest to the Senator that when he is proposing that we shall lift all restrictions upon the sending of our armed forces anywhere around the earth—and by this measure we are doing it not only in respect to the present war, and I do not object to that at all, but we are doing it in respect to any war—I submit that on our congressional responsibility we should at least require that the measure read "during the existence of any declared war."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I respectfully submit, in answer to what the Senator from Michigan has said, that the implication of the wording of the joint resolution itself is that the President shall have authority to send our armed forces to any part of the world in any war in which we are concerned. If the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, feels that at the present time it is to the interest of the American Government and the interest of the people of this country to send our armed forces into Asia Minor or northern Africa for the prosecution of our interests, I feel that he should have the right so to do.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the able junior Senator from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is true, is it not, that one may be shot just as dead in an undeclared war as in a declared war?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so.

Mr. CHANDLER. We have about passed the time when we can afford to wait until another nation declares war upon us before we say to our President, "You can use the armed forces in such and such an area." We had better let the President use our armed forces wherever he thinks it is necessary to use them, and not be obliged to wait until another nation declares that its forces are going to shoot. If they shoot, let us act immediately, and let the declaration of war be made later.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much for his observation and contribution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say in conclusion——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state his point of order.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall suspend.

Mr. McNARY. I have stated over and over again that we should follow the rules of the Senate. The routine morning business has not as yet been disposed of. I thought the able Senator was submitting a report, but his presentation has led to debate. I therefore make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution reported by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am advised that the routine morning business has not as yet been completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I have made a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution has come before the Senate under the heading of "Reports of committees."

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that. But this is not the time to ask unanimous consent for consideration of a measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to state that, after consulting the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who moved yesterday that a certain measure be made the unfinished business, it has been agreed, so far as he is concerned, that that bill may be laid aside temporarily while the joint resolution reported by the Senator from North Carolina is under consideration. But a motion to consider the joint resolution is not contemplated, so far as I am concerned, until the morning hour is finished, until we shall have completed the morning business, and it is my understanding that immediately upon the conclusion of the morning business the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] will ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily in order that his joint resolution may be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will come up automatically at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand that, but frequently the morning business is concluded before 2 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, the unfinished business is the business appertaining to the bill having to do with the Republican River Basin. The Senate has now before it the routine morning business, that is, reports of committees, and so forth. Let us follow through the morning business. I insist upon that procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 2110. A bill for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2111. A bill to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense; and

S. 2112. A bill authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2113. A bill for the relief of Rollin D. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. GUFFEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 118, which was ordered to lie on the table, and appears under a separate heading.)

THE ANTHRACITE INDUSTRY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read, and then that it may lie on the table.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) creating a commission to investigate conditions in the anthracite-coal-producing regions of the United States was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a commission to be composed of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and three individuals to be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Bureau of Mines, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the National Resources Planning Board, and one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. No member of the commission shall receive compensation for his services as such member.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining the facts relating to, and ways and means for improving, economic conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions of the United States, and in the conduct of such investigation the commission shall take into consideration, among other relevant factors (a) the availability in such regions, for national-defense activities, of skilled and unskilled workers, factories, and housing and other facilities, and (b) possible new and extended uses for anthracite coal and the byproducts thereof.

SEC. 3. The commission shall report to the President and to the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date. The commission shall cease to exist upon the submission to the President and the Congress of its final report.

SEC. 4. The commission is authorized, in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that I shall ask that the joint resolution be considered at an early date.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR OR REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and ordered to be placed on the calendar, or referred, as indicated:

H. R. 5800. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the calendar.

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 5881. An act to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia; to provide for regulation and control within the District of Columbia of such solicitations; to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to administer and enforce the provisions of this act; to authorize appropriations therefor; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6003. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938;

H. R. 6004. An act to require parking facilities for the persons employed in Federal office buildings in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6163. An act to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; and

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TWENTY-FOUR-HOUR WORK BASIS FOR DEFENSE PRODUCTION PLANTS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 204), as follows:

Whereas it is clearly evident that immediate speeding up of production to maximum capacity is essential to the successful prosecution of the war against Japan; and

Whereas this country cannot afford to be dependent upon any other nation or nations for vital war munitions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that all Government navy yards and all private shipyards and all other national-defense industries should take immediate steps to place themselves on a 24-hour-per-diem work basis.

Mr. TOBEY. I desire to address the Senate very briefly on the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the point of order made by the Senator from Oregon, the morning business not having been concluded, the Senator from New Hampshire probably should defer his remarks.

Mr. TOBEY. I accept the correction, and I will address the Senate on the resolution later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of further concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

MARTHA FRANCES SPENCE

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Martha Frances Spence, widow of Charles N. Spence, late an employee of the Senate, under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS IN CONNECTION WITH SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specied in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BULOW, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON WAR WITH JAPAN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the radio address delivered by the President of the United States on the night of December 9, 1941, relative to the war with Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S ALL-OUT EFFORT FOR DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on the subject America's All-Out Effort for Defense, printed in the Southern Banker for May 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD BEFORE ASSOCIATED POSTAL EMPLOYEES

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting of the Associated Postal Employees at White Plains, N. Y., on December 6, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD BEFORE AMERICAN BUSINESS CONGRESS MEETING

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the American Business Congress meeting at New York City on December 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. BRECKENRIDGE LONG BEFORE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Breckenridge Long, Assistant Secretary of State, before the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago, Ill., on Tuesday, December 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LOUIS F. CUCHI AT SAN JUAN, P. R.

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address recently delivered by Louis F. Cuchi, department defense chairman, before Statue of Victory at San Juan, P. R., which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR WITH JAPAN—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to the war with Japan, published in the Washington News of December 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

T. V. A. DAM IN JEFFERSON COUNTY, TENN.—ARTICLE BY RALPH SMITH

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to a Tennessee Valley Authority dam in Jefferson County, Tenn., written by Ralph Smith and published in the Atlanta Journal of December 8, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON SERVICE OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to repeat——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask the Senator if he wishes to speak in connection with the joint resolution?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina a question. I invite his attention to section 2 of his joint resolution.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have it before me.

Mr. DANAHER. It has been suggested to me by several Senators that the Senator from North Carolina has not as yet had the joint resolution made the unfinished business. I therefore withdraw any attempts to discuss it at this moment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now consider Senate Joint Resolution 117.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from North Carolina request that the pending unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understood it had been laid aside.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. The unfinished business will not automatically be laid before the Senate until 2 o'clock, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from North Carolina wants to ask unanimous consent to take up his joint resolution I would have no objection to that being done, but at this hour it is not necessary to ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, because the Senate may dispose of the joint resolution before 2 o'clock. If at 2 o'clock its consideration has not been concluded and the Senator then asks the Senate temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business in order to proceed with the joint resolution, so far as I am concerned I shall make no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the rules the unfinished business would not come up automatically until 2 o'clock. However, in the ordinary procedure, when the morning business is concluded, if there is nothing else the unfinished business is taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that unanimous consent is necessary for that procedure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then, until 2 o'clock, the Senator from North Carolina may move to proceed to consider the joint resolution without in any way interfering with the unfinished business, unless consideration of the joint resolution should extend beyond 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that unanimous consent is necessary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, unanimous consent is necessary because the joint resolution was not reported until today, and under the rule it must lie over a day unless unanimous consent is given for its consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. I thought the joint resolution had been reported yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I apologize.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to refer for a moment to a vindication, which usually is the reward of a little good judgment. Yesterday when this matter was brought up the Senator from North Carolina asked unanimous consent to consider the joint resolution then proposed. I objected because I wanted it to go to a committee. I observe today, as I might observe on all similar occasions, that the committee has brought in a substitute, indicating that hasty action is not profitable. I desire to make that very brief observation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point Senate Joint Resolution 117 as we received it yesterday, and also the substitute which has been reported today, as to which I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina certain questions. The RECORD will then show the joint resolution as we received it, as well as the substitute. I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, Senate Joint Resolution 117, as originally introduced and the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Senate joint resolution as originally introduced)

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, and of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, insofar as they restrict the territorial use of units and personnel of the Army of the United States, including selective trainees, are suspended during the existence of the present or any future war in which the United States is engaged, and for 6 months thereafter.

SEC. 2. The periods of appointment, enlistment, induction, and service, of all members of the Army of the United States, including selective trainees, now or hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States, are extended for the period stated in the preceding section.

(Substitute reported by the Committee on Military Affairs)

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, as amended, and of Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended, insofar as they restrict the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, are suspended during the existence of any war in which the United States is engaged, and during the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war.

"SEC. 2. The periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission of all members of the Army of the United States now are hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States are extended for the period stated in the preceding section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from terminating such periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission at an earlier date in any case.

"SEC. 3. Section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a comma and the following: 'and shall include persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended.'"

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it now in order to move to proceed with the consideration of the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5945), granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the ruling of the Chair, at what time may the Senator from North Carolina or any other Senator ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 117?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such a request may be made at any time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 117.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I object.

TWENTY-FOUR-HOUR WORK BASIS FOR DEFENSE PRODUCTION PLANTS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, is it now in order for me to make a few remarks on the resolution which I offered a few moments ago? I ask the courtesy of the Senate to have the resolution reread by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 204), as follows:

Whereas it is clearly evident that immediate speeding up of production to maximum capacity is essential to the successful prosecution of the war against Japan; and

Whereas this country cannot afford to be dependent upon any other nation or nations for vital war munitions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that all Government navy yards and all private shipyards and all other national-defense industries should take immediate steps to place themselves on a 24-hour per diem work basis.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Nation is at war, and in this situation there is nothing of schism or division in the Senate or throughout the Nation. We have one common objective, and that is to win the war as speedily and effectively as possible. I have submitted this resolution in good faith, to evidence to the Nation at large, and to our enemies in particular, that this Nation is united and will go to the furthest lengths to achieve victory. No single thing will do more to accomplish that end than complete 100-percent production in war and defense mechanisms.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator's speech, or with the disposition of his resolution, which I assume will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TOBEY. I will say to the Senator that that had not been my intention.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator seek immediate action?

Mr. TOBEY. I shall ask that the resolution be not referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. To be frank with the Senator, my intention is to address myself to the majority leader at the conclusion of my remarks and ask that, in view of the exigencies of the situation, time being of the essence, he agree and urge the Senate to give unanimous consent to a vote on the resolution, and thus indicate to the world at large, and to our enemies in particular, that America is united in an all-out effort to achieve victory.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not desire to anticipate what the able and distinguished leader may say, or what course of action he may recommend; but I think I should say to the Senate—and in doing so I do not believe I am divulging any confidences—that late yesterday afternoon the President indicated to me and to the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs that he had done, or was about to do, the very thing which the able Senator from New Hampshire suggests.

The matter came up in the course of a conversation of a general character about the future naval program. During that conversation the idea was voluntarily indicated by the President. So I think the Senator is in accord with the wishes of the President in the matter. He is certainly in accord with my wishes, because I feel that the Navy and all our other productive agencies, especially of a military character, should go on a 7-day, 24-hour-a-day basis.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. I am sincerely delighted that the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and a humble Member of the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire, are in accord in that respect. We are in perfect accord.

Mr. President, in view of the exigencies of the situation which exists today in this country and throughout the world, in view of the impetus, in my judgment, which would be given by the adoption of this resolution, portraying to the world at large, and to our enemies in particular, the wholehearted sentiment of cooperation between the President and the Congress evidenced by the resolution, and in view of the dismay which I think would accrue in the hearts of the Japanese and of any other enemies, I believe that the wise thing to do is to meet the issue squarely and send forth a clarion note from the Senate that all Americans—Republicans, Democrats,

Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and gentiles—are united, and that we demand all-out production in all defense mechanisms for one great objective—to win this war against the forces of darkness and evil that are now attacking us.

There is nothing partisan or personal in this matter. I address myself with due respect to my distinguished colleague the majority leader, and ask him, in view of these facts, if he will not join with me in seeking a vote on this resolution so as to portray to the world at large, and particularly, as I have said, to our enemies, that the Senate is united in this great objective.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, replying categorically to the Senator from New Hampshire, I wish to state that I appreciate the sincerity of his motives and what he has said about unity in the Senate, in the Congress, and in the country; but it seems to me that it is not wise in the beginning of this war to adopt on the floor, without reference to a committee, resolutions pertaining to the war. If we start in with such a practice, we may find ourselves bound by some precedent which would make it difficult or embarrassing to object to a similar procedure in the future.

I am in entire sympathy with the objective sought by the Senator; but in order that we may begin in an orderly way the consideration of whatever we may have to consider, I think it wiser that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

They may delay a day or two in acting upon it, but it seems to me that would create no difficulty. I think it would be a mistake now to pass upon the floor, without reference to a committee, resolutions pertaining to the war.

For that reason only I ask the Senator from New Hampshire not to insist upon present consideration of the resolution, but to let it go to the Committee on Naval Affairs; and I am sure the committee will give it prompt consideration.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the distinguished leader that of course I accept at par the sincerity and good faith and good will expressed in his remarks. I realize that the resolution would not have the force of law. Its purpose is merely to express to the Nation and to the world at large how we feel about this matter, and to bring home to them, as I think we should, with as little delay as possible, that we are in deadly earnest in this matter. Of course, delays are frequent, in Senate procedure, even though there be a request for immediate consideration and report; and my whole purpose is as I have just stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say, in all sincerity and candor, that I think it may save us trouble as we go along here if we refrain from adopting resolutions on the floor without reference to a committee.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall yield to the good judgment of the distinguished majority leader. In view of the suggestion which has been made, I ask that the resolution lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that he permit the resolution to be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, which, I am sure, will make a prompt report.

Mr. TOBEY. I withdraw my original request, and now request that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ADAMS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 202, providing for the payment of the funeral expenses of the late Senator ADAMS, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 202, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado on December 9, 1941, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Alva B. Adams, late a Senator from the State of Colorado, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection; but I think the Senator from Illinois should couple with his request a request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to make such an amendment to my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the request for unanimous consent is agreed to, the status of the pending business will be unchanged. Is there objection to the request for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. I ask the Senator, who is proposing the resolution, if he will not add to his request a request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the circumstances it is not necessary, if the request for unanimous consent is granted.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, suppose the resolution should be taken up under the unanimous-consent request without any reference to the unfinished business, and suppose that situation should continue throughout the day, the effect would be to lay aside the unfinished business, and when the Senate next met we should have no unfinished business. Of course, I state a suppositious case. I do not know that that would happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any call for the regular order during that time would bring the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in order to dispose of the matter in compliance with the request made by the Senator from Nebraska, I am glad to add to my original request a request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Illinois? None is heard. The question now is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 202.

The resolution was agreed to.

FRED PIERCE, SR., AND MARY PIERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TUNNELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$2,500" insert "$3,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
DAN R. MCGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER—INTERSTATE COMPACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief explanation of the unfinished business. In order to do so I think I should give the Senate a short history of the things which have happened which have brought about the compact between the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska which the House bill would approve.

Let me say, to begin with, that I have a very deep feeling in regard to the bill. I live practically in the center of the territory which will be affected if the legislation is enacted. I have lived there for more than 50 years. Naturally, I have had many opportunities to observe the desirability of doing what the bill seeks to do and what I think could be brought about if the agreement between the States should be approved. It means a great deal to the people of that community and likewise to the people of the communities just across the line in Kansas and to the people of the communities in the eastern part of Colorado.

Those three States agreed upon a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River and its tributaries in this territory. The real cause which brought about the appointment of the Commission by the States and this agreement was that the people of that community, having suffered because of dry weather and the loss of crops for 7 years in succession, have become absolutely irrigation-minded, and they want to irrigate the lands which can be irrigated in Kansas, Colorado, and Nebraska from

these tributary streams. Many of the streams go entirely dry in the dry season. An irrigation system, to be practical, would require the building of dams in various places for the preservation of flood waters, so that they could be turned out into the streams and used on the thirsty soil during the critical stages when irrigation is necessary if the soil is to produce crops.

The people in the locality have suffered for many years on this account, partially from their own fault, for they have not always been sympathetic with irrigation development. Since the irrigation problem has been confronted, however, and since the people in this region have been faced with the fact that the streams which they seek to use to irrigate their lands themselves go dry during the critical periods, making irrigation impossible, they have begun to realize, and now I think they fully realize, what many persons in that territory have been advocating for many years; to wit, that the proper thing to do is to store the flood waters behind dams in reservoirs, so that they may be released and used for irrigation during the critical period in the year when irrigation is necessary in order to save crops which are burning up.

There was, I think, an unfortunate thing contained in the compact which was agreed to by the three States, approved by their legislatures, and then sent to Congress, under the Constitution, for its approval. That unfortunate thing was an agreement contained in the compact that all the waters thus controlled were nonnavigable. I did not realize the importance of that objection; and I introduced a bill in the Senate to approve the compact without any reservation. Representative CARLSON, who represents the district in Kansas just south of the Kansas-Nebraska line, introduced in the House of Representatives an identical bill. That is the bill which is now before the Senate. The House Irrigation Committee was called——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state his point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Nebraska says House bill 5945 is now before the Senate. I raise the point of order that it is not before the Senate at the present time, for the reason that House bill 5945 has never been considered by any committee of the Senate. It came over from the House, and was placed on the calendar. It is not the same, in any sense of the word, as Senate bill 1361; the two bills are entirely different, and they have absolutely different effects upon the pact which is pending before the Senate. My point of order is that House bill 5945, therefore, has no right to be on the calendar of the Senate at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if there is any doubt on the question, let me say that yesterday, upon motion made by myself, the Senate took up the House bill for consideration. The bill was placed on the calendar under the rules of the Senate, for, when the House has passed a bill and a similar Senate bill on the same subject is already on the calendar, it becomes the duty of the clerk, automatically, when the House bill is messaged to the Senate, to place it on the calendar. The clerk did that, and yesterday the Senate decided to take up the House bill. I do not think there is any possible doubt about the parliamentary situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That would possibly be true if the bills were similar, but the bills are not similar, and they are not similar in the effect they would have upon the compact between the three States which is now pending. The point is that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation considered the amendment that was put into the bill by the House, and rejected it by an almost unanimous vote. There was only one vote to the contrary.

Mr. NORRIS. And only two for it. That was a big majority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There was only one vote for it. The record shows that the other members of the committee were for it. So the Senate committee rejected the amendment which the House had adopted. The bill came over from the House in that form, and was automatically placed on the calendar, not with the authority, not with a blessing, not with the consideration of the Senate committee, but the contrary is true, for the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation were opposed to this amendment and voted it down in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Chair expresses the opinion that under the rules the only mandatory requirement for reference applies to the general appropriation bills, but the Senator from Colorado loses none of his rights in this instance, because a motion would be in order at any time during the consideration of the bill to refer it to a committee, and, if the Senate should decide to refer it, of course, that could be done. The Chair is of the opinion that the point is not well taken.

The Senator from Nebraska will proceed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. REED. I come into this discussion as a friend of both parties and also as a Senator from one of the three States entering into the compact. We very much desire to obtain affirmative legislation. After a period of years the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas, through duly authorized representatives, entered into a compact defining the terms upon which the waters of the Republican River could be used and distributed. The House approved the compact with a number of modifications, to some of which there is no objection. The Senate committee reported a Senate bill. Coming from the State in which the Republican River empties its waters into another river, I am appealing to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Colorado to see if we cannot reach some kind of an agreement or understanding that would compose the differences. So, Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Nebraska, who has been so kind as to yield, I suggest that the Senator from Nebraska agree to strike out everything after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute the provisions of the Senate bill. The House will then refuse to concur; the bill will then go to conference, where I think it ought to go; and in conference, the conferees can work out the difficulties.

I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that there are some things in qualifying amendments which ought to be accepted; there are other things in them which ought not to be accepted. In conference there will be an opportunity to work out a proper and satisfactory bill. So, to shorten the debate and save time and preserve the rights of all parties in interest, including the State of Nebraska, the State of Colorado, and my own State of Kansas, I ask the Senator to accept the suggestion I have made. If he does not wish to do so at the proper time, Mr. President, I shall move the substitution I have indicated, or, if it shall become necessary, to send the bill back to the committee and let the committee make the substitution.

I have respect for the memory of the late Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams, who felt very deeply upon this subject, and respect for the committee, and my State of Kansas has some interest in this question. The commissioner of Kansas agreed to the compact. I do not like to have that compact between the States modified by putting in matters which I think are objectionable and which some of us think are unnecessary and irrelevant. I am speaking now for one of the three States concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. REED. I have.

Mr. NORRIS. In my opinion the suggestion made by the Senator from Kansas would not expedite the arrival at some conclusion on this bill. I was about to relate when I was interrupted——

Mr. REED. I beg pardon of the Senator from Nebraska. I did not mean to interrupt him unnecessarily. I was trying to make a helpful suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault with the Senator's interruption; I know it was made in good faith; but I desire to finish relating what I think is the history of the attempt to get legislation on this matter. One of the things which I think is absolutely necessary is that there shall be no further delay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NORRIS. I will; yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I ask to interrupt the Senator in order that I may emphasize the point which has just been made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I desire to make an appeal to the Senator from Nebraska to agree to the suggestion made by the Senator from Kansas. I do so for the reason that the amendments embodied in section 2 and the following portions of the House bill

are the controversial portions of the proposed legislation. The late Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams, was very much opposed to the adoption of those provisions of this bill, and when the Senate measure was under consideration by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation the late Senator from Colorado, who was the ranking member of that committee, made it quite clear that, as a representative of his State, he could not give consent to the adoption of these amendments, the effect of which I shall not attempt to describe now, except to say that they would make the Federal power superior to existing power in the States.

The interesting thing to me about this situation is that, as a result of our conversations in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, there was a feeling that this matter could be worked out in conference.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not want to be discourteous. I think the Senator from Wyoming and also the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] must realize, however, that if I yield for lengthy arguments and speeches I shall never be able to make an explanation of the bill. The Senator from Wyoming may make his motion; the Senator from Kansas may make his motion at the proper time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not making a motion; but will not the Senator from Nebraska permit me to finish my statement?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield the floor to the Senator from Wyoming, and he may make whatever speech he wants to make. I do that to show how anxious I am to be courteous and let the Senator have his way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite characteristic of the Senator. I appreciate his attitude, and I shall not occupy much time, at least at this juncture.

What I desire to call to the attention of the Senator from Nebraska is that the bill before us today was passed in the House of Representatives on the day the late Senator Adams died. It was passed in the House on the day when the Congressional representatives of Colorado were stricken with sorrow over the death of the senior member of their delegation. It may have been that no Member of that body would have objected to the adoption of the amendment, because of the understanding which we had that this matter would be worked out in conference; but, Mr. President, the bill having been passed in the House on the day Senator Adams passed away, it is now brought before the Senate in the knowledge that the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of this body had stood behind the late Senator from Colorado and had reported a bill without the controversial amendments in order that this important question might be dealt with in conference, where it could be heard in all its ramifications and implications. In that situation, the House bill is substituted for the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I submit that in these circumstances the proper thing to do is either to send this bill back to the committee or to strike out the controversial amendments, as the Senator from Kansas has suggested, and let the conference committee go into the merits of the matter. I feel it incumbent upon me, as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and as one who was present while the late Senator from Coloradio was explaining his position, to do everything that is in my power to bring about the consummation of the suggestion made by the Senator from Kansas.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for having yielded the floor to me in order that I might make this statement.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to finish my remarks. I hope Senators will realize that I ought to have time at least to be heard on this bill. I am willing to remain quiet and let them talk all day if they want to. If the Senator from Kansas wants the floor, I will yield it again; but at some time I want to be able to make an explanation of the bill as I see it.

Mr. President, I am very much moved by the attitude taken by the Senator from Wyoming in appealing to the Senate to carry out the wishes of the late Senator Adams. I do not believe there is any Member of the Senate who regrets his passing any more than I do; but I do not believe that a reference to our own colleague who has passed away should be made on the floor of the Senate or the floor of the House to prejudice either the House or the Senate against pending legislation.

The late Senator from Colorado was very much opposed to this bill. He would rather have had no bill at all than to have these amendments made to it. I was anxious to have these amendments in the first place because I believed in them, and in the second place because if the bill should be passed as the House passed it the bill would go directly from the Senate to the President of the United States for his signature. No conference committee would be appointed. I desire to say now that the majority of the conferees from the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will be with the Senator from Wyoming, and if the bill goes to conference God only knows when it will ever get out. In my opinion, it will never get out of conference unless the House conferees entirely surrender.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted—I was trying to tell a consecutive story—I had about reached the point where the House committee took up the bill. The House committee took up the bill a few days before the Senate committee did. The bill was pending in the House committee and the Senate committee for quite a long while. It was introduced on April 22, 1941. When the Interior Department finally reported on the bill—we were all waiting for the reports—they suggested certain amendments which had been practically agreed to in the House bill. The Federal Power Commission, to which the bill was referred, were very insistent on the amendment they proposed. Their amendment, however, sought to amend the compact.

Witnesses appeared when the House committee went into session. I appeared before the House committee. Practically all the members of the House committee were there; but there never has been a time when a quorum of the Senate committee was physically present when the members of that committee were considering this bill.

The House committee considered the bill nearly all day. A great deal of interest was manifested. Not only did I appear, but representatives of the Power Commission and the Interior Department appeared. I do not know how long the committee were in session. They did not finish the consideration of the bill on the first day. I do not know that they finished it on the second day they were considering it. They gave the bill much more consideration than the Senate committee ever gave it—a thousand times more.

Objection was made to the amendment suggested by the Federal Power Commission on the ground that it undertook to amend the compact itself. I thought, and the House committee thought, that that was beyond our province and our jurisdiction; that we could not amend the compact signed by the representatives of the three States and agreed to by the legislatures of the three States. So a modifying amendment was agreed to, because I think everybody on the committee felt as I felt then and as I feel now, that the Federal Government should not be deprived of any of its rights in these waters under the Constitution and laws of the States.

Until the Colorado Senators objected, I do not believe anyone ever contemplated a contrary idea.

The House committee unanimously reported the measure, and I am told that when they finally reported it the motion to approve the amendments and report the bill was made by a Representative in the House from Colorado who is a member of the committee. Nothing was covered up; nothing was crooked; everything was open and aboveboard. No unseemly delay was attempted by anyone.

When the amendments were agreed to, the gentleman from Kansas, Representative CARLSON, who introduced the original bill, put the amendments in the new bill, which is the one now on our calendar, and the committee automatically then reported it to the House, and the House passed it.

There was no thought of being disrespectful to a representative of Colorado. Such a suggestion seems to me unfair and uncalled for. Nothing indicating disrespect of anyone was attempted. Everyone was sorry to learn of the unfortunate death of Senator Adams, of Colorado, but we did not think—at least, I never thought—that his opposition should be later used as an excuse for clianging the regular legislative procedure.

The bill was passed by the House; it came to the Senate, and, under the rules of the Senate, was put on the calendar, since a similar Senate bill had already been reported and placed on the calendar. The Senate committee met a few days after the House commitee met, and I appeared at its meeting. I was the only one heard. The meeting did not last more than 15 minutes. The acting

chairman stated to the committee that the object of the meeting was to consider a bill—not the House bill but the Senate bill—and he asked me if I desired to say anything in regard to it. I told the Senate committee what the House committee had done, and stated—and I gave my reasons briefly—that the amendments improved the bill. I do not think there is any doubt about that. The more I have thought about it, the more I have felt that, if we passed the Senate bill as I introduced it, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] want done, it would meet a veto at the hands of the President. I am strongly impressed with the fact that if I had his duties to perform I should feel constrained to veto the bill in that form.

The amendments inserted will not hurt anyone. There is no attempt to do a wrong to Colorado. The same conditions apply to Colorado and its waters which apply to Kansas and Nebraska. There is no difference.

Mr. President, the language inserted in the bill we are now considering, after setting forth the compact, which is identical in every bill which has been introduced on this subject, contains the provision that is objected to. In my opinion, the objection which is made comes mostly from the Senators who object to what the Power Commission wanted to do.

For instance, section 2 (a), after setting forth the compact, provides:

SEC. 2. (a) The foregoing compact shall not be construed (i) to impair or affect in any sense any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin or the capacity of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to acquire rights in and to the use of waters of said basin; (ii) to subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by any State, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes, nor to subject such property to the laws of any State if such laws do not otherwise apply.

(b) The Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio, with the officials of the signatory States referred to in article IX of the compact in the execution of the duty of these officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of water facts necessary for the proper administration of the compact, and may perform such other services related to the compact, as may be mutually agreed on with the said officials of the signatory States.

Section 3 provides:

SEC. 3. The consent of the Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact amending the Republican River Compact: *Provided*, That a suitable person shall be appointed by the President of the United States to participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and to make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: *Provided further*, That such amendatory compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States.

Section 4 provides:

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or affect any right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce or the jurisdiction of the United States in and over the waters of the Republican River Basin as defined in said compact, as navigable waters or otherwise; and the consent of Congress hereby given is with the express reservation that it does not constitute an admission or declaration by Congress that the Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Republican River Basin as so defined are not navigable.

Mr. President, that is the entire bill, outside of the portion of it to which no one objects, in other words, the compact itself.

It is contended that this reservation is in effect an amendment of the compact itself. If that be true, I think the legislation would fail. I do not believe it to be true, and I am going to cite the Senate several precedents on the subject.

If it is the intention that the rights and interests of the United States should not be impaired or affected by the provisions of a State compact, the limitations contained in sections 2 (a) and 4 of House bill 5945, which is the bill to which I am referring, would seem to be appropriate for that purpose. Limitations of that sort in acts granting the consent of Congress to State compacts are not unusual where questions of navigability and the rights of the United States are involved, and have been provided for many years.

One of the earliest examples is found in the act of June 28, 1834 (4 Stat. 706–711), in which the Congress consented to a boundary line agreement between the States of New York and New Jersey with the following qualification:

Provided, That nothing therein contained shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the islands or waters which form the subject of said agreement.

More recently, Mr. President, in the act of February 16, 1928 (45 Stat. 118, 121), the Congress ratified, approved, and confirmed an agreement between the States of New York and Vermont, with the following qualification:

Provided, That nothing therein contained—

That means the compact, of course.

Provided, That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the regions which form the subject of said agreement.

Again, Mr. President, in the act of March 10, 1928, passed just a few years ago (48 Stat. 300–301), we find contained the following qualifications in the consent of Congress to an agreement or compact between the States of Wisconsin and Michigan:

Provided, That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of said agreement.

I presume there are other precedents already established to the effect that such an alteration as this bill undertakes to make would not be construed as an amendment to the compact itself.

Mr. President, as soon as the reports had been received from the departments of the Government, the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation met and took up the bill which I had introduced. I had appeared before the House committee, and the House committee had agreed upon and reported the amendments which are now contained in the House bill. I appeared before the Senate committee and argued the amendments, as I understood them. I took probably only 10 minutes. The committee then approved those amendments, and instructed the chairman of the committee to report the bill to the Senate with those amendments added, so as to make the House bill and the Senate bill absolutely the same. The chairman did not make that report. It seems that some members of the committee who were not present at that committee meeting objected; so another meeting of the committee was called before the chairman had carried out the instructions of the committee. Both meetings, Mr. President, were perfectly legal, because no Senator in either instance raised the point of no quorum, but as a matter of fact, the second meeting was held because it was alleged there was not a quorum present at the first meeting. So another meeting was held, attended by a minority of the committee, and those present at that meeting took up the former report, rescinded the previous action, and then ordered the bill to be reported without any amendment, which was done, and in that condition the bill was placed on the Calendar of the Senate. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. President, I do not make, and could not now make, if I wanted to do so, any point of order that a quorum of the committee was not present. The record shows a quorum was present; that is, the record does not show affirmatively that there was not a quorum present in either case. The first action taken by the committee was just as legitimate as the second action. I do not contend that the committee could not later rescind its first action, but when Senators speak of action having been taken by a committee at a meeting at which a quorum was not present, I submit that that situation applies to both meetings of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I shall yield in a moment. When in the second committee meeting the motion was made to rescind the action of the committee taken at the prior meeting, three votes were cast, two in favor of the motion and one against it. No vote was taken which showed a quorum actually to be present.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. The record of the committee, which I hold in my hand——

Mr. NORRIS. I admit that the record of the committee is correct. I am not trying to controvert it. I only mention that fact because the Senator and his colleague have raised such a fuss about the first committee meeting acting without a quorum being present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am talking now about the meeting which acted and which sent the bill to this body. The record shows present Senator ADAMS—he was present; Senator CHAVEZ—he was present; Senator MCFARLAND—he was present; Senator BUTLER—he was present; and the Senator from Wyoming was present. Later, as I recall, Senator CLARK of Idaho was present. So it appears that there was an actual quorum present in that committee meeting when the committee considered the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the record show that two members were not present but were counted for a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am referring to the Senators who were actually present.

Mr. NORRIS. How many were actually present?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I refer to Senators who were actually present and who took part in what was going on. They were the late Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and, of course, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is not a member of the committee, was present, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was present, and there may have been other Senators present.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is not a member of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. I should have been very glad if I were a member of the committee; then I should have presented some points with respect to the matter. I am not complaining about that. I am saying that what was done that day is just as legal as what was done on the previous day. The record in both instances shows a legal meeting of the committee, and it ought to show it. If anyone were to look around the Senate right now he could easily see without counting that physically there is not a quorum of the Senate present, and yet if we should pass this bill, and no point were made about no quorum being present, the Senate's action would be just as legal as though every Member of the Senate were in his place, and the action taken by the Senate could not be attacked except in a direct proceeding, and I do not know just how one would go about attacking such action.

Mr. President, if we follow the suggestion made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], we shall find, in my opinion, that we shall have greatly delayed the enactment of this proposed legislation. I should like to have this measure pass in the same form in which it was passed by the House. The Senate has the right to amend the measure; that I concede; and the amendments which the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and Kansas [Mr. REED] speak of would be in order if they want to offer them; but if the Senate agrees to them, and the measure goes to conference, the people involved, who have been suffering for 7 years, and who now want to get ready for irrigation and to irrigate their land, will be delayed further. Those people have been held up for 6 months now. They are ready to act. Organizations which are ready to act exist in my State. The Reclamation Service wants to proceed with some irrigation, but cannot do so until it is decided how much of the waters of these streams can be utilized in each State. So it is a highly important matter, Mr. President. It means almost everything to many people who have lived in that region for years and who have seen their crops burned up year after year, and who wish to try to irrigate land in some of the valleys affected which are as fertile as any land anywhere on the globe. Yet they lack only water. This agreement, if put into effect, would permit the residents of each of the States in question to go ahead, with notice as to just how much water may be taken from every one of the streams.

I appeal to the Senate to pass the bill without amendment, so that the people of those States may go to work. Some of them will be at work the day after the bill is passed. I do not think other Senators quite realize or appreciate what that means to many of the residents of the particular locality. I think I do realize it, for I have lived there for 50 years, and I know what they have been up against.

There is no attempt to take advantage of Colorado. There is nothing in the bill or the amendments that would hurt Colorado. There is only one possible way in which such a condition might arise. Under the New River case, if the United States Government were planning to improve navigation in the Missouri River, into which these waters ultimately flow, the theory is that the United States could stop the farmers from holding back any of the water in reservoirs and using it for irrigation.

Mr. President, even if that argument be good, there is not one chance in one hundred million that such authority would ever be exercised by the Government of the United States. The improvements which would be made in the way of holding back water in reservoirs would improve navigation, if they would have any effect whatever upon the Missouri River or the Mississippi River, because they would let the water out during times of low water and hold it back during times of high water. The best place on earth to store water is in the soil itself. Forty or fifty percent of it gets back into the stream by percolation.

Nobody would be hurt. There is no possible contingency except the one to which I have referred, and that is no real contingency.

I do not want to deprive the Government of the United States of any right it may possess. Under the interstate-commerce clause it has authority to provide for navigation on the Missouri River, which I think has already been done. No man on earth would think of preventing the farmers on the tributary streams from using the water for irrigation.

So far as I know, there is no power possibility involved in this bill. There may be. I have not tried to find out. That question has never been given consideration in connection with this measure. I do not know of any power possibility on the tributaries of any of these streams. I should be glad if there were such possibilities. If there were, they would not be interfered with. But there are no such possibilities. The question is one of irrigation.

We come down to the practical question of whether the States can agree upon the division of the water. That is all a compact ought to do, and all it can legally do.

Mr. President, I think I have said all I wish to say on this subject. Of course, I shall have to submit to any action the Senate may take. If it wishes to amend the bill, it has a perfect right to do so. I would not deprive the Senate of that right.

I have tried to impress upon the Senate the importance of very quick action. I have called attention to the fact that any other course than to agree to the House bill would mean delay, and the fact that there is nothing in any of the provisions of the bill which would hurt Colorado or any other State in the Union.

I hope that the Senate will give favorable consideration to the House bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Colorado is in agreement with much that the Senator from Nebraska has related as to the history of this bill. We do not reach the same conclusion with respect to the amendments which he has offered.

Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas decided to work out a compact for the use of the waters of the Republican River, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and in accordance with their own rules, regulations, and statutes. Those States attempted to work out a compact. It required negotiations; it required a great deal of thought on the part of the officials and those who were meeting to consider the subject to work out their differences. It required concessions on the part of one State to another in order to reach a compact.

The compact was reached, and was presented to the various State legislatures for ratification. The legislatures of the three States ratified the compact, and then, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, the compact came to the Congress for approval or disapproval. The Congress of the United States has the power, the authority, the duty, and the responsibility either to approve or disapprove the compact.

The Senator from Nebraska introduced a bill in the Senate providing for the approval of the compact. The States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas were in accord with the bill which the Senator from Nebraska introduced for that purpose. We agreed to it. We were for it. We wanted it passed. We now want it passed. We want it passed quickly.

The Senator from Nebraska has spoken of delay. If his original bill can be

brought before the Senate and passed quickly, there will be no delay. We do not want any delay. However, at the eleventh hour a new proposal was brought into the picture, a change in the ratification bill which the Senator originally introduced.

That amendment to the ratification bill is not, and never can be, satisfactory to the State of Colorado, for the reason that it not only amends the compact which the States have already agreed to, but attempts to amend the Constitution of the State of Colorado. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska will say that that is not possible, that it sounds ridiculous. I will admit that I am not a lawyer; in fact, I boast of that fact a little. [Laughter.] What I know about irrigation I learned from the business end of an irrigation shovel. All our water experts and irrigation attorneys are agreed that the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska has brought into the bill at the eleventh hour would do the things which I claim it would do to Colorado's rights. So we are opposed to it.

The late Senator Adams was very much opposed to the amendment which the Senator from Nebraska has offered. He made his position very clear. I am sure all Senators will agree that the late Senator Adams was a very able attorney, that he was not an alarmist, that he was a realist, that he was well founded in the law, that he was well informed on Colorado irrigation law, that he never spoke unless he knew what he was speaking about. This is what Senator Adams had to say with respect to the legal aspects of this law, which I admit I am not capable of discussing myself. In the hearings in his committee he made this statement:

> There is involved a principle in these amendments—

Speaking of the Norris eleventh-hour amendments—

> far greater in importance, as I see it, than the compact itself, and I know the people in my State have that viewpoint. They entered into the compact with their sister States, through their duly authorized representatives, with the idea of preventing controversy among the States, settling their agreement as to water, and these amendments would say that the thing they did, the paper they signed, the document that the legislature approved, does not mean what it says—why, it is something that represents the full thought of our people.

He made this further statement:

> I am very hopeful that this committee—

Speaking of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation—

> will take the bill that Senator NORRIS introduced and which approved the compact and was reported out, and the compact can be approved or disapproved, and if there are things in it that ought not to be approved, they can be met squarely, and not seek, by a process of amendment or diverse action, to make the compact say things that those who drafted it did not mean it to say, and then to have the Congress approve the compact with an interpretation which would change it so that it would not be the compact that the legislature in my State approved—that is, if these amendments are attached to the bill.
>
> And, of course, I think it is beyond the function of the Congress to make the compact; the States can only make the compact with the approval of the Congress; and it is also beyond the power of Congress to amend the compact.

That was Senator Adams speaking. He had given this bill much thought.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator from Colorado if he claims what he has repeated several times; that is to say, that the amendments put in the bill by the House committee are, as he claims, "eleventh-hour Norris amendments." Does not the Senator from Colorado know that I never proposed an amendment anywhere to the bill? I accepted the House amendments. I thought they improved the bill, and I tried to get the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to agree to the House amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will withdraw the amendments, I will guarantee that the bill will pass the Senate in 5 minutes' time by unanimous vote.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Nebraska could not withdraw the amendments. I do not think the Senator from Colorado expects me to do a thing of that kind. I have a right to urge the amendments, and the Senator from Colorado has a right to oppose them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not criticizing him for opposing the amendments; but I have a right, also, to do what I can to get the Senate to pass the House bill. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not quarrel with the Senator. He has a right to do what he is doing, and perhaps more than a right; perhaps it is a duty and a responsibility, as he sees it. I am not complaining about that. But when the Senator insists upon his amendments——

Mr. NORRIS. I do not have any amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And when the Senator at the same time complains about the delay in the enactment of the bill, then I think it is my duty to call attention to the facts. We can settle this argument right now. I am willing to accept the proposal made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who represents one of the other States signatory to the compact. A moment ago the Senator from Kansas offered to move to substitute for the language of the House bill the language of the bill which the Senator from Nebraska originally introduced, and which subsequently was favorably reported by the committee. Colorado is willing to have the bill passed in the form in which the Senator from Nebraska originally introduced it. I do not know of anyone other than the Senator from Nebraska who is standing in the way of such action. If the Senator from Nebraska will agree to it, the action can be taken immediately.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Colorado know that the House of Representatives is standing in the way?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not think it is.

Mr. NORRIS. The measure before us is a House bill. The House of Representatives has passed it. The committee recommended it unanimously.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senate does not have to take the House bill like a dose of castor oil.

Mr. NORRIS. I know the Senate does not have to do so; but the Senator from Colorado wants me to agree to a bill. I do not have to agree to a thing over which I have no control; and, God knows, I do not want to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want the Senator to do so. I want him to agree to a motion which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has offered to make.

Mr. NORRIS. I would just as soon agree to do what the Senator suggests, take the Senate bill or nothing, and defeat the whole thing. That was the attitude of the committee—to take it just as it is, or else not to take anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; Colorado wants the compact approved.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. Colorado wants the compact approved without being amended. What we are objecting to is any amendment of the compact.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the House action amends the compact. However, if it does constitute an amendment, in my judgment it would become a nullity; because I do not claim that we have a right to amend the compact. I have cited precedents in other cases in which it has been said, "In doing this we do not deprive the Government of any of the rights it has under the Constitution."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have great respect for the legal opinion and for the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska; but Colorado attorneys who have made a life study of irrigation law say that the House action constitutes an amendment to the compact. The late Senator Adams, for whose legal ability I had great respect, stated, as I have already read to the Senate, that this is an amendment to the compact.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; gladly.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming for the sake of argument that it is an amendment, can the Senator from Colorado tell the Senate how it will hurt anyone? What damage can come from it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The State of Colorado does not want to acquiesce in action of that kind. The State of Colorado entered into the compact very seriously, and gave it great study.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REED. I desire to call the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska, for whom I have the most profound respect, to the fact that the Government departments seeking to work out amendments could not themselves agree as to the proper amendments. The Department of the Interior,

for example, offered certain amendments; the Federal Power Commission objects to the amendments offered by the Department of the Interior. In the governmental departments having jurisdiction over the various phases of this matter there is not a complete meeting of minds. That is the reason, Mr. President, why, in order to iron out the differences and to avoid delay, I made the suggestion; and at the proper time I shall move that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the Senate bill, which action would automatically send the bill to conference. That is the place to thrash out and iron out these differences.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me. I only desired to make that statement. I wished to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to what I said before—that between the departments of the Government there is no agreement on this subject.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, what of it; what difference does that make?

Mr. REED. That means we have to go ahead and use our own judgment.

Mr. NORRIS. Does that affect us at all? I do not know the facts about the matter the Senator has mentioned. If the various departments are in disagreement, I do not know about it, nor do I care. The House committee framed the amendments and the House passed the bill. They are responsible for it.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Nebraska had read the letters he would have found expressed in them the point I have just made.

Mr. NORRIS. I have read them, and I was at the meeting of the House committee on one of the days when the matter was discussed. The committee had subsequent meetings and hearings which I did not attend.

If the Senator from Colorado will permit me to do so, I should like to say that the amendment suggested by the Federal Power Commission was, in my judgment, objectionable because in its zeal it sought to amend the compact itself; and I think there is universal agreement among the attorneys, especially those of the committee, that it would be beyond our province to attempt to take such action, and that we should not do so. Therefore, there was adopted a modified amendment to the effect that nothing herein contained shall be construed to mean that the United States Government surrenders any right it may have in regard to interstate commerce or the regulation of interstate commerce on these waters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Nebraska for their contributions to the discussion.

I wish to make plain the position of Colorado. I believe the Senate of the United States ought to respect the State of Colorado, which is one of the sovereign States of the Union. We in Colorado worked out a compact with Kansas and Nebraska to the best of our ability. We gave and we took until the compact was agreed upon. Now, when it comes before the Senate of the United States, an effort is made to force upon the State of Colorado a compact which is absolutely unsatisfactory to the State of Colorado, to the people of the State, and to its legislature. The amendment which has been offered here—I shall not refer to it any further as "the eleventh-hour amendment," but as the late amendment, the recent amendment—is not satisfactory to Colorado. It was submitted to our Governor, it was submitted to our water experts, it was submitted to our conservation board, it was submitted to our legislature and voted down unanimously. That is the way we feel about it. It is unjust for the Congress to attempt to force such a measure upon the State of Colorado.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I asked the Senator the question before, and I should like to repeat it. Will he tell the Senate what harm it would do to the State of Colorado, and whether it would hurt Colorado any worse than it would hurt Kansas and Nebraska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know whether it would affect them any worse, but, of course, it is the business of those who represent Colorado to know how it would affect Colorado. I cannot speak for Kansas or Nebraska, but I can speak for Colorado.

I wish to refer to a statement by L. Ward Bannister, who has been a water expert for many years, who has had a great deal of experience in irrigation law; who has lectured at Harvard Law School for a number of years, and who also lectures at Denver University on the subject of irrigation law. He had considerable to do with working out the legal aspects insofar as Colorado is concerned of the Hoover Dam, which was recently built on the Colorado River. He is a man of national standing in irrigation law. This is what he says in a letter addressed to me:

> Just a few remarks on a bill calling for the ratification of the Republican River compact.
>
> I note that the House amended the measure in such wise as to subject the river to the navigation powers of the Congress. This I consider a very dangerous thing to the water interests of the States involved in the compact. Even if the Congress has the authority, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, to take away the waters of the States which are parties to the compact in order to satisfy some want of some kind further down the river system, it does not follow that the Congress has to exercise that power. It is a well-settled principle in the field of interstate-commerce law that where the Congress has not exercised a power, there the States may function until the Congress sees fit to exercise the power. Furthermore, the Congress may, if it wants to, declare a stream nonnavigable, thus serving the agricultural and other uses of water in the States to which a stream or a segment of a stream lies. There is a strong tendency right now on the part of the Government to socialize all of the waters of the Nation, and to do it pretty largely in favor of the generation of electrical energy on the lower reaches of stream systems. That is a tendency which, in the interests of irrigation and industrial uses in upper States, should be checked. Power may well be generated at any dam, but it should be subordinate to other uses above, since it is perfectly possible to generate power with coal whereas we cannot develop an agriculture on coal.
>
> Furthermore, I think that all bills for flood-control dams with appurtenant power-generation uses should contain provisions to the effect that the Government water uses connected with the dams should be subject to the laws of the particular State in which those water uses are situated. If we don't look out, we are going to find the upper States on every stream system in America obligated to let water go down to satisfy some comparatively unnecessary project way down below.

The letter is signed by L. Ward Bannister. I hope the statement by him gives the Senator from Nebraska the information which he seeks as to what it is that Colorado fears about this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator thinks that is an answer to the question I asked him, in my opinion, it is not an answer; and, in reply to what the Senator has just read, I want to ask him if for the last 75 years, ever since the region affected, the Republican River Basin, has been settled in any way, if the Federal Government has done the things the writer of the letter thinks it might do, and what reason has he to think that the Federal Government, even assuming that it had the right to do it, would deprive these States of the right to use this water for irrigation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In answer to the Senator's inquiry, let me say that the Colorado Constitution provides priorities for the use of water. The first use of water in our streams goes to domestic purposes, the second use is for irrigation and agriculture, and the third for manufacturing or power. We contend—our attorneys contend at least, and I am presuming that they know what they are talking about—that the provision which has been inserted in this bill by this amendment which is before us changes those priorities and seeks to make manufacturing or power supersede the other uses of water. That is the thing to which we object. I know the Senator from Nebraska does not believe it is going to hurt us in any way.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Like the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who has the floor, I am not a member of the bar, and so I will have to speak as a layman, and perhaps apologize for asking the question. The Senator from Colorado appears to be considerably concerned and worried over the division of the waters covered by the compact. Now let us forget all the legal technicalities, and get down to a few brass tacks, such as the Senator from Colorado and I, neither of us being members of the bar, would like to consider in the decision of a question of this kind. How much of the territory covered by

this compact is located in the State of Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So far as this particular bill is concerned, Colorado's interests are relatively small as compared with those of Nebraska; but the principle is important, and it is the principle for which we are fighting. Otherwise, we should not be here contesting on this matter.

Mr. BUTLER. On page 6 the principle is taken care of. I had nothing to do with writing the compact or with the insertion of the amendments, but I understand the English language; and on page 6, lines 9 to 13, the bill says:

> The use of the waters hereinabove allocated shall be subject to the laws of the State to which the allocations are made. No State shall have the right to dictate the method of distribution or place of use of the waters herein allocated to another State.

I do not see why we are quarreling about this matter. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the flood from which all this controversy arises occurred on May 30 or 31, 1935. One hundred and ten lives were lost in that flood. Not one of them was lost in the State of Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator is in error in that statement.

Mr. BUTLER. Was one life lost there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Several Colorado families were drowned in that flood.

Mr. BUTLER. Of the 110 lives lost, nearly all were lost in the State of Nebraska. I think the Senator from Colorado will agree with me in that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true.

Mr. BUTLER. And practically all the material flood damage was in the State of Nebraska. We are concerned with getting a compact so that the Federal agencies may proceed with a program that will bring some sort of relief to that corner of the State, which needs it badly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to ask the Senator a question at that point. Is he sufficiently concerned with getting a compact that he will agree to the original bill which was introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]? If he is sufficiently concerned with getting approval of the compact which was entered into by the States, and will agree to that point, I assure him that the bill will pass the Senate without a word of objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to the Senator that after spending a whole day in hearings before the House committee, the language in question was attached to the compact. Not one word of the compact was changed over the signatures of the various representatives of the three States concerned. Several clauses were added; but, to my simple way of thinking, there is not a line contained in the paragraphs which were added to the compact which in any way infringes the rights of the States concerned. In order to get this bill through and expedite matters, I should like to see done what the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] seeks to have done, namely, that we accept the House bill and get the President's signature to it and proceed with the work which for six and a half years the people in Nebraska have been praying would be started.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The prayers of the people of Nebraska will be answered if the Senator will yield on that point.

The junior Senator from Nebraska read from page 6. He also read from other pages of the bill. Colorado is in complete agreement on that point. All of that was approved by the parties to the compact, and Colorado has agreed to it. The only thing Colorado has not agreed to is section 2, beginning on page 11. That is the only point with which we are in disagreement. We are in perfect and complete agreement with everything from page 1 to line 9 on page 11. If the Senator from Nebraska will accept the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] to strike out everything after line 9 on page 11, he can have this bill for which his people are praying, which they have been looking forward to for so many years; but does the junior Senator from Nebraska believe that the Congress should take a compact and pick it to pieces and change its whole course and its whole purpose without giving the States concerned an opportunity to approve or disapprove of the compact?

Mr. BUTLER. In answer to the Senator's direct question, I will say that I do not see any reason or logic in many things Congress has done; and one of them is the 6½ years of delay in the adoption of a compact which has been agreed to by the three States concerned. I do not see that any material change is made in the terms of the compact by the paragraphs which are added, beginning with line 9 on page 11.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska is satisfied with the amendment. The people of Colorado are not satisfied with it.

The Senator states that it has taken many years to work out this compact, which is true, because these compacts are not easy to work out; but the States worked out the compact through the give-and-take method. They sent the compact to Congress. They wanted the Congress to approve the compact, and now Congress wants to amend the compact. Our people object to the amendment. We cannot accept it. It is not possible for us to accept it. Our water experts and our officials are unanimous on that point.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to yield the floor to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not wish to take the floor. I merely wish, if I may, to say a word in connection with the Senator's argument on this subject.

Is it not true that in the last 2 or 3 years Members of Congress from the irrigation States have had to recognize a tendency on the part of some Departments of the Government to encroach on the sovereign rights of their States in the control of irrigation waters? That is true, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is absolutely true. Some bureau in Washington, created by Congress, has been endeavoring to do that.

Mr. MURDOCK. They want to encroach on the sovereign rights of our States to the control of the waters within our States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I believe the Senator from Colorado will agree with me in the statement that there is nothing we can do by statutory enactment here in Congress that will enlarge the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, as provided in the Constitution, over the waters within the United States. I believe he will also agree with me that we can do nothing here that will affect the constitutions of our respective States on that very question. So are we not in the position, by this very amendment, of approving the tendency of some of our administrative departments which are trying to get the camel's nose under the tent so as to encroach on the rights of our respective States?

I take the position—and I think that if the late Senator Adams were here today he would agree with me on it—that we cannot enlarge the Federal powers over waters by statutory enactment, and that the separation of jurisdiction over waters as between the States and the Federal Government is fixed by the Constitution. But what the Senator from Colorado wants to guard against, and what the Senator from Wyoming wants to guard against, and what I want to guard against, coming, as I do, from an irrigation State, is any encroachment by Government departments upon our right to control the irrigation waters of our States. If we once allow an amendment of this kind to go into a bill, even though on its face it appears harmless, our acquiescence in such an amendment may be the very thing that some of these encroaching departments want in order to get a foothold.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for his very clear statement of the situation, with which I am in complete agreement. Furthermore, the State of Colorado is engaged in suits with Kansas as to the Arkansas River. We have had long-drawn-out suits with Nebraska as to the waters of the North Platte River. We have had suits with Wyoming regarding the waters of the Laramie River. These suits have cost us and are costing us at the present time hundreds of thousands of dollars. They constitute a continuous drain upon us. We are fighting for our rights. This amendment seems very simple on its face, and the two Senators from Nebraska seem to think it is perfectly harmless. If it is harmless, why do they not drop it? If it is harmless, it is of no effect.

This very amendment is more than likely to cause us expensive lawsuits with all of the States adjoining Colorado. That is another reason for our opposition to it.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. REED. I yield for that purpose, because if a call is to be made, I should rather have it made now than later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Barbour	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Herring	Schwartz
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smathers
Bridges	Hughes	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bulow	Kilgore	Taft
Bunker	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lee	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Norris	Wiley
Doxey	Nye	Willis
Ellender	O'Daniel	
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to preface what I am going to say by renewing the suggestion I made earlier today. There is a difference between the House committee bill and the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. In what I say I wish to be as brief as possible, because I think this is a matter which we ought to be able to dispose of promptly. The House passed a bill known as House bill 5945. The Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, then headed by the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, reported Senate bill 1361. The main subject of both bills is the same. The States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska have entered into a compact as to the disposition of water in the Republican River and its tributaries, that river running through the three States named. There was no great difference of opinion about the matter. Then came some amendments which were placed in the House bill that do not appear in the Senate bill. There is some question at least about one of those amendments. The Department of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission do not agree on the matter. The Department of the Interior desires to give as much weight as possible to what it terms the consumptive use of water, which means, for us, irrigation. The Federal Power Commission, having in mind perhaps the New River case, thinks that the power to regulate interstate commerce ought to take precedence over other considerations.

Mr. President, there is no more chance of navigating the Republican River than there is a chance of navigating Pennsylvania Avenue. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska says, "Well, if the provision in question is placed in the bill the Government will never do anything with the river." I suppose that is what the State of West Virginia thought before the decision in the New River case.

The irrigation States are afraid, and naturally and justifiably afraid, of the effect of the amendment. The late Senator from Colorado, our good friend who has gone, Senator Adams, was afraid of the amendment, and the effect it might have upon the use of water by the irrigation States. My own State of Kansas is not so greatly concerned about it. We do have some irrigation. We may have some more if we can have this compact approved and the Federal agencies and the State agencies can work together. I do not have any tremendously strong opinion on the matter either one way or the other, except that in one or two respects I do question the House bill, and if I have to stand on one bill or the other I prefer to stand on the Senate bill.

The suggestion I am going to make is a very simple one. The motion I am going to offer is a simple motion, one frequently made in committee, and possibly on the floor of the Senate. The House has passed its bill. If we pass the House bill there is no chance of further consideration of the matter here. We can get at this subject in one of two ways. One is by the way which I am going to suggest first—I am not making the motion yet, I am only describing what I shall do in a moment—by making a motion to strike out everything after the enacting clause in House bill 5945, and substituting for the language found therein the language of Senate bill 1361. The effect of that would be to send the bill to conference.

There is another way of getting at it, and that is to amend the House bill on the floor of the Senate. I am reluctant to proceed in that way, unless the amendment is a simple one, merely clarifying or corrective in character. I hestitate to try to amend a bill of any importance on the floor of the Senate. I very much prefer to have it done in conference.

We could get at the matter in a third way, that is by recommitting both bills to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. President, it seems to me the expeditious way would be to send the bill to conference, and I, therefore, move that all after the enacting clause in House bill 5945 be stricken out, and that there be substituted therefor the language of Senate bill 1361, which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of this body.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded?

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Nebraska, who has occupied a considerable amount of time, wish to speak further?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have no disposition to speak, unless the Senator from Kansas has concluded. Has the Senator made his motion?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I shall speak.

Mr. REED. Then I yield the floor to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not wish to obtain the floor in that way. The Senator from Kansas has no right to yield the floor to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. REED. I shall ask for recognition following the conclusion of the statement by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I will let the Senator from Kansas proceed if he wishes. I should like to hear the Senator talk further on the question. He seems to object to the Senator from Nebraska talking, but he himself does not want to talk now.

Mr. REED. I beg pardon of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, but I wish to say that I have not used more than 10 or 15 minutes, and the Senator has spoken for over an hour.

Mr. NORRIS. I am willing to have the Senator talk all afternoon.

Mr. REED. I should not want to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I should not want to force the Senator to do that even though it might be very enjoyable to the rest of us.

Mr. President, I wish to plead with the Senate not to agree to the motion which has been made. I know that if the motion is agreed to and the measure in the amended form adopted, it will go to conference. If the motion is not agreed to, and the House bill is passed as it is, the measure will go to the President for signature.

Mr. President, if the measure is sent to conference, the conference committee, in my opinion, will not be able to bring in a report for a long time. In the first place, I do not want such delay to occur, and, in the second place, I wish to say that there can be no possible objection to the so-called amendments which the House put in the bill.

I asked the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] two or three times to state in what way the amendments would hurt the State of Colorado, and I submit that he has not told us. He read a letter from an attorney, a very well-written letter, which I believe has no more to do with this question than the flowers that bloom in the spring. The attorney is afraid that if the House bill were passed the State of Colorado would be taken off the map. The same thing applies to Nebraska; so Colorado would be in good company if it should go off the map. As I remember the Senator's statement with respect to the provisions of the constitution of Colorado, I believe they are exactly the same as those contained in the constitution of the State of Nebraska.

Mr. President, someone has tried to inject the power question into this discussion. As I said before, I do not believe a single kilowatt of power will be developed by this project. I do not know how any power can be developed by it. It is not a power proposition. It is entirely an irrigation proposition. At the same time

I do not want to say to the Federal Government, "If you have any rights there, this legislation cuts them out." I am afraid that would be the result of the proposed action. It would even cut out the Reclamation Bureau.

Some Senators from the Western States have been talking about what a terrible enemy the Federal Government is to those States; that it is wickedly trying to destroy all their irrigation. As I see it, there is nothing of that kind involved in this measure. If there is a secret understanding involved, I do not know anything about it. I believe the amendments suggested by the Secretary of the Interior will improve the bill. I think that the amendment which was put in by the committee, which met the Power Commission's objection, was also an improvement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator says he has asked me repeatedly for a statement as to how the amendment put in by the House would adversely affect the State of Colorado. I have given him several reasons, but I should like to add two more reasons which Senator Adams advanced, which are more or less of a repetition.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator has already read them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Senator Adams said:

> Our people are never going to concede the right of the Federal Government to regulate the use of the water of my State or to change our State constitutional priorities in the use of water: first, for domestic use; second, for irrigation; and third, for manufacturing use.

In another statement by Senator Adams, on the 18th day of November last, he said, speaking to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]:

> Senator, neither you nor I want to in any way cloud the rights of our States by an implied recognition of things which our people do not want.

That was the statement of Senator Adams. It seems to me that those two reasons are a complete answer to the Senator from Nebraska in his request for reasons why Colorado objects to the proposed amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Reduced to a nutshell, the statements mean that Colorado does not want the bill. I presume that ever since the State of Colorado has had a constitution the provision read by the Senator from Colorado has been in it. All these years the State of Colorado has lived under the power—whatever it may be—of the Federal Government, and the Federal Government has never yet taken anything away from it.

This amendment would not change existing law. The only change would be in the provision for a method of amending the compact. I do not see how there could be any objection to that.

We have an amendment which simply says that nothing in the act shall deprive the Government of the United States of its authority to do what? To do what it has always been empowered to do. We have lived all these years with that terrible thing before our eyes. All the amendment does is to say that the power of the Federal Government shall not be changed.

The thing of which the Senator is afraid is absolutely a myth. There is nothing to it. If there were, our States in the West would not now exist. We are indebted to the Federal Government for some of the best things that ever happened to us. One of them is the reclamation law. The Federal Government provides a method of irrigation. Under the theory advocated by the Senator from Colorado, if the Federal Government should contemplate starting a project involving these particular waters—and there are such projects in the State of Nebraska today—it would stay out, because it would not know how much water it would be entitled to take in the State of Nebraska from any given stream running through Kansas or Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does not the Senator believe that Colorado should have something to say with respect to pacts into which it enters?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not contend that Colorado is any better than her sister States, does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Colorado is a party to this pact, and is interested in it.

Mr. NORRIS. I know that. We come to the House bill, which says that nothing in this pact shall be construed to take away any existing legal right of the Federal Government. That simply means that the proposed legislation will not change the conditions which have always existed. We have lived under this condition for years and have not suffered. If we adopt the proposed legislation we merely continue the existing situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If that wording does not change anything it is perfectly asinine to put it in.

Mr. NORRIS. It is already in. If the Senator does not want to take away any of the rights of the Federal Government, why object to such a provision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We want to remove it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That proves that it is not harmless.

Mr. NORRIS. The argument the Senator makes is that Colorado does not want it. I do not believe that that is a good reason. If these amendments do not hurt, and they are in, and we can obtain expedition by leaving them in, I should like to leave them in, even though I believe they have no effect.

There is only one reason on earth that I can see why Colorado objects to this language, and that is that it is expected that some day this action will be used as a precedent in connection with something which has nothing to do with these waters. We will be told, "Look at this compact. The Federal Government agreed that certain streams were not navigable," when under the law perhaps they would be technically navigable because they are connected with a navigable stream. It is desired to use the present case as a precedent. The language does not affect this case. It does not affect these waters. It does not affect Colorado in the use of these streams. Everyone has agreed that the division is fair. At least I know of no objection to it. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] now comes forward with an amendment which in effect would mean either no legislation or a long delay.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to correct him. He has made an incorrect statement of what the bill provides. Section 4 reads as follows:

> SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or affect any right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce or the jurisdiction of the United States in and over the waters of the Republican River Basin as defined in said compact, as navigable waters or otherwise; and the consent of Congress hereby given is with the express reservation that it does not constitute an admission or declaration by Congress that the Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Republican River Basin as so defined are not navigable.

In other words, the Federal Government must undertake—and by implication give the States the right to do so—to consider the waters of the Republican River as navigable. That is what we object to. As I stated awhile ago, the Republican River is no more navigable than is Pennsylvania Avenue. Many times catfish get dust in their eyes when they swim upstream. [Laughter.] Yet it is insisted that a provision be retained in the bill which, by strained construction, might permit the United States to exercise jurisdiction over the waters of the Republican River as navigable waters. The Senator from Nebraska did not correctly state the principal point involved in the amendment which I have just read.

Mr. NORRIS. If I have not stated it correctly, I presume the Senator from Kansas has stated it correctly. I do not object to his construction of it.

I still maintain, Mr. President, that the language the Senator has just read leaves the situation in status quo, so to speak. If the Federal Government has no such power now, that language does not give it such power. If the Federal Government has such power, it has had it for 50 years, and has never exercised it with respect to these waters. So, so far as these waters are concerned, the power is a nullity.

I cannot see any excuse for the opposition, except that it may be desired at some time in the future, in connection with some other legislative proposal, to use this measure as a precedent. In connection with waters in Maine, Massachusetts, Ohio, or Pennsylvania, we may be told, "Here is a compact which says that these rivers are not navigable. We agreed to it, and we are bound by it." That is the danger of it. This provision would

have no effect whatever. It would not change the situation which now exists and has existed ever since there has been a State of Nebraska, a State of Colorado, or a State of Kansas.

I cannot see any reason for the opposition. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4854. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H. R. 5074. An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROMJUE, Mr. BURCH, Mr. FLANNERY, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FULMER, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. HOPE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER—INTERSTATE COMPACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5945) granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brown	Connally
Andrews	Bulow	Danaher
Austin	Bunker	Davis
Bailey	Burton	Downey
Ball	Butler	Doxey
Bankhead	Byrd	Ellender
Barbour	Capper	George
Barkley	Caraway	Gerry
Bilbo	Chandler	Gillette
Brewster	Chavez	Glass
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	Green
Brooks	Clark, Mo.	Guffey
Gurney	Mead	Stewart
Hatch	Murdock	Taft
Herring	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Holman	Nye	Tobey
Hughes	O'Daniel	Truman
Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Tydings
Kilgore	Pepper	Vandenberg
La Follette	Radcliffe	Van Nuys
Langer	Reed	Wagner
Lee	Reynolds	Wallgren
Lodge	Rosier	Walsh
Lucas	Russell	Wheeler
McFarland	Schwartz	White
McKellar	Shipstead	Wiley
McNary	Smathers	Willis
Maloney	Smith	
Maybank	Spencer	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to make clear to the Members of the Senate that the issue involved in this controversy is of vital concern to the people of all the Western States which depend upon the use of water for the irrigation of their lands. I should also like to make it clear that in supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who represents one of the States signatory to the compact, I do not do so for the purpose of wrecking the compact, as the senior Senator from Nebraska seems to imagine, but for the purpose of providing for consideration by a conference committee of the issues here involved.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Merely for my own information, since I have been required to be absent from the floor because of attendance at a committee meeting, will the Senator explain what is the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Kansas has offered an amendment to strike out from the House bill all after the enacting clause, and to substitute in lieu thereof the text of the bill which was recommended by the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which is the bill, word for word, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I will develop it.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The controversy arises from the fact that certain amendments were offered to an identical bill in the House of Representatives, and those amendments, in the opinion of those who discussed this matter in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate, would have an adverse and hostile effect upon the right of the States to control their water supply in the constitutional manner.

The issue arises because of the fact that within a few months or weeks the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in what is known as the New River case, involving Federal power over the control of a certain stream, and in the New River case, without going into the technical details, the Supreme Court, upon which, as it happened, there was no member conversant with the particular laws of the Western States and the need of the States dependent upon irrigation——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Perhaps it is beside the point, but the Senator from Wyoming will recall that he and I and the other Senators from the Western States have insisted for some months—indeed, perhaps for years—that there should be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States who is familiar with the conditions to which the Senator has just adverted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have felt that way, of course; and I am not, in any sense, suggesting that the membership of the Court is anything but of the greatest dignity and ability or that it desires to render other than just decisions; but, in the New River decision, the Court went far beyond the demands of the Federal Power Commission, and, in effect, declared that a stream may be regarded as navigable, and, therefore, under the complete jurisdiction of the Federal Government, though, in fact, it is nonnavigable.

Right there is the gist of this controversy. The people of the State of Colorado, the Legislature of the State of Colorado, the Governor of the State of Colorado, the legislatures, the people, and the Governors of all the other Western States are fearful that an effort is being made by the amendments which were added in the House of Representatives to undermine and destroy the local rights of the people of those States to control their own waters for domestic purposes.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Did not the opinion of the court in the New River case do that very thing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid the Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Even though the court should have rendered that opinion, is it necessary for the Congress to go along and ratify it at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all. I do not quarrel with the development of the New River; but, as I have said, the decision of the court in that case went further than was necessary to support the position which the Federal Power Commission was taking, and, as a matter of fact, I know from the attorneys who presented the case that the decision was quite beyond their expectations or their desires or needs.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Supreme Court has practically abolished intrastate commerce, anyway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right, and it is for the protection of that right and to prevent acquiescence in such an unnecessary extension of the Federal power that the representatives of the Western States are here resisting these amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is responsible for attaching the amendments to the bill in the House of Representatives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They came from the Department of the Interior and the Federal Power Commission; and it is my opinion, though this I cannot testify with knowledge—it is my opinion that they were not objected to in the House because the Members of the House who felt as I do thought that this matter was going to be settled in a conference committee, where the whole quesion could be discussed.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the matter discussed upon the floor of the House?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not discussed upon the floor of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator give the Senate the source of his information on that subject? I never heard of it before.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator never heard of what before?

Mr. NORRIS. That the matter was going to be settled in a conference committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was present at a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, at which the Senator from Nebraska was also present, when, it is my recollection, that very statement was made.

Mr. NORRIS. Who made it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding it was made by the late Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams, and it is further my recollection that the Senator from Nebraska at that time said, "Well, what is the use of having a conference? The members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate will be the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wyoming, and they will judge against us no matter what."

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has stated it exactly as I understand it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly; and I will say, Mr. President, that when the Senator from Nebraska made the statement——

Mr. NORRIS. I stated what I thought the conference committee would do when they got the bill. That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the Senator from Nebraska made that statement against the late Senator from Colorado and against the present speaker, he was imputing false legislative motives to each of us.

Mr. NORRIS. I deny that, and the Senator, from anything I said, so far as I know, has no right to make that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did not the Senator just admit that he said the Senator from Wyoming would be one of the conferees and that his decision would be adverse?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, I understood that the conferees would be Senators who were opposed to the House bill, and of course, there was nothing wrong in my statement to that effect. I think they will be conferees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I definitely think there was. The Senator was judging my legislative action.

Mr. NORRIS. I saw the Senator performing there then, and I was justified in saying that the Senator was opposed to the House bill, was I not?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator from Wyoming is opposed to the House bill, but is not opposed to a settlement of this controversy in a committee where it may possibly be settled.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not care to propound a parliamentary inquiry, but I am very much interested in the discussion of the merits of the pending bill. I am not really concerned about what Senators say in committee, as to who shall be conferees, and so forth. May I suggest to the Senator from Wyoming that he proceed with the discussion of the proposed amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the rebuke of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I was not rebuking the Senator; I am simply interested in the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The statement to which I made response was made upon this floor, and my sole effort is not only to explain the elements of the controversy but also to insist to all my colleagues that if, by any chance whatsoever, I should be named a member of the conference committee upon this or any other subject, I would not go into the conference committee with my mind closed; that, I say, was the allegation which was made against me by the Senator from Nebraska, and I felt perfectly within the proprieties in responding to it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to say to the Senator from Wyoming that certainly I did not intend to rebuke him or the Senator from Nebraska, but I am very much interested in this bill, and I am very much concerned about the proposed amendment. I have not been at liberty to be on the floor and hear the explanations that have been made, and I should like very much to know the purport of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am endeavoring to the very best of my ability to make such an explanation, but when I am interrupted by Senators to ask questions of me or for this or for that, I must necessarily respond; but I shall proceed as rapidly as possible.

I say the source of the controversy is to be found in that decision of the Supreme Court, which went beyond what the Federal Power Commission had asked. So when the States of Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas entered into a compact, those States, by their representatives appointed for the purpose of negotiating the compact, by their legislatures and their Governors, approved the compact which was presented to this body for its approval by the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I speak for myself, I know I speak for the Senator from Colorado, I speak for the Senators who are members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation who reported that bill, when I say that they are now ready to support the measure introduced by the Senator from Nebraska. In supporting that bill—and the measure before us will be in that form if the motion of the Senator from Kansas is adopted—we are giving to Nebraska everything that is asked, but we are running no danger of taking away from other States rights over the waters that rise within their boundaries, the loss of which they most deeply fear.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I seek only information.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. I am more than hazy about the colloquies which have been taking place.

Was this amendment made in the House after the Supreme Court rendered the decision in the so-called New River case?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the opinion of the Supreme Court has been responsible for the additional amendment which seeks to give more power to the Interior Department—power that was never contemplated by the States when they made the original compact?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true. Not only that, Mr. President, but when the Western States were admitted to the Union, the acts which admitted them and the constitutions of the States which were afterward formally approved by the Congress, before the States were admitted, specifically announced the power of the States over the waters within their boundaries. Now the expansion of Federal power is gradually taking away those rights. They are local rights, Mr. President; they are State rights; they are the rights of the people; and when it is possible for the Central Government in Washington to reach out beyond the boundaries of other States and take away those rights, then, indeed, our system is being changed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have been busy attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate, and I could not be here at the beginning of this discussion. I should like to ask some questions.

Does this compact interfere in any way with the waters of States which are not parties to the compact?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it does not. The compact deals with the waters of the Republican River; but the amendments which are added would have the

effect of creating what the Senator from Nebraska has called a precedent, and if those of us who represent the Western States acquiesce in those amendments the time will come when it will be asked, "How do you defend local rights? Did you not on the 10th day of December 1941 acquiesce in an amendment proposed by the Department of the Interior, an amendment proposed by the Federal Power Commission, which has the effect of saying that all these waters are under the Federal jurisdiction?"

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator has passed the point where I wanted to interrupt him. He was discussing the value of the water rights within the States and the right of the States to control their own waters. As I say, he has passed that point; but the question occurred to me, as he was speaking on that subject: Is there any economic right—not a political right—that is more valuable to Western States than the right to control the waters within their own boundaries?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know of no more valuable right; and I know that if that right is lost, and if the determination of the use of waters is to be vested in the bureaus which Congress creates, the people we represent here will be deprived of their ability to protect themselves in their own homes, in the counties and the States where they live.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, the Federal Government now controls water for the purpose of navigation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And, as I understand, it also controls water for the purpose of building bridges and dams. What other power would the Federal Government desire, and for what other purpose could such power be used?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is the power of flood-control, and power to utilize the rivers for power purposes, and so forth. If the Senator will bear with me, I think I shall be able to make clear the grounds upon which the opposition is made.

I was pointing out that because of the imminent fear of the loss of the right to control their own streams and waters, the three States involved in this compact—Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado—wrote into it this language, which is to be found on page 3 of the bill:

> The Republican River and tributaries thereof within the basin, as hereinabove defined, are not navigable, and all uses of water of a consumptive nature, as hereinafter defined, wherever such uses may occur within the basin, shall constitute paramount uses.

The Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior, having in mind the decision in the New River case, undertook, by the amendments which were added in the House, to destroy that provision of the compact. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, in my own opinion, the declaration in the compact that the stream is not navigable is more or less immaterial. Whether a stream is navigable is a question of fact. It is not a question of legislative action or declaration; but the Federal Power Commission suggested this amendment, to be found in section 4, on pages 12 and 13:

> Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or affect any right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce.

Who ever imagined that any three States or the Congress of the United States could amend the Constitution of the United States? Why should the Federal Power Commission insert a reservation to the effect that "nothing herein contained" shall be deemed to impair the power of the United States over interstate commerce? It could not be done. Why make the declaration?

The section proceeds:

> Or the jurisdiction of the United States in and over the waters of the Republican River Basin as defined in said compact, as navigable waters or otherwise.

Here we have the very nubbin of the controversy, here is the foot in the door, here is the declaration, the legislative declaration, to which the Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior would like to have the acquiescence of Congress, so that we may set up a precedent, indeed, to come back to plague us in the future whenever on behalf of our own people we seek to assert control over the waters of those streams.

Mr. President, that is not the only amendment. There is the amendment contained in section 2, which was proposed, I am informed, by the Department of the Interior. Let me say parenthetically that, though I am a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, when it was summoned for the first time to consider the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] I called the clerk and was told that the committee was being summoned to meet for the purpose only of considering the bill of the Senator from Nebraska to give congressional approval to the compact. When I found that there were no amendments I said, "That is all right; count me for a quorum. I have no objection. Of course I will give my approval to that compact made by the sovereign States."

I had no dream that these amendments were in prospect. They had not been passed in the House, and it was not until the second meeting that I discovered what was going on. Then I found, during the meeting, the reasons which the Department of the Interior set forth for the amendments. A letter was filed by the Department in which it set forth its argument for section 2. I ask Senators now to give heed to the Department's letter. In the first place, the letter alleged that the compact was ambiguous, and then it proceeded:

> One point of ambiguity of this nature is found in the last paragraph of article 2 of the compact when this paragraph is considered in the light of the general ends sought to be reached by means of the compact. This ambiguity might leave open the question as to whether the United States by assenting to the compact, without qualification, would have precluded itself from asserting or acquiring rights to the diversion and use of waters in the basin.

Mr. President, that paragraph says only one thing, that the ambiguity, the alleged ambiguity, of the last paragraph of article 2 might have the effect of precluding the United States "from asserting or acquiring rights to the diversion and use of waters in the basin."

Now, let me read the language which is alleged to be ambiguous. I remind Senators that the Interior Department's letter refers to the last paragraph of article 2 of the compact. Senators will find that article on page 3 of the bill. Let me read it:

> Beneficial consumptive use shall be the basis and measure of the right to divert and use the natural waters of the basin, by the citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations of the signatory States, and upon this principle the following allocations of water herein made are predicated.

The right referred to in this paragraph to which the objection is made is the right of "citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations of the signatory States"—Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado. There is not a word in that paragraph which by any flight of the imagination can be called ambiguous. There is not a word in that paragraph which in any way, shape, or form interferes with any right of the Federal Government. Why was it inserted?

The letter of the Interior Department went further. It took exception to the language of articles 6, 7, and 8, dealing with the building of storage and diversion works in an upper State for the benefit of lower States; and here again ambiguity was alleged. It was urged that a reservation had to be made in order to protect the rights of the United States.

Mr. President, no person could have read this compact, which was ratified by the Legislature of Nebraska, the Legislature of Colorado, and the Legislature of Kansas, and imagined that in articles 6, 7, or 8 any word or phrase interfered with the rights of the United States. Let me read article 6:

> A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to construct or participate in the future construction and use of any storage reservoir or diversion works in an upper State for the purpose of regulating water herein allocated to such lower State, provided that such right is subject to the rights of the upper State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, to control, regulate, and use the waters herein allocated to it.

Where is the basis for the charge that it is necessary for the United States to make any reservation to protect itself? All this article of the compact does is to protect the rights of the people of the upper States to the waters allocated by the compact against the exercise of the authority of the lower signatory States. No power of the United States under interstate commerce, no power of the United States under the reclamation law, no power of the United States under the Federal Power Act, and none of the powers reserved to the United States by the Constitution or given to it by any law of Congress, is in the slightest degree interfered with by this article. The same is true of articles 7 and 8.

I read article VII:

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations—

The United States is not involved there—

shall have the right to acquire in an upper State by purchase, or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such easements and rights of way, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs, and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits, required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article VI; provided, however, the grantees of such rights shall pay to the governmental agencies in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights-of-way are occupied for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements so occupied, based upon the 10 years preceding the use of such lands, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said governmental agencies.

Observe, Mr. President, this article deals solely with the activity of a lower signatory state, its citizens, its agencies, its associations, and its corporations. It has nothing whatever to do with the power of the United States. It conveys to the States involved no new power. It takes no power away from the Federal Government. All it does is to effectuate an agreement among the people of the three States by which the waters of this stream may be utilized.

Then we have article VIII:

Should any facilities be constructed in an upper State under the provisions of article VI, such construction and the operation of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of such upper State.

Any repairs to or replacements of such facilities shall also be made in accordance with the laws of such upper State.

Mr. President, article VI is the basis upon which article VIII stands. Article VI deals solely with the action of the signatory state, its citizens, its agencies, its associations, and its corporations. Again I say that nobody, by any flight of the imagination, can properly contend that the power of the United States is in any way affected here.

So, Mr. President, we say that there is no reason on behalf of the United States to insert these reservations, because its rights are not affected by the compact, and, therefore, the only reason for putting them in is the desire of some bureaucrat to extend the power which his bureau now exercises by virtue of the acts of Congress into areas not now covered.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] said that these reservations are meaningless. He says, and I think he is correct—I say it myself—that nothing in these reservations can change the situation. But, Mr. President, let us acquiesce in these reservations, and all that we who represent the Western States can take back to our constituents is a lawsuit. We will say to them, "Now you can go into court and fight it out." Is that what we want to do? Is that what Colorado wants? Is that what Kansas wants? Is that what Nebraska wants?

I know that I would not be properly representing the people of my State if I should stand here and give my consent to the adoption of these reservations, presented as they are in this manner.

Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate clearly and deeply the desire of the eminent and distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to have this compact ratified. I know how much it means to the people of Nebraska, and I am ready indeed to cooperate to the fullest extent of my ability to bring about the approval of the compact so long as it does not contain any language which may be interpreted as carrying any acquiescence in an extension of the Federal power. If we are to extend the Federal power, let us do it openly, let us do it understandingly.

Mr. GLASS. Let us not do it at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to have had the interruption from the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], "Let us not do it at all." With that, I agree. Aye, Mr. President, the very basic cause of all the troubles that are racking the world today is the loss of local economic and political power. Shall we upon the floor of the Senate, the Chamber which represents all States, acquiesce in the surrender of the power of the people who sent us here? Mr. President, I cannot do that; I will not do that. I shall stand here proclaiming the sovereign right of the State which sent me until that State either sends another representative or changes its concept of its local rights.

At the outset I pointed to the fact that this bill, with these amendments, was passed in the House of Representatives on December 1, the day upon which the then senior Senator from Colorado, the late Senator Adams, passed away. The Members of the House from Colorado, having learned early that morning of the disaster which had afflicted their State, were not in a position to give heed to the passage of bills upon the calendar. It was stated here that perhaps a member from Colorado moved the adoption of those amendments.

Mr. President, the record is to be found on page 9268 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 1:

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5945, granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Then the bill is set forth at length. There is not a word of debate; not a suggestion from any Member of the House. The Representatives from Colorado, who were following the lead of their distinguished senior Member, all stricken by sorrow, had nothing to say, though I know personally that every one of them was as opposed to these amendments as I am as I speak here this afternoon, or as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose the Senator has reference to what I said this afternoon in debate about a Member of the House from Colorado moving to approve the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I was referring—and I think the RECORD will sustain me—to the Committee on Irrigation of the House. I modified the statement by saying that I was so informed. I do not personally know it. I was not there. I was informed that in the committee the motion to approve and favorably report the bill we are now considering was made by a Member of the House from the State of Colorado, who was on the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the statement of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No one in Colorado holding any official position whatsoever is in favor of the amendment which is now pending to the compact bill. The Governor, the State legislature, and every Member of the Colorado delegation in Congress, both in the Senate and in the House, are unanimously opposed to the amendment which is now pending.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say again what I said earlier today, that my whole purpose has been to have these amendments heard by a committee of conference, where they can be analyzed, and where the people of the State of Colorado may protect themselves. I have not asked that this bill be sent back to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

After the bill had been ordered reported in the first instance, the late senior Senator from Colorado, before he discovered that these amendments were being added, stated to me that he had no intention of delaying consideration in the committee; and he carried out his word. He called the committee immediately into session; and the committee, acting at his request, reported the bill and it went on the calendar. It was the bill which had been introduced by the Senator from Nebraska, without the amendments which have created the controversy. It was on the calendar.

Now we are asked to pass the House bill with these objectionable amendments, so that the bill may go immediately to the President. I object to that. I desire to have carried out the original understanding which was expressed to me by the Senator from Colorado, and I think expressed to the Senator from Nebraska, that this matter should be settled in conference.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that originally the three States entered into a compact dealing with the subject matter now before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. What would happen to the compact in the event this amendment were placed upon it, so far as the States are concerned? Would it be necessary to send it back for ratification to the States, or could we, as a legislative body,

amend something that the States have already entered into without obtaining further ratification from the States themselves?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In answer to the Senator's question, it is my opinion that the amendments, which seem to go to the very essence of the compact and to change its terms, would legally destroy the effectiveness of the compact, and would in all common sense and logic require a resubmission to the legislatures of the States, because by adding these amendments we are approving something that the States did not approve. As I stated a moment ago, all we would do by action of that kind would be to present to our people a lawsuit.

Mr. LUCAS. This is merely a curbstone opinion, but it seems to me that if the States originally entered into a compact which was sent to the Congress of the United States for its approval or disapproval, and subsequently there is any material change which affects the compact in any way whatsoever, certainly it is not then a compact between the States, but is something else. It strikes me as only common sense—and that is all law is—that ultimately the States would have to ratify whatever material change the Congress might make in the original compact before the compact could become effective as a legal instrument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for that interjection. It is my own belief that the Senator from Nebraska, instead of demanding the passage of this bill with the amendments, ought to be cooperating with us to secure the passage of the bill as he originally introduced it. Then, there would be no question of any change in the compact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If there is any way by which the State of Colorado can call this compact back for further study because of the changes that have been made in it, we certainly intend to do so. The compact which is being forced upon us by Congress is absolutely unsatisfactory to us. We entered into one compact, and we now find that we have a different compact. If there is any way on earth of getting that compact back into our hands again we must do so for our own protection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for his interruption.

Mr. President, I wish to read from the record of the committee hearings. I am quoting words which were attributed by the stenographer to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]:

Senator NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I heard what you said about getting this through by agreement.

The chairman was the late Senator Adams of Colorado.

I would like to do that. I do not want to have a scrap on the floor of the Senate if we can avoid it and, as you say, have it settled in conference.

Now, I realize that that means, as far as the Senate is concerned—I am not on this committee, and I will not be on the conference committee, of course, but the chairman of this meeting, now presiding, will be a member of the conference committee, and I presume the Senator from Wyoming will be a member of the conference committee.

At that point I interrupted, and I am quoted by the stenographer as saying:

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have no reason to expect that.

Senator NORRIS. I do; so, when we get into conference, if you are going to have the conference settle it, as far as every Senator is concerned, it is represented by conferees who do not want any of these amendments——

Senator ADAMS (interposing). I assume the conference will represent the views of the Senate, whatever they may be.

Senator NORRIS. That is supposed to be the theory.

Senator ADAMS. And Senator BANKHEAD, being the chairman, will act in that capacity and, because he is the ranking man, would, I assume, make the customary suggestion to the Vice President who would appoint the conferees. Now, I do not know what appointments might be made.

Mr. President, I know that when the late Senator Adams made that statement he meant it; and I know that when I made the statement, that I had no reason to expect that I would be on the conference committee, I meant it. I do not know now who will be the members of the conference committee.

For my own part, I am ready to surrender any right I may have to serve upon the conference committee, saving only that I may have the right to appear before it. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] will not be on the conference committee. Colorado will not be represented on the conference committee, and I do not believe there is any reason for any Senator, including even the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], to suspect that the conference committee appointed by the Senate and the House will not fairly and honestly assess the issues involved in this question.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Kansas may prevail and that this controversial matter may go before the conference committee for solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Guffey
Austin	Caraway	Gurney
Ball	Chandler	Hatch
Bankhead	Chavez	Herring
Barbour	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Barkley	Connally	Holman
Bilbo	Danaher	Hughes
Brewster	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Doxey	La Follette
Brown	Ellender	Lee
Bunker	George	Lodge
Burton	Gerry	Lucas
Butler	Glass	McKellar
Byrd	Green	McNary
Maybank	Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah
Mead	Reed	Tobey
Murdock	Reynolds	Tunnell
Murray	Rosier	Van Nuys
Norris	Schwartz	Wallgren
Nye	Shipstead	Walsh
O'Mahoney	Spencer	Wheeler
Overton	Taft	Wiley
Pepper	Thomas, Okla.	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Chair please state the question upon which the Senate is about to vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which, as the Chair understands, is that everything after the enacting clause in H. R. 5945 be stricken and that the language of Senate bill 1361, introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], be substituted. Senators desiring to reject the House amendments will vote "yea," and those desiring to sustain the House amendments will vote "nay."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Chair has just stated the question, but may I put it in this way and ask if I am not correct, that those who desire to vote for the Senate amendment as offered by the Senator from Kansas will vote "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. REED. May I add to the explanation of the Senator from New Mexico that the principal purpose of the motion I made was to send this bill to conference, where the conferees will have a chance to support the views of the Senate as expressed in Senate bill 1361, reported by the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senator from Kansas to the fact—and when I do so, I think he will modify his motion—that the Senator has moved to strike out something introduced by Senator NORRIS. I do not think that ought to be in the motion.

Mr. REED. If I said that, I withdraw it.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Senators said it, but that is the way the Chair stated the question.

Mr. REED. What I said was, the Senate bill, which had been reported favorably by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I do not think I referred to the Senator from Nebraska at all.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Senator did; but I do not think the words I have indicated should be in the motion, anyway.

Mr. REED. They are not.

Mr. NORRIS. The Chair seems to think they are. That is what I am complaining about. The motion of the Senator from Kansas is that the House bill which we have been considering all afternoon be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the language of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is exactly as the Chair stated it. Is there any other question?

Mr. NORRIS. Several Senators made inquiry of me, I presume because of the fact that the Chair stated the amendment as being the bill introduced by the

Senator from Nebraska, and that made some Senators who had not heard the debate think that I was in favor of the motion because the bill was introduced by me, when, as a matter of fact, I have been trying all afternoon to convince the Senate that that bill ought to be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The amendment of Mr. REED was to strike out:

That, subject to the provisions of section 2 hereof, the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, which compact reads as follows:

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, hereinafter designated as Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, respectively, desiring to remove any and all causes, present or future, which might lead to controversies with respect to use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, and being actuated by considerations of interstate comity, and by a desire to effectuate an equitable division of the waters of the Republican River Basin and the efficient beneficial consumptive uses thereof, and in consideration of the mutual advantages resulting therefrom within their respective boundaries, and pursuant to acts of their respective legislatures, have resolved to conclude a compact for the attainment of these purposes, and to that end, through their respective Governors, have named as their respective commissioners for the negotiating of such a compact:

M. C. Hinderlider, for the State of Colorado, George S. Knapp, for the State of Kansas, and Wardner G. Scott, for the State of Nebraska, who have agreed upon the following articles, to wit:

ARTICLE I

The Republican River Basin, hereinafter referred to as the "Basin," is herein designated to mean all the area in the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which is naturally drained by the Republican River and all of its tributaries to its junction with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas, a map of which signed by the commissioners hereinabove named, is attached hereto and by reference made a part thereof.

The Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Basin, as hereinabove defined, are not navigable, and all uses of water of a consumptive nature, as hereinafter defined, wherever such uses may occur within the Basin, shall constitute paramount uses.

ARTICLE II

The term "Virgin Water Supply," as herein used, is defined to be the water supply within the Basin undepleted by the activities of man.

The term "Beneficial Consumptive Use" is herein defined to be that use by which the natural water supply of a drainage basin is consumed by the activities of man, and shall include water consumed by evaporation from reservoirs, canals, ditches, and irrigated areas.

Beneficial consumptive use shall be the basis and measure of the right to divert and use the natural waters of the Basin, by the citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations of the signatory States, and upon this principle the following allocations of water herein made are predicated.

ARTICLE III

There is hereby allocated to Colorado for use annually a total of 54,100 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described, and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin 10,000 acre-feet.

Arikaree River drainage basin, 15,400 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 25,400 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

In addition thereto there is hereby allocated to Colorado for use annually the entire water supply of the Frenchman and Red Willow Creek drainage basins in Colorado.

There is hereby allocated to Kansas for use annually a total of 190,300 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

Arikaree River drainage basin, 1,000 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 23,000 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 500 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,400 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 12,600 acre-feet;

The main stem of the Republican River at the Nebraska-Kansas State line, 138,000 acre-feet; provided that Kansas shall have the right to divert all or any portion thereof at or near the town of Guide Rock, Nebr.;

And in addition thereto there is hereby allocated to Kansas for use annually the entire water supply originating in the Basin below the Nebraska-Kansas State line.

There is hereby allocated to Nebraska for use annually a total of 234,500 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinfter described and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 11,000 acre-feet;

Frenchman River drainage basin in Nebraska, 52,800 acre-feet;

Rock Creek drainage basin, 4,400 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 2,600 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 800 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 1,200 acre-feet;

Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 4,200 acre-feet;

Medicine Creek drainage basin, 4,600 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,700 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 2,100 acre-feet;

The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the Colorado-Nebraska State line and the Nebraska-Kansas State line, and from the small tributaries thereof, 132,000 acre-feet.

The use of the waters hereinabove allocated shall be subject to the laws of the State to which the allocations are made. No State shall have the right to dictate the method of distribution or place of use of the waters herein allocated to another State.

ARTICLE IV

The specific allocations in acre-feet made to each signatory State by article III are derived from the computed average annual virgin water supply originating in the following designated drainage basins in the amounts shown:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 44,700 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 19,610 acre-feet;

Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 7,890 acre-feet;

Rock Creek drainage basin, 11,000 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 57,200 acre-feet;

Frenchman River drainage basin, 98,500 acre-feet;

Blackwood Creek drainage basin, 6,800 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 7,300 acre-feet;

Red Willow Creek drainage basin, 21,900 acre-feet;

Medicine Creek drainage basin, 50,800 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 16,500 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 21,400 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 27,600 acre-feet;

The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the Colorado-Nebraska State line and the Nebraska-Kansas State line and the small tributaries thereof, 87,700 acre-feet.

Should the future computed virgin water supply of any source vary more than 10 percent from the virgin water supply as hereinabove set forth, the allocations herein made from such source shall be increased or decreased in the relative proportions that the future computed virgin water supply of such source bears to the computed virgin water supply used herein.

ARTICLE V

The judgment and all provisions thereof in the case of *Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer of the State of Colorado, et al.*, v. *The Pioneer Irrigation Company*, decided June 5, 1922, and reported in 259 U. S. 498, affecting the Pioneer Irrigation ditch or canal, are hereby recognized as binding upon the signatory States hereto and the people of each said States, and Colorado, through its duly authorized officials, shall have the perpetual and exclusive right to control and regulate diversions of water at all times by said canal in conformity with said judgment.

The water decrees heretofore adjudicated to said Pioneer Canal by the District Court of Colorado in the amount of 50 cubic feet per second of time is included in and is a part of the total amounts of water hereinbefore allocated to the States of Colorado and Nebraska.

ARTICLE VI

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to construct or participate in the future construction and use of any storage reservoir or diversion works in an upper State for the purpose of regulating water herein allocated to such lower State, provided that such right is subject to the rights of the upper State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, to control, regulate, and use the waters herein allocated to it.

ARTICLE VII

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to acquire in an upper State by purchase, or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such easements and rights of way, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs, and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits, required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article VI: *Provided, however*, the grantees of such rights shall pay to the governmental agencies in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights of way are occupied for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed

against the lands and improvements so occupied, based upon the 10 years preceding the use of such lands, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said governmental agencies.

ARTICLE VIII

Should any facilities be constructed in an upper State under the provisions of article VI, such construction and the operation of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of such upper State.

Any repairs to or replacements of such facilities shall also be made in accordance with the laws of such upper State.

ARTICLE IX

It shall be the duty of the three signatory States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact.

ARTICLE X

The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Republican River Basin constitute the basis for this compact, and none of the signatory States hereby concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

ARTICLE XI

This compact shall become operative when ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress of the United States. Notice of ratification by the legislature of a State shall be given by the Governor of such State to the Governors of the other States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the Governors of the signatory States of consent by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

Done in the city of Denver, in the State of Colorado, on the 19th day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1941.

M. C. HINDERLIDER,
Commissioner for Colorado.
GEORGE S. KNAPP,
Commissioner for Kansas.
WARDNER G. SCOTT,
Commissioner for Nebraska.

SEC. 2. (a) The foregoing compact shall not be construed (i) to impair or affect in any sense any rights or powers of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, in and to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin or the capacity of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to acquire rights in and to the use of waters of said basin; (ii) to subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities to taxation by any State, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes, nor to subject such property to the laws of any State if such laws do not otherwise apply.

(b) The Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio, with the officials of the signatory States referred to in article IX of the compact in the execution of the duty of these officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of water facts necessary for the proper administration of the compact, and may perform such other services related to the compact, as may be mutually agreed on with the said officials of the signatory States.

SEC. 3. The consent of the Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact amending the Republican River Compact: *Provided*, That a suitable person shall be appointed by the President of the United States to participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and to make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: *Provided further*, That such amendatory compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or affect any right of the United States to regulate interstate commerce or the jurisdiction of the United States in and over the waters of the Republican River Basin as defined in said compact, as navigable waters or otherwise; and the consent of Congress hereby given is with the express reservation that it does not constitute an admission or declaration by Congress that the Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Republican River Basin as so defined are not navigable.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the entry by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska into a compact with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, which reads as follows:

REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

The States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska hereinafter designated, as Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, respectively, desiring to remove any and all causes, present or future, which might lead to controversies with respect to use of the waters of the Republican River Basin, and being actuated by considerations of interstate comity, and by a desire to effectuate an equitable division of the waters of the Republican River Basin and the efficient beneficial consumptive uses thereof, and in consideration of the mutual advantages resulting therefrom within their respective boundaries, and pursuant to acts of their respective legislatures, have resolved to conclude a compact for the attainment of these purposes, and to that end, through their respective Governors, have named as their respective commissioners for the negotiating of such a compact:

M. C. Hinderlider, for the State of Colorado,

George S. Knapp, for the State of Kansas, and

Wardner G. Scott, for the State of Nebraska, who have agreed upon the following articles, to wit:

ARTICLE I

The Republican River Basin, hereinafter referred to as the "Basin," is herein designated to mean all the area in the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which is naturally drained by the Republican River and all of its tributaries to its junction with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas, a map of which signed by the commissioners hereinabove named, is attached hereto and by reference made a part thereof.

The Republican River and tributaries thereof within the Basin, as hereinabove defined, are not navigable, and all uses of water of a consumptive nature, as hereinafter defined, wherever such uses may occur within the Basin, shall constitute paramount uses.

ARTICLE II

The term "virgin water supply," as herein used, is defined to be the water supply within the basin undepleted by the activities of man.

The term "beneficial consumptive use" is herein defined to be that use by which the natural water supply of a drainage basin is consumed by the activities of man, and shall include water consumed by evaporation from reservoirs, canals, ditches, and irrigated areas.

Beneficial consumptive use shall be the basis and measure of the right to divert and use the natural waters of the basin by the citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations of the signatory States, and upon this principle the following allocations of water herein made are predicated.

ARTICLE III

There is hereby allocated to Colorado for use annually a total of 54,100 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described, and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 10,000 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 15,400 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 25,400 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

In addition thereto there is hereby allocated to Colorado for use annually the entire water supply of the Frenchman and Red Willow Creek drainage basins in Colorado.

There is hereby allocated to Kansas for use annually a total of 190,300 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

Arikaree River drainage basin, 1,000 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 23,000 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 500 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,400 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 12,600 acre-feet;

The main stem of the Republican River at the Nebraska-Kansas State line, 138,000 acre-feet; provided that Kansas shall have the right to divert all or any portion thereof at or near the town of Guide Rock, Nebr.;

And in addition thereto there is hereby allocated to Kansas for use annually the entire water supply originating in the basin below the Nebraska-Kansas State line.

There is hereby allocated to Nebraska for use annually a total of 234,500 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter described and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 11,000 acre-feet;

Frenchman River drainage basin in Nebraska, 52,800 acre-feet;

Rock Creek drainage basin, 4,400 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 2,600 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 800 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 1,200 acre-feet;

Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 4,200 acre-feet;

Medicine Creek drainage basin, 4,600 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,700 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 2,100 acre-feet;

The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the Colorado-Nebras-

kn State line and the Nebraska-Kansas State line, and from the small tributaries thereof, 132,000 acre-feet.

The use of the waters hereinabove allocated shall be subject to the laws of the State to which the allocations are made. No State shall have the right to dictate the method of distribution or place of use of the waters herein allocated to another State.

ARTICLE IV

The specific allocations in acre-feet made to each signatory State by article III are derived from the computed average annual virgin water supply originating in the following designated drainage basins in the amounts shown:

North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 44,700 acre-feet;

Arikaree River drainage basin, 19,610 acre-feet;

Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 7,890 acre-feet;

Rock Creek drainage basin, 11,000 acre-feet;

South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 57,200 acre-feet;

Frenchman River drainage basin, 98,500 acre-feet;

Blackwood Creek drainage basin, 6,800 acre-feet;

Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 7,300 acre-feet;

Red Willow Creek drainage basin, 21,900 acre-feet;

Medicine Creek drainage basin, 50,800 acre-feet;

Beaver Creek drainage basin, 16,500 acre-feet;

Sappa Creek drainage basin, 21,400 acre-feet;

Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 27,600 acre-feet;

The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the Colorado-Nebraska State line and the Nebraska-Kansas State line and the small tributaries thereof, 87,700 acre-feet.

Should the future computed virgin water supply of any source vary more than 10 percent from the virgin water supply as hereinabove set forth, the allocations herein made from such source shall be increased or decreased in the relative proportions that the future computed virgin water supply of such source bears to the computed virgin water supply used herein.

ARTICLE V

The judgment and all provisions thereof in the case of *Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer of the State of Colorado, et al.* v. *The Pioneer Irrigation Company*, decided June 5, 1922, and reported in 259 U. S. 498, affecting the Pioneer Irrigation ditch or canal, are hereby recognized as binding upon the signatory States hereto and the people of each said States, and Colorado, through its duly authorized officials, shall have the perpetual and exclusive right to control and regulate diversions of water at all times by said canal in conformity with said judgment.

The water decrees heretofore adjudicated to said Pioneer Canal by the District Court of Colorado in the amount of 50 cubic feet per second of time is included in and is a part of the total amounts of water hereinbefore allocated to the States of Colorado and Nebraska.

ARTICLE VI

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to construct or participate in the future construction and use of any storage reservoir or diversion works in an upper State for the purpose of regulating water herein allocated to such lower State, provided that such right is subject to the rights of the upper State, its citizens, agencies, associations. and corporations, to control, regulate, and use the waters herein allocated to it.

ARTICLE VII

A lower signatory State, its citizens, agencies, associations, and corporations, shall have the right to acquire in an upper State by purchase, or through exercise of the power of eminent domain, such easements and rights-of-way, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits, required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article VI: *Provided, however*, The grantees of such rights shall pay to the governmental agencies in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights-of-way are occupied for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements so occupied, based upon the 10 years preceding the use of such lands, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said governmental agencies.

ARTICLE VIII

Should any facilities be constructed in an upper State under the provisions of article VI, such construction and the operation of such facilities shall be subject to the laws of such upper State.

Any repairs to or replacements of such facilities shall also be made in accordance with the laws of such upper State.

ARTICLE IX

It shall be the duty of the three signatory States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact.

ARTICLE X

The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Republican River Basin constitute the basis for this compact, and none of the signatory States hereby concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

ARTICLE XI

This compact shall become operative when ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress of the United States. Notice of ratification by the legislature of a State shall be given by the Governor of such State to the Governors of the other States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the Governors of the signatory States of consent by the Congress of the United States.

In witness whereof, the Commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

Done in the city of Denver, in the State of Colorado, on the 19th day of March, in the year of our Lord, 1941.

M. C. HINDERLIDER,
Commissioner for Colorado,
GEORGE S. KNAPP,
Commissioner for Kansas,
WARDNER G. SCOTT,
Commissioner for Nebraska.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is necessarily absent; but I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is absent on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] has a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. These Senators are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The Senators are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—53

Austin	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Glass	Reed
Barbour	Green	Reynolds
Bilbo	Guffey	Rosier
Brewster	Gurney	Schwartz
Bridges	Hatch	Shipstead
Bunker	Herring	Spencer
Byrd	Hughes	Taft
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	

NAYS—16

Aiken	Capper	Norris
Ball	Hill	Nye
Barkley	Holman	Pepper
Brown	La Follette	Tobey
Burton	Lee	
Butler	McNary	

NOT VOTING—26

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bailey	Kilgore	Stewart
Bone	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	McCarran	Truman
Bulow	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	O'Daniel	Wagner
Gillette	Russell	White
Hayden	Smathers	

So Mr. REED's amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is not open to further amendment, but it is open to further debate.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1361 will be indefinitely postponed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIANS—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on April 22, 1941, I introduced Senate bill 1367, for the relief of certain Indians. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYSTEM OF LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1057) to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MEAD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment and promotion, under the provisions of law, and an officer for appointment, by transfer, all in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. With the exception of the name of Jess H. Miller, to be postmaster at Natona, Kans., which I ask to have passed over, I ask unanimous consent that all postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Jess H. Miller to be postmaster at Natona, Kans., will be passed over; and, without objection, the other postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations made yesterday and today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified forthwith.

THE ARMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have just reported, from the Committee on Military Affairs, some routine Army nominations, and I ask that they be given immediate consideration.

Mr. MCNARY. Are they merely routine?

Mr. REYNOLDS. They are appointments and promotions in the Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. MCNARY. I am always willing to have routine nominations acted upon, but others should go to the calendar. I leave it to the good judgment and fairness of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that they are all routine.

Mr. MCNARY. I note that some are nominations of captains and majors, which I do not consider routine, and, therefore, they should go to the calendar. I want all these nominations to go to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 11, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 10, 1941:

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Sidney W. Reinmiller, Atlanta.
Iona M. Blair, Leaf River.
Sarah A. Withrow, McLean.
Basil Bennett, Shawneetown.

KANSAS

Elbert C. Carrico, Beloit.
Frank F. Pauls, Buhler.
Harrison Peter Landes, Kirwin.
Cecil L. Hinds, Mound Valley.

LOUISIANA

Walter L. Huckabay, Bienville.
Joseph W. Stegall, Delhi.
Hall S. Rogers, Grand Cane.
Jesse L. Beasley, Harrisonburg
Alvin C. Brunson, Mangham.
Minnie Jewel Perry, Ringgold.
Miles Kern Hartsell, Rodessa.
Dewey W. Payne, Springhill.
Stellie F. Milstead, Sterlington.
Stephen O. Wilson, Vivian.
Nannie H. Rogillio, Water Proof.

NEW JERSEY

Frank A. Hynes, North Bergen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O, Thou who art the judge of all men, and the truth by which we are judged, keep us deeply conscious of the inevitable law that whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. As we pass through the doorway of this day remind us of Him who bore our afflictions and suffered for us. Allow us not to be weakened by the sins of revenge, vainglory, nor greed; let Thy spirit move upon us with generous pity, yet with a vow of solemn duty.

We look upon the valley and it is dark, we lift our eyes to the horizon and it is dim. Blessed Lord, give us faith to believe that we see a star with healing in its beams. Establish our country in courage, patience, and in obedience, lifting our people above the corroding and false criticism which emerges from an essence which is irreconcilable with the traditions of our democracy. God bless America and the Congress, and in all situations grant that they may furnish every evidence of integrity which definite paths of duty can evoke. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 527. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 529. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 2297. An act to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions;

H. R. 2799. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

H. R. 3149. An act providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty;

H. R. 4495. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 4871. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5377. An act to amend section 111, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5476. An act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5509. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase or accept as gifts motorboats, yachts, and similar vessels for Coast Guard use;

H. R. 5694. An act to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photo-

graphing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 217. An act to authorize the town of Jupiter, Fla., to lease certain land patented to such town pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the Act of July 3, 1926;

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse;

S. 828. An act to increase the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State of Idaho for educational purposes by the act of July 3, 1890;

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson;

S. 1240. An act designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day;

S. 1412. An act to amend the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted land;

S. 1630. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps;

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes;

S. 1850. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, decorations, and presents as have been tendered them by governments of the Western Hemisphere, other than Canada;

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria;

S. 1943. An act to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Thomas Orgo;

S. 1957. An act to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes;

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey;

S. 1974. An act for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson;

S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries;

S. 1995. An act to amend the act approved June 23, 1938, entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes";

S. 2011. An act for the relief of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency;

S. 2026. An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers;

S 2028. An act to amend section 3 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), so as to transfer the administration of the naval supply depot, Oakland, to the commandant, twelfth naval district;

S. 2032. An act to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract;

S. 2047. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a board of public welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps;

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations; and

S. 2090. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to such other persons as may be specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Navy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute an easement deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River;

H. R. 1057. An act to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees;

H. R. 2611. An act to release all the interest of the United States in certain land constituting a portion of the right-of-way granted to the Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of July 1, 1862, as amended and supplemented;

H. R. 3193. An act validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way, in the city of Tracy, in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and in the town of Elk Grove, in the county of Sacramento, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356);

H. R. 4854. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 4932. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo.;

H. R. 5095. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians;

H. R. 5726. An act to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday.

DEFENSE HOUSING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following resolution (H. Res. 382) on the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended (Rept. No. 1490), which was read and referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Illinois have another rule he desired to file?

Mr. SABATH. The Committee on Rules has reported out another rule. It was assigned to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]. In his absence and in his behalf I submit the resolution for printing under the rule.

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 262) on the bill (S. 1544, Rept. No. 1491) to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway, which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1544, a bill to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order today to call the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN ANTHRACITE COAL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 255, creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania tell us whether or not any cost will be involved in connection with this commission, what the probable ultimate personnel will be, and so on?

Mr. BOLAND. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Clerk read the resolution in its entirety.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 255

Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a commission to be composed of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and three individuals to be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Bureau of Mines, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the National Resources Planning Board, and one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. No member of the commission shall receive compensation for his services as such member.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining the facts relating to, and ways and means for improving, economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States and in the conduct of such investigation the commission shall take into consideration, among other relevant factors (a) the availability in such regions, for national-defense activities, of skilled and unskilled workers, factories, and housing and other facilities, and (b) possible new and extended uses for anthracite coal and the byproducts thereof.

SEC. 3. The commission shall report to the President and to the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date. The commission shall cease to exist upon the submission to the President and the Congress of its final report.

SEC. 4. The commission is authorized, in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is recognized under a reservation of objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there will be no additional personnel and that the individuals to be appointed from other agencies of the Government will receive compensation from the agencies of the Government with which they are identified.

Mr. BOLAND. Yes; the deductions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we already have the facilities to do everything this resolution provides for. What is the Coal Commission for? What is the Department of the Interior for? What is the Department of Labor for? What is the Department of Commerce for? What is the O. P. M. for? We can get all this information without appointing another commission.

You might as well appoint a commission to go out and investigate the economic condition of the farmers or the economic conditions of any other class of our people. We have full information as to the amount of coal produced, we have full information as to what amount is available and what it costs; in fact we have all the information that this commission will get after 6 months of investigation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have the facilities set up for the investigation of our own anthracite coal. Why in a time like this do we want to have the Government interfere with the State of Pennsylvania? Also, as the gentleman from Mississippi well said, we have the organizations now in the departments of the Government that should be able to give the gentleman from Pennsylvania all the information he wants.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this measure has not been referred to a committee, has it?

Mr. BOLAND. Not yet.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I object until it is passed on by a committee of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOLAND. I wish the gentlemen would withhold their objections to permit me to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard; the request is objected to unless they are withdrawn.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to permit the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make a statement.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. We ought to have the information if the administration wants this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection for the present so that the gentleman might make an explanation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, referring to the objection made by the gentleman from Mississippi that there is already a coal commission that has this data, there is no anthracite coal commission. There is only the Bituminous Coal Commission, who have no jurisdiction in a matter of this magnitude. We have no commission at all as far as anthracite coal is concerned.

Now, with reference to the objection of my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I wonder if I might read excerpts from a letter from the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania to the President?

There are three counties in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania which have received to date scarcely $5,000,000 worth of direct defense contracts. The normal output of these counties is valued at more than $317,000,000, and includes $155,000,000 worth of an immense variety of products both metal and textile.

Our Nation is asking of the people of that great area that they devote only a small fraction of their industrial energies to the defense of our country. Moreover, in those 3 counties there are today 100,000 unemployed workers.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that there are some 25,000 families that have moved out of the anthracite region into Connecticut and other New England States because of the lack of nondefense work that should be carried on in an area of that kind. The facts are, too, that in the anthracite area, even at the peak production of anthracite, we have some 60,000 too many miners there. There are ghost towns dotted in different parts of the anthracite area. This is an opportunity to take care of the unemployment. We have the housing facilities, we have the water, we have transportation, we have all the necessary facilities and, in my opinion, the President of the United States with this board will be able to protect that great area by allocating certain defense projects in different sections of the coal fields. We are ideally situated to be of great benefit for immediate production. They will be able to take advantage of the unemployed, the skilled mechanics who had to leave their homes will be glad to come back, and employment will be made available for the unemployed mechanics who are there, and also the unskilled labor. We all realize that there is need for mechanics now in our peak production for defense purposes.

I think the objections of these gentlemen at this time are uncalled for when our need is so great. We have in my county, Lackawanna, something like 14,000 men working on relief projects, and we have some 3,100 in addition knocking at the door trying to get employment. This situation is typical in other sections of this territory. Here is an opportunity to get some of these defense projects in this area here where it is unnecessary to build houses. We have the vacant places. The Scranton Chamber of Commerce has made an extensive survey of Lackawanna County, Pa., relative to unemployment—both skilled and unskilled labor—vacant houses, idle plants, machines, and vacant land. The Governor of Pennsylvania has data that will be very beneficial for this commission, and we want to work in conjunction with him so far as this great area is concerned. I do not think it is fair to say that other places, like the farms, are in the same condition. You have not a hundred thousand unemployed on the farms, yet we have three counties in Pennsylvania

where there are 100,000 unemployed, with no place to go. That is the reason I ask for the immediate consideration of this resolution.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has about convinced me beyond all reasonable doubt that this resolution ought to go to a committee of the House. I object, for the present.

SYSTEM OF LONGEVITY PAY FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 1057, to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. ROMJUE, BURCH, FLANNERY, HARTLEY, and MASON.

RELATION OF NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM TO SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 294, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program in its Relation to Small Business in the United States the following Members of the House: Messrs. PATMAN; chairman; BULWINKLE; KELLY of Illinois; FITZGERALD; HALLECK; LEONARD W. HALL; and PLOESER.

WHEAT-MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FULMER, FLANNAGAN, and HOPE.

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 8, 1941, when the House considered House Resolution 254, I was absent as a result of illness due to food poisoning.

USE OF W. P. A. FUNDS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Emmet County Graphic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GALE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the American Legion Post of Moberly, Mo.; also, a statement pledging unqualified support signed by more than 200 members of the faculty of the University of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RADIO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5074) to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, but not after July 1, 1943, or the date upon which the President proclaims the existing national-defense emergency terminated, whichever occurs first, for the purpose of strengthening the national defense by providing additional safeguards, it shall be unlawful to employ any person or to permit any person to serve as radio operator aboard any vessel (other than a vessel of foreign registry) if the Secretary of the Navy—

"(1) has disapproved such employment for any specified voyage, route, or area of operation, and

"(2) has notified the master of the vessel of such disapproval prior to the departure thereof.

"No such vessel shall be granted clearance, depart or attempt to depart from any port or place in the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the Canal Zone, while having on board a person serving as radio operator in violation of this act. For any violation of this act, the master and the owner shall be severally subject to a penalty of not more than $1,000 for which penalties the vessel shall be liable. Such penalties on application may be mitigated or remitted by the Secretary of Commerce."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the House passed several months ago a bill to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes. The bill as it passed the House dealt with the general situation and provided for the elimination of certain radio operators found to be connected with certain organizations thought to be subversive. The bill provided the machinery whereby those removed from the ships might be heard on appeal.

The bill has been pending for a long time. There is a very great necessity for immediate legislation dealing with this situation. When it became manifest that the bill as it passed the House would not receive the favorable consideration of the Senate committee, or certainly not without a long delay, there was a conference on the part of the naval authorities, the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, the Maritime Commission, Federal Communications Commission, and other interests in an effort to formulate a substitute that would provide immediate relief. As a result of that conference this amendment was prepared. It places the elimination of operators entirely in the control of the Navy, so that the Navy can object to any particular operator.

The Navy, I may say, has a confidential report on a number of men who are believed to be proper subjects of consideration. The Navy, under the Senate amendment, can eliminate any man and say that he cannot be employed on a ship at any specified point or on specified routes or in certain areas of operation or zones. The bill imposes a penalty on any ship that violates the act, but the penalty is applicable only after notice that such person or persons shall not be placed on the ship.

I have consulted with the Navy about this amendment and I have consulted with all the agencies affected. They believe it is desirable to concur in this amendment immediately. I have consulted with all the members of my

committee who would be members of a conference, if we went to conference, and they believe the amendment should be accepted. I have also brought it up in the committee at a session of the committee and it is their belief that we should concur in this amendment and that we should not allow this condition to exist a day longer.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has not explained to the House just the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill. In what respects does the Senate bill differ from the bill that was passed by the House?

Mr. BLAND. The House bill defines a subversive individual as one who teaches, advocates, or believes in, the duty, necessity, or propriety of overthrowing the Government of the United States, or is, or at any time has been, a member of the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, the Young Communists League, or any organization which teaches, advocates, or believes in, the duty, necessity, or propriety of controlling, conducting, influencing, seizing, or overthrowing the Government of the United States by force. The bill further provided the machinery by which such individuals might be eliminated immediately, with the right of appeal afterward, and also provided for general investigations as to the general situation in the marine radio service. The evidence that was brought before the committee, as well as the evidence generally, was that there were about 200 radio operators who were under very considerable suspicion. That list was supplied by the Navy. The Senate amendment, which is submitted now, is an emergency bill, while the House bill was both emergency and permanent legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman believes that the Senate bill adequately takes care of the situation?

Mr. BLAND. For the present I think it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not quite answer the question. Does the gentleman think that this measure adequately takes care of the situation?

Mr. BLAND. I do.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Who has the right to determine the personnel of the radio operators now on these ships?

Mr. BLAND. A license as a radio operator is given by the Federal Communications Commission and the right to serve on the ship by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Mr. DONDERO. The question I am raising is, Who has the right to determine the personnel? Does it belong now to the Government, does it belong to the shipowners, or does it belong to certain groups in this country?

Mr. BLAND. Those people having been given a license to serve, then they have the right to get the employment, and I do not think any particular person has a right to say they shall not serve, but under the House bill, if there were a reasonable suspicion, he could not serve.

Mr. DONDERO. This leaves it to the Navy.

Mr. BLAND. Yes, the Senate amendment does so, and for the emergency.

Mr. DONDERO. And under present conditions I think such authority should be granted them.

Mr. BLAND. I will say to the gentleman that I believe there should be effective permanent legislation, but so far as I am concerned, I would not allow the necessity for affirmative permanent legislation to stand in the way of the immediate need.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it ought to be passed at once.

Mr. BLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the Senate bill is stronger than the House bill or the House bill stronger than the Senate bill?

Mr. BLAND. In my own opinion the House bill was stronger, but the Senate bill will sufficiently and adequately meet the emergency needs and the present needs, whether emergency or otherwise. I would say the House bill is stronger as permanent legislation, because it would have dealt with the situation in a general way as permanent legislation, and that must receive further consideration. The Senate amendment adequately meets emergency needs.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman also tell the House whether it is the intention of the Navy to immediately declare that these 200 people who have subversive connections will be discharged?

Mr. BLAND. I could not say they would be discharged, but I can say that that list was made up by the Navy and I am sure that the Navy will say that they cannot serve and that the Navy will say to any employer that these men cannot be employed on a particular ship or a particular voyage or to go into certain specified zones, areas, or services, if it thinks such action is necessary.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman will recall that the Dies committee held public hearings on this same question about 2 years ago.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. And recommended at that time that they be discharged. There are hundreds of them and there is no reason in the world why they should not be discharged right now.

Mr. BLAND. I quite agree with the gentleman and the House bill would have provided for that, but if I cannot get the House bill I want to take what will accomplish the purpose now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of our committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I was sorry I was at the telephone when the gentleman called this matter up. Will the gentleman explain to the House that when we had this bill before our committee the Communications Commission pointed out that there was no existing law which permitted them to take away a man's license for immorality or for any subversive tendencies or activities, and in our House bill we specifically charged the Federal Communications Commission with the responsibility for any subversive radio operators being permitted to continue in that trade?

Mr. BLAND. I have not explained that, but I am glad to say that the gentleman is correct. That is one of the factors that entered into my statement that the House bill was a better bill. But I am never going to be one of those who is going to stand in the way of getting much-needed legislation because opposition prevents me from getting all I think I ought to have.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. And will the gentleman not join me in my personal belief and that of the other members of the committee that we felt that much of the danger in the merchant marine today from subversive radio operators is due to the fact that the Federal Communications Commission has not in the past used due diligence in cleaning out that nest of hornets?

Mr. BLAND. I think that is true. I will say also that we were in close touch with the results of the study of the Dies committee and worked closely in collaboration with that committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The Dies committee 2 years ago recommended to the Federal Communications Commission that they do something about it, and nothing was done about it.

Mr. BLAND. We tried to provide legislation whereby they could do something.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Is not this the case, that in the matter of permanent legislation the House bill would be the kind of bill that we should pass?

Mr. BLAND. That is true.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Providing for findings, and the discharge of people found to be subversive.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But the bill of the Senate empowering the Navy to do something, to take summary and immediate action, and therefore to meet existing emergency may, in some respects, be even preferable to the House bill at the present time. I notice that the time is limited to the emergency, and when that is over, we might well take up the procedure of the House bill.

Mr. BLAND. I am of opinion that we will have another bill before the committee and consider it. Later we shall probably place permanent legislation again in the lap of the Senate.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman says that his own bill proscribes members of the German-American Bund.

Mr. BLAND. The House bill did, not the Senate bill.

Mr. CELLER. What is the language that the Senate uses with reference to subversive activity?

Mr. BLAND. It does not say anything. It just authorizes the prohibition of the employment of any person or permitting any person to serve as a radio operator aboard any domestic vessel if the Secretary of the Navy disapproves of such employment for any specified voyage, route, or area of operation.

Mr. CELLER. It is very broad.

Mr. BLAND. It is very broad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

ECONOMIC CONDITION IN ANTHRACITE COAL FIELDS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 255.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I am not satisfied with the gentleman's explanation, but I do not propose to object to this resolution if the House wants to vote on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the annual address before the Federal Farm Bureau Federation at the convention yesterday, and also to include the address by the President of the United States to the Federation and the response of the Federation to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4854) to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 11, strike out "or other officers of the Bureau of Reclamation" and insert ", an Assistant Commissioner, or the officer in charge of any office, division, district, or project of the Bureau of Reclamation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the necessity for this amendment?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, answering the question of the gentleman from Michigan, the House bill used this language in delegating the authority from the Secretary of the Interior to the Commissioner of Reclamation, in general terms:

Or other officers of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Senate amendment names the officers to whom the authority is delegated, to wit, the Assistant Commissioner or of the officer in charge of any office, division, district, or project of the Bureau of Reclamation. It named the officers, whereas the House bill said other officers.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In other words, the Senate amendment limits the authority?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Prattville (Ala.) Progress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DOUGLAS DAM AND ALUMINUM

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter which I wrote to Mr. Batt and an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE ANTHRACITE COAL REGIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will again recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND], and if the gentleman's request is again objected to, this is the last time the Chair will recognize the gentleman today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 255, creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. J. Res. 255), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a commission to be composed of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and three individuals to be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Bureau of Mines, one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the National Resources Planning Board, and one of whom shall be an officer or employee of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. No member of the commission shall receive compensation for his services as such member.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to conduct an investigation for the purpose of determining the facts relating to and ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States and in the conduct of such investigation the commission shall take into consideration, among other relevant factors (a) the availability in such regions for national-defense activities of skilled and unskilled workers, factories, and housing and other facilities, and (b) possible new and extended uses for anthracite coal and the byproducts thereof.

SEC. 3. The commission shall report to the President and to the Congress the results of its investigation, together with the recommendations, at the earliest practicable date. The commission shall cease to exist upon the submission to the President and the Congress of its final report.

SEC. 4. The commission is authorized, in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a memorial from the Florida Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENALTY ON EXCESS WHEAT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call attention to a bill that passed this House several weeks ago which permitted farmers who had excess wheat to have it computed on the normal-yield basis rather than an acreage basis. That bill passed the Senate today. The other body had amended the measure so farmers, having excess wheat, may feed it to their own livestock and poultry without paying 49 cents per bushel penalty on their own wheat. I hope the House will see fit to permit that amendment to remain in the bill. In view of what the Secretary of Agriculture has told us with reference to increasing the production of food of all kinds, especially of meat and eggs for the soldiers and for the people of other countries, this amendment should remain in the bill. I trust the House will see fit to approve it. I feel sure that, in view of the situation as it now stands, the Department of Agriculture should favor it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Member from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the President will veto this bill. You will recall he vetoed that very article last year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, I do not know what he will do, but I think in view of the circumstances he should be very glad to approve the amended measure. I just do not see how anyone could oppose it now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, many people have recently confused the Supreme Court decision in connection with Harry Bridges. They thought that was in connection with the deportation trial. That is not so. It was in connection with his contempt of court hearing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this country is at war and our authorities are picking up many aliens who may be dangerous to this country. I call upon those same authorities to take into custody now one Harry Bridges who has proved himself to be a very dangerous alien to this country. We commend the authorities for their action in taking up these aliens, but we certainly do believe that Harry Bridges should be included within that group.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LOYAL JAPANESE CITIZENS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is today my privilege to transmit to the President of the United States a copy of a telegram, the original of which I have just received from an American patriot of Japanese origin.

Because of the warm assurance of support of our just cause which it contains, I am pleased to inform the membership and the country of its contents:

FRESNO, CALIF., *December 9, 1941.*

Hon. B. W. GEARHART,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned, as president of Japanese Association of Fresno, hereby tenders to you and through you to the President of the United States the services of the Association in our defense against the unwarranted attack made by the Japanese Empire. No sacrifice will be too great which we may be called upon to make. It will be fulfilled willingly. We hope that we will be called upon to assist in the defense of the United States.

S. G. SAKAMOTO.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADMIRAL WILLIAM LEAHY

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction for me to know that there are rumors of recall to this country of Admiral William Leahy, Ambassador to France, to act as naval adviser in our present situation. I hope the rumors have foundation. I believe many of my colleagues who have heard Admiral Leahy testify before committees of the House of Representatives, as I have, will agree that his outstanding ability should quickly be utilized at home. He always inspired confidence because of his profound knowledge of naval affairs, but, best of all, he is not a speech maker.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two respects: One, to include a radio address of my own; two, to extend my remarks on the subject of social security and include therein a brief statement of Secretary Morgenthau.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COOPERATION IN THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to include in my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything I might have done to prevent our entrance into this war I do not know what it is. If there is anything more than I am doing that I can do to aid in the successful prosecution of this war I hope the Members of this House will advise me. Our utmost is all too little.

From 1 city of 11,000 in my district, Niles, Mich., this morning comes the news that 100 young men of that city are in the war zone. One, Eugene Freese, has lost his life. Another, Richard Adams, is reported to be in the hands of the enemy. This news item, which will be printed later in the RECORD, shows what the Midwest is doing. It shows what it will do. When these young men are giving their lives how inadequate, how small appear our efforts. God grant we may not fail them.

AGE LIMITS OF THE SELECTEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for 2 minutes, but will recognize the gentleman for 1 minute.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have before it the question as to what the age of the draftees shall be, one of several proposed changes within a period of 12 months.

It would seem that somebody should make up his mind about what age the draft should cover. The Senate said 21 to 31, the ages between which they raised practically 5,000,000 men during the first World War and did not change it. The Senate said that again in this war. The House changed it from 21 to 40. A conference put it at 21 to 36. You drafted some men of 36, then changed your mind again and put it at 28, making a rank discrimination against some who were in the service between the ages of 28 and 36. Now it is being proposed to go down to 18. I am opposed to going down to 18.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. CREAL. I am opposed to the 18's.

LOYAL CITIZENS OF FOREIGN BIRTH OR PARENTAGE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, now that we are at war, searching scrutiny of aliens in this country is desirable. Action against undesirable aliens is necessary. Certainly however, no intemperate word or hasty action should be spoken or taken against those individuals of alien origin living in the United States as loyal naturalized citizens.

In my congressional district in West Virginia there are thousands of persons of Italian parentage and descent, and also many other nationalities. They are patriotic. This Congress and the country should realize that now we must have the fullest cooperation of naturalized and native-born citizens. The words of Washington, spoken more than a century and a half ago, can be given renewed meaning and vigor:

Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, that country has the right to concentrate your affections.

A responsibility is implied as well as a right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial with reference to the gentleman from Washington, Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AGE OF SELECTEES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, may I not suggest that these trying days are times for everybody to keep a cool head, quiet tongue, and our feet on the ground. Publicity seeking ought to take a back seat, for politics are already over.

I should like to correct an impression that seems to be widespread around here that there is some proposal to change the age limits of the selectees. No such proposal has been sent to the House Military Affairs Committee by the War Department or the Selective Service Board. No such thing has been mentioned to me or to any other member of the committee as far as I know. If that suggestion does come to the House Military Affairs Committee it will have a thorough, fair, and impartial hearing; but, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to do whatever is necessary to win this war. I do not want to go below 21 years of age on the selectees and will not unless it becomes necessary. If it becomes clearly necessary I am willing to take that step, or any other step that may be necessary to save our country and its cherished institutions, and to preserve the liberties of all our people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

CLARIFICATION OF DUAL NATIONALITY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER].

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6109) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, to provide for the clarification of the dual nationality of certain persons, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the legislation?

Mr. KRAMER. I will be glad to. This bill is not an amendment to the act except that it adds a new section to the Nationality Act. This amendment has been presented at the request of the War Department. It has been approved by the War and Navy Department, the Department of Justice, the F. B. I., and the Department of State. Hearings were had before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I was subchairman, and after various amendments to the original bill this was reported unanimously by the committee.

It simply gives authority to the War Department or to the Navy Department to request and make it mandatory on the enlistees that any person entering the service, either the public service in the War Department or in the Navy Department, take an oath of allegiance to the United States. It affects those who have dual nationalities.

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Where is the communication from the Attorney General or the Navy Department or the War Department?

Mr. KRAMER. It is right there where the Department earnestly requests this. The War Department, the Navy Department, and the Department of Justice were present at all of the hearings and have no objection to the bill. It is most important at this time to the War Department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman explain what he means by dual citizenship?

Mr. KRAMER. I may say to the gentleman there are many countries that by reason of their nationality have a dual citizenship, such as the Japanese, the Germans, Italians, Hollanders, and the French, and even though born in this country they assume the right of being a national of the country from which their ancestors came.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, this involves persons who are born in a foreign land, who are alien, but finally become citizens of the United States? They are citizens of the United States but they have at some time been a citizen of another country; is that it?

Mr. KRAMER. No; their parents have come from another country and some of these nationals have a dual citizenship in this country; that is to say, the child born of a foreign national in those countries to which I have made previous reference.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean they have been a citizen of another country, either themselves or through their parents?

Mr. KRAMER. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they are American citizens?

Mr. KRAMER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very dangerous piece of legislation, in my opinion, and one that should not be passed by unanimous consent. It should be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, taken up under the 5-minute rule and considered in the regular way, so that it could be amended.

I know something about this dual citizenship of the Japanese in Hawaii and California. I exposed it when we were on an investigation in Hawaii in 1937.

But this bill goes far beyond attempting to cure that situation. If you will amend it to make it apply to those people who are born under the American flag and who really claim dual citizenship, such as the Japanese, and not try to make it a cloak for undesirable aliens to hide under, then I will not object to it. No one born in a foreign country can claim dual citizenship, for he renounces his foreign citizenship when he becomes naturalized.

But it is different with these Japanese who are born in Hawaii or California. When a child is born to Japanese parents he is immediately registered with the Japanese consul. His name is then sent to Tokyo and he is registered as a Japanese subject. He can go to Japan and own real estate and enjoy all the privileges of a Japanese citizen, even though he is a legal citizen of the United States. When I was in Hawaii, in 1937, Japan was drafting into her armed forces some of these native-born Hawaiian Japanese who had actually voted in our elections in Hawaii the year before. If this bill is amended to apply to such cases, that might be different. I would rather just deport them and get rid of them now.

But I am certainly not going to consent to the passage of this measure in its present form, for the reason that, as I see it, it reaches out and provides for covering in aliens who were actually born in foreign countries and who have no dual citizenship at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object, and demand that this measure be brought up in the regular way, so that it can be properly amended.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

There was no objection.

OBJECTIONS TO CERTAIN BILLS ON THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, preceding the call of the Private Calendar, I desire to make a brief statement. There are sundry bills on the Private Calendar canceling deportation warrants against certain aliens of Italian and German lineage to which we propose to object. We hope that our objection will not be interpreted as prejudicial against these bills. Perhaps under circumstances other than those which have recently arose they would be meritorious, but we thought it might be wise for the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to reconsider these bills in light of the circumstances which have developed in the last few days.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The fact is the committee has gone over every one of these very minutely and they have gone into them very carefully. Certainly the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization would not recommend relief for any alien who in any wise is dangerous to the interests of this country, even prior to what occurred last Sunday.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman may be entirely correct and I hope he is correct, but in view of existing circumstances we thought it might be well for the committee to reconsider its actions. If the committee reconsiders and then reports them, that is satisfactory as far as I am concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the committee further considers these bills and if it feels that with the changed circumstances, the declaration of war, the same action should be taken, the committee may take the necessary action and report the bills out. The action of the gentleman from Tennessee and the other members of the objectors' committee is in no way prejudicial.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman stated my position more eloquently than I could.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. Has the gentleman any idea how soon the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will consider and report the bills out? I have a bill on the calendar today that has been on it for months, long before the war started. This man was drafted in World War No. 1. He has 10 small children. His whole family is living in fear that some day the authorities will come in there and take them and ship them out of the country.

Mr. GORE. May I say to the gentleman from New York that under present circumstances he cannot be deported.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the matter the gentleman from Tennessee is discussing is one that is very important to various Members and to the persons who are affected. I believe the action taken by the gentleman from Tennessee and the other members of the objectors' committee, in the light of the circumstances, is the correct one, but if an objection is made and the bills go back to the committee, then under the rules of the House they must come out in an omnibus bill. The action taken is not in any sense an objection to the bills, but simply proper action by the objectors' committee to send the bills back to the proper committee of the House to see if the committee will report the bills back to the House in the light of the changed circumstances.

Under these conditions, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the proper course to pursue is to have the bills recommitted to the committee and then, when the committee acts again, have the bills come back as separate bills and go upon the private calendar as such, and not be reported out in omnibus bills.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. As far as I am concerned, that would be without objection if it can be done under the parliamentary situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe that under the parliamentary situation it can be done. The Chair will pass on that. When the bills are called that the objectors' committee wants recommitted, I hope there will be no objection, so that the Committee on Immigration can have original jurisdiction. Then, if on further consideration the committee reports the bills out, they will come out in the status they hold today.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the parliamentary situation will be complicated. The moment an objection is made to a bill, it goes back to the committee, and the committee will then have to report it again in an omnibus bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The suggestion is that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then, if the committee decides that it is a worthy bill, it cannot be put back on the calendar without going into an omnibus bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two procedures that may be followed. We can wait until each bill is called before submitting a request, or I could ask unanimous consent at this time that all bills reported out of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and on the Private Calendar be recommitted to the committee. I believe that to be a solution of the difficulty, and I shall submit that request.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The moment that is done the bills go back to the committee, under the rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are recommitted, and then the committee considers each one individually.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then we have to report the bills in an omnibus bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; then they may be reported as individual bills.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am trying to avoid their coming in here again in an omnibus bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I am trying to avoid, too.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following bills on the Private Calendar be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization: Calendar Nos. 454, 456, 458, 459, and 517.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I wish to clarify the situation to the House by making this statement. I want the House to know that the Committee on Naturalization and Immigration has been very careful not to report any bill unless a definite investigation has been made by the Department of Justice and the Immigration Service. We have hundreds of similar bills before our committees, but only a few bills are on the calendar, and none has been reported out of the committee except after careful consideration and study. The committee has not reported any bills unless such investigation was made.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that we have an immigration law, and every person who comes into the United States is supposed to come under that law. We ought not to have any private bills, especially at this time, to admit aliens to the United States. We have a sufficient number now, probably, to give us trouble on both coasts and throughout the country. As far as I am concerned, I favor an indefinite recess on passing any more private immigration bills.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Tennessee stated that he intended to object to certain bills he stated that he referred to bills relating to individuals of certain lineage, and he mentioned certain nations. The request of the gentleman from Massachusetts includes aliens of other lineage. For example, his request includes an alien who was born in Canada. I am referring to No. 454 on the calendar.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker I am informed by the gentleman from Tennessee that the gentleman from Michigan is correct, and that Calendar No. 454 does not relate to anyone of German or Italian descent. Therefore, I ask that Calendar No. 454 be eliminated from my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, as modified?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts covered Calendar Nos. 456, 458, 459, and 517.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

JOSEPH J. MANN

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar (H. R. 4668) granting a pension to Joseph J. Mann.

Mr. GORE and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the unanimous-consent request just made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Mc-

CORMACK], and in accordance with the general agreement, I understood that these bills were not to be sent back in the form of a recommitment to the committee, but were simply to be taken off the calendar and sent back to the committee for the purpose of the committee giving them such other consideration as may be deemed advisable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously, the bills will have to be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions if the committee is to have an opportunity to make a further study of them, as referred to by the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When and if the committee finds that those involved in these bills are not in any way engaged with any of the Axis countries in this war and the committee feels inclined to report the bill back to the calendar of the House, must they be brought up as an omnibus bill or can the committee report them out as individual bills as we have done in this instance?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bills may again be favorably reported by the committee individually, because they were not recommitted under the general rule that is applicable to such bills.

The Clerk will report the next bill on the calendar.

MARY JANE BLACKMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 138, granting a pension to Mary Jane Blackman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Jane Blackman, widow of William O. Blackman, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT EDWARD WHITESIDE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2922, for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside.

Mr. GORE and Mr. BARDEN objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PENSIONS TO CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS OF THE CIVIL WAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5798, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain dependents of veterans of the Civil War.

Mr. GORE and Mr. YOUNG objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CAPT. PORTER M. HOIDALE, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5135, to appoint Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, a lieutenant, senior grade, in the United States Navy Medical Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, a lieutenant, senior grade, in the United States Navy Medical Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant: *Provided*, That upon such appointment he shall have assigned as his running mate the junior officer of the line of the Regular Navy in the grade of lieutenant on August 5, 1939: *Provided further*, That upon acceptance of the appointment herein authorized his status as a captain in the Marine Corps shall be considered as terminated."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY KOTILA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 201) for the relief of Henry Kotila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry Kotila, of Negaunee, Mich., the sum of $115.80, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred as the result of an accident involving a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, on the Camp Escanaba-Gwinn Road, about 4½ miles northeast of Camp Escanaba, Mich., on November 26, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

C. D. HENDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 904) for the relief of C. D. Henderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. D. Henderson, of Monroe, La., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him arising out of a collision between the automobile which he was driving and an automobile belonging to the National Youth Administration at Monroe, La., on October 18, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

KENNELLY FURNITURE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1244) for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $135.66 to the Kennelly Furniture Co. of Mandan, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the unpaid balance of the funeral expenses borne by such company with respect to the burial of Redtomahawk, formerly an Indian Scout, United States Army, who died in 1931: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

WALTER M. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1428) for the relief of Walter M. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter M. Anderson of Reedsport, Oreg., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government on account of permanent injuries sustained by the said Walter M. Anderson when an automobile occupied by him was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on the 4th day of August 1936, at a point on the Umpqua River bridge on the Coast Highway near Reedsport, Oreg.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

IVAN RICHARD WITCHER AND NELLIE WITCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1430) for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher, the father and mother respectively, of William Dale Witcher, a minor, who was killed in an automobile accident which occurred on the Pacific Highway, United States No. 99, about 3 miles south of Sutherlin, Oreg., on July 31, 1940, when the truck in which he was riding was struck by a truck owned by the United States and operated by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

JOHN H. DURNIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2120) for the relief of John H. Durnil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of John H. Durnil, who allegedly was permanently disabled as the result of an injury received on October 18, 1926, while employed by the War Department as a laborer on the Missouri River near Carrollton, Mo., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CARROL D. WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2192) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carrol D. Ward, of Albany, Oreg., the sum of $25,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries suffered on March 2, 1934, on the Pacific Highway, between Albany and Corvallis, Oreg., when the automobile in which said Carrol D. Ward was riding was struck and turned over by a motortruck owned by the United States and driven by Carl Nelson, an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Reedsport, Oreg.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "for damages."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "suffered" and insert in lieu thereof "sustained."

Page 1, line 13, strike out the period after the word Oregon and insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Carrol D. Ward."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GERHARD R. FISHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3398) for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gerhard R. Fisher, of Palo Alto, Calif., the sum of $1,950, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for loss of equipment aboard the U. S. dirigible *Macon* which crashed at sea on February 12, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTELLA KING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of Estella King.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Estella King, of Provo, Utah, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her daughter, Bonnie King, who was killed on March 25, 1939, when she was struck, while crossing United States Highway No. 91, in Provo, Utah, by a truck operated by William E. Pyne, who was engaged in the performance of duties for which he was receiving compensation from the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. Payment shall not be made under this act until Estella King has released, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, all judgments or other claims arising out of such accident which she may have against any person.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "Works Progress" and insert "Work Projects."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ONIE MARTIN AND BETTY MARTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4099, for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill undertakes to pay to Onie Martin and Betty Martin the sum of $3,500 because on November 29, 1940, Mrs. Martin and her daughter were struck by a station wagon driven by Corp. Thomas Fountain, who had become dazed on account of monoxide gas poisoning. It does not say that they sustained any injuries. I wonder if the author of the bill is present to explain it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, a reservation of objection is not in order.

The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not permissible, under the rule. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two objections are required. No further objection being heard, the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and

directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Onie Martin and Betty Martin, of Boaz, Ala., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages on account of personal injuries received by Onie Martin and Betty Martin on November 29, 1940, near the town of Boaz, Ala., when they were struck by a Chevrolet station wagon operated by Corp. Thomas Fountain, Company A, One Hundred and Second Quartermaster Regiment (New York National Guard), National Guard of the United States in the Army service: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Martin", insert "$2,000."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "sum", insert in lieu thereof "sums."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESCO WOOD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5085, for the relief of Esco Wood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Esco Wood, of Heiskell, Tenn., the sum of $665, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him through the wrecking and destruction of a ton and a half Chevrolet truck owned by him, which on June 22, 1935, was run into and struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, No. 36854, which at the time was driven by M. E. Hayes, a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps, on Highway No. 11, in Grainger County, Tenn.; such payment to be conditioned upon the release of said M. E. Hayes from all liability for the payment of such damages: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "damages", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. W. DAUGHTRY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5282, for the relief of J. W. Daughtry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. W. Daughtry, United States commissioner, Dothan, Ala., the sum of $108.60. Such sum represents the amount of fees earned by the said J. W. Daughtry from January 1, 1941, to February 14, 1941, both dates inclusive, while acting as United States commissioner at Dothan, Ala., but not paid because his term as United States commissioner expired on December 31, 1940, and his appointment for another term was not effective until February 15, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after "1941", insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH KEENEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5541, for the relief of Joseph Keeney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Joseph Keeney, who was injured while in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, on Copper Ridge, in Knox County, Tenn., on December 17, 1934, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Joseph Keeney may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended and supplemented, are hereby waived and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, if filed within 6 months after the approval of this act, the claim of Joseph Keeney, of Powell's Station, Tenn., for injuries alleged to have been sustained while in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps, on Copper Ridge, in Knox County, Tenn., on December 17, 1934, when a log was dropped by other employees, compelling him to hold the same alone, which resulted in injuries to his breast and induced hemorrhoids, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. J. B. CONMY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5605, for the relief of Lt. Col. J. B. Conmy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Col. J. B. Conmy, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of his daughter Christine Clare Conmy, who was killed when a United States mail truck struck her on April 5, 1941, in Tacoma, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COMDR. JOSEPH SIMON AND R. D. LEWIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5646, for the relief of Joseph Simon, lieutenant commander (senior grade), United States Navy, and R. D. Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of Joseph Simon, former disbursing officer Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, in the sum of $1,871.52 and is further authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of R. D. Lewis, also a former disbursing officer of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, in

the sum of $5.51 representing amounts disallowed in the accounts of the said Joseph Simon and R. D. Lewis because of payments made to corporations and individuals who are now nonexistent or from whom collections have not been made: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts so credited shall be charged against any individual other than the payee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES C. DYSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 334, for the relief of James C. Dyson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James C. Dyson, of Parker, Colo., the sum of $5,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of a collision which occurred when the motorcycle on which he was riding as a passenger was struck by a United States Forest Service truck near Castle Rock, Colo., on August 19, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,500" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIA NEVILLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1190, for the relief of Julia Neville.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Julia Neville the sum of $300 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, as a result of a collision of an automobile which Julia Neville was operating with a United States Army truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps on United States Highway No. 91, about 1 mile north of Kanosh, Utah, on June 23, 1939, said collision being due entirely to the negligence of the driver of said truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" insert "the estate of."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$300" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,050.43."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville."

WILLIAM CORDER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1429, for the relief of William Corder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Corder, of Sutherlin, Oreg., the sum of $1,536, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses suffered by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on the Pacific Highway No. 99, about 3 miles south of Sutherlin, Oreg., on July 31, 1940, when the truck in which he was riding was struck by a truck owned by the United States and operated by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL CHALKER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1550, for the relief of Carl Chalker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Chalker, of Dothan, Ala., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by him when he, without fault on his part, was struck and permanently injured on May 12, 1940, in Dothan, Ala., by a truck owned and operated by the United States Post Office Department then and there being carelessly and recklessly driven by an employee of the Post Office Department in the said city of Dothan, Ala.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD BOVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 691, for the relief of Richard Bove.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard Bove, New York City, N. Y., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum represents reimbursement for the loss sustained by the said Richard Bove as surety on a bond conditioned upon the departure from the United States of the alien Carlo Bove. By reason of the failure of the said Carlo Bove to depart in accordance with the terms of the bond, such bond was forfeited and the amount of the bond was covered into the Treasury of the United States. The said Carlo Bove was deported from the port of New York, N. Y., on February 17, 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$400."

At the end of bill add:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN J. PRICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3091, for the relief of Martin J. Price.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Martin J. Price, now residing at 2736 North Forty-seventh Street, Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $3,050. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of his claim against the United States for property damage and personal injury sustained on July 12, 1940, at Estabrook Park, Milwaukee County, State of Wisconsin, when a truck owned by the United States Government and operated by a Government employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps struck the automobile owned and driven by Martin J. Price: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,050. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BESSIE PEARLMAN AND GEORGE ROTH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3433, for the relief of Bessie Pearlman and George Roth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bessie Pearlman, Boston, Mass., the sum of $209.10, upon either the making of an assignment of all rights under, or the filing of a discharge and satisfaction of, a judgment for a like sum rendered in the municipal court of the Dorchester district of the city of Boston on February 2, 1940, against Patrick J. McDonough, Dorchester, Mass., the operator of a United States mail truck, in favor of the said Bessie Pearlman, who brought action on behalf of her minor daughter, Evelyn Pearlman, in a suit for damages arising out of personal injuries received by the said Evelyn Pearlman on August 24, 1938, in Boston, Mass., when the automobile in which she was a passenger was in collision with a United States mail truck while it was being operated by the said Patrick J. McDonough in the regular course of his duties. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained as a result of such injuries

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Roth, Boston, Mass., the sum of $134.10, upon either the making of an assignment of all rights under, or the filing of a discharge and satisfaction of, a judgment for a like sum rendered in the municipal court of the Dorchester district of the city of Boston on February 2, 1940, against Patrick J. McDonough, Dorchester, Mass., the operator of a United States mail truck, in favor of the said George Roth, who brought action on behalf of his minor daughter, Anita Roth, in a suit for damages arising out of personal injuries received by the said Anita Roth on August 24, 1938, in Boston, Mass., when the automobile in which she was a passenger was in collision with a United States mail truck while it was being operated by the said Patrick J. McDonough in the regular course of his duties. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained as a result of such injuries.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all the language after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bessie Pearlman, of Boston, Mass., the sum of $200, and to George Roth, of Boston, Mass., the sum of $125, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries received by Evelyn Pearlman and Anita Roth on August 24, 1938, when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States mail truck in Boston, Mass.: *Provided*, That the above shall be in full settlement and discharge of all judgments held by Bessie Pearlman and George Roth against Patrick J. McDonough, Dorchester, Mass.: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BERTHA M. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4436, for the relief of Mrs. Bertha M. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bertha M. Smith, United States Commissioner at Opelika, Ala., the sum of $78.65. Such sum represents the amount of fees which the said Mrs. Bertha M. Smith earned between December 3, 1940, and February 15, 1941, while acting as United States Commissioner for the Middle District of Alabama, but not paid because her term as United States Commissioner expired on December 3, 1940, and, through an oversight, her appointment for another term was not effective until February 15, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

Add at end of bill:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN CARDILLO AND PHILIP CARDILLO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4525, for the relief of John Cardillo and Philip Cardillo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALLECK and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BURLINGTON AUTO CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5056, for the relief of the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Burlington Auto Co., Burlington, N. C., the sum of $663. Such sum represents the balance due the said Burlington Auto Co. on the purchase price of a Ford coupe, 1940 model, motor No. 18-5611983, sold by such company on May 15, 1940, and forfeited to the United States on August 15, 1940. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States arising out of such forfeiture.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the "period. Such sum represents the", and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the."

Page 1, line 11, after the figure 1940 strike out the period and the following: "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States arising out of such forfeiture." and add

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA M. PAUL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5387, for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Anna M. Paul, of Washington, N. C., the sum of $275. Such sum shall be in full settlement of her claim against the United States for fees for services rendered as conciliation commissioner of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina during the period July 15, 1939, to June 3, 1940, which payment has been denied due to the fact that during the same period she was holding office as a regularly appointed United States commissioner and that such dual employment was in contravention of the statutory provisions of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended June 22, 1938 (52 Stat. 857; 11 U. S. C. 63), and section 75 of said act, as added by the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1470; 11 U. S. C. 203): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. EARLE RUSSELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5545, for the relief of H. Earle Russell

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. Earle Russell, American Consul General at Casablanca, Morocco, the sum of $320.86. Such sum represents the amount paid the United States by the said H. Earle Russell to cover

the cost of the shipment from Johannesburg, Union of South Africa, to the District of Columbia in November 1939, of the household effects of a Foreign Service officer. Credit for the payment of the charges for such shipment was withheld in the accounts of the said H. Earle Russell, at that time American Consul General at Johannesburg, because, through no fault on his part, such shipment was made on a vessel other than a vessel registered under the laws of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN PAUL MURRAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5647, for the relief of John Paul Murray.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill may be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $61.10, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, John Paul Murray, seaman, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the fire in building No. 49, Barracks "A," United States Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I., on May 14, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 5647) were laid on the table.

LT. COL. JOSEPH M. KELLY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5701, for the relief of the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to allow credit to the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky, in the sum of $966, which sum represents checks drawn by said Joseph M. Kelly, as property and disbursing officer for the Kentucky National Guard, in the years from January 28, 1936, to June 1, 1937; and which sums were paid by said Joseph M. Kelly on properly presented vouchers, bearing sworn affidavits of Capt. Frederick M. Warren, for the services of Herman H. Reed as a member and employee of the National Guard of Kentucky; said vouchers having been a continuance of services of employment of said Herman H. Reed following the regime of Brig. Gen. Henry H. Denhardt (deceased) as United States property and disbursing officer; and which payments were first approved when made, and after the death of said Henry H. Denhardt were ordered reopened on February 8, 1940, and disallowed by the Comptroller General. The accounts of Henry H. Denhardt were relieved and allowed credit for by H. R. 9324, April 9, 1940, of all sums on vouchers paid to Herman H. Reed for services of employment prior to January 27, 1936.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "H. R. 9324, April 9, 1940" and insert in lieu thereof "Private Law No. 29, approved April 11, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIBBY, McNEILL & LIBBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5773, for the relief of Libby, McNeill & Libby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Libby, McNeill & Libby, for the value of certain electrical equipment, consisting of a Westinghouse rotary converter and a Cutler-Hammer starting box, borrowed by the Indian Service, Department of the Interior, at Yakutat, Alaska, from said Libby, McNeill & Libby, in October 1939, and destroyed by fire on or about January 18, 1940, while in the possession of that agency, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $150. There is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $150, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIUS YUHASZ AND ARVID OLSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1055, for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,182.66 to Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson, of Gary, Ind., in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for additional compensation for certain materials furnished and services rendered under a contract entered into with the United States for the construction of a dwelling, a boathouse, and a launchway for the United States Coast Guard at Port Orford, Oreg.; such materials and services having been authorized by the civil engineer of the United States in charge of such construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$4,182.66" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,686."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIOUX SKYWAYS, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1363, for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,750 to Sioux Skyways, Inc., of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages sustained to its Luscombe landplane *NC 28609*, growing out of a collision with United States Navy *J2F–3* airplane No. 1571 at the Sioux Falls Municipal Airport, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on March 13, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY S. GAY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1479, for the relief of Mary S. Gay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 38 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, are hereby waived in connection with overpayments aggregating $1,200.01, made to Mary S. Gay, nee Mary M. Sauser, as disability compensation under the said act by reason of an erroneous report made by the United States Veterans' Administration, without her knowledge, in respect to the pay received by her at the time of injury.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE AND MAMIE H. WELLS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1581, for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Wells, of Plains, Mont., the sum of $750, and to Mamie H. Wells, of Plains, Mont., the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck in the Cape Creek tunnel, Oreg., on November 10, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH V. BRODERICK

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1650, for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of Joseph V. Broderick, collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island, in the sum of $1,000, representing the value of certain stock-transfer internal-revenue stamps which have been lost by his office.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LULU HERON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 329, for the relief of Lulu Heron.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lulu Heron, field nurse in the Indian Service stationed in Alaska, the sum of $900.40 to reimburse her for the expense which she incurred in moving her house from the bank of the Kuskokwim River to a new site, when it was endangered by bank erosion resulting from flood conditions: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "to reimburse her for the expense" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUNT WHITNEY POWER & ELECTRIC CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 331, providing for the refund of money erroneously collected under a certain permit for the use of public lands in excess of the correct amount due thereunder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, the sum of $12,373.24, the same being the difference between the amount erroneously collected from said Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co. by the Secretary of Agriculture, between December 15, 1915, and August 31, 1935, under a certain power agreement, approved November 24, 1909, between said Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co. and the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, for the use of certain public lands in the State of California, and the correct amount due the United States under said agreement.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the figures "$12,373.24", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Page 2, line 6, at the end of the bill strike out the period and insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of the Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co."

MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 962, for the relief of Multnomah County, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Multnomah County, Oreg., the sum of $6,370 in full satisfaction of all claims of such county against the United States for taxes assessed by such county for the year 1928 against certain lots, numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, block 183, Portland, Oreg., which lots were purchased by the United States after the date of such assessment but prior to the date for collection of such taxes.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after the word "taxes", change the period to a colon and add the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REUBEN OWEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1903, for the relief of Reuben Owen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Reuben Owen, formerly an inmate of the United States prison camp, Kooskia, Idaho, the sum of $1,440, payable $50 per month for a period of 12 months, then $40 per month for a period of 12 months, and then $30 per month for a period of 12 months, at which time the payments shall cease.

This payment shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the Government for injury sustained by him while performing duties assigned him while confined to the United States prison camp at Kooskia, Idaho: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. F. BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2428, for the relief of G. F. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. F. Brown, of Jackson, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said G. F.

Brown against the United States on account of injuries sustained by him as a result of being struck on April 27, 1939, at Dyer, Tenn., by a vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Page 1, line 11, after "Corps", insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HJALMAR M. SEBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2436, for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $31,000 to Hjalmar M. Seby, general contractor, of Abilene, Tex., on account of damages and losses sustained by him at the hands of representatives of the United States Government through (1) unjust cancelation of contract No. 4646, United States Government Form No. P. W. A. 51 for extension and remodeling United States postoffice building, Vernon, Tex., known as Public Works Administration project No. 41; (2) failure of United States Government representatives to pay him for work done and materials furnished; (3) improper interference by United States Government representatives with him in the performance of his functions and duties as contractor under contract before-mentioned; (4) confiscation by United States Government representatives of materials and tools belonging to said Hjalmar M. Seby; and (5) failure of United States Government representatives to accord him, the said Hjalmar M. Seby, credit for increased prices of materials under the terms of the National Recovery Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$31,000" and insert "$14,369.61."

Page 2, line 12, after "Act," insert the following:

": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIN HOY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2545, to waive and revoke the statutes of limitation in the claim of Chin Hoy, of the county of San Joaquin of the State of California, against the United States of America for payment of benefits arising out of cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the statutes of limitation so far as the barring by claim of Chin Hoy, of the county of San Joaquin of the State of California, against the United States of America for payment of benefits arising out of cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration be, and the same are hereby, waived and revoked.

SEC. 2. That said claimant is hereby authorized to file and have said claim of $2,079.57 adjudicated and paid by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That Chin Hoy, of the county of San Joaquin of the State of California be, and he is hereby, authorized to file claim for benefits arising out of cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the year 1938: *Provided*, That said claim is filed within 6 months after the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 2. That the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is hereby authorized and directed to receive and adjudicate the claim of Chin Hoy in the amount of $1,830.02."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chin Hoy."

AUGUST SVELUND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2967, for the relief of August Svelund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to August Svelund, of Puyallup, Wash., the sum of $4,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical expenses, or property damage resulting from a collision on or about the 15th day of January 1932, in which the car being driven by August Svelund collided with the United States Army truck from Fort Lewis, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,500" and insert "$2,500."

Line 8, strike out "medical expenses, or property damage" and insert "sustained and medical expenses incurred."

Line 12, strike out "from Fort Lewis, Wash." and insert "in Tacoma, Wash."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL COHEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3087, for the relief of Ethel Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ethel Cohen, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $1,250 as compensation for and in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States for injuries sustained by her on April 23, 1939, because of negligence of the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,250 as compensation for and" and insert "$750."

Line 7, strike out "for damages."

Line 9, strike out "Work Projects" and insert "Works Progress."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DALE L. BARTHEL AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3225, for the relief of Dale L. Barthel and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums of $151.50 to Dale L. Barthel, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $29.50 to Peter M. Buckley, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $7.50 to Robert H. Bratsch, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $5 to Doris DeNure, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $155.35 to Ben J. Hunter, of Mount Vernon, Ill.; $281.75 to Ruel R. Jackson, of Washington, D. C.; $7 to Fred L. Logsdon, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $137.50 to Fred M. Morlan, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $144.10 to Thomas J. Pendergast, of Shawneetown, Ill.; and $281.30 to H. E. Shattuck, of Shawneetown, Ill., in full settlement of their respective claims against the United States for the loss of their privately owned articles of personal property as a result of a

fire that occurred on April 12, 1939, in the field office of a Works Progress Administration project located in Shawneetown, Ill., in which field office the articles of property were kept.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "of" strike out the rest of line 5 and all down to and including "Illinois" in line 3 of page 2, and insert the following: "$32 to Dale L. Barthel, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $2.50 to Peter M. Buckley, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $72.60 to Ben J. Hunter, of Mount Vernon, Ill.; $225.40 to Ruel R. Jackson, of Washington, D. C.; $3 to Fred L. Logsdon, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $110 to Fred M. Morlan, of Shawneetown, Ill.; $99.20 to Thomas J. Pendergast, of Shawneetown, Ill.; and $100.20 to H. E. Shattuck, of Shawneetown, Ill."

Page 2, line 16, after "kept", insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BELLA COSGROVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4355, to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear and determine and render judgment upon the claim of Bella Cosgrove.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of Bella Cosgrove, of New York City, New York, for damages resulting from personal injuries received by her on May 6, 1940, by reason of the negligence of the Work Projects Administration at the roadway of the intersection of One Hundred and Sixth Street and Central Park West, in the city of New York: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed $5,000.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within one year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bella Cosgrove, of New York City, N. Y., the sum of $621, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when she was alleged to have tripped on a wooden block negligently left in the street by Work Projects Administration employees on May 6, 1940, at the intersection of One Hundred and Sixth Street and Central Park West, in the city of New York: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Bella Cosgrove."

H. D. BATEMAN, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4537, for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech, residents of Wilson County, N. C., the sum of $1,048 in full settlement of their claims against the United States for damages resulting from the destruction of timber by the Civil Works Administration in the year 1934 on a drainage ditch and canal project, which project was later abandoned by the Civil Work Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHERINE McCUE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4831, for the relief of Katherine McCue.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Katherine McCue, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident in which she was struck by a car driven by an employee of the United States Post Office Department who was acting in the scope of his employment on September 13, 1939, in Minneapolis, Minn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM ROBERT SHANEYFELT AND MILDRED SHANEYFELT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5040, for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Robert Shaneyfelt, Decatur, Ala., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Robert Shaneyfelt and of his wife, Mildred Shaneyfelt, against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained on November 30, 1940, in Decatur, Ala., when the automobile in which they were riding was in collision with a truck in the service of the Work Projects Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Robert Shaneyfelt and his wife, Mildred Shaneyfelt, against the United States," and insert in lieu thereof:

"One thousand five hundred dollars and to Mildred Shaneyfelt, Decatur, Ala., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt and Mildred Shaneyfelt."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

MR. AND MRS. R. L. SAUNDERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5046, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr.

and Mrs. R. L. Saunders, of Poquoson, Va., the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Linwood Saunders, on May 22, 1941, as the result of being hit by Army aircraft near Poquoson, York County, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR W. JORGENSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5164, for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur W. Jorgenscn, Columbus, Wis., the sum of $2,163. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims arising out of personal injuries sustained on March 25, 1941, by Robert R. Jorgenson, minor son of the said Arthur W. Jorgenson, when an electric-light post fell on him. Such post had been placed in a leaning position against the wall of a public-school building in Columbus, Wis., by National Youth Administration workers engaged in a Federal building project on the school grounds: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of" strike out the remainder of line 6, line 7, line 8, line 9, to preceding the word "when" and insert in lieu thereof:

"$500, and the sum of $1,663 to the legal guardian of Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses and personal injuries sustained by Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor, on March 25, 1941."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson, and the legal guardian for Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor."

MRS. EDDIE A. SCHNEIDER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5290, for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider, of 3250 Ninety-third Street, Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y., the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Eddie A. Schneider, who was killed by the collision of a United States naval plane with private plane piloted by him, near Floyd Bennett Field, N. Y., on December 23, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. T. ELLIOTT, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5390, for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. T. Elliott, Inc., of Hampton, Va., the sum of $203.16 in settlement of actual damages sustained by the said G. T. Elliott, Inc., from collision of one of its boats with an anchor previously lost in the Norfolk area by a naval vessel of the United States and in settlement of actual expenses incurred by the said G. T. Elliott, Inc., in recovering the said anchor for the United States, the said anchor after recovery having been delivered by the said G. T. Elliott, Inc., to the officials of the United States and accepted by them: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "in," insert "full."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "actual damages" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims against the United States for damage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLENE RUHLMAN AND JOHN P. RUHLMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5473, for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Allene Ruhlman the sum of $10,221 and to John P. Ruhlman, both of New York, the sum of $3,185 in full settlement of their claims against the United States Government as a result of personal injuries and property damage sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an ambulance of the Civilian Conservation Corps, on the 6th day of September 1940 on the Harrisburg Pike, near Carlisle, Pa.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of" strike out "$10,221", and insert "$5,221."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. L. FREEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5576) for the relief of A. L. Freeman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $252 to A. L. Freeman, assistant postmaster, of Mangum, Okla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of funds which he paid due to error in counting defense postal-savings stamps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PACIFIC ART TILE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5643) for the relief of the Pacific Art Tile Co.

Mr. MOTT and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

A. PAUL JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5767) for the relief of A. Paul Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. Paul Johnson, United States conciliation commissioner, at

Broken Bow, Nebr., the sum of $25. Such sum represents the amount of fees which the said A. Paul Johnson earned while acting as United States conciliation commissioner for the United States District Court of the District of Nebraska, but not paid because his term as United States conciliation commissioner expired March 26, 1939, and, through an oversight, his appointment for another term was not effective until April 6, 1939.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the figure "$25.", strike out the period, and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Nebraska", insert "for the period between March 26, 1939, and April 6, 1939,".

Page 1, line 13, at the end of the bill strike out the period and insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHAIM WAKERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 456) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Chaim Wakerman, known as Hyman Wakerman.

Mr. MOTT and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

LT. COL. GORDON SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 501) for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith, Quartermaster Corps, United States property and disbursing officer, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C., the sum of $445.89, public funds for which he is accountable, and which were stolen from the office safe in the adjutant general's department on the night of November 28–29, 1939.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES ROSWELL SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1338) for the relief of James Roswell Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to James Roswell Smith, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an airplane crash which occurred while the said James Roswell Smith was receiving flight instruction under the civilian pilot training program at Hastings, Nebr., on October 7, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANE HAWK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4626) for the relief of Jane Hawk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, the sum of $7,500 to Jane Hawk, of Atlanta, Ga., for personal injuries received as the result of being struck by an automobile being driven by a Special Delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office on October 1, 1939.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all the language after the figures "$7,500" in line 7 and the rest of line 7, and all of lines 8, 9, and 10, and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000 to the legal guardian of Jane Hawk, of Atlanta, Ga.; the sum of $5,125.70 to J. L. Hawk, of Atlanta, Ga., for personal injuries, property damages, and medical expenses sustained by them on October 1, 1939, when the car driven by Jane Hawk was struck by an automobile being driven by a Special Delivery messenger of the Atlanta post office: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Jane Hawk, a minor, and J. L. Hawk."

PAUL W. MANKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5331) for the relief of Paul W. Mankin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul W. Mankin, of Knoxville, Tenn., the sum of $379.55 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him as a result of his Dodge four-door automobile being run into and wrecked by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck No. 82862, on the 26th day of July 1940, on the public highway between Knoxville, Tenn., and Sunshine, Tenn., said Civilian Conservation Corps truck at the time of said collision being operated by a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MRS. NOEL WRIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5573) for the relief of Mrs. Noel Wright and Bunny Wright.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Noel Wright, of Jackson, Miss., the sum of $1,118.50, and to the legal guardian of Bunny Wright, a minor, of Jackson, Miss., the sum of $767.60, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on acccunt of personal injuries received by them on July 11, 1941, when the car in which they were riding collided with a Government car owned by the United States Army Air Base and driven by Pvt. James H. Berrong, said collision being entirel the fault of the driver of the Government car; also, the sum of $602.21 to Mrs. Noel Wright to cover cost of repair to her car: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,118.50" and insert "$1,720.71."

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and the word "car" in line 5, and insert, "in Jackson, Miss."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

SOLOMON BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5984) for the relief of Solomon Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Solomon Brown, Walterboro, S. C., the sum of $50 per month in a sum not to exceed $1,000. Such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the permanent disability sustained by the said Solomon Brown due to the amputation of his right hand necessitated by several injuries to such hand received on October 22, 1932, while the said Solomon Brown was at work in the laundry of the United States Penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga.: *Provided*, That no amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHAN TSORK-YING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2419, for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence, the provision of section 3 of the act of Congress of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C. Annotated, title 8, sec. 136 (n)), which excludes from admission into the United States persons who are natives of certain geographical zones described therein, and the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162), as amended (U. S. C. Annotated, title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter be held to apply to Chan Tsork-ying; and the said Chan Tsork-ying, who is the wife of James Chew Young Lee, a citizen of the United States, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, may be issued an immigration visa and may be granted permission to reside permanently in the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Chan Tsork-ying as of December 21, 1937, the date on which she entered the United States, provided she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. M. SHERROD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1755, for the relief of C. M. Sherrod.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. M. Sherrod, the sum of $2,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States growing out of his personal injuries sustained in a mail robbery at Guthrie, Ky., on January 5, 1938, by three unidentified bandits.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daisy Mimms, administratrix of the estate of Arthur Mimms, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States growing out of the death of the said Arthur Mimms, who was killed by three unidentified bandits in a mail robbery at Guthrie, Ky., on January 5, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of C. M. Sherrod and Daisy Mimms, administratrix of the estate of Arthur Mimms."

RUTH STEWARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2460, for the relief of Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of exposure suffered by said Luther F. Steward, leader in Civilian Conservation Corps Company 1540, CC 5-80980L, S.P.-9, Henderson, Ky., by reason of outstanding service in the actual rescue of human lives performed during the Ohio and Green Rivers flood in 1937, which exposure resulted in the contraction of influenza and pneumonia, subsequently causing the death of said Luther F. Steward on April 29, 1937, in the marine hospital at Evansville, Ind.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the word "Treasury", strike out "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps" and insert in lieu thereof "not otherwise appropriated."

Line 8, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "*Provided*", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof:

"That no claim for legal services or for any other services rendered in connection with said claim, shall be valid unless approved by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; and any person who receives any fee, other consideration, or any gratuity on account of services so rendered, unless such consideration or gratuity is approved by the Commission, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each offense, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY KAHN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4665, for the relief of Harry Kahn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Harry Kahn, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States of America, for personal injuries sustained by Harry Kahn as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle near the entrance to Fort Humphreys, in the State of Virginia, on April 16, 1931.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

At the end of the bill insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA BOAT & BARGE SYSTEM, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4999, for the relief of the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., successor to the Columbia Barge Co., organized January 12, 1933.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., Portland, Oreg., the sum of $99,600, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages suffered in consequence of a break in The Dalles Celio Canal, and a breach of agreements incident to repair said break: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, notwithstanding the lapse of time, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., resulting from the failure of the United States to promptly repair a break in The Dalles-Celio Canal which occurred during April of 1933: *Provided*, That such suit shall be brought within 1 year of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc."

ESTATE OF JOHN J. MURRAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1535, for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of John J. Murray, formerly of Brasher Falls, N. Y., the sum of $1,575. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to meadow and pasture lands on the property known as the John J. Murray Estate, situated near Brasher, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., as the result of the use of such lands by the War Department for the camping and maneuvering of troops during field exercises in the month of August 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,575" and insert "$1,121."

Page 2, line 3, after "1940" insert:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT EDWARD WHITESIDE

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 454, for the consideration of H. R. 2922, for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation heretofore issued against Albert Edward Whiteside, and that the alien shall not hereafter become subject to deportation for the cause contained in the present warrant.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Attorney General."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 962—LIABILITY OF THE UNITED STATES TO MULTNOMAH COUNTY FOR TAX CLAIM

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 962, introduced by me, and which was on the Private Calendar today and received the approval of the House, is a bill to reimburse Multnomah County, Oreg., for taxes for the year 1928 in the sum of $6,370, without interest, which were levied and became a lien in the year 1928, on the real property where the new Federal Courthouse is situated in Portland, Oreg., in my district.

The facts giving rise to the claim are these:

At the time the Federal Government purchased and took title to this real property the taxes had already been levied, and under the Oregon law had become a lien upon the property. Under the Oregon law a claim for taxes is a claim which attaches to the land only and is not a personal claim against the owners of the land, and the only recourse the county has to recover delinquent taxes is through the foreclosure of its tax lien. However, before the date arrived for the collection of the taxes by this process, the Federal Government had taken title to the property, which barred the county from bringing a suit to foreclose the lien, as under the law it is denied the right to sue the United States.

The Attorney General, in passing upon the title to the property for the Government, through inadvertence and a misunderstanding, reported that these taxes according to his understanding did not become a lien until March 1, 1929, whereas in fact they had already become a lien on March 1, 1928. He also stated that the amount of such taxes, according to the terms of the proposal and acceptances between the Government and the sellers, must be added to the purchase price. By reason of this mistake the Federal Government proceeded to consummate the purchase, pay the purchase price, take title to the land without making provision for the payment of the taxes, which resulted in depriving the county of Multnomah of the opportunity to collect the taxes and necessitated presenting a private bill to the Congress directing payment thereof by the Federal Government.

I filed such a bill, and, as shown by the Report No. 1389 of the Committee on Claims, the claim is a just one and should be paid by the United States. The committee, in its concluding statement of the report, said:

The committee, in view of the fact that the terms of the proposal and acceptance provided that the Government would raise the purchase price in order to cover the taxes due for the year 1928, and due to the fact that it has been definitely established that the taxes for 1928 became a lien against the property as of March 1, 1928, and as such was a lien when purchased, approves the bill. In conclusion it may be stated that the only remedy provided by law for the county is against the property by the issuance of a certificate of delinquency and the foreclosure of that certificate against the property, and there is no provision for the entry of a judgment against the owner of the property, therefore it is recommended that H. R. 962, for the relief of Multnomah County, Oreg., do pass.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this bill will, in due course, pass the other body and be signed by the President, as it will rectify an error which has caused great loss to Multnomah County. Even with the payment of the original amount of the taxes, the county has been deprived of the use thereof since 1929.

PETROLEUM INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, House Resolution 383, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to continue until January 3, 1943, the investigation begun under House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and continued by House Resolution 15 and House Resolution 188 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Any unexpended balance authorized for use of the said committee under House Resolution 291, Seventy-sixth Congress, is hereby continued for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think he can conclude his investigation within the time he has asked?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. We hope so. It is hard to tell just how much time will be required. New situations are constantly developing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The committee has not completed its work as yet.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. No. The able gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] is the ranking Republican member of the committee and is familiar with the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand this is a unanimous request from the committee.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this committee has been conducting this investigation for about 3 years; has it not?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The investigation now authorized, while a renewal of the one in 1934 and 1935, started in August 1939.

Mr. SABATH. How much longer will it take to complete this investigation?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. It is difficult to tell because of ever recurring problems in connection with the very important subject assigned to us. The gentleman from Illinois will recall that after the investigation of 1934 and 1935, President Roosevelt wrote the Speaker of the House referring in a very complimentary way to the work previously done by our committee and recommending its continuance for specified reasons. I did not make the request, the investigation was urged very earnestly by the President.

Mr. SABATH. Has this committee made any report of its work?

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Yes; when it has found it advisable to do so and, furthermore, it has submitted some legislation, the most recent being the Pipe Line Act under which two important pipe lines are being built today, and another was very recently completed. The gentleman I think knows of the great amount of time the splendid gentlemen serving under me on this committee have given to this work. It is by no means an easy task and the gentleman must know it. If there ever was a time Congress should keep advised as near up to the minute as possible as to the condition of our petroleum industry it is now. Do not be surprised if you find the war to be one for the possession of oil more than for anything else.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time only to say that I believe this committee is rendering a real service for defense. Our crude-oil resources are going to be depleted unless we get some plan of intelligent development. I think this committee is going a long way toward the realization of such a plan.

I hope this resolution will be adopted without objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I thank the distinguished gentleman, who represents one of our most important oil-producing States, and whose interest in the work of my committee has been earnest and very helpful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Green County Board of Supervisors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, you will find on page 9563 of yesterday's RECORD that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] among other things said:

> The America First Committee isolationists should apologize to President Roosevelt. * * * Our belated preparation and mobilization for war was due in part to what some of the isolationists inside the House and outside the House have said and their influence on public opinion.

That statement is utterly without foundation. No one in this House, so far as I have been able to learn, has ever opposed preparation for national defense. For many months many of us—and I am proud to number myself among them—have been opposed to war. War having come to us in spite of our efforts, I know of no one who will not do his utmost to aid in carrying that war to a successful conclusion.

There is no disposition, so far as I have been able to learn, on the part of anyone on the minority side to criticize any Army or Navy official; and I for one do not propose, while this conflict continues, to attempt to decide what the course of conduct of our Army or Navy should be, for I know nothing of fighting on land or sea.

But Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article published in Secretary Knox's own newspaper, the Chicago Daily News. The article, a dispatch from Chungking, dated December 10, was written by a News correspondent, Leland Stowe, who states that there were "important American losses" at Pearl Harbor.

The dispatch goes on to say:

> It seems incomprehensible here how the Japs were able to bomb the Army's big airfields in Oahu, losing a few planes, and without large numbers of American fighters getting in the air promptly.

Then, Mr. Speaker, comes this all-important paragraph:

> This is especially true since United States representatives in Chungking were warned by Washington of the seriousness of the situation as early as last Friday when a code message stated that relations with the Japs might be ruptured over the week end. On Sunday evening, at least 1 hour before the Jap blitz on Hawaii, an official of the United States gunboat *Tulita* warned your correspondent: "It is going to happen tonight."

The point of this article seems to clearly indicate that the Navy was forewarned of the Jap attack and apparently made no preparations to meet it. The fact that it was published in Knox's paper, from which he continues to draw a salary as publisher while ostensibly serving the American people in the President's cabinet, makes the statements of this correspondent doubly significant. It appears that this correspondent in far off China has information being withheld at this time from the American people.

Why did not the President last night tell us about these "important losses" to which the Secretary's correspondent referred?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In a few minutes.

On yesterday the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] stated that there should be less talk in the House, and he then proceeded to add two pages to the RECORD as printed this morning. I agree with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. There should be no talk in the House by anyone unless that person has something to say. I trust that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] did not by his statement mean to intimate that a declaration of war had stopped his mental processes. If we are to have democracy, there is no reason why anyone who has anything sensible to say should not say it on the floor of the House.

It was not only with regret but with sorrow that I noticed on the day war was declared that recognition was denied to a Member of the House, the gentlewoman from Montana [Miss RANKIN] to express her views.

I noticed that last evening as the session ended a Member of the House was deprived of the opportunity of stating his views to the House, and I refer to a gentleman on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

However much we may disagree with the views which might have been expressed by the Member from Montana [Miss RANKIN], however much we might disapprove of the effort being made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], nothing is to be gained by fighting a war to carry the freedom of speech to the four corners of the world when here in the House of Representatives freedom of speech is denied the Members. The sentiment of this body, the opinion of Members privately expressed to the Member who is offending or is expressing views harmful to our Republic, are sufficient to still the observations of such Member.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRY. May I say to the gentleman that the statement of my colleague from New York was not only unfounded but asinine. It had the effect of disrupting our national unity at this critical time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That might be the effect so far as some are concerned. I do not resent any statement which challenges my patriotism; I do not resent any statement which challenges my courage, because statements of that kind which are untrue, obviously untrue, have no effect. The only reaction I have to statements of that kind is to become more settled, if possible, in my determination to follow through and to accomplish what I started out to accomplish in the beginning. I cannot agree with the gentleman that the statement was asinine, but, of course, that is a matter of opinion. I agree it was untrue and I agree that it caused me to make these remarks today. There may be some who resent it. I do not. I just call attention to it and to the utter lack of foundation for the statement.

Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed last night in the remarks of the President because he did not tell us what our losses in the Pacific were. I think he was right when he said he would not give us any information which might be of benefit to the enemy and when he said he could not tell us the extent of the loss to certain battleships because he did not know how long it would take to repair them or whether or not they could be repaired. But when a battleship or a warship is sunk, certainly the enemy knows that fact and there is no reason why the American people should not be advised of what has happened in the way of loss. If one battleship has been sunk, then there may be need for the construction of two or three more.

If our people are to exercise what he calls a privilege, that is, of giving and dying for our country, then they should have some foundation upon which to base the extent of their gifts to be made in the exercise of that privilege.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Briefly.

Mr. COX. What does the gentleman have in mind? Is he complaining because he can find no edge to the President's blade of last evening? In other words, is he complaining that after all he did not get what he expected, that is, information?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not complaining in particular. I am calling attention to the fact we did not get any information, to which we are entitled, as to the extent of our losses, because if we are to fight this war all over the world, all over the world, mark you, if we are to extend the draft age so that it will call for those from 18 to 45, if we are to send another A. E. F. to the Philippine Islands and beyond, into Asia, even, then our people who are to furnish the men, the guns, and the material are entitled to know what we have lost so that they have some idea of our need.

The President said, and truly, that the American people have stamina enough to meet with fortitude any loss which may befall. For that very reason they should from time to time be told of the losses as they occur. Confidence begets confidence. The truth, however unpleasant it may be, is no deterrent to the patriotic and determined citizen.

That is what I have been talking about. A point I wish to make is that the President, if I understand him correctly, said that we no longer needed any labor legislation.

Mr. COX. Did the President say that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Read it for yourself. I so understand the recent press reports. If we are to draft men from 18 to 45 to serve everywhere in the world, then there is no reason why this House, which a year ago voted amendments to the Wagner law which would have aided national production, should not act. A House that just a few days ago by overwhelming vote passed the so-called Smith bill should insist upon legislation which will give us production, not trust to the promises of anyone. There is no reason why we should not insist that we have legislation dealing with the labor situation.

It is only a few weeks ago that the President made the statement that no man would be forced by the Government to join a union in order to hold his job. It is only a few hours ago that the Mediation Board appointed by the President determined that men cannot work in the coal mines which supply the coal for the steel mills which make the steel from which we build ships until they have joined a union. I wonder what the Members of the House think of that proposition here, engaged as we are in a war, when these men who are exempted because they are in an essential industry take this attitude.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is entitled to recognition for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the most encouraging development of the last dark days has been the response of some of our sister republics to the south in joining hands with us in resisting what now has become our common enemy. It is most important that everything be done by us now not only to prosecute the war against enemy nations with all the vigor at our command, but also to do everything we can to develop friendship, understanding, and stronger ties of cooperation with the nations that are standing with us.

I presume that many of the Members of the House are familiar with what is known as the Good Neighbor Foundation. It is an organization of people, of which Mr. Benjamin Neal is the president and Mr. Edward Arnold, the moving-picture actor, one of the most prominent members. Many of you no doubt met these two gentlemen when they were here in Washington some time ago on behalf of the "I am an American Day," movement which it seems to me is most valuable from the standpoint of our national spirit.

I consider it a very real honor that I have been requested by this organization to introduce a resolution, House Joint Resolution 253, which I shall now read to the House:

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as "Good Neighbor Day" for the purpose of setting an example in neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow—leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world

Whereas the New World is composed of descendants of the Old World; and

Whereas the traditional hates and prejudices of the Old World have gradually given place in the New World, to a growing sympathy and understanding of man for man; and

Whereas, in North and South and Central America, this "good neighbor" spirit is eloquently evidenced by friendly international relations and the absence of barricaded frontiers; and

Whereas the citizens of the Western Hemisphere have an opportunity to point the way toward a more neighborly spirit among the peoples of the earth and toward a better understanding of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; and

Whereas New Year's Day, even before Columbus discovered North America, was a time for friendly celebration among the early Indians; and

Whereas, in both the Old World and the New World, New Year's Day, for many centuries, has also been observed as a special occasion for exemplifying the spirit of the "good neighbor"; and

Whereas during the past several years "Good Neighbor Day" has been officially proclaimed by a majority of the Governors of the United States, following the first such proclamation issued by the late Gov. James Rolph, Jr., of California, at the request of Benjamin E. Neal, founder of "Good Neighbor Day," on the 26th day of December, 1933, anno Domini; and

Whereas, in the United States, the occasion has been devoted to extending hospitality and good cheer to the unfortunate, renewing old acquaintances, and making new friends; and

Whereas the Members of the Congress of the United States, by this act, give public evidence of their faith in the quickening power of such precept and example: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the first day of January each year be, and hereby is, set aside as "Good Neighbor Day" and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion.

SEC. 2. That the civil and educational authorities of the States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day; officials and private citizens be urged to display flags of all nations of the Western Hemisphere, on Government buildings, at home, and in other suitable places on the first day of each year; and that ministers and laymen of churches be urged to sound the "good neighbor" note in watch-night services and other religious gatherings held

in celebration of New Year's Day—as public and private expressions of determination on the part of the citizens of the United States, to bring about a better understanding, better living conditions, and a better guaranty for the protection, the well-being, the prosperity, and happiness of men and women everywhere.

SEC. 3. That the first day of each year shall be known as "Good Neighbor Day," when individual citizens of this Nation will set a standard to be followed throughout all the days of the year, by extending the hand of friendship, hospitality, and brotherly love to our neighbors at home, and to friendly visitors within these borders, to the end that our example as "good neighbors" may speed the time when the Golden Rule shall become the rule of all the world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is there any thought of making that day a day of rest? Are you making it a national holiday?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I can assure the gentleman I would have no idea of proposing a day of rest at a time like this.

Mr. COX. It is not a holiday?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. Except that the day chosen happens to be New Year's Day, which we have always observed anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very earnestly that in the course of time, in the next few days, it will be possible for this resolution to be brought before the House. It has been my belief for some time that it is important to our relations with the nations of the Western Hemisphere that some declaration be made by Congress to indicate that the policy of cooperation among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, which has been so very well put forward by our President and Secretary of State, and which is now bringing to our side such valued support, is the policy of this country and of all its people. I believe a declaration by the Congress along these same lines, in a formal and forceful manner, would have a very profound and beneficial effect in this connection. This resolution in itself will be a valuable contribution to that end.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of December 7, 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from California who has just spoken that everything should be done to promote the good-neighbor policy. I am glad to advise the House that the Central American countries, Costa Rica, San Salvador, Nicaragua provisionally, Guatemala, and Panama, probably as a result of the good-neighbor policy, have declared war upon Japan. I believe this joint action with the United States has been taken as a result of the good-neighbor policy. I have always supported Secretary Hull and Under Secretary Welles in that policy, and am today in entire accord with the pan-American policy.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am wondering if the gentleman can inform his colleagues in the House if what appears to have been a smear campaign that was pressed against the gentleman pretty assiduously for some time now approaches an end?

Mr. FISH. I can only express that hope, but it is very hard to put an end to a smear campaign once it is begun.

Mr. COX. I have been hearing it said on every hand, and it comes from gentlemen who are not particularly admirers of the gentleman from New York, that this thing has been carried far enough and is now becoming the case of the entire House, and that the House owes some responsibility to itself to resist it. Therefore, the expression of hope is that whoever is responsible for this campaign will see the good sense of abandoning it, because if it is not a smear campaign against the gentleman, it has all of the appearance of such.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to take this opportunity of thanking the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] for his good advice.

Mr. COX. I do not always agree with the gentleman from New York but I have respect for him. I am trying to uphold the integrity of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this an exhibition of partisanship? I thought I had the floor. The gentleman yielded to me. Have I the floor now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to express, if I may without interruption, my thanks to the gentleman from Georgia for the scolding he has administered to all of us and which he does daily.

Mr. FISH. I do not want to get into any controversy on that. I have always said I would make no remarks on this situation which is before the grand jury until it is completed and until the pending trials have been held. Then I propose to speak out in no uncertain terms, but I have not thought that it was the proper time to do so.

I have taken this time because I may not be here tomorrow. I have two engagements of long standing in my own district. A bill may come up tomorrow from the Military Affairs Committee which I favor, and I want to go on record as being for legislation to freeze in the service all enlisted men now in the Army for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter. The measure also repeals provisions of the present law prohibiting American expeditionary forces, and gives the President the power to send troops wherever he may desire. I am in favor of that plan and believe it is very proper in time of war.

I am not in favor of the other proposal that may come before the House reducing the age limit of draftees down to 18 years. England has been at war for 2 years and has included only men 19 years of age. Last week they reduced it to 18½. With our enormous reservoir of men, it is not necessary—at least, at the present time—to reduce it under 21 years of age. I am in favor of 21 to 40 age limits, but whenever it is necessary or whenever we are lacking in manpower, then I will be in favor of lowering the age limit to 18. As a matter of fact, if it is necessary to continue the draft in time of peace, then I would favor including those between the ages of 18 and 22 and let the boys take their choice as to their period of service. But I do not believe it is necessary in a military sense to reduce the age limit down to 18—at least, not at the present time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to H. R. 962 and to include therein certain quotations, immediately after the consideration of the Private Calendar today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 11, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1152. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1153. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 382. A bill for the consideration of H. R. 6128, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1490). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262. Resolution for consideration of S. 1544, a bill to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway; with amendment (Rept. No. 1491). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 6135. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6195. A bill removing restrictions on the use, and terms of service, of units and members of the land and naval forces of the United States, including selective trainees of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6202. A bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 6203. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 6204. A bill for the relief of C. S. Hobson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6205 (by request). A bill for the relief of Erminia Alleva; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2144. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Veterans' Facility Local No. 44, West Los Angeles, Calif., urging that Congressman RAMSPECK, of Georgia, hold hearings on House bill 5730, which would provide for a decent living wage for Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2145. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petition of H. M. Rogers and a number of other citizens of Atlanta, Ga., and vicinity, opposing the passage of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2146. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, No. 2261, memorializing the proper governmental officials to put into effect a plan of priorities or allocations as recommended by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2147. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York State 4-H Extension Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4530; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2148. Also, petition of the International Congress of the People, New Rochelle, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2149. Also, petition of Elvi Kahkonen and James V. Grove and others assembled at Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs relative to Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1941

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

O Father of Mercies and Lover of men, deepen and quicken in us by the indwelling of Thy spirit such a sense of Thy presence as will enable us to meet all difficulties and temptations with steadfastness of heart, that we may pass this day thankful for the privilege of serving Thee as Thou deservest. Protect and assist, we humbly beseech Thee, all those who are serving our beloved country at home or abroad, by land, by sea or in the air, and grant that, being armed with Thy defense, they may be preserved evermore in all perils, and being filled with Thy wisdom and girded with Thy strength, they may do their duty to Thy honor and glory, serving Thee without reproach.

Upon these Thy servants, leaders of our Nation, we invoke Thy blessings without measure; grant to Thy people the gift of undivided loyalty; restrain us from uttering any untrue or unkind word, and keep us often silent, that, with hearts attuned to Thine, we may speak to Thee and hearken to Thy voice saying within us, "this is the way, walk ye in it," when from Thy path we are wont to stray. We ask it in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 10, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 138. An act granting a pension to Mary Jane Blackman;

S. 201. An act for the relief of Henry Kotila;

S. 501. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith;

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of William Corder;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mary S. Gay;

S. 1550. An act for the relief of Carl Chalker;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells;

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick; and

S. 1870. An act for the relief of John Paul Murray.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of Lulu Heron;

H. R. 331. An act for the relief of the Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co.;

H. R. 691. An act for the relief of Richard Bove;

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Multnomah County, Oreg.;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray;

H. R. 1755. An act for the relief of C. M. Sherrod and Daisy Mimms, administratrix of the estate of Arthur Mimms;

H. R. 1903. An act for the relief of Reuben Owen;

H. R. 2120. An act for the relief of John H. Durnil;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying;

H. R. 2428. An act for the relief of G. F. Brown;

H. R. 2436. An act for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby;

H. R. 2460. An act for the relief of Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Chin Hoy;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside;

H. R. 2967. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3087. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Dale L. Barthel and others;

H. R. 3398. An act for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher;

H. R. 3433. An act for the relief of Bessie Pearlman and George Roth;

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of Estella King;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 4355. An act for the relief of Bella Cosgrove;

H. R. 4436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha M. Smith;

H. R. 4537. An act for the relief of H. D. Bateman, Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard, and J. M. Creech;

H. R. 4626. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Jane Hawk, a minor, and J. L. Hawk;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn;

H. R. 4831. An act for the relief of Katherine McCue;

H. R. 4999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.;

H. R. 5040. An act for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt and Mildred Shaneyfelt;

H. R. 5046. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Esco Wood;

H. R. 5135. An act to appoint Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, a lieutenant, senior grade, in the United States Navy Medical Corps;

H. R. 5164. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson, and the legal guardian of Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of J. W. Daughtry;

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider;

H. R. 5331. An act for the relief of Paul W. Mankin;

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul;

H. R. 5390. An act for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.;

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday I issued a call for a Republican conference. The conference was had this morning, and a resolution was unanimously adopted, which I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Republican conference pledge to the President of the United States its unanimous support in the vigorous and efficient prosecution of the war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of the majority, and I am sure on behalf of the country, I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon, as minority leader, of our deep appreciation, not only of their resolution just presented by him but of his cooperation and that of his Republican colleagues in the prosecution of this war which has been thrust upon the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burton	George
Andrews	Butler	Gerry
Austin	Byrd	Gillette
Bailey	Capper	Glass
Ball	Caraway	Green
Bankhead	Chandler	Guffey
Barbour	Chavez	Gurney
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Bilbo	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Brewster	Connally	Herring
Bridges	Danaher	Hill
Brooks	Davis	Holman
Brown	Downey	Hughes
Bulow	Doxey	Johnson, Calif.
Bunker	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Kilgore	Nye	Stewart
La Follette	O'Daniel	Taft
Langer	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Idaho
Lodge	Overton	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
McCarran	Radcliffe	Tobey
McFarland	Reed	Truman
McKellar	Reynolds	Tunnell
McNary	Rosier	Vandenberg
Maloney	Russell	Van Nuys
Maybank	Schwartz	Wallgren
Mead	Shipstead	Walsh
Murdock	Smathers	White
Murray	Smith	Wiley
Norris	Spencer	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent because of the serious illness of his brother.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram embodying a resolution of the Seventy-first Infantry Post, No. 487, American Legion, of New York City, endorsing the stand taken by the Senate against Japan, and tendering its services in the existing war emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Resolutions adopted by Lodge No. 82, I. O. O. F., and the Dorcas Society of Grace Lutheran Church, both of Osage City, and the Board of County Commissioners of Crawford County, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of House bill 1410, the so-called general welfare bill, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr AUSTIN:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Orleans and Rutland, Vt., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have in my hand and present certified copy of a resolution of the Court of Common Council of the City of Hartford, Conn., unanimously endorsing the action President Roosevelt has taken against Japan. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution in full may be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Honorable Court of Common Council of Hartford, Conn., fully endorses the action of President Franklin D. Roosevelt which he has taken against Japan.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PAINTERS AND DECORATORS JOINT COMMITTEE, PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Mr. McFARLAND presented the following telegram embodying a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *December 9, 1941.*

Senator E. W. McFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following resolution adopted meeting of board December 8:

"Be it resolved by the members and board of directors of Painters and Decorators Joint Committee, Inc., an Arizona nonprofit corporation designed to fulfill the intent and purpose of a certain collective bargaining agreement entered into between Painting and Decorating Contractors Association employers and Painters Local Union 86 employees, that

"Whereas a state of war now exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the time has come for united action among all groups and classes of citizens of these United States in the defense of its great national democracy:

"Now, therefore, this board of directors duly authorized thereunto hereby unqualifiedly pledges the support of the group of employers and employees represented by it to the President of the United States to the civil and military authorities of the Government of the United States and of the State of Arizona and stands ready to perform whatever services may be required of the painting industry in the jurisdiction of Phoenix and Maricopa County in the prosecution of this war to its ultimate successful conclusion."

PHIL J. MUNCH,
Business Representative.

LETTER FROM DR. H. LOEFFLER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, yesterday I received a letter from an alien now residing in my State. I desire to read, not the letter in its entirety, but a portion of it. It is addressed:

DEAR SENATOR WHITE—

The writer first makes a reference to a meeting with me some years ago which I do not personally recall. Then he says the following:

Today, on learning of the declaration of war by Japan on the United States, I wish to show my deep gratitude toward the United States * * * for the liberty and happiness it offers to me and my family. I therefore am enclosing my personal check for $100, payable to the United States Treasury, which I would greatly appreciate if you direct it to the proper channels.

This check, although I realize it is small, I wish to make as an outright gift to the United States to use for the defense of this wonderful country. God bless America.

This letter and the accompanying check, which I am sending to the Treasury, came from Dr. H. Loeffler, of Winthrop, Maine. I have read the letter, because I think it is an example that all aliens in the United States might well emulate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 6009. A bill to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 889).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1688. A bill for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; without amendment (Rept. No. 890).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 5749. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 891).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2103. A bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges; without amendment (Rept. No. 892).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. Res. 204. Resolution favoring a 24-hour per diem work basis in all national-defense industries (submitted by Mr. TOBEY on December 10, 1941); with an amendment to the preamble (Rept. No. 893)

MARTHA FRANCES SPENCE

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 205, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 205, submitted by Mr. RADCLIFFE on December 10, 1941, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Martha Frances Spence, widow of Charles N. Spence, late an employee of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORTS RELATIVE TO INVESTIGATION OF RAILROADS, HOLDING COMPANIES, ETC.

Mr. TRUMAN. From the Committee on Printing, at the request of the chairman of the committee, I report Senate Resolution 191 with the recommendation that it be adopted and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 191), submitted by Mr. WHEELER on November 10, 1941, was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 2,000 additional copies of part I and each subsequent part of Senate Report No. 714, current Congress, as submitted to the Senate pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 71, 77th Cong.) directing an investigation of railroads, holding companies, and affiliated companies with respect to financing and certain other matters, be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ANNUAL REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION (S. DOC. NO. 146)

Mr. TRUMAN. From the Committee on Printing I report favorably, at the request of the chairman of that committee, an original resolution, being the customary resolution for the printing of the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-fourth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1941, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2114. A bill relating to the collection of certain claims arising out of certain loans to farmers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luther S. Sykes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2116. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Mathias and Elsie Mathias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2117. A bill authorizing the presentation of a distinguished flying cross to Roy William Ammel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported two original joint resolutions (S. J. Res. 119 and S. J. Res. 120) declaring that a state of war exists between the Governments of Germany and Italy, respectively, and the Government and the people of the United States, etc., which were passed, and appear under separate heading.)

AMENDMENT TO THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL-DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 6159, the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill, 1942, and ask that it be immediately referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I submit the amendment at the request of the Architect of the Capitol.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be immediately referred, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut, and printed.

The amendment is as follows:

At an appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

"To enable the Architect of the Capitol to prepare a suitable depository for the valued documents of the two Houses of Congress since the organization of the Government, $25,000 to be made immediately available. The Architect is directed to prepare suitable space directly beneath the crypt in the central portion of the building."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6159 making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

At the proper place in the bill to insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Orchard rehabilitation loans: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, for the purpose of enabling the borrowers to rehabilitate orchards in the States of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa which were destroyed or damaged as a result of the extremely cold weather in such States in November 1940, $1,000,000."

Mr. CAPPER also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

(For the text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

MRS. H. C. BIVINS AND OTHERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henriette Bivins, and Irvin Tatum, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the figures "$1,000" insert "$1,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

LLOYD SPENCER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., BEFORE YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF KANSAS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., chairman of the Republican National Committee and leader of the minority in the House of Representatives, before the biennial convention of Young Republicans of Kansas, at Topeka, on December 4, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

GARRETT WHITESIDE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Times-Herald of December 9, 1941, with reference to Garrett Whiteside, clerk of the Senate Committee on Enrolled Bills, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the President will shortly send a message to the Senate. I have no disposition to delay the joint resolution in which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is interested, though I certainly shall have to make a reservation in agreeing to its consideration so that the message of the President may be received.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from Texas very much, but I have conferred with our leader, and he has suggested that I defer asking immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 117 until after the arrival of the President's message.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the message is on the way. I do not know how many minutes it will be before it arrives. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., when it was called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 10, 1941, the President had approved and signed the followings acts:

S. 1060. An act to extend the 6 months' death gratuity benefits, now paid only to dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service of the United States; and

S. 1826. An act to permit seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters, and for other purposes.

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY AND ITALY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 454)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

On the morning of December 11 the Government of Germany, pursuing its course of world conquest, declared war against the United States.

The long known and the long expected has thus taken place. The forces endeavoring to enslave the entire world now are moving toward this hemisphere.

Never before has there been a greater challenge to life, liberty, and civilization.

Delay invites greater danger. Rapid and united effort by all the peoples of the world who are determined to remain free will insure a world victory of the forces of justice and of righteousness over the forces of savagery and of barbarism.

Italy also has declared war against the United States.

I therefore request the Congress to recognize a state of war between the United States and Germany and between the United States and Italy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 11, 1941.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message will be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Germany has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Germany; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall presently ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution just read to the Senate. Before the request is submitted, however, I desire to say that, being advised of the declaration of war upon the United States by the Governments of Germany and Italy, and anticipating a message by the President of the United States in relation thereto, and after a conference with the Secretary of State, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I called a meeting of the committee this morning and submitted to the committee the course I expected to pursue as chairman and the request which I expected to make.

I am authorized by the Committee on Foreign Relations to say to the Senate that after consideration of the text of the joint resolution which I have reported and after mature consideration of all aspects of this matter, the membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously approve and agree to the course suggested. One member of the committee was absent, but I have authority to express his views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CONNALLY. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MEAD (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably absent today. He has requested me to say that if he were present, he would vote "yea" on the joint resolution.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent because of the serious illness of his brother, who is in a hospital in Brookline, Mass., so desperately ill that the Senator from Montana had to leave Washington yesterday for Massachusetts. I am advised that if present the Senator from Montana would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting these Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. PEPPER. My colleague the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] has been engaged in the conduct of a hearing as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and is striving to reach the Senate Chamber, but has not been able to get here up to this time. He has sent word to me to ask that it be announced that if present and voting he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution.

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—88

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barbour	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tobey
Chandler	McCarran	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Murdock	Wiley
Doxey	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Norris	
George	Nye	

NOT VOTING—7

Andrews	Smathers	Wheeler
Bone	Tydings	
Lee	Wagner	

So the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH ITALY

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Italy has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Italy which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Italy; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with the same statement which I made earlier with regard to the Senate Joint Resolution 119 which has just been passed, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 120.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on the passage of the joint resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MEAD (when Mr. WAGNER'S name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from New York is unavoidably absent. He requests me to say that if he were present he would vote "yea" on the passage of the joint resolution.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent because of the serious illness of his brother. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting both Senators would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—90

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Daniel
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barbour	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McFarland	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis

NOT VOTING—6

Bone	Tydings	Wheeler
Lee	Wagner	

So the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) was passed.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDREWS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, on the vote on the joint resolution declaring the existence of a state of war with Germany, I was unavoidably detained as chairman of a committee conducting hearings involving national defense. I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as voting "yea."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I understand the desire of the Senator from Florida to be recorded, but I believe that to grant his request would be contrary to the rules and practices of the Senate and would establish a very bad precedent. Because of my personal affection for the Senator from Florida, I hesitate to make a point of order. Nevertheless, I must make the point of order that what he asks to have done is contrary to the rules and practices of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no question about the rules of the Senate in this matter. The only question is whether, on an occasion of absolute unanimity, the rule might be abrogated by unanimous consent.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted one brief observation, what I fear is that we might establish a precedent for suspending the rules by unanimous consent in cases of unanimity. Such a precedent might be used as an argument in favor of suspending the rules when there is a majority of two-thirds, and perhaps even when there is only a bare majority. It seems to me that the Senate cannot afford to establish such a precedent. I very much regret to have to make the point of order and raise an objection, because I understand the natural desire of the Senator from Florida to be formally recorded. However, he is now on record as to how he would have voted if he had been present, as are other Senators who were unavoidably absent. I must insist upon my point of order and my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate be permitted to submit reports during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON SERVICE OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed with the Members of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 117. I now move the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) removing restrictions on the use, and terms of service, of units and members of the Army of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question of taking up a measure for consideration is not debatable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It was not my intention to engage in debate in the strict sense of the word. I desire merely to make a brief statement.

Yesterday, when the Senator from North Carolina presented this particular joint resolution, I objected to its immediate consideration; and it was not acted upon yesterday, which was the earliest possible time it could have been acted upon. Since the objection was made by me, two momentous events have occurred; two declarations of war have been leveled against us. They change the atmosphere entirely. They change my purpose entirely. So I rise to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I withdraw any objection I had yesterday to his motion; and, however I may regret it, and however sorry I may feel that another A. E. F. shall be required by this country, I shall let the joint resolution pass, so far as I am concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina to consider Senate Joint Resolution 117.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with amendments.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I deem it unnecessary for me to consume the time of the Senate, except to say that

the joint resolution is very simple. It contains only three paragraphs. It merely freezes the present armed forces into the Army for the duration of the wars in which we are involved, until the expiration of those wars and for an additional 6 months thereafter, in order that the authorities of the Army may have the opportunity to disband the armed forces which have been engaged. In addition to that, the joint resolution lifts the ban upon sending the armed forces of the United States to parts of the world other than our territories and insular possessions and the Philippine Islands.

Mr. DANAHER rose.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there are two questions as to which I think the RECORD should be caused to speak by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. Inviting his attention to section 2, we read there a proviso; and, in order to put it before the Senate succinctly, I will read it. It is in lines 18 to 22:

Provided, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from terminating such periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission at an earlier date in any case.

Is it the purpose of the committee, in using that particular language, to authorize consideration of hardship cases and the type of case for which statutory exceptions are already provided?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Precisely.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, with reference to line 17, in section 2, there we find the word "enlistment." In order that the point may be made more apparent, let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that by this language the joint resolution is extending not only the periods of service, and training and service, of inductees and those who hold commissions but it is also indefinitely extending the periods of enlistment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. So I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina whether that represents a change in existing law as to the status of enlisted men.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It does.

Mr. DANAHER. And it, therefore, is a completely new concept, made necessary, I assume, by the exigencies of the situation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from North Carolina one other question with reference to enlistment. Certain rights are provided by statute to apply in favor of men whose terms of enlistment expired, let us say, this very morning, or yesterday, if you choose, who may return to the service within 20 days, may reenlist, and thereupon retain their warrants and their grades and certain emoluments which we give them by law. Will the Senator from North Carolina state whether the rights of such men, under the term "enlistment" now extended by this measure, will be protected?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Expressing a personal opinion, I feel confident that they will be protected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to yield to me long enough so that I may thank the Senator from North Carolina for yielding to me and for answering my questions.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for making the inquiries.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement. I had intended to offer an amendment to the joint resolution now under consideration; but the drafting clerk informs me that another bill amending the Selective Training and Service Act is to come before the Committee on Military Affairs. Therefore I will present the amendment at that time, so as not to delay the passage of the pending measure.

I may say that the Navy contemplates taking approximately 50,000 selectees into the naval service in the near future; and it will be necessary, therefore, for the bill to which I refer or a similar bill to provide that such selectees who go into the Navy shall be treated under the same law as that which relates to selectees who go into the Army. Rather than offer the amendment at this moment—which action, it was suggested, might delay the passage of the pending measure—it can be offered at a later time, either as an amendment to another measure or as a separate bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall appreciate it if the Senator from Massachusetts will offer it on another bill, for we hope the identical language will be used in the House in reference to the subject under discussion.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the passage of the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass? On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that, if present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent because of the serious illness of his brother. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained from the Senate. I am advised that, if present and voting, both Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has been detained in a very important committee meeting and may not arrive in time to vote. If present, and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—86

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Herring	Schwartz
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Hughes	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	White
Downey	Murray	Wiley
Doxey	Norris	Willis
Ellender	Nye	

NOT VOTING—9

Bone	Langer	Tydings
Bulow	Lee	Wagner
Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler

So Senate Joint Resolution 117 was passed.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I was detained by a late train, and regret that I was not in the Chamber when the recent votes were taken. Had I been present, I should have voted "yea" on all three joint resolutions passed by the Senate in answer to the challenge of the countries which have made war upon us.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this place a statement prepared by me when the word reached us that Mussolini and Hitler had declared war against the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1941, WITH REFERENCE TO RECOGNIZING THAT A STATE OF WAR EXISTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND NAZI GERMANY AND FASCIST ITALY

Today Mussolini and Hitler declared war against the United States. According to the terms of the tripartite treaty between Japan, Germany, and Italy, these three brigands are thus affirming their unity in the 4-day-old far-eastern war.

We sought peace in the Far East and met with a treacherous attack. The American people responded with complete unity for a righteous response to the war challenge hurled at us by Tokyo. We had no alternative then. We have no alternative now.

Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and the war lords of Japan are blood brothers, and the declaration this morning makes it clear that their common objective is the destruction of the United States and our way of life—that they are gearing their war machines together for our destruction. They have linked their war machines with the chains of bondage and destruction in a common war against us. They have jointly created a state of war and have now admitted it.

We have no choice. They made the choice for us. There can be no dissension. We have recognized a state of war with Japan. We must now recognize that Japan, Germany, and Italy are all waging war against the United States. A state of war exists, and we must recognize it. This is merely a realistic recognition of what already exists, and by our recognition we affirm our fervent determination to preserve those things we hold dear. Our answer comes from a united people and a righteous cause. America faces the greatest crisis in her history. When this war is over, freedom, not slavery, must be our lot. One hundred and thirty-one million people go forward now in the spirit of unity, loyalty, and sacrifice—go forward as one person, intent on the preservation of our beloved country.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING JOINT RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, any joint resolution or bill which may be ready for his signature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same; and

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson; and

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1190) for the relief of Julia Neville, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Joseph Keeney;

H. R. 5545. An act for the relief of H. Earle Russell;

H. R. 5573. An act for the relief of Mrs. Noel Wright and Bunny Wright;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman;

H. R. 5605. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. J. B. Conmy;

H. R. 5646. An act for the relief of Joseph Simon, lieutenant commander (S. C.), United States Navy, and R. D. Lewis;

H. R. 5701. An act for relief of the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of A. Paul Johnson;

H. R. 5773. An act for the relief of Libby, McNeill & Libby; and

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Solomon Brown.

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment, those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization;

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post No. 1248, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.;

S. 2093. An act to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 527. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 529. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 2297. An act to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions;

H. R. 2799. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

H. R. 3149. An act providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty;

H. R. 4495. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 4371. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4993. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass, and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida;

H. R. 5377. An act to amend section 111, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5476. An act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5509. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase or accept as gifts motorboats, yachts, and similar vessels for Coast Guard use; and

H. R. 5694. An act to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 329. An act for the relief of Lulu Heron;

H. R. 331. An act for the relief of the Mount Whitney Power & Electric Co.;

H. R. 691. An act for the relief of Richard Bove;

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Multnomah County, Oreg.;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the estate of John J. Murray;

H. R. 1755. An act for the relief of C. M. Sherrod and Daisy Mimms, administratrix of the estate of Arthur Mimms;

H. R. 1903. An act for the relief of Reuben Owen;

H. R. 2120. An act for the relief of John H. Durnil;

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carrol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 2428. An act for the relief of G. F. Brown;

H. R. 2436. An act for the relief of Hjalmar M. Seby;

H. R. 2460. An act for the relief of Ruth Steward, administratrix of the estate of Luther F. Steward;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Chin Hoy;

H. R. 2967. An act for the relief of August Svelund;

H. R. 3087. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 3091. An act for the relief of Martin J. Price;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Dale L. Barthel and others;

H. R. 3398. An act for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher;

H. R. 3433. An act for the relief of Bessie Pearlman and George Roth;

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of Estella King;

H. R. 4099. An act for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin;

H. R. 4355. An act for the relief of Bella Cosgrove;

H. R. 4436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha M. Smith;

H. R. 4537. An act for the relief of H. D. Bateman; Henry G. Conner, Jr., executor of the last will and testament of P. L. Woodard; and J. M. Creech;

H. R. 4626. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Jane Hawk, a minor, and J. L. Hawk;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn;

H. R. 4831. An act for the relief of Katherine McCue;

H. R. 4999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.;

H. R. 5040. An act for the relief of William Robert Shaneyfelt and Mildred Shaneyfelt;

H. R. 5046. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of the Burlington Auto Co.;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Esco Wood;

H. R. 5164. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson, and the legal guardian of Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor;

H. R. 5282. An act for the relief of J. W. Daughtry;

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider;

H. R. 5331. An act for the relief of Paul W. Mankin;

H. R. 5387. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna M. Paul;

H. R. 5390. An act for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.;

H. R. 5473. An act for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Joseph Keeney;

H. R. 5545. An act for the relief of H. Earle Russell;

H. R. 5573. An act for the relief of Mrs. Noel Wright and Bunny Wright;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman;

H. R. 5605. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. J. B. Conmy;

H. R. 5646. An act for the relief of Joseph Simon, lieutenant commander (S. C.), United States Navy, and R. D. Lewis;

H. R. 5701. An act for relief of the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of A. Paul Johnson;

H. R. 5773. An act for the relief of Libby, McNeill, & Libby; and

H. R. 5984. An act for the relief of Solomon Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying; and

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 5135. An act to appoint Capt. Porter M. Hoidale, United States Marine Corps, a lieutenant, senior grade, in the United States Navy Medical Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CASUALTIES IN JAPANESE ATTACK ON HAWAII

Mr. TOBEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to make to the Members of the Senate a brief statement of importance.

All of us have been receiving requests in reference to the list of casualties resulting from the attack made upon our naval vessels and planes in Hawaii last Sunday. Many Members of the Senate, I know, have been anxious, as many fathers and mothers throughout the country have been, to know when the list would be available.

This morning I learned from the Navy Department that the casualty list had arrived this morning by Clipper; that it is now in the possession of our Navy Department, and that notices are being prepared to be sent to the next of kin of those who have fallen in the service of our country. It seemed to the Navy Department and to all of us, as I am sure will be agreed, appropriate that the next of kin should receive official notice from the Department, rather than to learn through announcements in the press that their sons or next of kin had fallen in the line of duty.

I am sorry to say that it will be some hours, possibly another day, before all the next of kin are given the sad news; but I am informed that as soon as the next of kin have been given the painful news which will be sent from the Navy Department today, the casualty list will be made public. That ought to occur within 2 or 3 days.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the able Senator from Massachusetts whether he can give us an estimate of the number of casualties?

Mr. WALSH. In the President's statement the other night over the radio, and perhaps in his speech before the joint session—I do not recall for the moment—he mentioned the number "3,000." I fear it is somewhat in excess of 3,000. I do not know the exact number. I do not know, either, whether the number of 3,000 means deaths, or persons incapacitated or injured as well as the deaths.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TOBEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Massachusetts has made an announcement on behalf of the Navy Department affecting casualties in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that the same policy will be adopted by the War Department in regard to casualties in the Army.

Mr. WALSH. The War Department, I understand, have a much smaller number of casualties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; a much smaller number.

Mr. WALSH. And they have already given out such information as they possess.

Mr. BARKLEY. The fact is that a list of casualties in the Army has already been published in the press. It ought to be stated, I think, that both the Navy Department and the War Department will pursue the course which has been indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts; that as soon as casualties have occurred, and the next of kin have been notified, they being regarded as being entitled first to notification in a communication from the Government, the lists will be made public.

Mr. WALSH. That is the procedure which both the Navy and the Army intend to follow.

I should have added, in explanation of what appears to be delay, which I fear some persons might improperly criticize, that it would be most harmful and painful and almost indefensible for a list to be so hurriedly prepared that a boy on leave, or absent, would be numbered among the casualties when it might appear later that he was alive. So the Navy have had a great deal of checking to do to be sure that when they make the announcement they have unmistakable evidence of the death of the officer or enlisted man.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not think there is anything further that I desire to say at this time.

CONDUCT OF WAR

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, this is a fateful day in the annals of this Nation of ours. The action which the Senate unanimously took today, in which I concurred in all good conscience, was, in stark reality, a Gethsemane for many of us.

The Republican conference, to which I belong, assembled this morning, unanimously adopted the resolution which was read by the clerk at the request of our distinguished leader the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. In that resolution we pledged to the President of the United States our wholehearted support in the efficient and vigorous prosecution of the war to a successful conclusion.

There is no schism under the Capitol dome, and none in the Nation today. The Nation stands as one behind the President to win a victory over the forces of darkness and evil that surrounds us. The great question before America today, in all good conscience, is, Shall the American Nation survive? That is what we face today. To that call there can be nothing but unqualified, unreserved support and allegiance.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I happen to be a Member of this body, and like the President of the United States I took an oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. One of the essential rights of any man in public life, in my judgment, is the right to look the facts in the face, and on behalf of the people back home, in the hinterlands of this Nation, to offer honest criticism at all times. I hold a brief for my argument now; and where does it originate? It comes from a gentleman who is now Attorney General of the United States, than whom there is no more ardent supporter of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his administration. I refer to Mr. Francis Biddle, the present Attorney General of the United States, who supports me in my contention.

Mr. Biddle, speaking at the American Bar Association convention the other day, made this statement, in which I concur:

> It is particularly important at this time, when we are on the very edge of war, that we encourage forums which develop open and full discussion of the policies of government.

He further said, and well said:

> Every government can live only on criticism

But there is a greater authority, in my judgment, no less a man than the greatest liberal of all times in the history of our Supreme Court, the late, beloved Oliver Wendell Holmes, of blessed memory, who, in an opinion in *Frohwerk* v. *The United States* (249 U. S.), said:

> We do not lose our right to condemn either measures or men because the country is at war.

On Monday last I addressed myself to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and asked about the debacle at Pearl Harbor—for that is what it was—asked if he would not tell us frankly and fully the extent of the naval losses. He very properly said that he thought we should wait upon the speech of the President, which was to come that evening in a Nation-wide broadcast, when he expected, or hoped, as I think he expressed it, that the President might tell us the facts. I asked him if he expected the President to tell us the facts. He said, "I have no knowledge of what the President is going to say."

I, with 90,000,000 other comrades, citizens of this Nation, listened with great interest and earnestness to the President's speech. It was a trying speech to make. My heart went out to the President in that hour of agony to his soul. But I listened in vain for a definite state-

ment as to the losses which were suffered in that debacle at Pearl Harbor. The President did say we had suffered heavy losses, severe losses; but I believe the American people want just one thing in this hour of crisis, and that is the truth all down through, and the truth will always bear the test. As someone said of old:

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I share the concern of the Senator from New Hampshire, as I know every other Senator does, that as full and complete an account of what happened should be given. But I am sure the Senator will appreciate, indeed, I know he already does, that this is not a war which will be won or lost by one battle. There are many places which are points of danger for us; for example, the Panama Canal. There is no doubt in my mind that the Japanese do not know definitely how much damage they have done. They may have a very good idea about it, but whether or not this ship or that ship is completely out of commission, or partly out, is a matter of tremendous importance to them in any future plans they may make. Likewise, it is of great importance to our own naval forces that such information be not put into the hands of the enemy.

From some little knowledge of what went on—some little knowledge—I shared the opinion the Senator is now expressing until I got a little glimpse of matters. Then it seemed to me that the President would be wanting in that degree of caution, all things considered, which is necessary in this long and difficult struggle, if he were to put the Japanese in complete possession of information as to everything that went on in Pearl Harbor. I think in due time the information will be forthcoming.

I am not here defending falsehood; I am not here saying we are not entitled to the truth; but I think as this struggle proceeds we must all realize that sometimes it is better Americanism not to withhold the truth when it can be told, but to withhold it when it aids our enemies more than it serves our own people.

The President has said that we have suffered a very heavy blow at Pearl Harbor, a disaster, of course varying in degree according as one may speculate about it. But I should not feel that we would be helping those who are dying on the high seas if right now we put Japan in possession of accurate information of what they accomplished or did not accomplish. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. TOBEY. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, the Senator from New Hampshire would say that what the Senator has stated is accurate; but I point out that there are 40,000 Japanese in Hawaii, thoroughly clever people, and to me it seems inconceivable that they would not carry back to the Japanese authorities information as to all that happened.

Mr. TYDINGS rose.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to say, before the Senator resumes, that I hold in my hand the report of Prime Minister Churchill to the people of Great Britain about what happened to Britain's two warships, and it is in marked contrast to the attitude toward the people of this country, for he made public the destruction of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*. He made his report blunt:

I have bad news for the House which I thought I should impart to them at the earliest possible moment.

Then he gave the details of the losses of those two capital ships.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate that the Senator is curious to know all the details, as all of us are; but the two happenings were not similar. In the case of the sinking of the two British ships the Japanese could not help knowing that those two ships went to the bottom. There were observers all over the place. The Japanese themselves saw what happened, and there would be no point in withholding any information. In the case of what happened in Hawaii, we are not certain that the Japanese know whether they got a single ship. Their reports were, of course, at variance from time to time. Even if they did get one ship, or possibly two, I do not think we should tell them what ships went down; I do not think we should tell them how badly they were hit, if they were hit at all, or how many escaped completely from their attack. In other words, the Navy has to meet a new situation instantly, and lack of information on the part of the Japanese and possession of information by us may decide some battle being fought, even as I am talking on the floor of the Senate.

I do not mean to indicate that I would have anything covered up or hidden at all, but this is going to be a long war, and I do not think we should start out by notifying the world of everything that happens to us or what we are going to do about it. I think the proper thing for us to do now is to forget what happened for the moment and get ready for the next attack, and when we get a breath I would join the Senator in bringing everything to light, if it is not then public. But in the meantime, in the interest of fair play and with a view to defending America—and I know the Senator wants to do that as much as anyone else does—I am certain, from what little I do know that is accurate—from what little I do know—that no good purpose would be served by disclosing any of the details so that the Japanese would come into possession of the information.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that I had not finished my remarks. I appreciate what he has said, and in great measure I agree. But before I get through I will have some thoughts to suggest in which I think he will concur.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article from the New York Times of this morning, written by Arthur Krock, which I shall read. It reflects, far better than I can state, my viewpoint on the present situation. It reads:

[From the New York Times of December 11, 1941]

IN THE NATION—THE DISCLOSURE OF "ENOUGH OF THE TRUTH"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 10.—The President has laid down a rule which, he said, will govern that censorship of military news at the source which is both inevitable and essential in time of war. The information, he explained, must first be completely verified by the Government. Then it will be given to the public unless the heads of the Navy and War Department believe that its publication will lend aid and comfort to the enemy. Since timing is one of the factors in lending aid and comfort, the implication is that even verified news will be held up long enough to meet the requirement.

The President's stated formula is of particular interest because of the disaster suffered by the American Navy and air force in the Hawaiian Islands. Many people in Washington now know the chief facts of the losses suffered by the United States Sunday morning. In his radio speech last night the President says he has not sufficient information to state the exact damage that was done. This was undoubtedly true, for some of the targets of the Japanese were crippled instead of being destroyed, and there has not been time to discover the extent of these injuries and the amount of time and labor required to repair them.

But the President and the Government know; the Japanese, Germans, and Italians know; and many people in Washington know, of irreparable damage to other targets of which the public has not yet been informed. The facts have been verified, and since the enemy knows them well their publication will not aid the enemy.

A WIDE FORMULA

But in the President's formula there was also the restriction on circulating any fact that will lend comfort to the enemy. This is broad enough to keep back all legitimate news of adversity to which the public is entitled.

Doubtless the enemy will find great comfort whenever the American people are informed of losses in war. He probably always hopes that such information will depress and discourage them, and his pride is served by the knowledge that his achievement has become general information among those directly affected. These are very fertile seeds of comfort.

So if information to which the public is entitled is to be tested for its elements of giving comfort to the enemy, and the test is made narrow, that which is adverse will be held back unduly and often suppressed. A narrow construction of what gives aid will have the same result. This is proved by the fact that the President continues to withhold certain facts of irreparable damage wrought by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor which, as their communiques have revealed, they know all about. Only the American people have been denied the information.

In his radio speech the President also said: "If you feel that our Government is not disclosing enough of the truth, you have every right to say so." The writer of this article feels that the Government is not disclosing enough of the truth about the losses at Pearl Harbor and respectfully avails himself of the right conceded by the President, to say so.

Yesterday, only a few hours after the sinking of two major British battleships, Prime Minister Churchill announced the fact in Commons. It was a bitter admission that the shedding of "blood, sweat, and tears" goes on and must still go on if the war against the aggressors is to be won or even continued. Doubtless it lent comfort to the enemy. But it did not lend aid because the enemy knew he had sunk the battleships, he had so informed his peoples, and all the suppression

or withholding in the world would not raise the ships again.

THE BRITISH SYSTEM

The British concept in these matters is that the public is entitled to know the facts of the war when that will not advantage the enemy, and that the British people can take the bad news with the good. After some fumbling starts with censorship and suppression, they have followed the procedure under which Mr. Churchill made his prompt statement yesterday. Once again it would seem that the United States Government insists on repeating mistakes of others which have been plainly demonstrated.

The clearest statement of British censorship objectives which this correspondent has seen was made by Mr. Daniell, chief of the London Bureau of the New York Times. He said:

"British censorship was designed solely to prevent the leakage of military or other information which would be of value to the enemy. Included in that category are the movements of troops and ships, the identification of military objectives damaged in air raids and similar matters. It was not intended, and as far as I know it never has been used, to curb criticism of the Government for its domestic or foreign policies, nor has it been used to conceal the blunders of officialdom."

That is a fairer and sounder formula than the one the President laid down. The same advantages cannot be taken of it by blunderers or incompetents in office, and its protections are adequate.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], this morning in the saddest pronouncement of his life, advised the Senate and the Nation that 3,000 American sailors have either gone to their death or been seriously injured, and we have a complementary list on the part of the Army of lesser proportions. That statement has been given out as a direct result of the Pearl Harbor debacle. But, Mr. President, this morning I, with 85 other Members of this body, voted to remove the restrictions on sending our men out of this continent. Not only that, sir, but we voted to declare war on Germany and on Italy. What that means to millions of young men in this country only those who are fathers and mothers, and the boys themselves, with the hope of life ahead, can visualize in their inner souls. What it all means came over me with a crushing effect this morning, and I could hardly keep back the tears as I voted my comrades, in all good conscience, to those ends. But, Mr. President, when we cast such votes we have a right, more than a right, we have a duty, and we are derelict in that duty if we do not act as men and demand that those who may be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice shall not make that sacrifice because of inefficiency in any great branch of the military service in this country.

I now particularly come home to an article written by R. L. S. and published in the Christian Science Monitor, than which, if you please, there is no publication more highly esteemed in this Nation the article is headed "Why, Mr. Secretary—why?"

It will bear reading if the Senate will bear with me. It reads:

Speaking simply for ourselves, we find covering a war at the Washington front a mite strenuous. Of course, there is time to sleep and even occasionally eat, but one can't overindulge either of these luxuries. All of us who have gone from the State Department to the White House to the Capitol Hill have witnessed scenes in the past 48 hours which are unforgettable and worth far more than the cost of the extra energy. Still we attribute to the unusual exertions a certain irritation of feeling which in one or two instances has caused us to break out in angry exclamations.

One of these upsetting events was the discovery in yesterday's New York Times of a large advertisement placed by the American magazine in which the periodical noted an article by the Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox. The advertisement was a large, pretentious affair, showing three 16-inch guns of the U. S. S. *North Carolina* extending over about half a page, and underneath the explanation which is drawn from Colonel Knox's article that the Navy is equipped with "amazing, new, secret, deadly devices that no enemy will ever know about (till it's too late)," the words "too late" being underlined, while in another part of the same advertisement is a quotation from the body of Colonel Knox's article saying: "We can win on both oceans." The advertisement is headed, "You asked for it, Japan."

Well, we suppose you are right, Colonel Knox.

SIMILAR COUP IN JAPANESE-RUSSIAN WAR

But it was a hectic night last Sunday. And all through it came reports of a Japanese surprise raid on Pearl Harbor, T. H., and confused announcements of losses of American warcraft. They were very uncomfortable hours indeed. It was fortunate, 't appears, that the fleet wasn't wiped out. The White House says that one old battleship had capsized and other losses were sustained which were not specified. It seems to us that as the initial excitement and anger over the dastardly attack abates, and as the editorial writers and columnists get their second wind in denunciations of Japan, it might be well to consider how the Japanese were able to surprise the fleet in the first place.

The Japanese, in fact, attempted just such another coup as they played on the Russian Fleet at Port Arthur in the Japanese-Russian War when they attacked without warning and virtually won the war by their treachery. Of course, it is easy to see with the wisdom of retrospect that that is just what the Japanese would try again, a third of a century later. It must be added, too, that nothing could so unite the divided American people as such treachery as this. But in our gratitude to the Japanese for taking the full moral responsibility for the awful decision, and of cementing the public unity, we must not lose sight of the fact that our fleet was caught napping. The loss of one or two battleships in the delicate balance of naval strength in the Pacific is no little matter. The risks to American success in that early Sunday morning 2 days ago were simply terrible. Even though war had not been declared the situation was such that one would have supposed the most intense naval and military precautions would have been exercised.

Where were the patrols that are supposed to protect the fleet? Secretary Knox speaks of "amazing, new, secret, deadly devices" that the enemy won't know about (until too late). We would have supposed these would have included mechanical listening posts to catch the throb of approaching aircraft.

I was told by two Members of the Senate on the floor of this Chamber that the mechanical listening devices were not in working order.

I continue to read from the article published in the Christian Science Monitor:

We don't mean to be unfair to the Secretary, and maybe these were employed. Possibly the responsibility lies elsewhere. But questions like these are being asked right now everywhere in Washington, as the Capital comes out of its daze. True, the Japanese were perfidious. But does that excuse the apparent laxity of the fleet, when the one lesson that Axis strategy has taught the world to expect is perfidy?

IS NATION DANGEROUSLY OVERCONFIDENT?

Colonel Knox recently explained to a press conference that most of the articles that appear in magazines under his name, he doesn't really write at all. Perhaps we shouldn't be vexed by this latest piece. Probably he didn't write it. His habit, he explains, is to sign his name to articles which are prepared for him by "ghosts," after he has inspected and perhaps revised them. He doesn't take pay for the articles himself, he says, but hands it on to the real writers or to some naval relief society. Right now the feeling is growing in Washington that it would be better for everybody if the Navy Secretary would devote his full attention to the Navy, rather than writing (or not writing) magazine articles (whichever he does).

There is, in fact, a feeling among informed insiders that the Nation is showing dangerous overconfidence to the new war. It is possible that Americans have little idea of the struggle ahead. It is hard to draw the line between simple faith and cocksureness, but certainly braggadocio is not the thing that wins wars. This is no time for pompous breast beating from anybody. This, in fact, is war. To many reporters waiting outside in the cold December air on the portico of the White House Sunday night, Colonel Knox did not look very happy as he left the Cabinet meeting. He must have been asked a good many questions in there how his Navy happened to be surprised. It would be interesting to know his answer. Meanwhile, the impression gains currency here that from now on the real head of the Navy will not sit in the Navy Building but will occupy a chair before a big, broad desk in the west executive wing of the White House. He was once Under Secretary of the Navy and his initials are F. D. R.

Mr. President, much more could be said.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator repeat what he was reading from? I did not hear the statement.

Mr. TOBEY. I was reading from an article in the Christian Science Monitor of December 9, 1941, under the heading "Intimate message: Washington," and a subtitle, "Why, Mr. Secretary, why?"

I concur in that article, and I do not understand how any Member of this body or any citizen can fail to concur. Let me say again that today we voted to send our boys anywhere in the world without restriction, to lay down their lives. Millions of them will lay down their lives before peace again reigns on this earth; and many of us in this Chamber will not live to see this Nation come out on a level plane again. It is a question of survival today. The swords of the world are against us, and there will be hell to pay for awhile. In all good conscience, how can we sit by and fold our hands and say, "We must not ask for details," when the ships were lying at anchor with no

steam up, when the listening devices were not in operation, and when 3,000 American boys lie dead today?

I hold a brief for the home life of America. I say that we have a duty—and I am going to perform it in spite of all the criticism that may be leveled at me—to demand that the Navy Department be administered by a Secretary of the Navy who is responsible, who stands for efficiency and not for talks and magazine articles, and who has in his heart a great single purpose—to prosecute this war successfully no matter what the cost. That is what America demands today. Let him who fails to measure up to that standard take notice, for in my judgment the wrath of the American people will descend in terrible form in the not distant future on those responsible unless we arouse ourselves and measure up to our duties as citizens of this great democracy, in the interest of the common people of this country, who will pay the bills and make the sacrifices.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator spoke about some Senators advising him that there was something wrong with the listening devices, or that a proper watch was not kept.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct. The listening devices were not working.

Mr. LUCAS. Where did the Senator obtain that information?

Mr. TOBEY. I do not know where it came from.

Mr. LUCAS. Where did the Senator obtain his information?

Mr. TOBEY. From two Senators, who told me so on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is willing to take information from two Senators and make a speech of this kind and broadcast it to the country without himself checking up with the Navy Department to ascertain whether the statements he makes are true. Is that correct?

Mr. TOBEY. I stand on what I have said.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. TOBEY. I have answered it. That is all the answer the Senator will get from me.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. The Senator has not consulted with the Navy Department to ascertain whether any of the stories he has been quoting from the newspapers are true.

Mr. TOBEY. I have quoted from the article in the New York Times this morning by Mr. Krock.

Mr. LUCAS. Why does not the Senator check with those who know the facts before he makes statements of that kind?

Mr. TOBEY. I have requested the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to make an investigation of the dereliction and inefficiency. That is the province of the Naval Affairs Committee, of which the Senator is a member.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator from New Hampshire is willing to indict the Secretary of the Navy and all the men at Pearl Harbor, many of whom now lie wounded, and many of whom have died, on the basis of a newspaper article and on the basis of what two Senators told him. The Senators who gave him the information are not willing to give it to the rest of the Senate, and are unwilling to state where they obtained the information.

Mr. TOBEY. My indictment is far broader than that. My indictment has a basis in truth and fact. At Pearl Harbor we met with almost unspeakable disaster. Where were the reconnoitering planes? Why was not steam up in the boilers? I could ask a thousand questions. It is the province of the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate the matter. That is the job of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is chairman of the committee, and of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is a member of that committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that as a member of the committee I know more about this situation than does the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not question that statement. The Senator naturally would.

Mr. LUCAS. Who told the Senator that there was no steam in the boilers of the ships in Pearl Harbor?

Mr. TOBEY. I would not want to tell all the things I hear on the floor of the Senate about the debacle at Pearl Harbor. The Senator would not want me to do so. There has been common talk among Senators as to what is going on. I believe that the Senators to whom I refer know what they are talking about.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not believe that the Senator from New Hampshire knows what he is talking about.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator has a perfect right to his opinion. The Senator is not on the job unless he finds out the truth and gives it to the Senate and to the people of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to rise on this occasion, serious as is the situation throughout the United States and the world. I think that I appreciate as fully as does any other Senator the grave and serious responsibilities which rest not only upon the Senate, but upon every American citizen, as a result of our war with Japan, Germany, and Italy.

I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am glad that I am, especially when I sit here and listen to some of the billingsgate and harangue that comes from the lips of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, it is a serious thing to indict anyone in this crisis upon rumor or innuendo until one knows absolutely what he is talking about. This is no time for any Member of the Senate to indulge in any condemnation until the facts are known. I undertake to say that the Senator from New Hampshire does not know the facts. He admits that he does not know the facts, but he is willing to accept statements made in some newspaper article. He is willing to be led by some other Senator on the floor, and to place before the Senate this type of an alarming picture at a time when the crying need is unity.

As was pointed out by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is also a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire had better wait to see what the strategy is and ought to be. The Navy knows best. Of course, no one wants to keep the truth from the American people, and the truth with respect to what happened at Pearl Harbor will ultimately come out.

The Senator from New Hampshire is no naval strategist. He may think that the war can be run from the floor of the United States Senate, but it cannot be. We must have faith in the men in the Navy. The Senator condemns the men in the Navy and tells the country that he has no faith in men of the naval forces at Honolulu, that steam was not up in the boilers, that the listening devices were not in working order, that there was no this, and no that. How does anyone know at this hour what the situation was?

It is all very well to discuss these things in the lobby of the Senate and to speculate and conjecture. But, Mr. President, when a Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and makes such statements to the world as cold facts, Japan and Germany and Italy must be pleased. Is there any doubt now in the Senator's mind that this group of gangsters seeks the greatest prize of all—the Western Hemisphere? In my opinion he is doing a serious injustice to this country when he speaks so loosely.

I dislike to take the floor to make this statement, but I do so with all the seriousness I possess. I say that the time has passed for the Senator to continue to practice the type of tactics he has been practicing here in the United States Senate during the last 6 months—yes, braggadocio, braggadocio about this and that which the Senators read. I dislike to speculate where this country would be at the present tme if we had followed the theory of the junior Senator from New Hampshire. And he dares condemn the negligence of someone out in the Pacific without any facts. I say to the Senator from New Hampshire, "Insofar as negligence is concerned, look at your own record from the standpoint of national defense." Ah! Shame on you for saying at this hour, only 96 hours, practically, after the occurrence of those sad events, "No details, no details." Why they have scarcely finished burying the heroes of Pearl Harbor and yet the Senator wants some detail about the listening apparatus.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. TOBEY. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois when he requested me to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. That is all right; I will yield when I conclude.

Mr. TOBEY. Why not be fair, I ask the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I refuse to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Why does not the Senator from Illinois accord me the same

favor I accorded him when I yielded to him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. We heard him cry, "No details, no nothing!" But for the past 6 months he has been standing on the floor of the Senate, denouncing and condemning the administration. He just read from articles that Frank Knox wrote, as though he might have some personal grievance against the Secretary of the Navy. He is not of my political faith; he belongs to your political faith; he comes from up in your State. I presume you have had some trouble with him in the past; I do not know.

But be that as it may, he is my Secretary of the Navy; and until evidence is disclosed—capable and competent evidence—before the Committee on Naval Affairs that he is guilty of gross negligence I, as one Senator will not stand by and permit anyone else to condemn him and condemn the men of the Navy upon whom the welfare and the future security of this country rest. Some of the very men you condemned, sir, may be the men who in the final analysis will save you, your home, and our country.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Illinois to yield to me, but he preferred not to do so, as was his privilege.

I put the word "erratum" after something the Senator said, and call attention to the fact that it is not 48 hours since the attack occurred, but over 100 hours; the disaster occurred on Sunday morning at 7 o'clock, and it is now Thursday afternoon at 2 o'clock.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that it is entirely within his right to speak as he has spoken; but I should like to propound a question which was propounded some 2 000 years ago in Holy writ, "Who made thee a ruler and judge over us?" I claim the same prerogative to inquire about this catastrophe, and I will indulge in the same criticism; and it is endorsed by no less an authority than the authority I get this morning, and many Members of this Chamber know it to be true.

I now turn to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I ask him if it is contemplated that in the not distant future the Committee on Naval Affairs will cause an investigation to be made of what happened at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to refrain from answering that question until I take the floor?

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to preface what I have to say in reference to the inquiries made by the Senator from New Hampshire by stating what I said personally to the President of the United States last Monday night, when I had the privilege of being at the White House, together with the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, and listening to what he intended to say in his radio speech to the American people about the "serious set-back" to our military forces in Hawaii. After we had finished our conversation about the Navy and when I was about to leave the President's presence I said, "Mr. President, you have begun a new life. A new epoch has come into your life. You are no longer President of a political party or of a group or of a majority of the American people. You are now a war President; and it is the first necessity—and I have not any doubt that you will respond to it—that a war President should have the absolute confidence of the American people."

I have frequently said, on this floor and elsewhere, that our first line of defense is our Navy. Our first line of defense from now until the end of this war is the war President of the United States of America.

I added just this brief word: "You must win the complete confidence of the Congress and the American people. They are ready to give you their confidence, wholeheartedly, without restraint."

My God! We have no other course; we have no other course but to throw ourselves and all that we have—heart, soul, body, mind, and all our possessions—into his hands, for him to use as our war President, to the end that this war shall result in a real, lasting victory.

I do not desire to appear presumptuous to the President, but I did desire to impress upon him the fact that, as the war President of the United States, he has the confidence of the Members of Congress, that he has the confidence of all the American people, and that he can rely on it. I thought I might encourage and strengthen his faith. I suggested that he try to preserve it, as being most essential to the success of his leadership.

All that is preliminary to my statement about the subject matter before the Senate today. The President of the United States, as Commander in Chief, developed in that conversation that he has constantly before him, as information comes in as the result of our military efforts, two propositions: "How much of unfavorable news shall I, in frankness and in candor and in order to maintain the confidence of the American people, disclose to them?" The natural tendency and impulse would be to disclose all.

But he has another proposition: Much as I wish to convey information to the American people, how much must I withhold in order to prevent giving aid and comfort to the enemy? He alone must make that line of demarcation. The Army cannot do it; he is their Commander in Chief. The Navy cannot do it; he is their Commander in Chief. As I said the other day, until such time as we have evidence or assurance—something besides suspicion, something besides prejudice, something besides the clamor and desire in our hearts to know all, even the worst—we should let him make that decision and support him in it to the end.

That does not mean that when we arrive in the course of this conflict at the point where, or the time when, we think his decision detrimental to the welfare of our country, we should not speak, but surely that time is not here yet; surely we have scarcely begun to wage war.

Therefore, with all due respect to the earnestness of the Senator from New Hampshire, and his desire, and that of other Senators, to obtain information, which I want personally to have very much, indeed, I think we shall have to wait until the Commander in Chief, considering his desire to retain the confidence, the loyalty, and cooperation of the American people, thinks it is his solemn duty to speak.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I should like to finish, but I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I concur, sir, in what the Senator has just said, but what I tried to point out this morning in my remarks is that we have suffered this disaster of unspeakable magnitude which has caused 3,000 deaths, and there are statements being made on the floor of this body and in the cloakrooms of inefficiency which made the disaster possible. So I turn, as does the Congress, and as the Nation does also, to the committee of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and ask the question whether the committee, in its wisdom, should not undertake to investigate whether inefficiency, or something more than that perhaps, of a grievous nature, is responsible for what happened at Pearl Harbor.

That is entirely different from calling on the President to give out the news. That is a question of whether the Navy and those at the head of the Navy and who represent it were inefficient, and loss of life and property of unspeakable proportions ensued therefrom. That is what interests the American people.

Mr. WALSH. I said that my opening remarks were preliminary to what I was about to say.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator will pardon me, I hope.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly. The Senator is within his rights and is doing what he believes to be his duty. I have no quarrel with the Senator; I want no quarrel with any Senator; I am chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and I want the confidence and support of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Massachusetts has it.

Mr. WALSH. And I must maintain it to the very end, perhaps to a greater extent than any other man, for this is, after all, at the outset, largely a naval war; therefore, I am going to have no personal quarrels, and, so far as the conduct of my senatorial and committee duties is concerned, I shall be more than ever impersonal, I shall respect the rights of the minority to be on guard against mistakes as well as to cooperate.

To proceed, I myself, as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, have no official knowledge of what took place in Hawaii. I have heard some things which I think, when all the facts are disclosed, will be found to have been somewhat official or semiofficial; but, I repeat, I have no official knowledge of the details of the disaster at Hawaii, and no member of my committee has any official knowledge of it.

I do not know the number of casualties. I only know that the President

says there were 3,000. I do not know how many planes, if any, were destroyed or how many bombers, if any, were destroyed. I do not know any of the tactical movements either by the enemy or by our own Navy and Army. I know nothing about whether there were on the vessels of the Navy the detection devices to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred; whether they were in operation; whether our ships were moving or whether they were not. I must frankly say I have some knowledge, though it is not official and I think it is what is generally known about the disasters that happened to some of our naval vessels.

The Senator from New Hampshire asked me why we do not get this information. Other Senators have asked me the same question: "Why does not the Naval Committee investigate and inquire into what was the extent of the disaster? Why does not the committee take steps, if carelessness and negligence existed, to punish those who were responsible?"

My answer to the first inquiry is—and that is why I began as I did—that there is a Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and I feel obligated to accept his decisions and his policy and his silence until the time arrives or the situation arises when I think his silence or his attitude would tend to lead to a lack of confidence or distrust on the part of the American people. We must remember that army and naval officers are under the Commander in Chief and they cannot speak without permission.

But, aside from the President's judgment let me say that there is some explanation in my mind of his attitude, though what I say is not official, namely, that the suddenness of the attack, so far as we are all informed, the rapidity with which the enemy appeared to have acted, and the destruction which followed must have created a state of temporary confusion and caused a situation which necessitated delay in gathering all the information as to the losses suffered.

I am giving my personal interpretation. First of all, every officer and man on every naval vessel and airplane had to ask "Is the enemy coming again?" rather than stop and find out what had happened and get all the details and send them to Washington. They had to be on the alert; they did not know the minute or the hour when there would be a recurrence of the attack which the newspapers say occurred. They had to bury their dead or provide for sending the bodies of the dead to their loved ones; they had to bind up the wounds of the injured, and they had to prepare against another attack or a series of attacks. This, Mr. President and Senators, may or may not be a partial explanation of the reason why all the information has not been transmitted to us.

Furthermore, if a vessel was damaged, is it not of some consequence, in giving out a statement of the extent of the damage to know whether it amounted to $5,000 or to $5,000,000? That would require going into some description of the part of the vessel which was damaged or how it was damaged or when it was damaged. I can conceive why there should be delay in getting complete information and sending it here. I do not know whether or not it is here, but I certainly can conceive of it being difficult to give out, at this stage, any detailed complete record of the losses and to state explicitly what the damages are or how quickly they can be repaired. And furthermore, care, great care must be exercised in not letting the enemy get the information.

All that is aside from what I said before about the war President's own judgment as to how far he can go in bringing comfort to the enemy, in letting the enemy know how depressed we are, the gloomy picture that we ourselves might admit, how weak and incompetent we may judge ourselves, or seem to think or believe was the attitude of our armed forces in that region.

The next subject is the matter of investigation of personal conduct and punishment. Mr. President, if there was carelessness, if there was neglect of duty, if there was failure to prepare for what took place on that fateful Sunday morning, the Commander in Chief must, and I believe will, put his hands upon it, and act in such a manner that he will receive the confidence of the American people. If he fails to do it, time will let us all know, because it is impossible to hide from the numbers of people in the naval and army service there and the numbers of people in the Hawaiian Islands what eventually will be known to all of us as the real, complete story of what took place.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with what the Senator has just said with respect to the truth ultimately being told in connection with the very serious disaster at Honolulu. Is not that exactly what the President in effect said in his speech he would do as soon as the information came, and he was absolutely certain as to what it was all about—that that information would be given to the American people?

Mr. WALSH. I am grateful to the Senator for calling my attention to that thought. I understood the President to say that he would give out such information—I am speaking now more of a personal conversation than of what the Senator refers to—when it became available, and when, in his judgment, it ought to be made public. That is somewhat aside from what the Senator referred to in the President's radio speech; but I concur in what the Senator says about that. The President did make that statement, as I understand, and I have not the slightest doubt that the President is going to do it. I have not the slightest doubt of it. He will have to do it; but if we were in executive session I should say that I think the President also has a responsibility to the American people not to say anything or tell any story, whatever it may be, that might shake confidence at the very outset of this war in any branch of the military service. He has to consider that aspect of the matter, too. He may even have to act drastically without any extensive disclosures of the reasons or the detail facts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me say this to the Senator from Massachusetts, because I want him to know how deeply I feel it:

With complete respect for the Commander in Chief and the President, and certainly without intending the slightest reflection upon him, I desire to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that my great consolation in this situation from a congressional point of view is the fact that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

When we confronted, for instance, the *Greer* incident, and the first statement given to the country was, to say the least, incomplete and unwittingly deceptive, perhaps, it was the Senator from Massachusetts, in his official capacity, who, 3 weeks later, produced the truth. It was the Senator from Massachusetts, in his official capacity as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, who produced the truth in respect to the *Kearny* incident.

I repeat, the thing in this situation which is of consolation to me, and which makes me willing to await time and events for the verdict, is that I know the able Senator from Massachusetts, as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, is vigilantly on guard, and he will move with courage and effectiveness whenever it is necessary.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am deeply touched by the gracious and generous references made to me and my service on the Naval Affairs Committee by the distinguished and able Senator from Michigan. It is not the first time he has expressed similar sentiments. Let me add that the very fact that the Senator feels as he does, and that the other Members of this body feel as they do, makes me tremendously conscious of my responsibility. I hope and pray that I may be given the strength and the purpose and the conscience not to do anything in this crisis that will forfeit the confidence of my distinguished colleagues or of the American people.

I desire to say now that while I shall be loyal to the very end to our war President, and support and cooperate with him, I shall not refrain, if my conscience prompts me and I believe my country's interests are at stake, from striking a blow against any inefficiency, against any dereliction of duty, against any slackening of our defense that may result injuriously to our country.

Mr. President, I should like to know all that transpired at Hawaii. I do not know. I shall have to do as I asked my brother Senators to do—to place their confidence and trust, at least in these early days of war and of sad disaster, in our war President, and trust to him to do the right thing, and to lead us to victory and out of the sad and gloomy encirclement in which we find ourselves.

I desire again to appeal to my colleagues here. The other day I appealed to them to wait until after the President himself spoke; but I desire again to appeal to them to have confidence in our war President—not merely President

Franklin D. Roosevelt; not a President of the Democratic Party; not a New Deal President, but a war President—a new role; a role which will determine his place in history, which I hope may record for our country the glorious achievements of another Washington, another Lincoln.

WAIVER OF NAVIGATION AND INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 5111, Calendar No. 918.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5111) authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Maryland if this parliamentary action has been agreed upon with the leaders on both sides?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It has been.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then I shall not object. I think, however, the nature of the bill should be explained before the agreement is entered into.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, when the national emergency became acute we found that some of our legislation concerning merchant marine and shipping generally was not adequate for pending purposes. The result has been that a number of bills have been introduced and passed providing either for new legislation or for modification of existing legislation. In nearly every instance it has been provided in the law that such changes were made only in connection with the present emergency and would terminate at the end thereof. I shall not attempt to go into any discussion of the various measures, but will state that the bill now before the Senate, known as House bill 5111, is one which has passed the House and has been favorably reported by the Commerce Committee with two amendments.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator state what the bill proposes to do?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill provides for waiver of navigation and shipping laws. As I stated a moment ago, a number of changes have been made recently in our navigation laws, especially those affecting our merchant marine, and those changes have been adequate for the immediate and specific purposes which were in mind. It is believed, however, that situations will arise, and quite frequently, when it will become necessary that some action be taken, and be taken quickly, when there will not be time to have specific legislation passed for the purpose desired.

Let me illustrate. Quite often it will be necessary in our operations to use barges or dredges which are not of American manufacture. There might be times when it would be necessary for us to use shipping not under American registry in order to meet certain pressing requirements.

I wish to emphasize, however, that no attempt is made in the bill to suspend any law, or to make any new law. It merely provides for waivers under certain conditions, and the waivers are restricted in scope. For instance, the waivers cannot effect any change in the division into watches or in regard to hours of labor. There are certain other limitations stated.

It is further provided that whenever any waiver is desired, such a waiver cannot be made unless upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce, supported by the written recommendation of at least three of five named officials, four of whom are certain designated members of the Cabinet.

It is also provided that such a waiver shall apply only to some specific instance. Then a report shall be made to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce from time to time in regard to what is done under the act.

It has not been possible to forecast exactly what changes might be made or might be necessary from time to time in order to meet new shipping conditions. That is why the bill, which is of a somewhat omnibus nature, has been brought forward. But, as I stated a moment ago, it does not suspend any law; it merely provides for waiver under certain conditions, and such a waiver applies to a certain, specific instance only.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Are we to understand that the waiver relates to compliance in individual, specific cases, and is not a waiver of regulations in general?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is the point exactly. The waiver is only in some specific instance, as has been stated. Then a report must be made to Congress in regard to the matter. It would not be necessary to bring forward what we might call general legislation if it were possible for us to forecast what additional changes in existing laws might be necessary from time to time on account of the national emergency and the war. But we cannot forecast all of them. On the other hand, we do not want to ask for a suspension of a law when it may be necessary only that there should be a waiver in some specific instance.

Every reasonable attempt has been made to throw around the proposed law suitable restrictions and yet to provide adequate elasticity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not been able to study the bill, and that is why I am asking so many questions with respect to it. By whom is the waiver provided for in the bill to be made?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The waiver is to be made by the Secretary of Commerce, upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, or any three of those five.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no further questions.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is quite obvious, Mr. President, that it is essential that we pass the proposed legislation, and pass it quickly. It would not be necessary in times of peace, but the perfidious and treacherous attacks made upon us by Japan and the status of war which has been thrust upon us by Germany and Italy make it imperative that we should have such legislation, and have it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5111) authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "materials", to insert "and, when in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce there is no other reasonable recourse"; on page 2, line 2, after "Navy", to insert "and of"; on line 3, before the words "the Secretary", to insert "and of"; and on the same line, after the word "Treasury", to insert "and of the Secretary of Labor, and of"; on line 4, before "United States", to insert "Chairman"; on line 5, after the word "Commission", to strike out "or the Office for Emergency Management" and insert "or any three of the above-named officials", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, but not after June 30, 1943, for the purpose of securing the most expeditious transportation consistent with safety of men and materials that are necessary to national defense and to reduce delays in waterborne transportation, provide quicker turnarounds, expedite deliveries, and help to prevent shortages in defense or critical materials, and, when in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce there is no other reasonable recourse, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, upon written recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, and of the Secretary of War, and of the Secretary of the Treasury, and of the Secretary of Labor, and of the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, or any three of the above-named officials, to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel inspection laws of the United States, except laws requiring the division of crews of vessels of the United States into watches, or limiting the hours of labor of seamen on such vessels, but only to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as he may find after investigation to be necessary or proper for the national defense: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not waive compliance with any of such laws to such an extent as will permit the navigation of any vessel in an unsafe condition, nor with the coastwise laws of the United States where the service desired can be supplied promptly by American ships: *Provided further*, That in the exercise of authority granted by this act, the Secretary of Commerce shall waive compliance with any of such laws only by specific rulings for specific occasions, and shall in each case specifically state the particular laws with which compliance is waived and the reasons therefor: *And provided further*, That during the effective period of this act the Secretary of Commerce shall, at the convening of each session of Congress, and monthly while the Congress is in session, report to the Congress every action taken by him under authority of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States."

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same; and

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO WHEAT-MARKETING QUOTAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. AIKEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONSERVATION-PROGRAM PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 887, Senate bill 2077, relating to the agricultural conservation program payments to farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2077) amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the bill in question was reached on the calendar on Tuesday, I objected to its consideration, because the bill was not explained and I was not familiar with its objectives. I have discussed the matter with the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] and find that its provisions will not result in extending our agricultural program in any way. The bill meets the situation regarding the expansion of areas for military purposes, as I understand. I think the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] did not understand the situation, but I am satisfied the bill is a meritorious one and that it should pass. It was not passed yesterday on account of my objection to its consideration then. In fairness to the Senator from Arkansas, and to the Members of the Senate generally, I think I should make that statement, and upon that statement I ask that the order for the calling of the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum, be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas. As I understand, the bill in no way modifies or infringes upon the agricultural program which we have adopted as a policy, nor upon the conservation program, but it applies particularly to farmers whose lands have been taken or may be taken by the Government in defense areas on which to construct factories or cantonments or training camps, and provides that the owners of such lands shall receive the conservation checks they would have received if the Government had not interfered with the ownership of their land, or the production and harvesting of their crops. Is that correct?

Mr. SPENCER. That statement is entirely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the proposed legislation is recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SPENCER. Yes; it is recommended by the Department of Agriculture and by the War Department.

Mr. McNARY. The bill provides for something which should be done in fairness to the farmer and to promote the national defense.

Mr. SPENCER. Under the present law certain practices must be followed in respect to the harvesting of crops. Now the Government comes in and takes certain lands on which farmers have growing crops, and they cannot harvest them. The Government cannot technically make the payments provided to be made, although the money has been set aside for that purpose. The proposed legislation would correct that situation. The amounts in question have already been calculated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2077) amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the words "operations as", to insert "landlords", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso under the head "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 144, 77th Cong., approved July 1, 1941), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1940 and 1941 carried out farming operations as landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who complied with the terms and conditions of the 1940 and 1941 agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers, and wherever in either of such years the acquisition of title to, or lease of, any farm for use in the national-defense program caused the producers to lose their interest in the crops planted thereon, or the proceeds thereof, prior to the time of harvest, the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers on such farm in such year shall be entitled to apply for and receive the payments which they would have received under the agricultural conservation program for such year if they had been permitted to retain their interest in such crops, or the proceeds thereof, to the extent that it does not clearly appear that in connection with such acquisition full compensation was made for the failure to receive such payments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third meeting, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jess H. Miller to be postmaster at Natona, Kans.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on yesterday that nomination was passed over at the request, as I recall, of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The Senator from Kansas is not on the floor at this moment. I suggest that the nomination go over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 12, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1941:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER

John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1948. (Reappointment.)

MEDICAL DIRECTORS IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Edward C. Ernst, January 15, 1942.
Peter J. Gorman, January 19, 1942.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

AIR CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Edwin Randolph Page, Air Corps.

To be lieutenant colonels

Capt. James Keller De Armond, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Walter Llewellyn Wheeler, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Norme D. Frost, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).

Capt. Linus Dodge Frederick, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).

To be majors

First Lt. George Lawrence Holcomb, Air Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. William Ray Clingerman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Walter Eckman, Air Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States).

APPOINTMENT FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

To be rear admiral

Capt. Arthur S. Carpender to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of October 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 1941:

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

First Lt. Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, to Chemical Warfare Service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law.)

To be colonels

Frederic Granville Munson, Judge Advocate General's Department.
×Carl Herndon Seals, Adjutant General's Department.
×Gordon Handy McCoy, Field Artillery.
×Robert Boyd Cole, Infantry.
Milton Hager Taulbee, Field Artillery.
Sidney Glenn Brown, Infantry.
George Clinton Donaldson, Infantry.
Joseph Hamilton Davidson, Infantry.
Russell Henry Brennan, Judge Advocate General's Department.

To be captain

Edwin Lankford Kirtley, chaplain, United States Army.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants

Walter Jacob Powers, Dental Corps.
Russell Martin Madison, Veterinary Corps.
James Clayton McIntyre, Veterinary Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All officers listed below, with the exception of James Thomas Curry, Jr., Air Corps, and Earle J. Carpenter, Air Corps, now hold rank as temporary lieutenant colonel.)

To be lieutenant colonels

Mortimer Francis Sullivan, Cavalry.
Eggleston Westley Peach, Quartermaster Corps.
Leslie Dillon Carter, Cavalry.
Don Riley, Infantry.
Pembroke Augustine Brawner, Infantry.
Isaac Leonard Kitts, Field Artillery, with rank from December 4, 1941.
×Fred Charles Thomas, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from December 4, 1941.
×Merrill Deitz Mann, Air Corps, with rank from December 4, 1941.
Albert Carl Foulk, Air Corps, with rank from December 4, 1941.
Edward Vincent Harbeck, Jr., Air Corps, with rank from December 4, 1941.
Hubert Butler Bramlet, Chemical Warfare Service.
Edward Ernest Hildreth, Air Corps.
Samuel Gordon Frierson, Air Corps.
Phillips Melville, Air Corps.
John Gordon Williams, Air Corps.
Albert Brown Pitts, Air Corps.
Bernard Scott Thompson, Air Corps.
Willis Ratcliffe Taylor, Air Corps.
Robert Duane Knapp, Air Corps.
Louis Braswell Knight, Infantry.
×Lowell Allison Elliott, Chemical Warfare Service.
James Thomas Curry, Jr., Air Corps.
Harry Albert Fudge, Quartermaster Corps.
Burdette Mase Fitch, Adjutant General's Department.
William Bettencourt Souza, Air Corps.
Alfred Lindeburg, Air Corps.
Joseph Alexis Wilson, Air Corps.
Theodore Anton Baumeister, Quartermaster Corps.
Clements McMullen, Air Corps.
Ames Scribner Albro, Air Corps.
Milo McCune, Air Corps.
Benjamin Buckles Cassiday, Air Corps.
Charles Yawkey Banfill, Air Corps.
Myron Ray Wood, Air Corps.
Robert Theodore Cronau, Air Corps.
Rex Walter Minckler, Signal Corps.
Frank Charles Peters, Quartermaster Corps.
William Joseph Gainey, Quartermaster Corps.
Lloyd Chartley Blackburn, Air Corps.
Edward Jenkins, Infantry.
William Campbell Goldsborough, Air Corps.
Roscoe Bonham, Philippine Scouts.
Walter Raymond Peck, Air Corps.
Leon Aurile White, Coast Artillery Corps.
Ephraim Preston Jolls, Coast Artillery Corps.
Walter Lee McCormick, Coast Artillery Corps.
Arnold Dante Amoroso, Coast Artillery Corps.
Clarence Omer Bell, Coast Artillery Corps.
Fred Brenning Waters, Coast Artillery Corps.
Arthur Girard Hamilton, Air Corps.
Charles Mellis Myers, Coast Artillery Corps.
Cyrus Quinton Shelton, Coast Artillery Corps.
Frederick Rockwell Chamberlain, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Emil Charles Kiel, Air Corps.
Harold Lee George, Air Corps.
Lewis Allegeo Dayton, Air Corps.
Younger Arnold Pitts, Air Corps.
Howard Zabriskie Bogert, Air Corps.
Charles Roderick Mize, Finance Department.
Joseph Branson Canfield, Quartermaster Corps.
Emile Peter Antonovich, Quartermaster Corps.
Hans Christian Jespersen, Infantry.
Lyle Meredon Shields, Quartermaster Corps.
Harvey James Golightly, Infantry.
Charles Hale Dowman, Air Corps.
×Leonard Murphy, Infantry.
Edgar Baldwin Heylmun, Infantry.
Thomas Welch Blackburn, Air Corps.
Thomas Hayden Davies, Infantry.
Claude Weaver Feagin, Cavalry.
Harry Francis Hanson, Infantry.
Lee Vyvian Harris, Field Artillery.
Harry Anton Johnson, Air Corps.
Bob Edward Nowland, Air Corps.
Barney McKinney Giles, Air Corps.
Roy Travis McLamore, Quartermaster Corps.
Bernard Joseph Tooher, Air Corps.
Claude Edward Duncan, Air Corps.
Albert Francis Hegenberger, Air Corps.
Max Frank Schneider, Air Corps.
Donald Gardner Stitt, Air Corps.
Richard Pegram Boykin, Quartermaster Corps.
Eugene Walter Lewis, Quartermaster Corps.
James Brian Edmunds, Quartermaster Corps.
Alexander Forest Dershimer, Quartermaster Corps.
Oscar William Koch, Cavalry.
Helmer Swenholt, Corps of Engineers.

John Joseph Gahan, Infantry.
James Franklin Greene, Quartermaster Corps.
Charles Maze Simpson, Jr., Signal Corps.
Albert Milton Pigg, Signal Corps.
Arnold Richard Christian Sander, Infantry.
Stanley Marshall Prouty, Infantry.
Glenn Charles Salisbury, Air Corps.
Harold Ralph Wells, Air Corps.
Samuel Nairn Karrick, Corps of Engineers.
Malcolm Stoney Lawton, Air Corps.
Jasper Kemper McDuffie, Air Corps.
Howard Knox Ramey, Air Corps.
Lionel H. Dunlap, Air Corps.
Harold Daniel Smith, Air Corps.
Michael Al Quinn, Quartermaster Corps.
Earle J. Carpenter, Air Corps.
James Pratt Hodges, Air Corps.
James Alvin Lewis, Infantry.
Herbert Edson Willis, Quartermaster Corps.
Frank Lauderdale Cook, Air Corps.
Bradford W. Kunz, Quartermaster Corps.
Adel Curry Harden, Finance Department.
Oakley George Kelly, Air Corps.
Bernard Tobias Castor, Air Corps.
James Alexander Mollison, Air Corps.
Harold Webster Beaton, Air Corps.
Lawrence Brownlee Savage, Quartermaster Corps.
Richard Clark Jacobs, Jr., Infantry.
Charles Stricklen Shadle, Chemical Warfare Service.
Edwin Thomas May, Infantry.
Stephen Bowen Elkins, Finance Department.
Edgar Eugene Glenn, Air Corps.
Joseph Jones Yeats, Infantry.
William Henry Buechner, Infantry.
John William Monahan, Air Corps.
Cortlandt Spencer Johnson, Air Corps.
Andrew Reid Duvall, Infantry.
Henry Walter Ulmo, Coast Artillery Corps.
Charles Carl Chauncey, Air Corps.
Julian Meredith MacMillan, Infantry.
Raymond Dailey, Quartermaster Corps.
Homer Barron Chandler, Air Corps.
Carl Weston Pyle, Air Corps.
Frederick Eugene Coyne, Jr., Finance Department.
John Myers McCulloch, Air Corps.

ADDITIONAL PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Frederick Cantwell Kelly
William Henry Powell, Jr.
Junius Penny Smith
Harry George Armstrong

To be captains

Robert William Lloyd
Richard Reynolds
Charles Raymond Sharp

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

Gerald Arthur McCracken
Jerome Joseph Hiniker
Douglas Monroe Beebe
Kenneth David Eye
Virgil Gordon Walker
Jack Menefee Messner
Hal David Oakley, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

NEVADA

Pete Petersen, Reno.

TEXAS

Mary McMurrey, Coldspring.
Thomas L. Satterwhite, Coolidge.
Ameta C. McGloin, Corpus Christi.
George W. Dear, Troup.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who art light, help us to dissipate the darkness; Thou who art life, may it beat in us with full pulsation and with a deep sense of fidelity, of meekness, and long-suffering. It is only through entire consecration do we get an insight into the transforming power of the things of God, augmenting the divine in us and clearing our faith. Oh, do Thou appeal to that instinct of recovery, love of country, and to that temper of hope which Thou hast established in the true American heart.

Almighty God, let us live alive and free, never forfeiting the dreams and the ideals of our religion, free education, and the open church. Breathe upon them all the pure spirit of Heaven, delivering our people from fear, never being seduced by sordid reckonings nor by the disguises of false friendships. We pray Thee to crown us all with Thy blessed promises which mean faith, conviction, sacrifice, and heroism.

We praise Thee, Almighty God, that weeping may endure for the night, but joy cometh in the morning.

In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with, and that the Journal be approved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order today for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess at the call of the Speaker.

There was no objection; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER THE RECESS

At 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 4, 1941:

H. R. 768. An act for the relief of William E. Thomas; and

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Fred Spencer.

On December 5, 1941:

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Margaret M. Cutts.

DECLARATION OF WAR BY GERMANY AND ITALY AGAINST UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 454)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Congress of the United States:

On the morning of December 11, the Government of Germany, pursuing its course of world conquest, declared war against the United States.

The long known and the long expected has thus taken place. The forces endeavoring to enslave the entire world now are moving toward this hemisphere.

Never before has there been a greater challenge to life, liberty, and civilization.

Delay invites greater danger. Rapid and united effort by all of the peoples of the world who are determined to remain free will insure a world victory of the forces of justice and of righteousness over the forces of savagery and of barbarism.

Italy also has declared war against the United States.

I, therefore, request the Congress to recognize a state of war between the United States and Germany, and between the United States and Italy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 11, 1941.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST GERMANY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 256, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Government of Germany has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Germany; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 393, answered "present" 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—393

Allen, La.	Bishop	Butler
Andersen, H. Carl	Blackney	Byron
	Bland	Camp
Anderson, Calif.	Bloom	Canfield
Anderson, N. Mex.	Boehne	Cannon, Mo.
	Boggs	Capozzoli
Andresen, August H.	Boland	Carlson
	Bolton	Carter
Andrews	Bonner	Cartwright
Angell	Boren	Case, S. Dak.
Arends	Boykin	Casey, Mass.
Arnold	Bradley, Mich	Celler
Baldwin	Bradley, Pa.	Chapman
Barden	Brooks	Chenoweth
Barnes	Brown, Ga.	Chiperfield
Barry	Brown, Ohio	Clark
Bates, Mass.	Bryson	Clason
Baumhart	Buck	Claypool
Beam	Buckley, N. Y	Clevenger
Beckworth	Bulwinkle	Cluett
Beiter	Burch	Cochran
Bender	Burdick	Coffee, Nebr.
Bennett	Burgin	Coffee, Wash.

Cole, Md.	Hinshaw	Patton
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Pearson
Collins	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.
Colmer	Holbrock	Peterson, Ga.
Cooley	Holmes	Pheiffer,
Cooper	Hook	William T.
Copeland	Hope	Pierce
Courtney	Houston	Pittenger
Cox	Howell	Plauché
Cravens	Hull	Ploeser
Crawford	Hunter	Plumley
Creal	Imhoff	Poage
Crosser	Izac	Powers
Crowther	Jackson	Priest
Culkin	Jacobsen	Rabaut
Cullen	Jarman	Ramsay
Cunningham	Jarrett	Ramspeck
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Randolph
D'Alesandro	Jenks, N. H.	Rankin, Miss.
Davis, Ohio	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Reed, Ill.
Day	Johns	Reed, N. Y.
Dewey	Johnson, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Dickstein	Johnson, Ind.	Rich
Dies	Johnson,	Richards
Dingell	Luther A.	Rivers
Dirksen	Johnson,	Rizley
Disney	Lyndon B.	Robertson,
Ditter	Johnson, Okla.	N. Dak.
Domengeaux	Johnson, W. Va.	Robertson, Va.
Dondero	Jones	Robsion, Ky.
Doughton	Jonkman	Rockefeller
Douglas	Kean	Rodgers, Pa.
Downs	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Drewry	Keefe	Rogers, Okla.
Duncan	Kefauver	Rolph
Durham	Kelly, Ill.	Romjue
Dworshak	Kennedy,	Russell
Eaton	Martin J.	Sabath
Eberharter	Kennedy,	Sacks
Edmiston	Michael J.	Sanders
Eliot, Mass.	Keogh	Sasscer
Elliott, Calif.	Kilburn	Satterfield
Ellis	Kilday	Sauthoff
Elston	Kinzer	Schuetz
Engel	Kleberg	Schulte
Englebright	Klein	Scott
Faddis	Knutson	Scrugham
Fellows	Kocialkowski	Secrest
Fenton	Kopplemann	Shafer, Mich.
Fish	Kramer	Shanley
Fitzgerald	Kunkel	Shannon
Fitzpatrick	Lambertson	Sheppard
Flaherty	Landis	Short
Flannagan	Lanham	Sikes
Fogarty	Lea	Simpson
Folger	Leavy	Smith, Maine
Forand	LeCompte	Smith, Ohio
Ford, Leland M.	Lesinski	Smith, Pa.
Ford, Miss.	Lewis	Smith, Va.
Ford, Thomas F	Ludlow	Smith, Wash.
Fulmer	Lynch	Smith, Wis.
Gale	McCormack	Snyder
Gamble	McGehee	Somers, N. Y.
Gathings	McGranery	South
Gavagan	McGregor	Sparkman
Gearhart	McIntyre	Spence
Gehrmann	McKeough	Springer
Gibson	McLaughlin	Starnes, Ala.
Gifford	McMillan	Stearns, N. H.
Gilchrist	Maas	Stefan
Gillette	Maciejewski	Stevenson
Gillie	Maciora	Stratton
Gore	Mahon	Sullivan
Gossett	Manasco	Sumner, Ill.
Graham	Marcantonio	Sumners, Tex.
Granger	Martin, Iowa	Sutphin
Grant, Ala.	Martin, Mass.	Sweeney
Grant, Ind.	May	Taber
Green	Merritt	Talle
Gregory	Meyer, Md.	Tarver
Guyer	Michener	Tenerowicz
Gwynne	Mills, Ark.	Terry
Haines	Mills, La.	Thill
Hall,	Mitchell	Thom
Edwin Arthur	Monroney	Thomas, N. J.
Hall,	Moser	Thomas, Tex.
Leonard W.	Mott	Thomason
Halleck	Mundt	Tibbott
Hancock	Murray	Tolan
Hare	Myers, Pa.	Traynor
Harness	Nelson	Treadway
Harrington	Nichols	Van Zandt
Harris, Ark.	Norrell	Vincent, Ky.
Harris, Va.	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Hart	O'Brien, Mich.	Voorhis, Calif.
Harter	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
Hartley	O'Connor	Vreeland
Healey	O'Hara	Wadsworth
Hébert	Oliver	Walter
Heffernan	O'Neal	Ward
Heidinger	O'Toole	Wasielewski
Hendricks	Pace	Weaver
Hess	Paddock	Wene
Hill, Colo.	Patman	West
Hill, Wash.	Patrick	Wheat
Whelchel	Wilson	Worley
Whitten	Winter	Wright
Whittington	Wolcott	Young
Wickersham	Wolverton, N. J.	Youngdahl
Wigglesworth	Woodruff, Mich.	Zimmerman
Williams	Woodrum, Va.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rankin, Mont.

NOT VOTING—36

Allen, Ill.	Larrabee	Schaefer, Ill.
Bates, Ky.	McArdle	Sheridan
Bell	McLean	Smith, W. Va.
Buckler, Minn.	Magnuson	Steagall
Byrne	Mansfield	Tinkham
Cannon, Fla.	Mason	Weiss
Costello	Murdock	Welch
Delaney	O'Day	White
Flannery	O'Leary	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Osmers	
Johnson, Calif.	Pfeifer,	
Kelley, Pa.	Joseph L.	
Kerr	Robinson, Utah	
Kirwan	Scanlon	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same; and

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5945. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska with respect to the use of the waters of the Republican River Basin.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1057) entitled "An act to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees;" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MEAD, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) entitled "An act to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act;" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BULOW, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5584) entitled "An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce."

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST GERMANY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 119, which is identical with the resolution just adopted by the House, and pass the Senate resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was read a third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the action just taken by the House in the passage of House Joint Resolution 256 be vacated and that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST ITALY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rule and pass Senate Joint Resolution 120, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Government of Italy has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Italy, which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Italy; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 399, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—399

Allen, Ill.	Beckworth	Bryson
Allen, La.	Beiter	Buck
Andersen,	Bender	Buckley, N. Y.
H. Carl	Bennett	Bulwinkle
Anderson, Calif.	Bishop	Burch
Anderson,	Blackney	Burdick
N. Mex.	Bland	Burgin
Andresen,	Bloom	Butler
August H.	Boehne	Byron
Andrews	Boggs	Camp
Angell	Boland	Canfield
Arends	Bolton	Cannon, Mo.
Arnold	Bonner	Capozzoli
Baldwin	Boren	Carlson
Barden	Boykin	Carter
Barnes	Bradley, Mich.	Cartwright
Barry	Bradley, Pa.	Case, S. Dak.
Bates, Mass.	Brooks	Casey, Mass.
Baumhart	Brown, Ga.	Celler
Beam	Brown, Ohio	Chapman

Chenoweth	Hart	Norton
Chiperfield	Harter	O'Brien, Mich.
Clark	Hartley	O'Brien, N. Y.
Clason	Healey	O'Connor
Claypool	Hébert	O'Hara
Clevenger	Heffernan	Oliver
Cluett	Heidinger	O'Neal
Cochran	Hendricks	O'Toole
Coffee, Nebr.	Hess	Pace
Coffee, Wash.	Hill, Colo.	Paddock
Cole, Md.	Hill, Wash.	Patman
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Patrick
Collins	Hobbs	Patton
Colmer	Hoffman	Pearson
Cooley	Holbrook	Peterson, Fla.
Cooper	Holmes	Peterson, Ga.
Copeland	Hook	Pheiffer,
Courtney	Hope	William T.
Cox	Houston	Pierce
Cravens	Howell	Pittenger
Crawford	Hull	Plauché
Creal	Hunter	Ploeser
Crosser	Imhoff	Plumley
Crowther	Izac	Poage
Culkin	Jackson	Powers
Cullen	Jacobsen	Priest
Cunningham	Jarman	Rabaut
Curtis	Jarrett	Ramsay
D'Alesandro	Jenkins, Ohio	Ramspeck
Davis, Ohio	Jenks, N. H.	Randolph
Davis, Tenn.	Jennings	Rankin, Miss.
Day	Jensen	Reece, Tenn.
Dewey	Johns	Reed, Ill.
Dickstein	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Dies	Johnson, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Dingell	Johnson,	Rich
Dirksen	Luther A.	Richards
Disney	Johnson	Rivers
Ditter	Lyndon B.	Rizley
Domengeaux	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson,
Dondero	Johnson, W. Va.	N. Dak.
Doughton	Jones	Robertson, Va.
Douglas	Jonkman	Robsion, Ky.
Downs	Kean	Rockefeller
Drewry	Kee	Rodgers, Pa.
Duncan	Keefe	Rogers, Mass.
Durham	Kefauver	Rogers, Okla.
Dworshak	Kelly, Ill.	Rolph
Eaton	Kennedy,	Romjue
Eberharter	Martin J.	Russell
Edmiston	Kennedy,	Sabath
Eliot, Mass.	Michael J.	Sacks
Elliott, Calif.	Keogh	Sanders
Ellis	Kilburn	Sasscer
Elston	Kilday	Satterfield
Engel	Kinzer	Sauthoff
Englebright	Kleberg	Scanlon
Faddis	Klein	Schuetz
Fellows	Knutson	Schulte
Fenton	Kocialkowski	Scott
Fish	Kopplemann	Scrugham
Fitzgerald	Kramer	Secrest
Fitzpatrick	Kunkel	Shafer, Mich.
Flaherty	Lambertson	Shanley
Flannagan	Landis	Shannon
Flannery	Lanham	Sheppard
Fogarty	Lea	Short
Folger	Leavy	Sikes
Forand	LeCompte	Simpson
Ford, Leland M.	Lesinski	Smith, Maine
Ford, Miss.	Lewis	Smith, Ohio
Ford, Thomas F.	Ludlow	Smith, Pa.
Fulmer	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Gale	McCormack	Smith, Wash.
Gamble	McGehee	Smith, Wis.
Gathings	McGranery	Snyder
Gavagan	McGregor	Somers, N. Y.
Gearhart	McIntyre	South
Gehrmann	McKeough	Sparkman
Gibson	McLaughlin	Spence
Gifford	McMillan	Springer
Gilchrist	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Gillette	Maciejewski	Stearns, N. H.
Gillie	Maciora	Stefan
Gore	Magnuson	Stevenson
Gossett	Mahon	Stratton
Graham	Manasco	Sullivan
Granger	Marcantonio	Sumner, Ill.
Grant, Ala.	Martin, Iowa	Sumners, Tex.
Grant, Ind.	Martin, Mass.	Sutphin
Green	May	Sweeney
Gregory	Merritt	Taber
Guyer	Meyer, Md.	Talle
Gwynne	Michener	Tarver
Haines	Mills, Ark.	Tenerowicz
Hall,	Mills, La.	Terry
Edwin Arthur	Mitchell	Thill
Hall,	Monroney	Thom
Leonard W.	Moser	Thomas, N. J.
Halleck	Mott	Thomas, Tex.
Hancock	Mundt	Thomason
Hare	Murray	Tibbott
Harness	Myers, Pa.	Tinkham
Harrington	Nelson	Tolan
Harris, Ark.	Nichols	Traynor
Harris, Va.	Norrell	Treadway
Van Zandt	Weiss	Winter
Vincent, Ky.	Wene	Wolcott
Vinson, Ga.	West	Wolverton, N. J.
Voorhis, Calif.	Wheat	Woodruff, Mich.
Vorys, Ohio	Whelchel	Woodrum, Va.
Vreeland	Whitten	Worley
Wadsworth	Whittington	Wright
Walter	Wickersham	Young
Ward	Wigglesworth	Youngdahl
Wasielewski	Williams	Zimmerman
Weaver	Wilson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rankin, Mont.

NOT VOTING—30

Bates, Ky.	Larrabee	Schaefer, Ill.
Bell	McArdle	Sheridan
Buckler, Minn.	McLean	Smith, W. Va.
Byrne	Mansfield	Steagall
Cannon, Fla.	Mason	Welch
Costello	Murdock	White
Delaney	O'Day	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	O'Leary	
Johnson, Calif.	Osmers	
Kelley, Pa.	Pfeifer,	
Kerr	Joseph L.	
Kirwan	Robinson, Utah	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the resolution and declaration against Germany.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a cartoon which appeared on the editorial page of the new Chicago morning newspaper, the Chicago Sun. It depicts the strong hand of isolationism clasped in the strong hand of interventionism, with the ugly and treacherous face of Nippon in the background. That handclasp shows a determination to carry through until the end.

The unanimity of action just had here shows the same purpose on the part of the Representatives of the people with respect to those other vicious enemies of democracy who have today declared it as their intention to destroy us.

Those who have heretofore shared such widely divergent views with respect to our foreign policy are to be heartily commended upon such a unity in thought and purpose in the face of the greatest danger that ever confronted this Nation.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the ruthless and barbarous attack by the Japanese on the United States last Sunday depicted the detestable and infamous acts of the Axis Powers. Even though representatives of the Imperial Japanese Government had been and were at that very moment attempting to negotiate peaceful settlements of the difficulties between the two Governments, the Japanese armed forces were on the move to make this barbarous attack. By the same inhuman method Hitler, with his German Armies, attacked country after country. Likewise, Mussolini and his Italian Army in the same manner stabbed in the back France and other countries in this unholy war on the rights, liberties, and freedoms of men.

It is evident that the conquest and aggression by Germany, Italy, and Japan is directed and moved by the forces in Berlin, under the control and dictatorship of Hitler. The democracies have been too patient, all in the hope and with every determined effort that the world would not be faced with such conquests and aggression but would continue in peaceful pursuits. The President and the people of America have been patient, even though for the past 2 years war appeared inevitable. In our declaration of war against Japan last Monday many of us felt then, as we do now, that Germany and Italy should have been included, because the attack of the Japanese was in actuality an attack by all of the Axis Powers. We face a realization and with only one course to pursue. We have wanted peace, but if war is the answer, then, by the grace of God, we will give our resources and our lives to put an end to conquest and aggression in order that the peoples of the world may ultimately abide in peace and happiness. We accept the challenge in voting this declaration of war, including not only against the puppets of the Japanese Government, but Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy as well. We will move together in unity with calm and sturdy deliberations and determined acts, giving to us and all whose cause we represent ultimate victory.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, we have been at war with Germany and Italy for some time. By my votes in Congress I have been doing everything in my power to prepare America for the war that is now on us.

President Roosevelt saw what was coming when other people did not. I am happy to say that upon every occasion since I have been in Congress, he had my full and complete support. No matter what our ancestry is we are in this fight together against the enemies of the United States. Let us forget all our differences and go to the job as Americans. We will win this fight and win it quickly if every man, woman, and child in America will buckle down to a full day's work. It is a serious time but it will soon pass if each and every one of us will give to our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, our full and hearty support and cooperation. Let each one of us determine to do whatever task is assigned by that Commander in Chief.

It is a pity that two mad men, Hitler and Mussolini, could upset the whole world. They must be put down. If the Italian people could express themselves they would say the same thing.

I am convinced that if the ordinary citizen of Italy saw the chance, he would destroy Mussolini and Italy would soon become the ally of America in its war for freedom and democracy.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, history records no more treacherous and dastardly act than was committed by Japan last Sunday when it attacked America while still pretending to seek understanding and to want peace.

Now, as expected, its partners in infamy, Germany and Italy, have declared war on these United States. A strong, determined, and united Nation, believing in the righteousness of its cause and trusting in Divine Providence, accepts the challenge and dedicates itself and all of its resources to destroy those nations who have embarked upon a course of world domination and who have been properly classified as "international desperadoes and assassins."

The American people will meet this new threat with courage and confidence. No one doubts ultimate victory.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the resolution declaring war against Japan, as well as the resolution declaring war against Hitler and Mussolini. I shall vigorously support a program of all-out war against the enemies of our country. This is a war of defense, a just war, an anti-Fascist war, and a war of liberation.

I have the honor to represent the Twentieth Congressional District of New York. It is composed of Americans of all races, colors, and creeds: Americans of Italian extraction, Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and Jews. They have lived and worked for America.

In keeping with the great traditions of Washington, Lincoln, Garibaldi, De Diego, and Frederick Douglas, they will fight and die for America.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as I anticipated by my letter to the President on Monday before voting for the declaration of war against Japan, we now find for a fact that the other Axis partners, Italy and Germany, have declared war against us. War is horrible but there are things more horrible than war. It is very gratifying to me that already I have received numerous telegrams, letters, and other messages from my constituents commending me for my vote for war against Japan as they heard me answer "Aye" through their radios. Knowing the people from whose loins I sprang I know it is their desire that I cast my vote for them today for a declaration of war against these two remaining deadly enemies.

May I take this opportunity to utter this word of deep appreciation, not only to my colleagues in the Congress, but to all of the people of our great country as they forget their petty differences and solidify their strength for the common defense.

We have serious business before us. Our hearts and all of our capacities are bound to be put to the supreme test. The duty to defend one's home and all that he cherishes is in fact not a duty; it is on the contrary a privilege. History will record that this war was not of our making. We take up the challenge with clean hands. Ours is a rich heritage. Even the poorer ones of us enjoy blessings undreamed of by the peoples of any other country or clime. We are admonished, however, from those who receive much, much in like manner is expected.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, Alaska, although not yet a State, unhesitatingly joins the several States by intention and by firm purpose in support of the resolutions formally declaring the war which has been thrust upon the Government and people of the United States by the Governments of Japan, Germany, and Italy. Under these circumstances, no loyal citizen can have the least doubt of the course of action to be taken.

Even before the infamous attack made upon us at Hawaii last Sunday by the Japanese, the citizens of Alaska were of one mind in support of all the policies of the Government looking toward national defense and toward the maintenance of our just rights. There was even then no doubt and no disunity. In Alaska we are, in my judgment, singularly blessed in the absence of "fifth columnists," saboteurs, and traitors, and for that we are profoundly thankful.

While the people of Alaska are apprehensive because they know that, if not on the firing line, they are only one step removed from it, they are determined to do all that lies in their power by stamina and courage and fortitude and manhood for the cause of the Nation, which is the cause of freedom.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this day will go down in history as one of the most important days this country has ever seen or will ever see.

The unanimous action of Congress has crystallized what many have foreseen as an inevitable fact. There is now a direct and awful clash of conflicting philosophies of life and government. Those philosophies are, on the one hand, that of the totalitarian states in which as a principal component is the view that the individual is subservient to the state and, on the other hand, that of the free, democratic, representative governments, the cardinal keystone of which is that such such governments are created by men; derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; and are charged with the responsibility of insuring to their citizens the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, the freedom from want, and the freedom from fear.

This great country of ours and every man, woman, and child in it subscribes to this philosophy. Our way of life, our liberty, and our civilization have very definitely and insidiously been challenged. We have today accepted that challenge, and we are conscious of the terrific task that lies before us.

In the great work that now must be done, all elements of our population will join together and the unity that has always marked the actions of our people in times of national stress will prevail now with greater force, with greater effect, and with ultimate victory.

We now fight to live. We shall continue to live as freemen because the fight that has come to us will end in final and lasting triumph of the principles for which we stand.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, the die is cast. We have now crossed the Rubicon. In spite of the honest and sincere effort made by this Congress to spare our country the horrors and tragedies of war, we are now engaged in grim, terrible, and total warfare with all three of the Axis Powers. We are now a united people, with but one thought and one aim, and that is to win the war as quickly and decisively as possible. This war must not, and shall not, end until we have ridded the world of the horrible scourge of nazism and until we have made assurance doubly sure that the sun will be setting very early in the Land of the Rising Sun.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is the most tragic moment in American history. War with the Axis Powers probably means a long, bloody, and costly war.

We are now confronted with war on two oceans, and with the armed forces of Germany, Italy, Japan, and their allies and satellites. The very existence and destiny of not only America but that of free people all over the world is at stake.

America stands united in a righteous and sacred cause, that of defending a peaceful world against brutal military aggressions by lawless dictators.

We are fighting to safeguard, preserve, and transmit to posterity the eternal principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. From now on politics is out and only unity and action to achieve victory is vital to America.

I appeal to all American citizens of foreign origin to unite with 100 percent loyalty in defense of the United States and our free institutions.

My country, in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right; but, right or wrong, my country!

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, today, when the vote was taken declaring a state of war to exist between Germany and Italy and the United States, I was on my way to the naval airport at Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the preparations being made at that field for the protection of the New York Harbor. When I was informed of the action of Germany and Italy declaring war on the United States I immediately left for Washington, arriving a few minutes late. I would have cast my vote for the joint resolutions declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany and Italy, as I did in the case of Japan on Monday, December 8, 1941.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I voted "aye" on the resolution declaring that a state of war existed between the Government of the United States and its people and the Governments of both Germany and Italy. Last Monday I likewise voted "aye" on a similar declaration of war on the Japanese Empire.

My country has been first wantonly and savagely attacked by Japan. This Nation, governed by a coterie of ruthless Asiatic gangsters, collaborating with an equally ruthless and savage crew of European gangsters headed by Adolf Hitler and his satellite, Benito Mussolini, are now jointly waging war on the United States.

What are we fighting for? The answer is plain. We are fighting not for territorial gains, not for commercial supremacy, not for the right to hold subject peoples in thrall, but for the right of free people to remain free, for the right of freedom of expression; for the right of every man to worship his God as he sees fit; for the right to live in peace and security; and for the reestablishment of, and the practicing of, honor and faith and good intent among all peoples.

The gage of battle has been offered; the challenge is accepted.

The battle will be long. The cost in blood and treasure will be tremendous. It will call for courage, patience, work, and faith.

Much as we love peace and hate war we will match force with force and still more force.

For the moment might seems to be in the ascendant, but right is, after all, immutable and will prevail.

So, my countrymen, be not cast down. It is the final battle that wins a war. That victory will be ours.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, war has come to America. On Sunday, December 7, the Japanese struck swiftly and foully, even while their representatives pretended to negotiate for a peaceable understanding with our people. They struck viciously, without warning, leaving hundreds dead and dying in the wake of their planes. Now Japan's guilty partners, Germany and Italy, have declared war upon us. No man can truthfully say the United States sought war. It has been forced upon us. But, thank God, it finds a united people. It finds a people who will stand firmly together, however long and dark may be the road that lies ahead. It finds a people determined that our Nation shall win through to complete victory.

Yes, our Nation has been attacked. An evil, cunning enemy has struck hard at our Pacific defenses. The mask has fallen away from our foes. Their avarice and perfidy stands revealed in its true light. The gangster nations of our time now stand together.

America goes into war with clean hands. The records leave no doubt on that score. The overwhelming guilt of our common foes is plainly written. Time and again the American people have sought to avoid war. We leaned over backward in that effort. So diligently did our Government seek accord with Japan that its apparent appeasement of the Japs brought strong protests from patriotic citizens.

Despite all these efforts, this evil power attacked our Nation treacherously and dastardly, just as a murderous assassin attacks while lurking in the dark. Tragically, American citizens have paid with their lives for Japanese infamy. And now this nation without honor stands allied with Germany and Italy.

Our task is plain. To every American there comes the solemn duty to make sure that the great sacrifice of our compatriots in Hawaii and in the Philippines is not forgotten on the inevitable day of reckoning. There must be all-out, never-ending effort until every blow struck, every life taken shall have been avenged a thousandfold. These monsters of tyranny and aggression must be ruthlessly crushed. They will long rue the day that the fury of a peaceable, liberty-loving people was unleashed.

Aggression against the American flag and American citizens has done what many attacks upon the American way of life have failed to do. It has cemented all factions and all groups into one solid front, fiercely determined to triumph, to preserve freedom, justice, and order.

But let no person mistake the magnitude of the task that lies ahead of us. This will not be an easily won war. Japan has a seasoned, well-trained war machine. It is a thoroughly ruthless machine. Back of it stand all the resources and the cunning and the might of her Axis partners, Germany and Italy. Their strength, too, is directed against us, and in every conceivable way they will wage war upon us. They and Japan are one, and they in their turn must answer to our righteous indignation.

It is a grave and serious moment in our national history. Truly are we now lined up for the great struggle for world freedom. The mantle of responsibility is ours. Upon us as a nation depends the preservation of world freedom. America is living a great hour of destiny. You and I are challenged. Every person who bears the name "American" is challenged to see that our Nation does not fail in this glorious responsibility.

Our people must work together and stand together. Every shoulder must be put to the wheel. There must be unity in every walk of life. Personal differences and politics must be forgotten. Every person can help in this struggle. Many will proudly wear our country's uniform. Those who cannot can still bear its colors. We can produce food, or we can produce fighting equipment. We can help to make every idle acre bring forth food. We can help to make every wheel and every lathe turn out materials for war. We can invest in defense bonds. And wherever we may be or whatever our task may be, we can talk for our Nation. We can believe in the things our boys are fighting for. We can let our neighbors know that we, in the best way we can, are fighting for those things, too.

Greed and treachery cannot defeat honor and decency. If we fight for and work for the things in which we believe, if we remember always to be Americans, though the road ahead may be long and weary, there can be but one ending. We shall win gloriously. America shall triumph. The rampant forces of greed and hate and fear shall be banished. The Axis and their guilty partners shall be crushed. Their kind will not rise again.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, again the people of America, for the second time in 4 days, are confronted with a situation which affords them no choice except to indulge in a declaration of war through the Congress, which invariably, in the final analysis, carries out the wishes of the majority of them. In fact, it will be our third declaration of war in 4 days and will materialize the fears of so many of our people who have for several years feared the necessity of our fighting Germany and Italy.

History will record the fact, however, that, in line with our invariable policy, it is not only not a war of aggression on our part but that it results from the most dastardly, most cowardly, most infamous, most treacherous attack on American soil and people which has ever occurred. In fact, when the peace negotiations, which were merely a sham and a smoke screen, are considered, such an attack has seldom occurred against any nation. The very treachery of this attack in the midst of these negotiations in our Capital cause it to be quite natural for our armies to have lost the first battle and the first several skirmishes. America has lost battles before and will, doubtless, lose others before this unfortunate war, which has been thrust upon us, is concluded, but America never has lost and will not now lose the last battle.

It is an ill wind which blows good to no one. The very nature of this infamous attack has solidified our people as they, perhaps, could not have been otherwise solidified. There is no division now. From the President to the lowliest citizen we are in absolute unison having closed ranks and each having given to himself the command, "Forward march to victory."

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within the present week we are called upon to vote a war resolution. There can be but one answer. I hope that we may, by unanimous vote, show to the world that democracy does work and that, as far as this Nation is concerned, we are as one people in our determination to see that the heritage that we hold dear shall be safeguarded for those who come after us.

All of our people will be called upon to make sacrifices. There is a job for every man, woman, and child in America, whether it be on the home front, farm, in the mill, mines, or armed forces. Whatever the cost ruthless aggression by totalitarian powers must be crushed. All that we hold dear is at stake.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I was unable to reach the floor of the House in time to vote for the war resolutions today. A telephone call from my office, placed at 10:15, failed to reach me at my home, which is 200 miles away. I got the message indirectly from Congressmen WEISS and SCANLON and I attempted to engage a private plane from my home town, but due to the weather conditions, which were very bad west of the Allegheny Mountains, the pilot deemed it inadvisable so it was necessary for me to drive 30 miles to catch a plane at the Pittsburgh airport. Consequently I arrived in Washington too late to cast my vote, but had I been here I would have voted in favor of the resolutions.

The above is true, in spite of the fact that I have four sons eligible for service in the Army. One is now in the service, another in the R. O. T. C., and the other two have received their notices. The fifth son will arrive at the age of twenty-one in another year, making five of my own sons eligible for service in the armed forces of this country. Their mother and I are proud of the fact the family can and will make this contribution.

Mr. McARDLE. Mr. Speaker, I arrived at the Capitol shortly after 2 p. m., too late to cast my vote on the declaration of war against Germany and Italy. The reason I was not in Washington was because I have had an indefinite leave of absence because of illness and after the vote on Monday on the declaration of war against Japan, I returned to Pittsburgh to again seek the medical services of my physician, and advised my office to keep me informed of anything of importance which might come up in the House. I received word this morning from my secretary at 9:35 a. m. that they expected a declaration of war against Germany and Italy today. I immediately contacted the Pittsburgh airport and found that the plane had left at 9:30 and the next flight would not reach Washington until 3:50 p. m., neither would train service have gotten me to Washington at an earlier hour, therefore, I drove from Pittsburgh to Washington arriving here shortly after 2 p. m. Had I been here in time I would have voted for a declaration of war against Italy and Germany and so wish to have the record show this fact.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, in casting my votes for declarations of war against

Hitler and Mussolini, I am reminded of those words of Shelley when he wrote:

Power, like a desolating pestilence,
Pollutes whatever it touches; and obedience,
Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom, and truth,
Makes slaves of men, and of the human frame
A mechanized automaton.

Autocratic dictatcrs have set forth to destroy our democracy and we accept the challenge. The American policy has ever been one of friendship and peace. We are loath to change that role, but when arrogant, self-seeking war lords attack and assail us, our people rise as one to resist with every ounce of strength at our command such unwarranted and wanton violations of all we hold dear.

The sword is drawn and may God grant that when it returns to the sheath it will be to a lasting peace where free men may know they are free.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I joined unhesitatingly with all the Members of this Congress in declaring a state of war to exist between this country and Japan. It was the only possible reply to the dastardly attack made upon us by a government whose emissaries were at that very instant in peace conference with our Government.

Today we have met the declarations of Germany and Italy with similar declarations. We are completely and utterly at war. In these few days the aspect of life in this country of ours has changed and every man, woman, and child has become a part of the force that will be needed to defeat the purposes of, and finally to utterly destroy, the powers of darkness against which we have arrayed ourselves.

Nothing could have been done that would have united this country more completely than Japan's mode of attack. But this initial spirit of unity will fail if there be less than united action too. This war is like no other war in history. Methods used in 1918 will not serve now—weapons must be adapted to the new war, and those weapons must be produced with a speed which looks impossible and which must be increased constantly with unfaltering strides. Victory will be won on the production line—uncountable numbers of lives will be lost if that line fails.

Congress has appropriated vast sums and has vested all power in the Chief Executive. Congress assumes that he in his turn will give authority to qualified men to sweep aside the confusion that prevails in defense agencies and bring to bear on the production problem the genius of American business. Congress assumes he will protect the speed-up program from all interruption, that he will free and protect the American farmer and the American laborer so that they may give unstintingly of themselves to the country they love just as truly as those Chinese who built with their own hands and so keep in repair the Burma Road, love China.

I have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A5523, the following words. I repeat them here because they express my deep-seated convictions as clearly as I know how to express them:

The Members of this House know that I have supported every single defense measure. My entire concern and my every attitude has been predicated upon the strongest possible defense for America. But because I have known how slowly we were moving toward any military security, because I have been peculiarly aware of the confusion of our efforts, I have tried to make those efforts more constructive, and have done all one person can do to hold us as a nation to the high ideal of our representative form of government. I have not always agreed with the foreign policies of the administration. Yet once those policies were enacted into law I have consistently supported their implementation.

But all that is passed. We are at war and there is no place in our lives for anything that will not build our strength and power, and build it quickly. Each Member of this Congress has a new duty placed upon him by this action. He must be more aware of the implications of every move we make in no matter what direction; more alert to every danger, even that which might come from our own individual selfishness, apathy, or fear; stronger for truth and honesty of purpose and of fact; wiser in little things that greater wisdom may prevail.

Each citizen of this great country has his part to play, his duty to the ideal that is America, his responsibility in the whole program of an all-out war, but ours is the larger responsibility. Let us not permit ourselves any littleness, any selfishness, any intolerances. Rather let us assume a greatness beyond ourselves, reconsecrating ourselves daily to the ideal of brotherhood that is America, that the light of her vision, though now dimmed, may shine with a deep serenity even in this darkness and so become the sun of tomorrow's day.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, earlier today Italy and Germany declared war on the United States, and it is with a heavy heart I vote in favor of declaring war against Germany and Italy. There is no course left open for representatives of this great peace-loving people than to meet the onslaught of aggressor nations. We recognize that a state of war exists. In recent months I have on numerous occasions said that only Congress may declare war and that only one man, Adolf Hitler, can put us into war against Germany. That man has declared ruthless war against us. He fomented the treacherous attack of the Japanese armed forces and has brought war instead of peace into the Pacific the same as he did in Europe. I know that taking the offensive is the best sort of defense. I have consistently upheld the leadership and on every occasion supported the foreign policy of President Roosevelt, and I will do my utmost in support of measures for the successful prosecution of this war against the evil forces of dictatorship aggression so that we may preserve to this Nation in perpetuity the liberty and supremacy which are ours and for which our forefathers fought and sacrificed.

Victory will not be won by wearing V buttons nor by boasts of our might, but victory will be won and security for our children and children's children by national solidarity and unity, in support of our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, and by loyalty, work, consecration, and combined determination to win or die. I have confidence in our President and gladly yield deference and devotion to him and unselfish support of his leadership. Let us dedicate ourselves to fight on land, sea, and in the air until this threat to our security and way of life is destroyed. This is our Gethsemane.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, this morning the expectations of all Americans were fulfilled. The jackals are now running in the pack with the Asiatic wolves, but we shall stand our ground and wipe out forever these menaces to morality, religion, respectability, and civilization.

For 2 long years we have watched the war and we hoped that some means might be found to avoid adding our portion to that sea of human blood that was sweeping white a world of people. But our rights were transgressed, our safety jeopardized, our citizens slain, and finally war itself was declared against us. We Americans detest war, but down to the lowliest citizen we are grateful that our beloved Nation will not sell her soul for peace. We will stand together in a unison that the world has never seen. Descendants of all races, creeds, and colors, holders of various shades of political thought and philosophy, we shall go forward, shoulder to shoulder and step by step, to defend the sanctity of our country and the blessedness of its institutions.

God has been very good to the United States, but he has been even more generous to those of us who are fortunate enough to have been born here or whose parents immigrated to its shores. He, through the constitutional rights which could have been inspired by only God Himself, has given us the fullest blossoming of a civilized life. The right of freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of thought, and, above all, the right to worship God untrammeled and unrestrained. It has been a life of security and happiness for all of our people, young, middle aged, and old. A life where men had the sanctity of their thoughts and the sanctity of their homes respected. It has been a life for each and every one of us that men could not have dreamed of 150 years ago, and we who have enjoyed it and who treasure it will give everything we possess, including the last drop of our blood if necessary, to protect, preserve, and to pass it on to the generations that are to come.

We must be forgiving to those of our citizenry who, in the past, were taken in by the European propagandists and who, perhaps, contributed in some manner against the defense of our country. They, too, are fully cognizant of the danger that now confronts us and of the value of the American way of life.

Our sacrifices, no doubt, will be great ones—ones that will take our time, our efforts, our money, our hopes, and our blood, but we shall drive forward despite setbacks to ultimate victory. May God extend his blessings over our flag, our land, and our people.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the message of the President

calls for prompt and positive action. As a Representative from the city of New York, with a population of more than 7,000,000 people, I want the Nation to know that the citizens of New York, living on the brink of the ocean, are ready, willing, and prepared to act as the first line of defense along the east coast.

In the present crisis, regardless of racial origin, religion, or politics, we stand united squarely behind our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep responsibility for the future of our country that I have cast my vote today for the resolutions that recognize a state of war to exist between Germany, Italy, and our own country.

Without choice upon our part war has been declared upon us. It has not been because of any choice upon the part of our people. But, now, that Germany and Italy, following the action of Japan, have made a declaration of war against us there is no other course open to us than to answer the challenge, and, pledge the resources of this Nation to the successful prosecution of the war to the end that the security of our people be made certain and sure.

The action we have taken will mean sacrifice. I would have avoided it if it had been possible. Until we had war thrust upon us, first, by Japan, and now by Germany and Italy, I have voted upon every measure presented to this House, during the war emergency period, upon the basis of whether the particular measure would tend to take us into war. If, in my opinion, it had such a tendency then I voted against it. And, with the same desire to protect our people from the ravages of war I have voted, without exception, for every appropriation that would build up and make stronger our defense.

In conclusion, may I say, that never did I think the day would come when I would vote for war. But, when powerful nations declare war upon us then there is no alternative. The resolutions just passed provide the only proper and adequate answer that could be made.

It is needless to say that my regret is deep and sincere that the course we have followed, for the more than 2 years the war has raged, has not saved us from participation in the war. I am deeply disappointed. But, with a realization that our national safety and security is threatened there is but one duty for all of us and that is to support to the fullest extent our Government, in the fulfillment of its duty to provide for the security and safety of our people, and, the principles of freedom to which this Government is committed. In the fulfillment of this task may we have the help of the divine hand that has never failed us in the past as a source of strength.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, without precedent, in treachery and double-dealing, Japan, with a suddenness and heretofore unrecorded viciousness and disregard for human lives, civilian as well as military, on Sunday last, invaded our shores, murdered our people, and wrecked and sunk some of our ships, attacked us as a nation, and, to complete the picture, declared war on us while they pretended to be negotiating for peace with our Secretary of State. No such history has been made before by human beings or by any nation.

The President, on Monday, December 8, addressed the joint session of the House and Senate, and, after stating these facts, asked the Congress to declare a state of war to exist between this Nation and the Japanese Empire. The President's voice had scarcely died away in the Chamber until a resolution was presented to the House declaring—I quote:

> Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committted repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved, etc.*, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared.

Little was said. No arguments or speeches were necessary for the passage of this resolution. The atrocious acts of Japan, like a sudden calamitous stroke, united the American people as never before.

This morning, according to the President of the United States, the Governments of Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. The President in the same statement asked the Congress to declare a state of war existing between Germany, Italy, and the United States. A similar resolution was presented to the House of Representatives, and, without one word of debate and without a dissenting vote, the Congress passed the resolution declaring a state of war to exist between the Governments of Germany, Italy, and the United States.

I, for one, have fought every move that I thought would cause us to enter a war unnecessarily, but when nations assault us and declare war against our people and our country there was and is but one answer, and that is to stand back of our Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and to answer with the united force of 130,000,000 great people and with every resource at our command and to bring to their knees the nations that have so outrageously violated our sacred rights.

Whatever arguments, contentions, and maybe mistakes that have taken place or occurred in the past are water under the bridge and we must stand together as one in this hour of America's greatest crisis. Our armed forces in the air, on the sea, and on the land must be backed up by a united civilian solidarity heretofore unknown in this country. For my part I feel the American people will, though it may take time, meet the challenge and furnish the unity and solidarity in both thought and action necessary to bring this country to a triumphant victory.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have desired peace above all things. We have done everything humanly possible to insulate ourselves against the temptations and provocations which might lead to war. Our consciences are clear. We have gone further in the pursuit of peace than any other nation in history. We have tried to keep our ships at home. We have kept our citizens from war zones. We have restricted our commerce and closed our eyes to events. These pathways are henceforth closed to us. Germany and Italy have declared themselves at war with the United States. We are prepared to resist in the certain knowledge that righteousness and justice cannot be destroyed. Our cause today is identical with the cause of human freedom and eternal liberty. The enslaved millions of Europe and Asia are looking to America, the last great hope on earth, for salvation. We are today a people resolute, united in our determination to succeed in our quest. We shall make war upon the land, upon the seas, and in the air with the bravery and courage of a free people to the end that mankind may realize in our lifetime the ideals of humanity for which all decent men must strive. With God's help we cannot, we must not, we will not fail.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning Germany and Italy joined their Axis partner in crime, Japan, in making war against the United States.

Within an hour after being formally advised of this fact by the President, the Congress, without a dissenting vote, accepted the challenge thus laid down.

America is now engaged in a world-wide, all-out war against the forces of aggression. From this moment onward we are fighting for our continued existence as a free people. We have allied ourselves with the other democracies in the task of stamping out the monster of totalitarianism which threatens to enslave the world. We will never lay down our arms until victory is won.

Our Nation has never sought war. We have always been a peace-loving and liberty-loving people. It is for the restoration of peace and the preservation of liberty that we are called upon to fight at this time. Neither are possible so long as the totalitarian outlaws now rampant are permitted to continue their depredations. They must be exterminated if our lives and the lives of those who come after us are to be worth living.

Hitler has contemptuously referred to democracies as being unable to function speedily and efficiently in a crisis. Today we have demonstrated that the greatest democracy on earth can act in a constitutional manner with the utmost dispatch, and in due time the Axis Powers will find that our efficiency in production and our determined fighting spirit will spell their doom.

In the light of the tremendous task which faces us, it must be obvious to all that we must quickly readjust our lives so as to contribute in every possible way to the successful prosecution of the war which has been thrust upon us.

We must greatly expand our Army and Navy. Production must be doubled and redoubled. Home defenses must be organized. We must give up many of the material things of life to which we have become accustomed. There can be no more "business as usual." Heavier and heavier taxes must be borne. All our effort must be concentrated on the defense of our homeland and on the destruction of Hitlerism. Everything else must be subjugated to these purposes. I know that all Americans will do their part, each in their own way.

Today, as never before, we are a united people, and in unity there is strength. However, we must not expect a quick or a cheap victory. It is a long, hard road

which lies ahead, and some reverses must be expected. These reverses we must take in stride. It is not who wins the first battle, but who wins the last one, that counts in the end. If we all do our share the final victory will be ours and that of world civilization. To arms, America!

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, by the act of Japan, by the action of Germany, and the action of Italy, today we are at war with those nations.

I have, by my consistent vote, done all in my power to arm and prepare this country—dear to all of us—against any eventualities. I, like most of my colleagues, prayed for peace but acted to prepare our armed forces against any aggression.

Sunday, without warning, Japan launched her military and naval might against our territory and our gallant defenders as well as our fellow citizens.

On Monday, I cast my vote in this House for a declaration of war against Japan.

This morning, Germany and Italy declared war upon us. Today, I cast my vote in this House for a declaration of war against Germany and Italy.

North and south, east, and west, Americans of every class, creed, and color are united as never before. We, their Representatives, stand here rallying around our dead and we are "highly resolved, that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

I pray that Almighty God may bless our arms; I know that we shall achieve ultimate victory. Then once more "peace on earth, good will to men" will be the cherished possession of all.

THE SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled Senate Joint Resolution 119 and enrolled Senate Joint Resolution 120.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in today's RECORD after the roll call.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the two resolutions just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize at this time only Members who were absent on a roll call or to present a letter or telegram from a Member who was not here.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LARRABEE] is ill. He has gone to the Mayo Clinic for a physical check-up. It is a matter of very deep regret to him that he was unable to be here today.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman should not state how the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LARRABEE] would have voted. If he has a letter from the gentleman from Indiana he may place the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LARRABEE] has written a letter to the Speaker of the House in regard to this vote. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in full in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, because of the fact that I was recuperating from an attack of flu, and was advised to enter the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn., for a complete physical check-up, I left Washington last Saturday, December 6, for my home.

Upon arriving home late Sunday evening I was shocked and astounded to learn of the unwarranted and dastardly attack upon our country by the Japanese, resulting in the loss of lives of Americans and ruthless destruction of our property.

Although it was impossible for me to get back to Washington in time to cast my vote for the resolution declaring war on Japan, had I been present I should have done so.

I immediately contacted Majority Leader McCORMACK by telephone, and he advised me to proceed to the Mayo Clinic to obtain the treatment which had been recommended; that while he would like for me to be present he assured me that it was of much more importance at the moment to protect my health in order that I could return in good health, ready for the strenuous days which lie ahead.

Accordingly I decided to remain at Mayo's, but, nevertheless, have kept in close touch with developments by means of the radio.

It now appears that Germany and Italy, partners of Japan in this terrible threat to our liberties, have joined openly with their Axis colleague. This merely brings into the open what we have long been aware of and there can now be no doubt as to who our foes are.

Neither can there be any doubt as to America's united and indomitable answer to the ruthless challenge which Japan has made. There can be but one answer—and that is that America will fight until this murderous alliance has been smashed.

I stand firmly with our leaders and join in their determination to accept this challenge from these aggressors who have put the entire world in fear and turmoil. We must and shall declare war also upon Germany and Italy. It is our clear course, and my only regret is that I am unable to be present to cast my vote along with my colleagues in a united front.

No one hates war more than I. It is terrible to contemplate its horrors, the loss of lives, and the sadness and desolation which war brings. We have wanted peace, and even while endeavoring through mutual understanding to preserve peace we have been the victims of a treacherous attack. America has been challenged, and we will fight to the utmost to protect ourselves and preserve the liberties which we have so long enjoyed.

With assurances of my wholehearted cooperation, I am

Sincerely yours,

WM. H. LARRABEE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent when the vote was taken on the resolution declaring a state of war existed with Germany. Had I been present I would have voted "yea," and I want it so recorded.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I also was unavoidably absent from the city on official business during the vote on the resolution declaring a state of war existed between Germany and the United States. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, due to the illness of my mother I was home this morning. As soon as I heard that a war resolution was to be taken up today, I, together with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] chartered a plane but arrived too late to vote on the resolution declaring that a state of war existed between Germany and the United States. Had I been here I would have voted "aye."

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I was in Pittsburgh this morning on official business and did not know that these war resolutions would be considered. At 12 o'clock I received word of the business to be considered by the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], and I chartered a special plane to Washington. I arrived in time to vote on the resolution declaring that a state of war existed between Italy and the United States, but not in time to vote on the declaration declaring that a state of war existed between Germany and the United States. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] was called home on account of the serious illness of his mother. Had he been here——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot record how his colleague would have voted had he been here. Only the Member himself may do that.

REMOVING RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE AND TERMS OF SERVICE OF THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 117, removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States."

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, as amended, and of Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended, insofar as they restrict the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, are suspended during the existence of any war in which the United States is engaged, and during the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war.

SEC. 2. The periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of all members of the Army of the United States now or hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States are extended for the period stated in the preceding section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from terminating such periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission at an earlier date in any case.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a comma and the following: "and shall include persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the Senate bill is not identical with the provisions of the House bill originally introduced by the chairman and to which the Committee on Military Affairs agreed. The bill which passed the Senate merely refers to the Army of the United States and not the selective-service trainees if later on a portion of them are taken by the Navy.

I think it would have been wise to retain the language of the original bill introduced by the chairman, using the words, "the land and naval forces of the United States, including selective-service trainees." This would have been all-inclusive and on the same basis for all services. If at a later date selective-service trainees are taken into the Navy, they would not be covered by the provisions of the Senate bill on the same subject.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that the gentleman is in error about the report of the House committee, but that is immaterial. At the last meeting we had we did report out what the Senate has passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6195) was laid on the table.

THE LATE JOHN W. MOORE

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, in this solemn and tragic hour in which we as the representatives of a free people have accepted the gage of battle hurled at us by the ruthless totalitarian forces of nazi-ism and fascism, I ask the indulgence of the House that I may announce the death of a beloved, respected, and honored former Member of this House, more recently an official of the Federal Housing Administration, the Honorable John W. Moore, of Kentucky, who passed from the paths of living men at 10 minutes after 10 this morning.

In 1925 Mr. Moore was elected to membership in the Sixty-ninth Congress to fill the unexpired term of the brilliant and colorful Robert Young Thomas, Jr., who had long represented that historic Kentucky district known as the "Bloody Third." I had been elected in 1924, and at the beginning of the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress in December of 1925, he and I together took for the first time the oath of office as Members of Congress. He was reelected in 1926 to the Seventieth Congress. In the primary campaign of 1928, Mr. Moore engaged in the most spirited and spectacular race of his career. He was pitted against one of the most redoubtable figures in the political history of Kentucky, a foeman worthy of the steel of any man who ever entered the arena of politics in that State. He emerged from that campaign victorious, but in the landslide that engulfed most of his State delegation in 1928 he went down to defeat, as did the rest of us, battling for the principles embodied in the Bill of Rights, fighting under the banner of religious liberty, a banner which, though it trailed in defeat, thank God did not trail in dishonor.

The first vacancy that occurred in the House in either party in the next Congress was caused by the death of his successor. In his race for reelection came the first test of strength following the calamitous landslide of 1928. The eyes of observers throughout the country were on the special election in what was then the third district of Kentucky. The victory which Mr. Moore won foreshadowed the election of a Democratic majority to the House in 1930.

Born and reared in the rock-ribbed Republican county of Butler, John Moore was always an ardent, stanch, dependable member of the Democratic Party. He was also a democrat in the broadest and most vital sense in which that word can be used. Rocked in the cradle of democracy, nurtured at the breast of democracy, he was an exponent of that democracy which teaches every man to be his brother's keeper and to love his neighbor as himself.

Mr. Moore was always quiet, modest, unassuming, unobtrusive. He never sought the white glare of the spotlight or attempted the role of a political prima donna. He was innocent of Machiavellian practices and of the machinations of practical politicians; yet he was notably successful in his political contests because of his plain common sense, his candor, his frankness, his honesty, his homespun philosophy, his adherence to the Golden Rule, his sound judgment, and the conscientious manner in which he decided public questions.

Elected to represent a very historic district, he occupied a seat that had been adorned by such men as Beverly L. Clarke, Joseph R. Underwood, grandfather of the eminent late Senator from Alabama, Elijah Hise, Charles W. Milliken, W. Godfrey Hunter, Herschel Goodnight, John S. Rhea, James M. Richardson, and Robert Y. Thomas, Jr. He recognized fully the solemnity and gravity of his obligations under his oath of office to support and defend the Constitution as a Member of this House, and was ever faithful to the trust reposed in him by a great and proud constituency.

He was, in private life, as clean a man, as spotless a gentleman, as exemplary a citizen as ever occupied a seat in this historic Chamber.

His life was gentle; and the elements
So mixed in him, that nature might stand up
And say to all the world, this was a man.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked this morning when I received the news of the death of my good friend, John W. Moore. I had known him since boyhood, and I want to say to this House that he was one of the best men I ever knew.

He served here in the House of Representatives with great distinction, and he had the respect and confidence of the people in his district. He voluntarily withdrew from Congress and accepted a position here with the Federal Government, where he has rendered honorable and efficient service. The country has lost a faithful servant, and I have lost a very dear personal friend.

I know he has many friends, both here and in Kentucky, who will mourn his loss. He was a good man, he was a great man, and his death has been a great shock to me.

He was a kind and affectionate husband and father. I know the House will join with me in extending our sympathy to his widow and his two daughters, and we share their sorrow.

At some more appropriate time I hope the House may have an opportunity to give full expression of its sympathy.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it has been with profound regret that the Members of the House who served with John W. Moore have learned of his death.

He served in the Seventy-first and Seventy-second Congresses. He was a splendid, kindly, unassuming man. He endeared himself to all who knew him by his fine companionable disposition, his sincerity, and his loyalty. He was a practical man endowed with that greatest of human attributes, common sense. He kept his feet upon the ground and thought things through without emotion and without being influenced by unsound arguments or temporary clamor. He represented his people with courage and fidelity. In every walk of life, he measured up to his full responsibilities. He will be missed not only by his wife and daughters, to whom he was deeply devoted, but by all those with whom he served and all who knew him. When his State was redistricted and another Member was placed in his district, he thought more of party harmony and success than of his own ambitions. He voluntarily retired and did not become a candidate for reelection. This act on his part was characteristic of his unselfishness.

We will miss his presence, but he will still remain in the hearts of his friends and his many virtues will be cherished as a heritage.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful tribute paid to Mr. John Moore by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], expressed the sentiments of all who knew him. It was my privilege, and remains a cherished memory, to have been associated with him for several months. I held, from close association with John Moore, a great respect for his ability, an admiration for his character, and a sincere feeling of friendship for him personally. I have never heard spoken an unkind word about him. His friends and associates will miss him, as he was recognized everywhere as an outstanding Kentuckian and a gentleman in all that that word implies.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GREGORY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the memory of our deceased friend, John W. Moore, a distinguished and outstanding Kentuckian, who this morning passed from life's stage of action.

John Moore left a record of distinguished service to his country and to his fellow men both in public and private life, and I know that his family will receive great comfort in the knowledge that he was a Christian gentleman, a useful citizen, and one who left an indelible impression, a lasting and beneficial influence upon all those with whom he came in contact.

Mr. Speaker, John Moore was truly a Kentucky gentleman; and so long as real character, so long as sincerity of purpose and devotion to duty are honored among men, so long as courage of conviction may be cherished among men, just so long will the memory of John W. Moore occupy a hallowed place in the minds and hearts of those who knew him well.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, because of my close association with and great admiration for John W. Moore, who has today answered the last summons, I cannot let this solemn occasion pass without joining our good friends from Kentucky in paying a word of tribute to him.

During his first term in Congress his office was across the hall from mine in the old House Office Building, and for some time we also resided at the same hotel here. I, therefore, had the opportunity of becoming well acquainted and closely associated with him. Our families also became intimate friends. I feel a deep personal loss in his untimely passing.

Although he had been failing in health for several months prior to his passing today, I think of John W. Moore at this moment as the tall, powerful, stalwart, robust physique, as well as a giant in character and intellect during the several years he served his district and State with honor and distinction in the Congress of the United States.

He accepted his task as a Representative of the people very seriously and was diligent and courageous in all things at all times. He possessed deep and abiding convictions and had the courage to stand by them regardless of the cost. Although quiet, modest, and unassuming, when once he had carefully considered an issue and having made a decision, he could not be swerved from what he believed to be his path of duty.

He was a gentleman of high ideals, was intellectually honest, and devoted to his State and Nation as well as to his family and friends. He lived not for himself alone, but was known for his many deeds of kindness to others. To know John W. Moore was to honor, respect, and admire him. It was a privilege to serve and work with him here, and I feel honored to know that he was my friend.

I am sure that I voice the sentiment of every Member of this House in offering my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to all members of his family.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add my word to the ones just spoken by the various members of the Kentucky delegation on the life and character of my warm personal friend, Hon. John W. Moore.

I never knew a finer character, I never knew a man who at all times was more genuine courteous and affable in his bearing and his dealings with his fellow man.

His life reminds me of the words of Ella Wheeler Wilcox when she said:

> So many gods, so many creeds
> So many paths that wind and wind,
> When just the art of being kind
> Is all this sad world needs.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we were greatly shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the death of our good friend and former United States Representative from Kentucky, the Honorable John W. Moore. Mere words on occasions like this are almost futile. However, the family and thousands of loyal and devoted friends of Mr. Moore must gather some consolation at least from the fact that our friend and former colleague lived a very splendid and useful life. He had won and held the confidence and esteem of all those who had the pleasure of knowing him well. It was the good fortune of my family and myself to know him and his family well as good neighbors and good friends and fellow Kentuckians. He served the people of his district, his State, and our country ably and loyally through the years. He was honored and respected by his colleagues, Democrats and Republicans. He at once commanded the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Words cannot measure the loss that his family have sustained. Neither can his place be filled among his friends. His clean, upright life through the years will be an inspiration to all of us and to all Kentuckians. In his passing I feel the sense of a real personal loss. I join with the other Members of the Kentucky delegation and the host of friends of Mr. Moore in the House in extending to Mrs. Moore and the other members of the family my profound sympathy.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Speaker, I just had a long-distance call from my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. JOE L. SMITH, who states it was physically impossible for him to be here today. He regrets his absence.

INDEFINITE LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTION VOTE

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed when the roll call was just taken. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both resolutions.

Mr. FLANNERY. Mr. Speaker, being absent from the Chamber on the first vote today, which came up more quickly than I expected, I want to go on record as being in support of that resolution, as I supported the resolution involving Japan and Italy.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I had to answer an emergency call at Philadelphia, I was unable to answer the roll calls on the declarations of a state of war as existing against the countries of Italy and Germany. I arrived here a few moments after the completion of the calls.

If I had been present, I would have emphatically voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a message I have received from the gentleman from Florida, Hon. PAT CANNON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] but first will take a few minutes myself.

The resolution makes in order H. R. 6128, known as the defense housing bill. It provides for an open rule with 2 hours' general debate and amendments under the 5-minute rule.

In June the President called attention to the need for additional housing and recommended the appropriation of additional funds. Subsequently, H. R. 5211 was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to authorize an additional appropriation to be expended under the provisions of the present Housing Act. However, after the holding of hearings on H. R. 5311 Mr. LANHAM's committee reported a new bill, H. R. 6128, which proposed 10 amendments to the Housing Act, and it was unanimously reported by the committee. Personally I feel, and those connected with the administration of the law feel, that these amendments, with the exception of the fifth and eighth, will be helpful in administering the act.

The original Housing Act provided for an appropriation of $150,000,000, and later a bill was introduced to amend the act providing for an additional $150,000,000 authorization. Due to some criticisms and objections voiced during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Rules for a rule, I called upon Administrator John M. Carmody, of the Federal Works Agency, as well as officials of the other housing agencies administering the act, to explain the use of expensive equipment that that been installed in the housing units constructed under the original appropriation. Assurances were given to the Committee on Rules by the representatives of the Federal Works Agency and other housing agencies and by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that expensive materials and equipment would not be used in future construction, whereupon a rule was granted for the consideration of the bill authorizing the second $150,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, when the need for still further defense housing was found necessary H. R. 5311 was introduced. It merely provided for the amendment of the original amended act by increasing the amount from $300,000,000 to $600,000,000. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds considered it for many months, and it is my understanding that a subcommittee made a tour of inspection and inquiry to recommend, if found necessary, the safeguarding of future expenditures.

A few days ago I was informed that a committee composed of the heads of three Federal housing agencies had a conference and agreed to three perfecting amendments that would be helpful in the administering of the act, but they do not agree to amendments No. 5 and No. 8 as proposed in the new bill, H. R. 6128. Amendment 5 covers a new section, designated section 4, appearing on pages 3 and 4 of the bill, which in part contains this provision:

and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income.

This amendment should be struck out of the bill, as I cannot conceive the justification for it.

This restriction, as you will note, does not apply to private sales, whereby private real-estate operators may purchase without any restrictions; but if they could be utilized to advantage by municipalities for slum clearance or for persons of low income, they must first come before Congress for authorization for such sales.

Consequently, regardless of what the chairman of the committee says, I feel that that is an unwise restriction and discriminatory against municipalities and the people of the lowest possible income.

In that connection, I have a letter in my possession from the National Committee on the Housing Emergency, Inc., of New York City, which says:

While it is true that the purpose of defense housing is not slum clearance, it may very well be that at the end of the emergency the most advantageous disposal of certain projects, from both the social and financial viewpoints, would be their conveyance to local housing authorities. In certain instances this may be the best means of preventing the dumping of properties and thereby disrupting the real-estate market.

Local authorities should not be excluded from purchasing these projects when they are offered for sale, but should be given the same opportunity as private purchasers to bid for them.

They also object to section 7, amending the old section 305, and this is what they say:

We believe it to be most inadvisable at this time to attempt a piecemeal reorganization of housing agencies. We are convinced that the best interests of the defense housing program can be served by maintaining the status quo until a comprehensive reorganization can be effected.

Amendment No. 8 includes a new section 305, appearing on page 7 of the bill, which reads, in part, as follows:

War Department and Navy Department: *Provided*, That any other agency lawfully designated by the Administrator to construct projects for which funds were available at the time of designation may continue such projects to completion: *And provided further*, That the Public Buildings Administration may utilize the services of local housing authorities in such construction herein authorized; and in carrying out the other provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to utilize and act through the Federal Works Agency and other Federal agencies and any local public agency, with the consent of such agency. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this act for defense housing or for defense public works and equipment therefor shall be available for transfer to any agency authorized in this section to construct the same.

Mr. Speaker, I have also a copy of letter from the Executive Office of the President, Office for Emergency Management, Division of Housing Coordination, addressed to Mr. LANHAM by Mr. C. F. Palmer, Coordinator. On page 2 of that letter he states:

The sale or disposition of these projects should not be limited in such a way as to force them into competition with private housing, now or later. Furthermore, in many cases the best interests of the Government and of the local communities will be served by taking these houses off the market after the emergency and then making them available to that low-income group which private enterprise cannot serve.

He continues to say:

Referring to the proposed amendment to section 305, which would narrowly limit the administrative responsibility of the Federal Works Administrator in selecting the most practical and efficient channel for construction: I am fully in sympathy with every reasonable effort to concentrate responsibility in defense housing but in localities where responsible local housing authorities are at work, it is in most cases more efficient to have the design and construction carried out by these local authorities (which the proposed amendment permits) under the supervision of the United States Housing Authority (which the proposed amendment prohibits). Not simplification but further confusion will be created if an agency other than the United States Housing Authority undertakes to supervise and channel Lanham act defense housing to local housing authorities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there may have been some agreement in a conference on the part of Messrs. Edy, Reynolds, Palmer, Straus, and Forman, housing officials, that

amendments Nos. 5 and 8 should not be embodied in the bill. I know this legislation is immediately necessary, and while these two amendments have been questioned, I am satisfied, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings, they can be adjusted to the entire satisfaction of all.

For the time being I will not take any more time. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], reserving to myself the balance of the time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has said, this matter comes to us under a resolution from the Rules Committee, which we are presently considering to make in order the so-called defense housing bill. It will be recalled there was some effort to bring it up under suspension of the rules a few days ago. This effort failed, I think, not because of any particular opposition to the bill, but rather because the membership felt it should come up under a rule and be considered in that way.

This proposal is nothing more or less than a further authorization of funds for defense housing, with certain amendments to the original act which the committee feels should be adopted.

When the program was originally and first before the House, I supported it. I supported it because it seemed to me then that we were under an obligation and necessity to provide housing in certain areas for defense workers where the temporary character of the employment was such as to make it impossible or impracticable for private financing to build the housing that is absolutely necessary. This program has been under way for some time, and there have been some criticisms of the program. It is not necessary to go into them except that it might be said, in passing, that some thousands of these units have been constructed in places where apparently they were not needed because they are not occupied today. It would seem to me that those in charge of determining the locations at which the houses are to be built should be very, very careful to determine definitely the need for such housing before the funds made available by the program are expended, because it has been said to us that even with these funds it may very well be that we cannot provide all of the housing that will be necessary.

I said this measure calls for an additional authorization. It also has some amendments to the bill, and as one who heard the presentation of the committee when they asked for the rule, I want to commend the committee for the amendments which they are writing into the act. I think they have done a good job. I shall not undertake to go into them in detail, because that will better come from the members of the committee, who know what they are, but I just want to say to the members of the committee that I am glad they have drawn a definite line between the necessities or desirabilities of slum clearance or subsidized housing and defense housing. I think this program is written to take care of the needs of defense housing, and other considerations should not be entered into.

I am glad, too, that the committee has indicated a desire and a willingness to consult with local authorities to determine the locations at which these projects shall be built, because whatever may be said of the necessities of the moment, there is no one of us who wants to completely disrupt the general housing conditions in any locality.

I am glad the committee has done what it has with respect to rents. As I recall it, the original proposal was to charge rents on the basis of ability to pay, an arrangement under which one person might have one of these houses and pay a lesser rent than his neighbor would be paying for exactly the same house. The program now, as I understand it, is to charge a fair, economic rental for these houses, which I think is desirable.

Then, too, I think the committee, in undertaking to centralize the authority for the construction of these houses, is doing a good thing. They provide that this shall be carried on under the Federal Works Administrator, who shall act through the Public Buildings Administration or, in its discretion, through the War and Navy Departments. This is an old, established agency of the Government that I think is well staffed and well qualified to carry on this work.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. BEITER. I am wondering if the committee presented anything to the Rules Committee of why they made that change. We now have a United States Housing Authority, an agency that has constructed defense homes during the past year, and apparently done a good job. Why did they make the recommendation? Was there any testimony before the Committee on Rules as to why they made that change?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; there was, and I take it that in due time the committee members will speak about it, but it is my understanding that it has been agreed by all of these different agencies that it would be better to have some centralized authority. Of course, the gentleman and I have been here long enough to know that while a lot of different people and different agencies may agree that there should be a centralized authority, each one wants that centralization in his own agency. The committee had to make that decision, and without casting reflection on some of the other agencies, although there have been some criticisms, as the gentleman and I have heard, I think probably the committee has selected an agency that can and will do a good job, an agency that has built some of these houses, doing a good job with the part that they have carried on.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. What would the gentleman think about a provision in this act which would read in effect that in carrying out the provisions of the act preference should be given to the employment of competent engineers and architects in private practice, on the basis of competence and at established rates of compensation?

Mr. HALLECK. That suggestion has been called to my attention by people in my own district. I have not had a chance to talk to members of the Legislative Committee about it, but I rather think that they will be heard upon it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. I think my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], if he will listen to me in my opening remarks, which I hope will be brief, will be quite content about that matter. I am going to discuss the matter just as soon as this rule is adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I shall be glad to have the gentleman from Texas do that, because I was impressed with the suggestions of these people, who said, why not give some of this work to us, we are small, and, of course, work that these people might be doing now will not be carried on, and if they can be helpful on this program, I think they should be given a chance.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, it is the intention to use them, but the adoption of the amendment that they have recommended I think would be unfortunate, not only for them, but in a good many other respects. I think I can explain that to the entire satisfaction of the gentlemen who have received these telegrams. I have received them, and they are all of a similar nature, and, of course, emanate from the same source. I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who has not received similar telegrams and letters. I think I can explain what will be done and that it will be entirely satisfactory to the architects.

Mr. HALLECK. I know that the gentleman from Texas would be the last man to complain of these people because they send these telegrams. That is their right, and I think they should be taken care of.

Mr. LANHAM. Absolutely; and I am in sympathy with taking care of them. They are suffering now when practically all construction is being done by the Government. I think the statement that I shall make will give assurance to the Members in that respect.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman from Texas believe that because of the fact that these architects are right there on the ground, it will tend to expedite the work and also save considerable money?

Mr. LANHAM. I do think so, and they are going to be used.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I join with what has been said. I have received letters from practically every ar-

chitect in my district, and it seems to me that the local architects are in a position to adapt the type of house and the structure to the local climate, the local conditions, and that, therefore, they are in a position to render outstanding service in this construction program.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. In this bill are many references to defense. Does not the gentleman think it is time to take that word "defense" out of these bills and insert in lieu thereof the word "victory"?

Mr. HALLECK. We are going to gain that victory, of course, and our immediate job is the defense of our land. I am inclined to think it will still be defense, but it will be a victorious defense.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 2, lines 22, 23, and 24, it refers to temporary units, while up above it refers to the cost per unit. Did the gentleman get any information in connection with the cost of temporary units as compared with permanent costs?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, who is better informed on that question.

Mr. LANHAM. These temporary units will cost just as little as they can be built for. It is not intended that the average cost should apply to them. For instance, where you build around a powder plant in some rural community some temporary buildings to be occupied for a brief time, they will be built just as cheaply as possible. Those in charge thought there was no necessity to place any restriction upon them, but they do not come within the general provisions with reference to the average cost.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit further, how do construction costs of temporary units now compare with the figures cited in subsection (b)? In other words, do temporary units now cost us $1,000, or $2,500, or $4,500, or what?

Mr. LANHAM. There have been some which I think are temporary that were built by certain agencies, which agencies will not be used under this act. In many instances I think the costs have been greater than they should have been. They perhaps were not designed to be temporary, but they are temporary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not oppose the passage of this rule. Likewise, I will no doubt vote for the passage of the bill, but there are some things that I think the House should be advised of and conscious of.

When the bill which this bill amends was before the House for consideration last, certain assurances were given to the Committee on Rules particularly, and to the House of Representatives in general, by those administering the law about certain things which would be done, to wit: I was able to get a set of specifications for the type of house that was being constructed under this program. To my amazement I discovered that not only were these houses provided with electric refrigerators and electric stoves but that in the actual construction of the house copper pipe was used for the water pipes in these defense-housing units—temporary housing units, if you please. Not only that, but copper screen wire was being used in the screens; that the highest price brass was being used in the hardware in the house.

A contractor who was building some of these houses told me that in the construction of the flues of this house the specifications called for a type flue that would be put in a house to last 60 years. After those specifications were read, the attention of the then head of the department, Mr. Carmody, was called to it, and he assured us that if we would not put hard and fast amendments in the bill which would probably harm the program that kind of construction would be cut out.

Recently the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], a man whom I love and respect, went to the trouble of taking at least some of his committee on an inspection tour of these housing projects all over the United States. Members of that committee tell me that they are still using copper pipes and copper screens in the construction of some of those houses.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say it is by reason of many things that we discovered on that trip of inspection that we have proposed these amendments to this bill that there may not be a recurrence of the criticism which has come with reference to defense housing and that we may obviate the objectionable things which have been done in appropriations made heretofore for that purpose.

Mr. NICHOLS. I certainly hope that will be done, but while I am on my feet I want to make this observation: We are at war. This is a time when we are calling on every citizen of the United States for patriotic effort, and I want to here sound a plea to the heads of the bureaus, the bureaucrats of this country today, let us have some of your patriotism. I want to see the heads of some of the bureaus downtown start thinking about this thing seriously.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think it is a terrible thing that many of the administrative heads of the Government today will not keep faith with the Congress and will not keep faith with the people of the United States. They are guilty, and I charge them. They are guilty of deceit on the Congress. They will come before the committee of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and they will tell them things that they will do and will not do, and the minute they get the law into their hands then, by the promulgation and preparation of regulations interpreting the law, you you cannot recognize the law as the one that was passed, and they will do exactly the thing that they promised they would not do, in order to get the bill passed. To me that is a sad commentary on government in this country. I hope that in this emergency surely they will keep the faith.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman is always fair, and I know he wants to be fair. I will say that some of the bureaucrats that he charges are bureaucrats, are not infallible, but in some cities I know this to be the fact, that certain fire regulations and certain ordinances make those men who are building these houses construct them under certain regulations. They must install certain flues.

Mr. NICHOLS. All right. If that is the case, then the city council or city governing body can change the regulations. Listen. There is no use to argue with me that it is necessary to put copper pipes, copper screens, and a lot of this highfalutin stuff into these temporary houses, material the gentleman would not put in his own house as a permanent installation.

Mr. BEITER. I think it is unnecessary to use copper for pipes and screens. The gentleman speaks of changing ordinances and regulations. If they change it for John Jones——

Mr. NICHOLS. Let me say to the gentleman that good fireproof flues can be built without the use of the expensive material called for in these specifications. The gentleman is on awfully thin ice if he aims to defend the extravagant expenditure of money that has been lavished on the construction of some of these temporary defense housing projects under the bill we passed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield the gentleman from Oklahoma 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma for making this disclosure. I think it is one of the meanest, lowest-down, dirtiest tricks I have heard of being imposed on the people of this country by whomever is in charge of the program—I do not care who he is. They are closing industries all over the United States on the ground that there is no copper, yet we learn such facts as these today. It is enough to make the whole city stink. It is stuff of this kind that will wreck this country, if it is ever wrecked. I hope this will be a lesson. So far as I am concerned, I am going to use this information for all it is worth. I congratulate the gentleman for exposing it.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. If I understand the gentleman correctly, his complaint refers to temporary buildings.

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes.

Mr. HAINES. The gentleman is not referring to permanent structures.

Mr. NICHOLS. I do not understand that we are building any permanent structures under this legislation. If we are, let us not fool ourselves. These buildings are going up in communities which have become over-populated by reason of a mushroom growth of some industry which has made it necessary to construct housing beyond existing facilities. Let us not kid ourselves that any of these things are going to be permanent houses built by the Government.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on account of complaints that have come to the committee, they are not now using this copper the gentleman refers to. Furthermore we are stimulating them to use plastics just as much as possible and to avoid the use of any raw materials necessary for national defense.

Mr. NICHOLS. All I know about is that a member of the gentleman's committee told me that in the committee's inspection trip they found houses still being constructed with copper pipe and these other things I have mentioned.

Mr. LANHAM. Members of the committee who made the inspection trip advised me that, though houses had been built that way, such materials will not be used in any now under construction and will not be used hereafter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is one matter today I wanted to allude to. You will observe that in this bill there is no restriction upon the use of private architects and private professional services. I think this is a matter in which the Congress has been rather derelict, and particularly so at a time when it becomes increasingly difficult for trained men functioning in the building architectural field to get along. We should consider for a moment these restrictions that are placed upon the building of houses. They may not cost more than $6,000, and difficulty is experienced even below that ceiling. Materials are not available. Obviously it does not warrant the services of an architect. So today the 24,000 architects in the United States of America are faced with a real serious problem. In a great many cases they have had to dissipate their staffs that they recruited over a period of time from experienced architects; and, as a result, with no private building, no Government building available today they are in the position of a neglected group in the country. It is a matter that richly deserves the attention of Congress.

I was going to offer an amendment to the bill to make it mandatory that these professional services be required, but after conferring with the gentleman from Texas I am content to abide by the language now carried in the bill, that no restriction shall be placed upon the use of competent, private engineering and architectural service.

Mr. Reynolds, who is the Administrator of the Public Buildings Administration and the Federal Works Agency, has given assurances that wherever necessary the services of private architects will be employed. I have every reason to feel that he will. For a great many years I have been sitting across the table from Mr. Reynolds in connection with appropriations for the Federal Works Agency and for the Public Buildings branch before that became a part of the Federal Works Agency. I believe him to be a man of real ability. He is a man of energy, he has had long experience, he has come up from the bottom, and he is one of the good administrators who is really trying to do a job. So, if this bill passes, it means that this building will be reposed in that agency of government which has always been considered as the permanent construction agency of the Government.

We are making a distinction between different agencies of the Government. The Housing Authority is given little part in this picture. I think it has done many good things. Perhaps it has done some things that were not so good. But we do recognize the fact that the great backlog of experience is in the Public Buildings Administration and it will be under the administration and jurisdiction of Mr. Reynolds, who is a very capable administrator. When he gives assurances that private services will be used in the construction of these projects, I shall be content to abide by that assurance.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. I agree with the gentleman as to his estimate of Mr. Reynolds. He is a very unusual, high-class man. But if he now announces that he will take care of our architects in this construction, what is the objection to putting that in the bill and giving that same assurance?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas to answer that question.

Mr. LANHAM. As I stated a few moments ago, when we get into the committee I will be glad to explain that and I think it will be to the entire satisfaction of my beloved and distinguished friend from New Jersey and other Members.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I know the gentleman is interested in using private capital as he is in using private architects. This morning some of us received letters from the head of the National Real Estate Board who said that private capital would take care of a great deal of this building if they could get the priorities, but it seems they will not let them have the materials to build privately while, on the other hand, they give the Government agencies the materials to build the property at Government expense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I received a copy of that wire and incidentally, I may say that Mr. Bodfish is the executive vice president of the United States Building and Loan League, which is an association of the building and loan associations throughcut the country and, parenthetically, may I say I regard him as an outstanding authority in the field of home construction and home financing. I can see, of course, some difficulty. That is to say, that they would like to build homes all over the United States and I hope it can continue, but, of course, everybody recognizes that the first demand is for homes in those areas that are characterized as defense areas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, obviously that has got to be No. 1 on the list. I do believe we are going to have to set ourselves to the problem of seeing that a complete damper is not placed on home building in the country. Otherwise consider the tremendous dislocation of labor that cannot all be absorbed into the defense industry. The welfare of the country demands that that question have attention and that home construction by private builders and private financing be continued.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is my understanding that the particular complaint was that there was some trouble about priorities for defense housing. Clearly it would seem to me that the necessity for governmental intervention and the use of governmental funds to build defense houses should not be aggravated by another policy of Government which makes it impossible for private funds to build those same houses as distinguished from the general problem of housing that applies to the whole country. I do not know whether that is true or not, but it would seem to me that if the system of priorities is being used in such manner as to prevent the private building of defense houses, then we ought to look into it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana I tried to make that distinction. First of all, we have to take care of those strictly defensive areas where there is a necessity for housing to accommodate workers in the defense industries. Everybody, I think, recognizes that that is No. 1 on the list of demands.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. I know that it is a very controversial and very misunderstood situation that priorities are set in favor of the public housing under this act or any other act. May I say that the same priorities are granted to the private builder in the same area, so there is no discrimination. In a defense area that has been designated as a defense area

there is no discrimination between the private builder and the Government. If the private builder wants to build a hundred or a thousand houses he gets the same priorities as the Government has in the same locality.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Going back to the gentleman's statement relative to architects, does not the gentleman feel that the plans and designs of houses when they go into a local community should conform to the type, planning, and tradition of that particular community?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the bill contemplates that very thing.

Mr. McGREGOR. I call the gentleman's attention to page 6, where it says "so far as practicable."

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that obviously when we draw language for a bill to govern the whole housing program, there has to be some leeway, there has to be some flexibility. There may be difficulties so that a portion of that housing program may for one reason or another deviate somewhat. I do not know that you can nail down an agency so close by means of legislative language. Otherwise, it would be necessary to come back here and get relief before they could complete a project.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not a fact that that particular language would allow the Federal authorities, if they so desired, to absolutely ignore your local people? It says "so far as may be practicable."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is good language. There has to be some flexibility.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, there is a cost limitation upon these houses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. LANHAM. We can only build so far as it is practicable under the cost limitations.

We will make them conform to the act in planning and design in keeping with the traditions of the city itself, so they cannot build a $10,000 house under this bill just because it may be a $10,000-house neighborhood.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering who determines that cost value. Is that determination in the Federal authorities or in the local authorities?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me make this observation, and then I shall yield.

There is one other thing in this bill that I think is very important. It provides that these projects must in each case come back to the Committee on Appropriations for an appropriation and for justification. It means that here is an over-all authorization, but if they set up $8,000,000, $10,000,000, $20,000,000, or $50,000,000 worth of projects they have to have their lay-outs and come before the Committee on Appropriations, and we shall have a chance to look at them, probably a chance to examine the specifications, and get a second idea of what they undertake to do. In the past that has never been possible. Here was a blank check, and only by going out into the field somewhere did we ever find out just how this housing project moved forward.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Perhaps this question ought to be asked of the chairman of the committee. I wonder if any thought has been given to protecting the American taxpayer if private building facilities are sought in the construction of these homes and competitive bidding is resorted to, whether or not the man who files the lowest responsible bid is going to be given the contract to build these houses.

Mr. LANHAM. That is done in practically all instances with reference to this particular construction. There are instances where speed is highly necessary in a particular area and where the construction can be done more economically under a negotiated contract by reason of the fact that the contractors in bidding, not being able to anticipate the market price of materials, will necessarily place the bids high, whereas the Federal Government in doing the building can comply with the existing market price. For that reason, there are cases in which we can use both systems.

[Here the gavel fell.]

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING—HOUSE RESOLUTION 386

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 386), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6135) to authorize the appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is some justification for the criticism of my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma. Still, I believe that after hearings before the Committee on Rules, and after the passage of the second appropriation bill, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has started to correct the abuses that have existed. They are just as sincere and just as desirous of doing this as are the members of the Committee on Rules. I am satisfied that nearly all the shortcomings or mistakes or abuses have been eliminated.

As to the use of copper, as stated by my colleague from Oklahoma, we have been assured that no more copper or expensive materials that are needed for defense purposes are now being used in the construction of these buildings. Not only that, but due to the restrictions as to the cost of these buildings it will be impossible to use these materials even though the amount for the construction of the buildings has been increased, which is necessary owing to other conditions.

I am satisfied that with the amendments which have been adopted to take care of a few minor matters the bill will be in such shape that every objection or shortcoming will be rectified and taken care of.

Though I personally feel the United States Housing Authority should continue to be utilized because of its splendid record and efficient organization, it is not because of lack of confidence in the Public Building Administration, especially the gentleman who will administer the law under the new Administrator, Colonel Fleming, who, though new to housing construction, I know can rely on the ability and experience of Mr. Reynolds, who has been for many years in the service of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, lest I forget, I wish to say I have had many conferences with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in whom I have the utmost confidence, despite his failure to report my resolution providing for the decentralization of certain Government bureaus and agencies, and in view of these conferences I feel that later on he will bring about a clarification of the two amendments to which I have alluded. Further, that the services of the United States Housing Authority will be utilized and that the municipalities will be permitted to acquire these buildings when not needed for national defense, I say this in view of the additional necessary requirements for housing based on the President's statement that national-defense production must go forward on a 24-hour, 7-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, while it is charged that the Committee on Rules does and can hold up the consideration of legislation, that cannot be said in this instance. The bill was introduced on November 28, reported the same day, and after 2 days' consideration by the Committee on Rules a rule was reported out. I can assure the House the same action will prevail in the future on any requests for rules coming from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

WAR RESOLUTIONS VOTES

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was informed of the war declarations by Germany and Italy against the United States. I was at that time

at the Coast Guard Academy at New London on official congressional business. I immediately started back to Washington, flying for the first time in my life. I arrived here a few minutes too late to have my vote recorded on the two resolutions, and, of course, under the rules of the House I could not qualify. If I had been here in time, I would have voted "yea" on both resolutions, declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Germany and Italy.

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6128, with Mr. BEAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I shall try to be brief by reason of the fact that the particular provisions of this measure were explained by me when it was before the House under a suspension of rules on Monday of last week. However, there are two or three things which I wish to bring to your attention.

Of course, we all realize that our Nation, by reason of unfortunate circumstances, has been plunged into war, and it becomes necessary on that account to exercise all due speed in preparing our equipment for defense. The necessity for and the urgency of the enactment of this measure has been brought vividly and forcefully to the attention of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds by the President of the United States, by the Housing Coordinator, by the War Department, by the Navy Department, and by other agencies of our Government. The committee has labored diligently for several months in a study of this problem and has brought in this measure, which, in our judgment, should be passed exactly as presented, with the exception of one and possibly two amendments.

The first amendment to which I refer is a committee amendment, which I will explain now because it is easily understood. This is on page 4, in the last proviso, where there is a provision with reference to rentals charged by the Army and the Navy on that part of the housing to be used by them. The term "enlisted personnel" is used. Of course, it may be necessary, and likely will be, for some of the officers, and junior officers in particular, to occupy some of that housing, and the committee amendment is simply to strike out the word "enlisted."

The other amendment which I wish to bring to your attention, and concerning which I wish to get your judgment as to whether or not it should be offered, is with reference to the rule which has just been presented to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. Two or three days ago, after two days of hearings, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds authorized an increase of $150,000,000 in the amount provided for in title II of the act which has to do with public works or community facilities in these congested areas of national defense. I think, perhaps, there are more Members of Congress interested in this particular feature of this act than any other, and it has been clearly established that the amount stated is the minimum amount under which the most urgent needs can be taken care of. If it is the thought and wish of the Members, in view of the fact that this has been heard before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Rules has reported a rule upon it, that we save a legislative day by offering that amendment to the act in this measure, I shall be glad to do so if I can get your expressions that this would meet with your approval.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my distinguished friend and member of the committee from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does our distinguished chairman feel that we should increase the present provision by $150,000,000? In other words, then, this bill would carry an authorization of $750,000,000 and take care of the $150,000,000 for the facilities referred to.

Mr. LANHAM. The bill would carry an authorization of $300,000,000 for defense housing and an additional $150,000,000 for community facilities.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then there would be included the $150,000,000 as carried in the authorization bill for facilities that we reported out of the committee yesterday?

Mr. LANHAM. There would; and we have a rule upon that, and it could be taken up on another day. It has been clearly established that this authorization is necessary, and I am simply seeking your judgment as to whether or not I should offer that amendment, as there seems to be no controversy whatever about the urgent need for it, and thereby obviate your labors on another legislative day which you might devote to other purposes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds knows, the Rules Committee had a hearing on the rule to which he referred, a rule making in order the bill which he suggests might be offered as an amendment to this bill, and there was no opposition whatever to the rule.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Therefore if this amendment has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and if the Rules Committee could find no holes in it, it does seem that we might take the cherry in one bite instead of two.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say in response to the observation of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that the urgency of that appropriation is also recognized, and I have made the suggestion in order to elicit your expression, simply to obviate the necessity of spending considerable time in this body later on a measure which does not seem to be in any way controversial.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman state what amounts have been previously authorized for this purpose and generally for what purpose the money is expended?

Mr. LANHAM. One hundred and fifty million dollars have heretofore been authorized for public works, so-called community facilities, in the congested areas of national defense, for schools, hospitals, sewerage, water purification, and the purposes stated in title II of the act.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the gentleman will present that amendment, because, from my observation, the amendment is more necessary than the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, in the opinion of the committee both are vitally necessary. The other is to be taken up under a rule in the same way that this is, and I thought if agreeable, in order to save time, realizing the many burdens upon the Members in these strenuous days, that I would offer that amendment at this time.

Mr. HOLMES. My understanding is that the gentleman makes this suggestion to amend Title II.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, that is correct, but I am seeking in that regard the sentiment of the Members. I shall be glad to offer the amendment in order to save the time for the many other duties that now confront Members.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am 100 percent in favor of the $150,000,000 for facilities, because I think that is urgently needed, but I do feel that the three hundred million in the bill before us is not all needed; so, in order to clarify my position, I consulted the Parliamentarian this morning, and he told me that, if a point of order were raised to the amendment if it should be offered, it is not germane to title I, and the point of order would be sustained, and therefore it could not be done.

Mr. LANHAM. Perhaps it could not be done except by unanimous consent, and it is for that reason that I am seeking to discover whether or not the Members wish to consider it today and thereby save their time in another legislative day, to be used for other purposes. I am not sure about the parliamentary ruling in that respect, owing to the fact that this is an amendment of the same act.

Mr. MICHENER. Why does not the gentleman offer his amendment, and then if it is not in order and the point of order is made, it will be stricken out if the House does not want it?

Mr. LANHAM. It would be stricken out if the point of order were made

against it and the point of order sustained, but if it is the sentiment of the Members that it should be offered, I shall be glad to offer it. I think it may be germane, anyway, but I am not seeking to run roughshod over the membership to offer the amendment unless it meets with the approval of the membership.

Mr. DONDERO What possible objection could be raised to the gentleman's position?

Mr. LANHAM. I know of none. Otherwise I would not make the suggestion.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have no objection to the amendment if we are going to have a full explanation made of the work already carried on. I have some pertinent questions to add in regard to the work which has been presently completed, particularly in comparison with the naval-defense projects in the city of Newport. Is this explanation to be made in some of the localities?

Mr. LANHAM. With reference to community facilities?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. No; in regard to cost and other pertinent questions that may be asked.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course the suggestion I am now making is simply with reference to public works and community facilites, not the housing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have no objection to the amendment, but I am asking the question of whether or not the bill itself is to be fully explained.

Mr. LANHAM. This pending bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The bill before the Committee.

Mr. LANHAM. It will be taken up under the 5-minute rule. It was explained largely by me on Monday last; and if the gentleman will get the RECORD of that day, he will find an explanation of it. Under the 5-minute rule, it will be explained of course.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RABAUT). Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much interested in the gentleman's amendment, but in your explanation of the amendment your referred to the fact that this was going to be centered upon congested areas only. Of course, the gentleman also would say that this would be applicable to localities for instance in the Middle West, where housing is needed for national defense?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, the purposes of this act, of course, are with reference to facilities and housing made necessary where such facilities and such housing are not already available and cannot be supplied by private capital in congested areas that are made congested by reason of our defense operations.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I want to know. For instance, in my State we are going to build some national-defense industries and there may be such a thing where a private industry cannot take care of it, and it may be so that we cannot take care of these people coming in. This would be applicable to my State the same as any other area?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, it is applicable to all States.

Mr. STEFAN. I wanted that clear before I vote.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. In that same connection, who determines the localities in which this money shall be spent?

Mr. LANHAM. With reference to the need in the first place?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; and as to the place where the improvement is to be made. Who determines that?

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman mean the general location or the site?

Mr. THOMASON. The general location.

Mr. LANHAM. The general locations are now determined by the housing coordinator, who is appointed by the President. He is Mr. Charles F. Palmer.

Mr. THOMASON. Is all the money to be spent under this bill to be under the direction of General Fleming?

Mr. LANHAM. The Federal Works Agency has control of the construction, but not determining the need. Furthermore, we have an amendment that this money is not to be turned over to anybody until the Appropriations Committee from time to time determines very definitely the need therefor in any area.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr DONDERO. May I suggest in answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] that our defense effort largely determines where some of this money will be expended in the building of houses.

Mr. LANHAM. To be sure. Now for the present I should like to have your expressions about the community facilities, because I do not want to consume all the available time. I want to have some time available for members of the committee who may wish to discuss some of the provisions of this measure. I have another observation I wish to make with reference to the architects and I should like for the present to see whether or not it is agreeable to you gentlemen in my effort to save you time to offer the uncontroverted amendment with reference to the need, and urgent need, for community facilities.

Mr. HOBBS and Mr. BROOKS rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RABAUT). Does the gentleman yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Answering the gentleman's question, as you know, I have been very much interested in this very matter and have made a canvass of a number of Members of the House with respect to their opinion. I find absolute unanimity, especially in view of the fact that the state of war which has been declared to exist with three nations in the last 3 days has made it more obligatory that we act, and act speedily, and that no point of order could possibly be considered under circumstances now existing.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my friend for that contribution.

In order to expedite this consideration, May I inquire if there is any Member present, after the explanation which has been made, who would desire either to oppose the adoption of that amendment or to interpose a point of order against it?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I have mentioned something about a point of order on this amendment in case it did not apply to all States.

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, it applies to all States. If my friend will read title II of the act I think he will find it is for general application all over the United States where there are congested areas of national defense.

Mr. STEFAN. With the explanation of the gentleman that it is applicable to all States, I certainly have no intention of interposing a point of order.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yields?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I hope the gentleman will offer the amendment he suggests. I know of numerous projects that are very worthy and very much needed for national-defense purposes, for which there is no money presently available. That amendment will seek to correct it. I am told there are 8 or 10 times as many projects for which applications are now on file that should be cared for as there are funds to care for them.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say that the $150,000,000 provided for in the bill upon which the Rules Committee has reported a rule will just take care of the most urgent situations with reference to community facilities.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will any of that $150,000,000 be available to appropriations made heretofore?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes. It will be available for this purpose all over the Nation, even to those projects that have heretofore been authorized, because with the vast demand upon this fund, the money has had to be spread pretty thin in some places.

Mr. GIFFORD. Is this $150,000,000 to be tied to this $300,000,000 only, or can it be used for money heretofore appropriated?

Mr. LANHAM. The $150,000,000 I am talking about is with reference to community facilities, such as hospitals, sewers, schools, and so forth.

Mr. GIFFORD. Exactly; but I am shocked here that you want $150,000,000 to service $300,000,000. One hundred and fifty million dollars is too much money to put in public utilities and such things as the gentleman describes as against $300,000,000 in housing.

Mr. LANHAM. My friend, I think, realizes that a good many of these plants have to be put far from urban populations and that we have to supply almost every community facility for these plants. Had my good friend been before

the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and heard the testimony in this regard, I think he would be convinced of the necessity for this.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think I have a little sense about the real-estate business. You put $150,000,000 in these public utilities. You cannot sell them and get any money back. You are going to give them away to the communities.

Mr. LANHAM. No; that is not intended.

Mr. GIFFORD. You can sell the houses and get something back out of the $300,000,000 but you cannot sell the utilities and get any part of the $150,000,000 back. That is too much money in proportion to the cost of the housing.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say with reference to sewers and various things of that kind that they wil be sold to the cities wherever the cities will buy them. Otherwise they will belong to the Federal Government. We are going to dispose of them. We want to get as much money back for these facilities as possible and we will require the cities to contribute all they can from the standpoint of their normal needs.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would have to oppose such an amendment. The gentleman asked the question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RABAUT). Permit the Chair to call attention to the provision of the rules that Members desiring to ask questions shall first address the Chair. No Member has addressed the Chair and several Members have spoken at one time. The gentleman from Texas is so popular the Members feel so much interest in this subject, and the subject is of such vital importance that in the interest of orderly procedure the Chair feels that the rules in this particular should be observed.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, let me make this statement. I do not want to consume all of the time on this side for there are members of the committee who will give very pertinent information about this matter. In conclusion on this part of it I will simply say that I have no desire to offer the amendment if you do not wish it offered. May I conclude this part of the discussion by asking if there is any Member present who will rise in opposition to it or interpose a point of order against it? I do not know whether a point of order would be sustained.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would not go so far as to interpose a point of order.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. The distinguished gentleman from Texas has very splendidly gone into the merits of the $150,000,000 needed for public utilities. There appeared before our committee Members who showed there was need for this $150,000,000, but I have figures which I intend to reveal to the committee in a few minutes which show there are still 15,000 or 16,000 vacant houses. I contend that we do not need all this additional $300,000,000. I am hoping that the committee will go along with me this afternoon and authorize $150,000,000 for facilities and $150,000,000 for additional housing so we can save $150,000,00. I am not questioning the need for facilities, but when we have 15,000 or 16,000 vacant houses, that is Federal units that have been constructed, we do not need another $300,000,000.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say in response to my good friend from Ohio that I am glad he will not oppose the $150,000,000 for community facilities.

May I say with respect to these vacancies that since the last figures were published they have been very largely diminished. This act has been so amended by the bills we are proposing that hereafter we shall obviate vacancies, because we are going to require that a definite showing be made before the Appropriations Committee before they get the appropriations. Nobody is going to take this money and go high wide and handsome with it.

Mr. BEITER. In other words, there is a limitation on this $300,000,000 so that if only $100,000,000 is needed that is all they will get.

Mr. LANHAM. If only $100,000,000 is needed that is all they will get from the Appropriations Committee. This is merely an authorization.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Would the gentleman object if I endeavored to strike out $500,000,000 and make it $450,000,000? After all, this money has got to be appropriated by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to my good friend from Ohio that as a matter of fact need has been shown for more than the $300,000,000 herein authorized. As the President has said, we are going to have to double and quadruple our present defense production and we must expect that present needs will be exceeded. As a matter of fact, 10,150 units are now required in the gentleman's own State. There are only two States of the Union requiring more.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman referred to my State. Would he state whether or not the request has been made and the assignment granted?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know. They probably have not been requested because funds have not yet been authorized. The need exists, nevertheless, and the need has been determined.

Mr. Chairman, unless some gentleman here is going to interpose an objection to the offering of the $150,000,000 amendment for community facilities, I should like to proceed with what I have to say and reserve some of my time for other members of the committee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to secure an expression from the gentleman on a matter about which I spoke to him a while ago, which is this: An application in Arlington County, Va., for a hospital, has been turned down as I understand because they claimed that under the terms of this act that area is not eligible for any of these funds. I wish the gentleman would state whether there is any such provision in the bill and whether it was the opinion of the committee that that was so with reference to this area adjacent to Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman will doubtless recall that no longer ago than Tuesday of this week when District of Columbia business was in order, with the approval of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds $2,500,000 was set aside from this very fund for things that are closer to the District of Columbia than the gentleman's hospital. In my judgment, certainly this is a defense need.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield briefly to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. This is a very important question and I would appreciate the gentleman's answer. I understand that in this defense housing only incidentally will be covered the Army housing?

Mr. LANHAM. This is correct; only incidental Army and Navy housing is necessary in some of these areas.

Mr. HOBBS. Surely. I realize that.

Mr. LANHAM. Furthermore, we provide in this measure that what is permanently useful to them can be turned over to them and we will allow them to fix the rentals because of the fact they have commutation for quarters for their men.

Mr. HOBBS. The bulk of the Army and Navy housing that is needed now will be handled by some other agency?

Mr. LANHAM. It was so stated in the act. This is principally for industrial housing.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. In my home community they are building 300 of these houses. It is designated as a defense area. We already have vacant houses in my community. I am wondering what arrangements will be made with reference to rental of these defense housing projects which are to be constructed, as to whether or not they will permit the people to leave houses which they already occupy and move into the new houses.

Mr. LANHAM. We have a very definite amendment to the act in this bill to the effect that the rentals will be based upon the value of the houses. We are not going to have people living in duplex defense houses with those in one end of the house paying one rental and those at the other end paying another rental. We are stopping that.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Briefly.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman knows I have talked to him on many occasions in reference to the architects.

Mr. LANHAM. I am just coming to that. I have ben trying to answer these questions first.

I suppose approximately 200 Members of the House of Representatives have either written to me or spoken to me about telegrams they have received from achitects. I have received some telegrams from my own district. I doubt if there is a Member of the House who has an architect in his district who has not received a similar communication.

I take no exception to that. The similarity of the wording, of course, indicates very clearly that the telegrams were all inaugurated from the the same source, and I take no exception to that.

They are proposing that an amendment be offered to give them preference in all of this housing that is to be done. I sympathize with the architects of this country. They have had a hard time. So have some of the engineers, landscape architects, and others. I want to see them get just as much work as they possibly can get, because Federal construction has limited their field except in certain instances.

We provide in this measure that the construction shall be done primarily—that is, aside from construction done by the Army and Navy Departments—through the Public Buildings Administration, which is the century-old permanent construction organization of our Government, and which has done the best defense-housing construction that the members of the committee have seen on their recent trip of inspection. Then we provide that the Public Buildings Administration may use the local housing authorities where they are competent and can carry on the work, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to an assurance from Mr. Reynolds, Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, and I am sure that he is deserving in every respect of the ecomiums paid him here today. He is a straight shooter, upon whose word you can rely. He has done the best housing we have seen in connection with this act. This is going to be a colossal task. Mr. Reynolds has given the assurance that he is not going to add architects to his architectural force in the Public Buildings Administration and that when he goes into these cities and towns, by reason of the fact that the provisions of this measure are that insofar as practicable in location and design this housing shall conform to city planning and city traditions, the first step he will take will be to get a local architect to help him carry on that work. You can rely upon what he says.

There are certain isolated communities where no architects will be necessary. I gave an example of a powder plant in a rural community where we may put up some temporary but livable dwellings to serve for a brief period and, of course, no architect is necessary in doing that. It would be foolish to prescribe that you have got to hire an architect to build those simple temporary dwellings. But in the instances of urban dwellings and in accordance with the provisions of this act, Mr. Reynolds said that the first step he will take will be to get the services of local architects and that he could not get along without them.

In the first place, if in this measure we say we are going to give any character of service a preference, there is no reason why we should not carry that preference idea on down the line, to the material men and the local merchants who sell the material, and it would not take a great stretch of your imagination to see that you would get into a very ridiculous situation if you carried that idea to its ultimate extent. I wish that everything could be done by local people, but I realize that in many instances this will not be possible. He is going to use these architects and he says that is the first step he is going to take, that he could not well carry on this work without them. But to encumber this law by stating preferences of that character will delay the operation and would be contrary to what we all are seeking to do. Furthermore, suppose you stipulate that they be given preference? That would not mean necessarily that they would get the work. The Federal agencies could then say, "All right, in the interest of economy we will not have any architects at all. We will just build some standardized buildings that have already had architectural treatment."

We have the assurance of the Commissioner that he is going to use them, and that he could not get along without them in accordance with the purposes of this act, and that that is the first step he will take when he goes into these urban communities. That is just as good an assurance as I want that it will be carried out. I can see the implications and the intricacies of starting in here to put in preferences with reference to every character of service that is to be rendered under this act.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. I have also discussed this with Mr. Reynolds himself, and he has given me the same assurance that he has the gentleman. However, there is some justification for the complaint of the architects and engineers. It is a well-known fact that it has been the established policy of the Army and Navy Departments and other departments not to employ private engineers and private architects. They use their own men.

Mr. LANHAM. But I may say to my friend that the Public Buildings Administration is launching now on a different kind of construction. It has not been doing it long, but the best construction that has been done under this act has been done by it. Mr. Reynolds is not going to increase his architectural force; he is going to use these local architects. It will be the first step taken to make these buildings conform in design to the buildings in the respective communities. If you start in on this matter of preference, you may as well go on down the line or you will have local people complaining that they are not given this, that, and the other preference that might necessitate delays in carrying on this construction.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman on everything he says with reference to these isolated sections. I think the Government should have a free hand to go into the localities, but I have been vitally interested in the building in metropolitan areas. Does this legislation give this agency the right of eminent domain to condemn land and build wherever they please?

Mr. LANHAM. It does that with reference to this defense housing. When land is not otherwise available the agency goes in under a declaration of taking and then the final determination is in the courts under that declaration.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would agree that that would be proper procedure out in the rural sections, where you would have to follow that procedure.

Mr. LANHAM. They do not do that where by private negotiation they can acquire the land without it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What percentage has been built in the cities as against in the rural sections up to now under this program, just generally?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot give the gentleman the percentage, but of course there has been a great deal built in the cities and a great deal built in the rural sections. I do not have the exact percentage at hand.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have seen the projects in both places. I have seen them in the rural sections, and I favor that, but I have seen them in the big cities, and it looks to me as if they are encroaching upon the real estate businessmen and upon the business of everybody else in the community. When you go in there and build block after block of houses you create confusion. The contractor does not have any competition, then; you know he cannot compete. The Government is against him. He is right at the mercy of the Government. If the Government can go in there and condemn property and build, then I say that we ought to put the rankest restrictions around it.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, we have it in the bill that it must be done according to the local planning and the local designs. We have the assurance of the Commissioner that not only will he give preference to these architects but he will, as his first step, select them in preparing the designs for these buildings under the terms of this act. But when you get into provisions of preference, you have to go right on down the line. It is unfair to express preference to one kind of service and not express preference to all kinds of service locally. I want them all to be used locally wherever they can be used. We have the assurance that they will use these architects locally.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not know that the minds of the gentleman and I meet on this proposition. I agree with what the gentleman says, but what I want to bring out is this. I am afraid that when the Government goes into the municipalities and builds block after block of buildings it is going into a pretty dangerous business, because it is going to stifle competition. Further, after the war is over, it will leave hundreds of thousands of empty buildings, and the city will have to take care of them with respect to the sewage and various things like that. Why would it not be well for us to go slow and let the F. H. A. participate in this construction? I understand

that the President a day or two ago issued some sort of an order raising the borrowing limit or the insurance limit to 90 percent so private capital could have a chance to go to work. Whenever private capital operates in a community it operates for the best interests of that community.

Mr. LANHAM. We want private capital to operate, and the provisions of the act are that not until the available housing has been determined by a survey and the extent to which private capital and the F. H. A. will do the building will any of these funds be used. It is not the intention to go right into the heart of a city and build these houses, because the plants are normally not in the heart of a city. We are trying to get construction of a kind that ought to be built and that can be sold to recoup this money for the Government. This is not a subsidized low-income housing proposition. These men make good wages. The proposition is to build houses in which they can live permanently and buy the houses, so the Government can recoup as much of this money as possible.

I may say to the gentleman that I have seen pictures of some housing done under this act heretofore which I do not believe would be decent housing in any community. We are trying by the amendments we have suggested here to obviate in the future any criticism we have been having in the past.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I appreciate the fairness with which the gentleman and the members of his committee have gone into this whole problem, especially the problem in connection with the utilization of the services of the local architects. Is the attitude of the gentleman as now stated the attitude of the members of the committee also?

Mr. LANHAM. It is. We have gone into it very thoroughly. The local architects will be used. However, Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment would cause a great deal of confusion. What we are trying to do is to obviate this criticism and these kinks in operation. Consequently, I make the statement that they are going to be used, and the Public Buildings Administrator has said that that will be the first step he will take.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Does the gentleman feel, further, that the language placed in this bill as an amendment setting forth that the designs should conform to the design and location of local planning and conditions will more or less compel the Administrator to use the services of local architects?

Mr. LANHAM. The Administrator so feels and wants to comply with that requirement in administration.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield to me?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have two questions I want to ask the gentleman. In the first place, I have one of these very large defense projects in my district, being in connection with the Lockheed plant. There has been no requirement for public building of this sort in my district, as that has already been supplied by private capital, but in the language on page 2, where it states, "The President shall find an acute shortage," and so forth, does that mean he has to find that there is no private capital available to build these buildings?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; that is the intent of the act, as has been expressed from the beginning, and the Housing Coordinator goes into each community and makes a survey of available housing and a survey of what can be done by private capital, and this is only to take care of the excess. Of course, I am sorry there is any excess, and I wish more of this work were being done by small businesses that we already have in our various communities and would not involve this migration of labor to such a great extent.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have an increase in employment of from 2,200 to 35,000.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman, I think, will need some relief.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; we do not need any relief, because all of this new housing is now being supplied by private capital, and no Government money has been spent.

Mr. LANHAM. That is fine, and that is the intent of the act wherever that can be done.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, my second question is this and I ask it of the gentleman as an able and distinguished lawyer. Do these people who live in the homes provided by the Government on Government-owned land, retain their right to vote in their own communities?

Mr. LANHAM. I suppose they do, if they are there temporarily, just as we who serve here in the Congress retain that right. I must confess that I have not looked into the legal aspect of that matter and this is the first time it has been brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have been informed that living on Government-owned land as residents they are deprived of their right to vote. Certainly, in some of the States, and I wondered if the gentleman had gone into that to his own satisfaction or would be willing to do it, ultimately, for the benefit of the House and the people concerned.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, I will say to my friend that I feel sure my sympathies and sentiment would be quite in accord with his own, but I think that would have to be done by independent legislation and not made a part of this act because it ought to apply to all Government land and not merely that acquired for defense housing.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that in my own State it would require an amendment to the State constitution to give the people who live in these Government-owned premises the right to vote in my State.

Mr. LANHAM. In response I will propound a legal question to my good friend from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not a lawyer, so do not ask me a legal question.

Mr. LANHAM. That question is whether or not any statute we might pass would nullify the provisions of the constitution of California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say that, of course, there is the provision that the right to vote shall not be abridged, but of course, at the present time the laws in the various States that qualify voters are different. Consequently, it would require some kind of statement, perhaps, on the part of the Congress that a man's rights shall not be abridged by virtue of his living on Government land.

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be glad to confer with my friend about that, but I do not believe it would quite come within the province of this particular legislation.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANGELL. Is the language in the amended bill with reference to the employment of architects that found on page 5, line 20, that—

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the employment or utilization of the professional services of private persons, firms, or corporations?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. We make it permissive, and that is the way, in the judgment of the committee, it should be, and we believe it is for the best interests of the architects.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman will recall that I have had this matter up with him because there has been a great deal of complaint in my own State, and not only the general complaint that the gentleman has spoken about.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that.

Mr. ANGELL. Because we have had a very bad situation, and permit me to say this. We have had quite a large undertaking there and they brought in outside architects when we had a number of very efficient architects there on the job. But they were ignored and architects brought in from the outside.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that.

Mr. ANGELL. And under the language here they can do the very same thing.

Mr. LANHAM. But let me say to the gentleman that that is not going to be done because we have another provision in this measure to the effect that the local authorities and the local housing authorities shall be consulted, and that the building in location and design shall conform, insofar as it is possible to do it under the terms of this act, to the city planning and the city designing. The Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration has said that the first step he will take is to go in and get these local architects.

Mr. ANGELL. These architects that they brought in from the outside had to comply with local building restrictions.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand that, but we are putting in the amendment a requirement that never was in it before and we are placing some additional duties upon the Public Buildings Administration and the Commissioner has made that definite statement upon which we may rely.

But when you go into this matter of making preferences, why are not your

local men, your plumber, your groceryman, your furniture man, your material man, entitled to as much preference as anybody else?

Mr. ANGELL. They are.

Mr. LANHAM. Then, suppose material is not there to go into the construction of one of these buildings, and you go to the local man, the only man who by preference can get it, and he says to you, "I will get it in 2 weeks," then you have to wait 2 weeks. I repeat I want as many local people accommodated as possible.

Mr. ANGELL. But in the case I have in mind the material for the project was on the ground and it was not a question of importing material from Louisiana, Texas, New York, or some other place but the only question involved was the employment of architects. There were competent architects available locally where the project was situated, but instead of employing these architects the agency imported architects from the outside. This practice should stop. Political considerations should not enter into carrying forward these national-defense projects while the very life of the Nation is at stake.

Mr. LANHAM. I wonder if the gentleman realizes the force of the observation I made a short while ago, that if you put in this bill that preference shall be given to local architects that would not mean necessarily that the architects would have to be hired.

Mr. ANGELL. But it would mean something, while the language that is there now means nothing.

Mr. LANHAM. And suppose the Federal agencies already had some designs that were somewhat in keeping with the local city planning and designs, they could use them without any architect at all. The best assurance you can get is the assurance given by the Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration, and if you have had any dealings with that gentleman I know you respect him.

Mr. ANGELL. Oh, I have the greatest respect for that man, but he may not be the one to make the decision.

Mr. LANHAM. That will be the first step that he will take.

Mr. ANGELL. I repeat, he may not be the one to make the decision.

Mr. LANHAM. In reply, let me say that the committee found a great many mistakes that have been made in housing, built under this act heretofore, and it is the intention of the committee to follow up the administration of this matter. We do not want to see any duplication of some of the architectural eyesores that have been evident on this trip of inspection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am very glad to know that the committee has appreciated the mistakes in the Housing Authority, and I simply call to the gentleman's attention the housing project in the city of Newport, R. I., which I think is an abomination. I am not familiar with any other housing, but as a contrast to that, I call the gentleman's attention to the naval defense-housing project in the same city, to show what can be done for about the same amount of money.

Mr. LANHAM. There are a good many we do not like, and we are trying to obviate them, and we do not want them duplicated and we intend to try to see to it that they are not duplicated. That is one principal purpose of this bill. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used 46 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. I must decline to yield further. I am leaving little or no time for the rest of the members of the committee. If we start to talk about these particular places, all of the time will be consumed and much more time. It is the purpose of the committee to see that we do not have a recurrence of many conditions which have existed, for instance, like that in the district of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. We had an unfortunate occurrence in that district and it is the purpose of this measure to see that such things as were done in the gentleman's district shall not be done again. The committee and the Congress have been subjected to unwarranted criticism, and it comes from some of the administration of the act and not from the legislation itself, and we are putting the intent of the legislation so clearly in this measure that if you will pass it without a single amendment, except the one striking out the word "enlisted" as suggested, we believe you will not have all of this criticism hereafter hurled at the defense housing.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. And I believe it.

Mr. LANHAM. And I mean it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 47 minutes.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have been advised that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOLFENDEN] was absent today on account of official business and was unable to reach the Chamber in time for the casting of the vote that was taken. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, the installation of large munition plants in this country has upset the housing facilities of the localities in which these factories are being located. Our Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has made a survey of these places. This bill which we are now considering is the result of that survey. We feel that this is an honest bill, in that it deals fairly with the workers and the communities. We know that there have been errors in judgment in some cases, and our investigation has again proven that "hindsight is more accurate than foresight." Yet I, for one member of the committee, feel that those who are in charge of the successful operation of this program are honest, loyal, patriotic Americans doing their very level best to meet the problems of this situation. I know that each and every one of them is doing all in his power to see to it that the communities, workers, the taxpayers, and the Government get a fair deal. No one can do more. I urge that the House approve this bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BISHOP. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Would you say that was the case at San Diego or Long Beach, Calif.?

Mr. BISHOP. No. I said that in many cases there were mistakes made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 6128 was brought before us on December 1 under a suspension of the rules, I objected to the procedure because I felt that a bill of such importance as this—spending $300,000,000—should be given ample time for consideration and allow any acceptable amendments to be incorporated in the bill. At that time I appeared in the Well of the House and asked the membership of the House if they desired to know of conditions existing in our Federal Housing units and raised 16 questions regarding these conditions. Because the membership voted to refuse to allow the bill to be considered under a "gag" rule and followed my suggestion that it be sent to the Rules Committee and brought out under an open rule, I feel it is my duty to endeavor to answer those 16 questions and give you the information to the best of my ability. These 16 questions are found on page 9519 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 1, and I will answer in the order given there.

First. The 10 agencies that are competing with one another are found on page 62 of the hearings of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee and include the Public Buildings Administration, United States Housing Authority, Navy Department, War Department, Farm Security Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Alley Dwelling Authority of the District of Columbia, local housing authority, Division of Defense Housing, and Federal Works Agency. In addition there are 7 management agencies.

Second. I refer you to a list of 28 names that I have here for your inspection. These employees were taken from the United States Housing Authority from February 1, 1941, through November 2, 1941, with salaries ranging from $1,080 to $5,600. The names and titles are included in this list.

Third. I would refer you to this letter which I have before me dated July 15 from Mr. Clark Foreman, Director of Defense Housing, to Mr. Langdon, 785 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., which states:

> If you still feel strongly that we are wrong in this position, I will, of course, respect your position; but as we are continually embarrassed by the fact that we allow an inexperienced authority to construct under supervision of the U. S. A. and do not allow them

to manage the projects our recourse will, of course, have to be the exclusion of such projects even from construction.

Fourth. The findings of the committee after a tour of inspection was to the effect that housing is needed in some localities but facilities are needed immediately as schools and hospitals are overcrowded and local communities are financially unable to cope with the influx of defense workers. Committee members will no doubt speak for themselves on this phase of my questioning.

Fifth. I want to read to you from a report of Nathan Straus, Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, given to me on December 9, 1941:

Your requesting the facts and dates concerning the Pensacola project which we had ready for occupancy for several days before we could find someone to whom the keys could be given even although there was a great demand for housing. On June 1 when the project was ready for occupancy, we requested advice from Mr. Foreman, who is responsible for the management of the project, as to whom the keys should be delivered. We were advised that the keys should be delivered to a representative of the management section of his office who would arrive in a day or two. Although several other inquiries were made in the interim, we were advised by wire as late as June 10 that his representatives had not yet arrived at the project. On June 13 we were advised that Mr. Foreman's representative had arrived, the keys had been delivered to him, and the first tenants had moved in.

Sixth and seventh. I would refer you to conditions that the committee found at Long Beach, Calif., and to this telegram dated September 26 to Mr. John M. Carmody, Federal Works Administrator, Washington, D. C., from Carl L. Erkson, city manager of Long Beach, Calif., and a telegram dated November 19 to the Honorable FRANK BOYKIN, chairman of the subcommittee, from Francis H. Gentry, mayor of the city of Long Beach. Yet after the receipt of this telegram of November 19, our chairman called the committee together, along with officials here in Washington, and informed us that it would now require approximately $400,000 to change the location of this site because of the fact that work had been started even although the local people objected and even although the standing committee had made known its recommendations that the houses should not be built at Long Beach.

Eighth. Relative to the W. P. A.'s using $1,688,000 of W. P. A. funds, I would refer you to the testimony of Mr. Carmody before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which is shown on page 56 of the hearings, and which states:

I have heard no mention of the contribution the Work Projects Administration, a constituent unit of the Federal Works Agency, has made to the home registration program and the finding-of-need program of the Coordinator's office. I have here and am putting into the record the description of the Work Projects Administration program allocating $1,688,000 for this project.

Then on pages 57, 58, and 59, Mr. Carmody incorporates his chart.

Ninth. I would refer you to the testimony given by W. J. Guinan, chairman of the Builders Association of Metropolitan Detroit, on page 16 of the hearings in the city of Detroit, a portion of which reads as follows:

Mr. GUINAN. We offered to develop 5 to 10 basic plans in the low-field bracket—to prepare the plans and specifications, to submit them with a survey of how many could be built in a 90-day period. That seemed to us to be a constructive plan.

Mr. HÉBERT. Do you mean you did not even get an answer to that letter?

Mr. GUINAN. No. Of course, it might have been mislaid.

Mr. HÉBERT. We ought to find out if the Federal agency is ignoring private capital. I have heard that several times.

Tenth. I would refer you to the report of the Truman committee, the low bidder being P. J. Currier Lumber Co., which was approximately $300,000 low on this job, yet his financial statement and his experience questionnaire was on a par with higher bidders.

Eleventh. I would respectfully refer you to page 2 on the report of the Office of Management Division, Executive Office of the President, summary as of November 25, 1941, which shows the number of units programmed: Army, 1,820; Defense Housing Corporation, 2,346; Farm Security, 200; Federal Works Agency, 19,582; local housing authority, 14,191; Maritime Commission, 697; mutual-owning D. H. D., 799; Navy, 15,765; Tennessee Valley Authority, 250; United States Housing Authority, 5,344; which is a total number of units programmed—60,994 permanent, 9,891 temporary—70,885.

Twelfth. Number of houses constructed by all units is found on page 2 of the report, which shows 60,994 permanent, 9,891 temporary, making a total constructed of 70,885.

Thirteenth. The total number of houses constructed and ready for occupancy but vacant is 11,977 permanent, 1,406 temporary, making a total of 13,383.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does your report show how long those houses were vacant after being completed and ready for occupancy?

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is familiar with the report, which is as of November 25. I will be happy to include the entire report, showing the exact time, if the gentleman desires me to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman does not quite get my question. What I am trying to find out is whether or not some of these houses might have been vacant for several days.

Mr. McGREGOR. The report does not say whether they were vacant 1 day or several days. If the gentleman will wait, I will give him the number of houses under construction, not quite ready to be occupied. But I hope he will remember we have a total of 13,383 houses, as given by Mr. Palmer's office, vacant and ready for occupancy as of November 25.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman realizes that several days at least must elapse after the completion of a house before the securing of tenants. I mean it is not simultaneous.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman feels that I have better judgment than to say it would not take several days, but I am sure the distinguished gentleman realizes there would not be 13,383 houses completed in 1 day or 10 days. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed, I will be glad to yield later.

Fourteenth. The number of houses yet under construction by Federal agencies is 7,458 permanent, 3,764 temporary, making a total under construction of 11,222 and a total number of houses constructed and vacant and yet under construction, 24,605.

Fifteenth. For the statements majority ranking Members made, I would refer you to the statement of Subchairman FRANK BOYKIN in his release to the Los Angeles Examiner under date of September 27, which reads as follows:

Waste of millions of dollars in the national-defense housing program was charged yesterday by a congressional Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds here to investigate housing conditions in defense areas. Mr. BOYKIN charged the houses are "unsightly, only partly occupied, and too far from adequate bus service."

From the Hollywood (Calif.) Citizen-News of September 27, I read:

Waste charged in housing projects. Representative F. W. BOYKIN charged in an interview that the Government is wasting millions of dollars on its defense-housing program and asserted that private industry could build 25 percent cheaper.

From the Los Angeles Times of September 26:

Demountable homes under construction for defense workers here condemned today by Representative FRANK BOYKIN, chairman of investigating committee, as "the most fragile and worst we have seen. They look like the first strong wind could pick them up and move them right off their foundations. It seems to me that these houses could be built for $1,000 instead of $2,800."

I have others that I would be happy to show any interested Members of the House.

Sixteenth. The construction of 750 single units when there were a thousand rooms available is set forth in the hearings of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, page 71, the testimony of Mr. Carmody, Administrator of Federal Works. He states:

This need is to remain and must be met. Let us meet it and we will build a dormitory out there and arrange it so the rooms can be turned promptly into apartments. We built it. We built 750 units in 30 days. One of the best jobs for speed that has ever been done. The Public Buildings Administration got right on top of it and did it. They are all vacant. In the meantime it was discovered there were a thousand rooms available in the community for rent. This survey the Work Projects Administrator and others made revealed that fact. The dormitories are there. We have asked the Coordinator what to do about it, and I am not sure we have got definite information. There is a good deal of buck-passing about that business.

Mr. Chairman, those are the answers to the questions that I submitted to the House on December 1. I fully realize that there is a possible need for a small number of houses, but as a member of the committee of investigation, I can

truthfully say to you that there is a greater need for facilities. By that I mean schools, sewers, hospitals, and so forth.

I think you realize that some of these days in some of these communities there will be a "ghost town" caused by the Federal Government's constructing houses in that local community, and I think you will agree with me that the results will be that the value of the privately owned property will decrease. Then the private-property owners will blame you and me for that condition.

I am of the conviction that since we have such a large number of houses still vacant we should reduce the total cost of this bill which can be used only for houses and use a part of the money for facilities. We are certainly in an emergency and we must save every dollar we can save. There have appeared before our committee representatives who have given us a chart and submitted to us actual figures showing the need of money to assist the local governments in the construction of facilities.

May I say to you, when they requested $150,000,000 for facilities, they showed us a need for $150,000,000. The housing units have shown us no definite need and we still have the number I gave you as vacant.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think the gentlemen has asked 15 or 16 pertinent questions and answered them eloquently and completely. Now the gentleman says that before your committee they were able to justify that first $150,000,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And I understand the gentleman has indicated that they have not justified the other $150,000,000?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is the gentleman going to introduce his amendment to strike out $150,000,000?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is my intention.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I hope he does.

Mr. McGREGOR. Under the present law we have spent $150,000,000 under one Lanham bill, $150,000,000 under another Lanham bill, making $300,000,000 for houses alone. Then we spent $150,000,000 for facilities. Now they come along and we are asked to increase that $300,000,000 to $600,000,00 for houses. In other words, we are asked to spend as much in this one appropriation for houses alone in face of these irregularities, which no one has disputed, if you please, in face of these vacancies, as we have appropriated all through the program since October 1940 when we started the Lanham Act.

I say to you members of the committee that we do need facilities, but we have no need for $300,000,000 worth of houses. I will endeavor to put in an amendment providing for $150,000,000 for houses and $150,000,000 for facilities, and in that way save your people and my people $150,000,000, and the bills can go through together. I am firmly in accord with the distinguished chairman of my committee that they should go through together.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I call the gentleman's attention to Public Law No. 24, which is title VI of the Defense Housing Insurance Act.

I heard someone say a while ago that that was for cheaper types of housing, and yet that very title VI under that act applies to $4,000 single units. This bill the gentleman is discussing right now applies to single-unit types to average $3,750, in no case to exceed $4,250. It applies to $6,000 double units, $8,000 triple units, and $1,500 four-family units.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. PLOESER. And the reason a good many of these private contractors are not taking advantage of this 90-percent loan insurance is because they fear Government competition in building this defense housing. I think the present is a poor time—when the House right now is in process of starting an investigation to try to save small business—a poor time for us to go further along the road to crush it.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman is correct and I thank him for his contribution.

I can see no reason why we should pass this bill today for $300,000,000. My friends, that is as much as we have appropriated since we started in the housing construction. In H. R. 6128 we are setting up a new personnel administration. Why give to this new administration as much as was carried in the two previous bills for defense housing for $150,000,000 each? Congress will be in possible continuous session. Why not give $150,000,000 now and later on, as the need is shown, appropriate more money? My candid opinion is that when any one department has too much money to spend it spends somewhat unwisely.

Let us hold this program down, endeavor to save some money. The records will show that during the World War no money was appropriated for defense-housing units, and up to now we have appropriated $300,000,000 and $150,000,000 for facilities. This bill calls for $300,000,000 and another bill is coming in in a few days for $150,000,000 for facilities which will make a total expenditure for housing and facilities of $900,000,000, as against no appropriation for this purpose during the last World War.

I ask you Members of Congress to give very careful consideration to this before you vote for this entire amount. I expect to offer an amendment to this bill which will reduce the amount as well as give local authorities more power and I trust that you will give my amendments consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Section 3 of the bill authorizes $600,000,000 to be appropriated. Is this in addition to the $300,000,000 already authorized and appropriated?

Mr. McGREGOR. The original act is amended to make the total read "$600,000,000." That is $300,000,000 in addition to what has already been appropriated for housing alone. The gentleman will recall that we had one bill asking for $150,000,000 for housing, and then a second bill authorizing an additional $150,000,000 for housing. In other words, if this bill should pass, the total then authorized for housing alone would be $600,000,000. This bill increases the amount $300,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. It really includes the $300,000,000 heretofore authorized.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct. This bill is not a new authorization of $600,000,000; it is a new authorization of $300,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So when you take the $150,000,000 in the bill passed some time ago for facilities and add to that the $150,000,000 bill which was reported today it makes the total $300,000,000 for facilities and makes the total for both housing and facilities $900,000,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, may I ask the gentleman this: When those figures were placed in those acts, did they anticipate the three declarations of this week?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would say to the gentleman no.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman give us a rough estimate, just as rough as he cares to make it, of what is likely to follow with these two propositions of housing and facilities for defense as a result of what we have done this week?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would be very glad to consider that, but time alone will tell. I wish I could give the gentleman a more definite answer.

Now, if I may proceed, Congress is going to be in continuous session, and we need not appropriate such a large sum as $300,000,000 at one time. Let us appropriate in smaller amounts as needed.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. From the statement the gentleman has made I know he has given the subject very careful and deep consideration. It prompts me to ask what if anything is provided in the legislation now before us to protect communities against the receipt of insufficient funds to provide the municipal facilities that are given to these housing projects, such as light, and water, and sewerage, and police and fire protection, and school facilities, and so forth? In the past the housing agency has adopted a Hitler-like attitude in dealing with communities and their representatives. I have in mind at this moment a community in the district I represent where the housing agency

went into that locality and built houses without regard to building and plumbing codes and regulations of the community and then in addition thereto have refused to pay even the actual cost of the municipal facilities, that were furnished on the same basis as other taxpayers were required to pay. Why should private home owners be required to carry the burden of supplying municipal facilities to these housing projects; unless these projects are required to pay upon the same basis it means that the private owner has his own tax burden increased by just the amount that the Government does not pay. I have before me a copy of a letter addressed to the Public Works Agency by J. Claud Semin, solicitor of the Borough of Audubon in Camden County, N. J. I also have a copy of the letter I addressed to the agency. These letters are as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1941.
(Attention Mr. H. Milton Colvin.)

GENTLEMEN: I have submitted to the Board of Commissioners of the Borough of Audubon the contract which you left at my office some time ago. The consideration set forth in the contract amounting to approximately $13,000 on an annual basis is not satisfactory to the Commissioners and is not in line with the agreement made between your representatives and the representatives of the Borough of Audubon and the Board of education several months ago.

At that time it was agreed to pay the school board $16,700 and the borough $18,300 in addition to the $2,444 already deposited in escrow to cover the use of the sewer disposal plant. These three figures made a total of $37,444. When this agreement was discussed the services to be furnished by the borough did not include street lighting and fire-hydrant service. Your contract now comes through including these two services, and for the sum of approximately $13,000 annually instead of $18,300.

According to the best information which we have been able to obtain up to the present time buildings erected on this project, if owned by private individuals, would be valued at a minimum of $900,000 for the purpose of taxation. In addition to the buildings the land assessed would equal another $200,000, making a total minimum ratable of $1,100,000. If these were owned by private persons the annual taxes paid to the Borough of Audubon on this assessment based on the 1941 rate would be $52,360. However, of this amount the borough would only receive $3.68 per $100, or taxes to the Borough of Audubon would be $40,480. This amount is still $3,036 more than the amount agreed upon in the board room of the high school several months ago and well within the rights of your department under the Lanham Act.

At my request the Commissioners are continuing to supply municipal services to this project, but they feel they cannot continue this indefinitely in fairness to the other taxpayers and citizens of the borough.

We will await your reply before taking any further steps.

Yours very truly,
JOHN CLAUD SIMON.

DECEMBER 11, 1941.
ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I wish to call to your attention the situation with respect to the defense housing project at Audubon, N. J., wherein it seems to me that the Federal Works Agency has failed to keep faith with the representatives of the borough.

As I understand it, an agreement was entered into by which the school board was to receive $16,700 and the borough $18,300, in addition to the $2,444 deposited to cover the use of sewer-disposal plant. This sum does not include service to be furnished by the borough for street lighting and fire-hydrant service. But, notwithstanding the agreement of contract that has now been submitted by the Federal Works Agency, including the above services, which were not a part of the original price, and furthermore reduces the amount of $18,300 to $13,000 annually.

I wish to call to your attention that the amounts agreed upon were not sufficient to cover the cost of the service nor equal to what would have been paid if the project houses had been in the hands of private owners. There is no justification, in my opinion, in requiring the citizens of Audubon to maintain service for Government property at less than cost. To do so makes the burden of the private owner all the heavier. It must further be remembered that this project did not come to Audubon upon any invitation on its part, but was imposed upon the community by action of the Government.

I sincerely hope that consideration will be given to the above matter and that the Government will at least support that which it promised.

I am,
Very sincerely yours,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is a condition we find, however, in a number of places, and it is a further reason why we should not appropriate $300,000,000 at this time. Under this bill we have a new set-up. Under this bill the P. B. A. has charge of this program, and we are giving them $300,000,000 before trying the organization out in its new field. Mr. Chairman, that is not good business. Let us give them $150,000,000 at a time. Congress will be in continuous session. Perhaps we can save a little bit of money.

Mr. DOWNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DOWNS. Is it not true that, as the result of the investigation by the committee, the new bill as presented now remedies the situation presented by the gentlemen on the other side of the House?

Mr. McGREGOR. In reply to the gentleman, we are hoping that it will remedy the situation, but we were just as sincere when we passed the first Lanham Act.

Mr. DOWNS. Is it not true that this bill takes care of the tax situation that was brought up?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am not an attorney, and that is a question in my mind. There is provided payment in lieu of taxes, but that covers a lot of things.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS].

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the pending bill at this time, in my opinion, is a necessity. I say this because of the events of the last few days. Speed is needed. This is not the time to dilly-dally. We have presented this bill in form so that it will be necessary for the agencies to go to the Appropriations Committee and every project appropriation must be approved before it can be expended.

The Housing Coordinator's Office has shown a direct need for $300,000,000. The gentleman from Ohio, whom I admire very much, attended the hearings held on this bill, he heard the testimony of the Housing Coordinator and he saw the facts presented by Mr. Palmer at these hearings.

The committee has given this bill a great deal of thought and study. We have traveled throughout the country looking over housing projects. It is true we found some poor projects and we found some very good projects. It is true that we found that in administering this bill perhaps improvements could be made. We found that 12 different agencies were building defense housing. We have rectified that in this bill. We have now placed it under one agency and such construction as the Army and Navy may desire. We found that in some instances these agencies have gone into various cities and set up housing projects on sites which were not approved and of a type of construction such as we saw in the district represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], which was not proper construction. In this bill we have provided that local authorities must be consulted and the type of construction must be in accordance with the plans of construction in that community.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. You have made reference to conditions in the district represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

May I say that if the committee had opportunity to visit the district which I represent it would have found similar conditions existing there. I assume from what the gentleman has said that it is the intention of the committee by this bill to correct that situation so that it will not occur again, and I commend the committee for the course it is taking in this respect; but I am not satisfied that sufficient provision is made in this bill to properly compensate municipalities for the facilities and services that are rendered by them.

In section 306, page 6 of the bill, it is stated:

> The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall approximate the taxes.

I cannot understand why the word "approximate" was used instead of saying "shall be equal to the taxes" if it was the intention to see that such an amount was to be paid. In the municipality of which I spoke a moment ago, where Hitler-like conditions were imposed by the Public Works Agency—I cannot describe it more perfectly than in that manner. For instance, we went before the representatives of the Agency, and we laid before them the cost of the facilities that were to be used by the Housing Agency. They promised to pay for them an amount that would equal or approximate the amount that would be paid by private owners. They tentatively entered into an agreement to do so. Yet within the last day or two they submitted a formal agreement that to-

tally avoids the tentative agreement that had been previously made. Thus, their action leaves an expenditure of money by the municipality that will have to be carried by the private home owners of that community to pay for the facilities that are being used by the Government project. The letters between the municipal solicitor, and my own to the Agency, will bear out what I have just said.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his observation, but the committee feels that the corrections made in this act will take care of the tax situation. As I stated, the district represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] was not the only district in which we found houses which did not meet with our approval. I do not doubt for one moment that the gentleman has some of that housing in his district, but this committee as a result of its trip throughout the country has endeavored to correct the situation in this bill.

I heard reference made to a statement which was attributed to the gentleman from Alabama the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BOYKIN] and, I think, I was present when the statement was made. His statement was made in reference to some temporary housing which we found out on the Pacific coast. I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] that the housing was not proper housing. Perhaps he was a little pronounced in his statement. We recommended on our return that none of that housing be constructed in the future.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I state in fairness to the gentleman's committee that there was a second project under construction when the committee came into my district. The committee saw it. It was stopped and reformed. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. DOWNS. I thank the gentleman. We feel this bill is an absolute necessity. We feel that this housing program must be speeded. We feel that $300,000,000 is needed to carry out the program. I hope the committee will approve this bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Did the gentleman's committee visit the defense area of Wichita, Kans.?

Mr. DOWNS. No; we did not.

Mr. HOUSTON. I understand it will be necessary to construct anywhere from 6,000 to 20,000 houses in that defense area. If this bill does not go through, I should like to have somebody explain to me how they expect to build them.

Mr. DOWNS. That is true about Wichita and that is true in many other areas where large defense plants are going to be constructed. If this bill is not approved, we shall be face to face with a severe housing condition insofar as our defense program is concerned, and it will impede our defense program. It is no time to slow up on defense in a wartime like this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to meet conditions and problems which have arisen in this country due to the defense effort on the part of our Government. We are at war, and war will bring additional problems to this Nation.

Fundamentally, I have always been opposed to every and any effort on the part of the Federal Government to project itself into any activity of the American people that could be done or completed by private enterprise, private capital, and private effort, but I realize that on account of the intense effort put forth by this Nation to build its defenses, conditions and problems have been created which must be solved by the Federal Government.

Perhaps no district in the United States is more affected by the legislation now before the House than mine. Adjoining my congressional district within the last year a $20,000,000 tank plant was constructed where 9 months before was a cornfield. It is a semiagricultural section. A few weeks ago it was my privilege to go with Secretary Knox to the dedication of a $20,000,000 naval ordnance plant constructed just 1 mile from the $20,000,000 tank plant. That site 8 months before was a truck-garden area.

Naturally, I do not have to paint a picture to lure your imagination or influence your judgment in favor of legislation of this kind when I call your attention to the fact that thousands of workers are required to operate those plants and build the equipment required for our defense. Not all of these people need new homes, I am well aware of that, but many of them do. In addition to the homes that will be required to house these defense workers are the additional facilities that will be required, such as have been enumerated here this afternoon, including public schools. Many school districts in our area have written, appealing to me to provide some way and some means for school facilities for the additional children who have come into those communities because of the national-defense effort which this Government is putting forth.

Perhaps the administration of prior acts has not been as perfect as it should have been. I sympathize with the presentation made by the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee, in his careful consideration and examination of the problems presented, but let us not for one moment, now that we are at war with three of the great powers of this world, do one thing to retard in any way the effort of our Government to complete the defense necessary to preserve our way of life. I know the need for this legislation and shall vote for the bill. I have the utmost confidence in the ability, integrity, and judgment of the splendid and able chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] and his committee. They have had a difficult task. They have done a commendable piece of work, and I will support them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, my object in taking this time today is to make a few observations along this line. The other day Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and head of the R. F. C., was before our committee, and I made this observation to him which I wish to make on the floor.

In my opinion we, the people of this country, and I include myself in that group, have turned yellow against the private-enterprise system of America when we recede from action and do everything possible to push the Government into ownership of the things we financed ourselves for 150 or 160 years. It seems to me that we are checking out on the so-called private-enterprise capitalistic system heretofore followed. Personally, I do not like it at all. Private industry will have to carry the burdens when the day comes that you must write them off unless you shift to Government ownership. Upon private industry you are going to depend for the revenues with which to carry on this Government in the post-war period. If you do not intend to depend upon private industry for that revenue, I wish someone would rise in his seat at the present time and tell me from what source you are going to draw that revenue.

If we are going to depend upon that particular goose to lay the golden egg, why do we continually and forever insist upon Government sticking its nose into everything, and willingly go along without a single protest and permit the Government to do so? It is beyond my ability to figure that out.

Certainly, as I said a day or two ago, we shall spend on this particular job no less than $150,000,000,000. If there is anything that I loathe, if there is anything for which I have no respect, it is a fellow who puts himself, through seeking a position or accepting an appointment, to a job which has to do with spending other people's money, and then proceeds, without giving any consideration whatever to the other fellow's economic life stream to waste the money involved. I am certainly convinced that in the departments of the Government in this country today we have some men who are as ruthless with the taxpayer's dollar as any man can be with any proposition on earth; political and bureaucratic wastrels of the worst type.

Mr. Chairman, in no way do I mean to infer that all Government managers of bureaus are of this type. They are not all so disposed or unqualified. But based upon investigations of various congressional committees and disclosures that have been made from time to time as a

result of special work of House and Senate committees we all know that many ruthlessly wasteful operations have been carried on as the dance of the billions has progressed.

If this Congress does not assume the responsibility of calling a halt on some of these fellows who have no training in handling business, who have no respect for their dollar or any other dollar, we can easily find absolute financial bankruptcy forced upon us, to be followed by complete chaos in this country as a result of the programs which we have voted here almost unanimously this very week. In my opinion, this is the time for us to talk about it. This is the time for us to do something about it, not in the postwar period. These billions are going to be rolled out just as boys playing with marbles and counting them out of a bag, and so far as I am concerned, as long as my people permit me to stay here and represent them, I do not intend to be noncritical on this question of spending. I intend to continue a little more aggressively than heretofore, because I know what inexperienced, ruthless spenders will do with funds of stockholders, with funds of political constituents, and others.

We have certainly had plenty of notice in this country to put ourselves on the job if we care to assume the responsibility, and I am now giving some of the reasons why I have so consistently voted against so many billions of dollars which have been brought to this House for approval.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it not plain to the gentleman that some of those bureaucrats and administrators down here are plainly obsessed with one opinion, and that is because Congress allocates the money it is their job to get rid of it no matter where they get rid of it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. And just as quickly as possible. They seem to think the burden is upon them to spend it quickly, and we have plenty of cost sheets to demonstrate that it has been a ruthless operation.

Of course, we all want quick results now. We have wanted production in the past. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a way to do a thing quickly and at the same time do it economically. That appears to be a passing art, however. Private industry in this country has for decades done things quickly, accurately, and economically. But to ask Government administrators to so perform may be asking just too much. To do things on a big scale requires great spending. It is not the quantity of spending or the dollars that I object to but it is the little consideration we obtain as a result of the dollars disbursed. From time to time it appears that our debate is not very clear on this point; and I will say not only our debate but our voting. It would appear at times that we think all that is necessary is to vote the billions and that all else will be well. But just spending is one thing while spending and getting results at reasonable cost is an entirely different accomplishment. The first operation means waste, extravagance, and finally failure. The second operation means success. Why do we have to talk in terms of $150,000,000,000 today? It is because of the wasteful approach that is made to the job in hand. We are just forgetting how to do things at a reasonable dollar cost. If this is to be our course, then we might as well prepare ourselves mentally to witness a complete dollar economic washout in the years to come. The charges made and admitted here today are a warning to all concerned. The responsibility is on this House. I am willing to assume my share of responsibility and do what is necessary to clean out some of these wastrels who can, if given a free hand to continue their profligacy in handling the billions of dollars of cost we now face, become an abomination to our whole program of winning this war and saving the peace. May God have mercy on us if we permit billions of dollars of taxpayers' efforts to be wasted. Private enterprise has demonstrated a greater degree of accomplishment than any other type ever participated in by man. We know this but it appears very necessary for us to state the facts to ourselves from time to time in order to not forget that they are facts.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this authorization is defense. Now, if we had a purpose for defense when this bill was reported out a week ago, the need now is many, many times greater than it was at that time, and in order to defend this country we are going to have to produce the arms and equipment to prosecute a mechanized war and this requires many man-hours of work. Just in today's paper I read that factories were going to be asked to run 168 hours a week. This will require many man-hours of work and comfortable rest.

Now, in answer to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, and I do consider him a distinguished colleague because anyone who is trying to save money is distinguished. He has a fine economy record in this house.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think the gentleman meant to say 168 hours a week per man.

Mr. WILSON. The factories will run 168 hours per week.

Mr. DONDERO. That means three shifts.

Mr. WILSON. And the workers will be called upon to do their part, which means about one-third of that time or 56 hours per week. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] is interested in saving money and he is to be admired for that. However, this $300,000,000, this is not an appropriation, it is merely an authorization. The passing of this bill will not spend a dime. It simply authorizes the expenditure and the money has to be appropriated through additional legislation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman not feel that if we authorize the money it will finally be spent?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I feel it will be spent and I feel we are going to spend many times that much before we do the job of licking the Axis powers.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Was it not brought out in the report, and is it not also contained in the bill, that if we do pass this bill it does not necessarily mean that the money will be spent under one appropriation, but that requests will be made from time to time whenever the money is needed and should be passed upon piecemeal by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I have the highest regard for the gentleman's opinion and I would like for him to tell us whether or not in his opinion that will expedite expenditures or expedite the defense program, just because we are forcing them to go before the Appropriations Committee every time they want a few dollars for a project. I am asking the gentleman, is that going to expedite our defense program?

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer that?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to cut down the gentleman's time, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] is trying to save money on the one hand, and spend it on the other. I believe it is a very wise thing to have the various needs go before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILSON. I am not going to comment on that, except to say that in my opinion the gentleman from Ohio has a splendid record of economy. However, I feel it would be a waste of time to authorize and authorize over and over again from time to time when these appropriations are needed. I traveled with this committee in making some of the investigations of defense needs. San Diego, Calif., is a great defense area. In that area we found what we called "hot beds," where men were sleeping in beds three shifts per day. That is not a healthful situation for any worker. What would happen to our production if an epidemic should break out in areas like that? It would be like dropping a bomb on one of those plants. According to the newspapers, Indianapolis is expecting 17,000 workers who will come in there next year. They have less than 1 percent of vacancies, and they are wondering what they are going to do with the 17,000 additional workers and their families. In my district we have men driving 87 miles each

way per day, making a total of one-hundred-and-seventy-four-odd miles per day, back and forth. What are they going to do when the roads get icy? Many accidents have already happened and, of course, they will become more numerous.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I wonder what protection a community has from having a housing project foist upon it when the mayor of the city and the city government say it is not necessary?

Mr. WILSON. Of course, that is unfortunate.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have a letter just handed to me signed by the city manager of Long Beach, Calif. There is also a letter signed by the mayor of the city of Long Beach protesting against the housing program in that city because they say it is not needed. The matter was postponed, at least, or stopped; and yet, when the committee comes back here we understand that they started again to examine the project. What protection have the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. WILSON. I cannot yield further. I agree that there are many injustices, but the committee cannot pick out the individual projects and authorize the appropriation of money for these particular projects.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why can we not have in the bill a proviso that no appropriations made hereunder shall be approved unless specifically authorized by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. WILSON. I would not attempt to answer the gentleman's question. In making this investigation I was about the most hard-boiled man on the entire committee. Our meetings sometimes would run until 10 or 12 o'clock at night, and these are some of the questions that I would ask: What percent of increase in personnel do you have? I thought that was a very pertinent question for determining the need for additional housing. Then there was this question, What is the percent of turn-over in your personnel?; and also, How many people have you had refuse to accept employment because they could not find houses to live in? and, How many have quit their jobs and left employment in these vital defense industries because of inadequate housing conditions?

The answer to those questions, Mr. Chairman, have led me to feel that we must authorize this entire amount of money and probably in the future will be called upon to authorize more, to house these workers, so that they can do this job and produce machines for the boys to defend their lives, and to conquer our enemy. I also urge that we include in this bill the $150,000,000 for facilities, because those facilities are vitally needed in many industrial centers in the interest of the health of our workers.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order that I might address a question to the distinguished chairman of this distinguished committee, for whom I have such great personal respect. Before doing so I want to say that I deeply appreciate the effort that has been made by the committee to correct many of the evils that have been found to exist. There is one evil, however, that has come very forcefully to my attention with reference to one of the building projects in the district that I have the honor to represent. I see by section 306 on page 6 that an attempt has evidently been made by the committee to deal with that situation. I am uncertain, however, as to whether it has effectively done so. That uncertainty arises because of the use of the word "approximate" in line 10 of the section. It reads:

> The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall approximate the taxes.

I would like to ask the chairman if the effort is made by the language in the bill to provide sufficient income to each municipality for the facilities furnished. If so, then why were not the words "be equal to" used instead of the word "approximate"?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say in response to the distinguished gentleman that that question was brought up a week ago last Monday when this bill was before the House under suspension of the rules by our distinguished friend and colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LANHAM. Thereupon I took the matter up with the general counsel of the Federal Works Agency and asked him to give me an opinion with reference to that matter and this is what he has written, after quoting the section to which the gentleman has referred:

> The proposal is that the amount to be paid for taxes shall "approximate the taxes which would be paid" if the property were not exempt from taxation. If the wording read that "the amount should be the amount that would be paid," the local authorities alone could determine what that amount is and may by unjust assessments place an undue burden upon the property and upon the tenants residing therein. The reason the word "approximate" is used is to leave the amount within the determination of the Administrator, and the plain intention of the section is that, in fixing the amount, he must endeavor, insofar as he is able to do so, to fix it at the amount that would be paid if the property were privately owned. In the performance of his duty under the wording stated, he cannot fix the amount at less or at more than normal taxes. If the determination of the amount were not left in his hands, so that he had the authority finally to fix it, there would be the possibility of considerable controversy between him and the local authorities as to what the amount should actually be.

So you will see that the intention is, after a conference with the authorities of the States, to be an amount that is "equal to," but for the reasons stated by the general counsel the word "approximate" is more appropriate in the section.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I appreciate the explanation and hope the act will be so administered. It is needless to say that I am in full accord with what has been said as to the necessity of defense housing. I have always supported such legislation and will continue to do so as long as the need for the same is shown to exist. I have merely sought to point out some of the corrections in policy that have been shown by experience to be necessary. I shall vote for the bill with the assurance that has been given by the chairman of the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I accompanied a subcommittee from this general committee on this trip throughout the country. I also witnessed the various things which were discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] and which formed the basis of his remarks. I might say there is some justice in most of his observations, but I think that listening to him presents a picture that is out of balance, that the emphasis is placed upon the bad in this program to the entire neglect of what is good.

I think that generally this housing program, when you consider its magnitude and the speed with which these houses had to be built, has been a creditable job, with two or three exceptions. I think the element of speed was one thing which probably in some cases produced construction which was somewhat inferior to what we might have had, if we had our own good time in which to build the houses. But, in the meantime, remember that the airplane factories were being constructed, that men were pouring into San Diego, pouring into Long Beach, pouring into Vallejo, to the navy yards, in the district of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], at the powder plant, to the Pittsburgh steel mills, to the Detroit manufacturers, and it was necessary that these houses be built quickly.

I was interested in one thing; wherever we went we consulted with every interested party in the district affected, and universally, without exception, members of management of the industries said that they needed housing and they needed it quickly. The men who worked in those mills, factories, and plants also insisted that they needed houses and needed them quickly.

I believe that as a result of this trip and as a result of the testimony taken and as a result of the testimony before the committee we have a much better bill than we had before, but I do not blame too seriously the administration of this bill when I consider the various things which affected it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee on the excellent work they have done in bringing this bill before us. There are two items in this bill, in the brief time I have at my disposal, that I want to call attention to. One is the $150,000,000 proposed for utilities in the defense-area districts.

My own district is comparable to that described by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and I agree with the excellent statement he has just made. We have in a suburban territory in my

district under construction two huge aluminum plants. There will be employed there between five and six thousand men. Much of the aluminum needed for our war efforts will be produced there. It will bring a large number of school children into the district. They will need facilities of various kinds, and it is most important that we plan for those facilities prior to the time that those school children find themselves in that community and without facilities.

So I commend the work of the committee in that respect, and I hope that particular provision will be included in the bill.

The other provision is with reference to the employment of professional services in the construction of these projects. We have had an unfortunate situation in my State in that a $400,000 building project by another agency was carried on and they imported an architect from the outside to handle the project.

We have a large number of very fine architects who are skilled and expert in this particular type of construction. These men were available, but for political reasons others were brought in from the outside. I regret that the language of this bill is not more specific. It is unfortunate that it is a milk-diet provision. It merely provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the employment and utilization of the professional services of private persons, firms, or corporations; but there is absolutely nothing in the bill that provides that they shall be employed where they are available and where comparable conditions exist, or even that they shall be given preference. I think the committee should amend that section. I took this amendment up with the chairman of the committee while the committee was still developing the bill, but this weak provision was inserted in the bill, which will permit this agency to go forward in the future just as has been done by other agencies in the past. I have the highest respect for Mr. Reynolds; he may not be the man who will administer these projects. We are living in very serious, hectic days. No man knows when he goes to bed at night who will be at the head of one of these undertakings in the morning. We should provide in the generic law for the utilization as far as practicable in local communities of local people, so that the scandal of employing and the bringing in for political reasons of outside architects and other professional employees will not happen again.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Chairman, this bill in its present form is much better than we started out with. At this particular time I believe all the funds carried in the bill can be used for housing. We have just passed this week measures in this House that will call for this type of legislation more than ever before. I say this because I have been at some of the areas and seen what is needed. Not far distant from here is the Martin plant in Baltimore, Md. This operation needs additional housing at the present time. We are going to need more tanks, more airplanes, more guns, more machinery, but we shall have to have places to put the people who work in these plants, or we must provide some place for them to live, so we can turn the wheels of production to keep the stream of supplies going to the men on the firing line.

I am for economy just as much as any Member of the House, but the time is here when we have got to stop quibbling. We have got to look realities in the face and pass the needed measures to deal with them. This legislation should have been passed 2 weeks ago. We are going into war unprepared in certain places. The House must do what is necessary to provide the materials of national defense, to give the necessary equipment to these boys whom we expect to do their part for us. I hope, therefore, this bill is passed in its present form.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one-half minute.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I want, in my humble way, to support this measure as presented by our distinguished chairman and other members of this committee. I assure the membership on my side of the aisle that I would not recommend an authorization of $300,000,000 for defense housing if I did not honestly, sincerely, and thoroughly believe it was necessary. This is not an appropriation; it is an authorization protected with this language: In such amounts as the Congress—let me repeat, the Congress—from time to time shall appropriate. In other words, during the expenditure of the first $300,000,000 it was a blank check. We just gave the organization $300,000,000, and they could spend it in any way, shape, or manner they saw fit and Congress had no control over that expenditure. Now we are trying to safeguard the expenditure. We have eliminated the nine different agencies that were constructing houses, all having separate organizations throughout the United States. We are placing this legislation under one responsible head, under a department of the Government that has been in operation for a century, a department which has the proper personnel, and integrity to know what to do as we found from our dealings with this particular group during many, many years. I have the utmost confidence that they will carry out this legislation to the letter of the law. There is no need for this department to circumvent the intent of Congress. Other agencies, in my opinion, have not interpreted the original legislation in the spirit in which Congress intended it should be carried out.

In our inspection we found deplorable housing construction so bad I would not have it in my back yard for a pigeon loft. That is an honest statement of fact. We hope we have stopped that.

We are providing in this bill that the commissioner of public buildings, when he is to take up a project shall consult with city or municipal authorities, that they shall all sit around a table and discuss the various needs of the community.

When they arrive at a conclusion that they need housing, he will then cooperate with the municipal authorities in designing, and so forth, and he may also utilize the services of architects, engineers, and landscape artists, and any other of the Federal Housing Authority that has already been set up and operating under State law. We have many housing authorities that have done a splendid job throughout the country. We are trying, in this legislation, which is an amendment to the original law, to lay down some fundamental principles that are sane and sound, and in keeping with the character of our municipal life.

We have had many complaints of lack of cooperation and we do not blame the people back home for complaining when they do not get cooperation. That is why we are here. We are here to listen to their complaints. After the 3 months' study that this committee has made I think we have a bill here, which was unanimously reported by the committee. Of course, mistakes were made in the past, and some of them were terrible mistakes, but we hope, under this legislation, it is going to be possible for the Congress from now on to have better control over the expenditure of this money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read, that amendments may be offered to it, and this will not obviate pro forma amendments to strike out the last word and allow discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I take it that amendments will be offered from paragraph 1 straight on through. In other words, they will be taken up in order from page 1 on?

Mr. LANHAM. In that order, yes. I think the first amendment would be the committee amendment with reference to the word "enlisted," then the amendment with reference to the facilities, then members of the committee should be given preference in offering amendments, after which amendments that any other Member wants to offer will be in order, if in order. Pro forma amendments to strike out the last word will also be in order.

Mr. McGREGOR. I believe my distinguished chairman will recall that I spoke to him a few minutes ago and asked for the privilege of offering an amendment on page 3, line 16, striking out $600,000,000 and inserting $450,000,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. This would not obviate the gentleman's right to do that

and to speak on the amendment as under the regular 5-minute rule.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman still wants to offer his title II amendment first?

Mr. LANHAM. I understand that is a matter of unanimous consent, more or less.

Mr. McGREGOR. The only reason I bring it up is this: If one amendment is defeated, we can go along on the other amendment. There is no use defeating two amendments. I am heartily in accord with the title II amendment for $150,000,000 for facilities, but I am not in favor of the $300,000,000 expenditure.

Mr. LANHAM. I so understand. Since these first two amendments are not in any way controversial, I thought we might act on them first, then the gentleman may offer his amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the architects and engineers in my districts are deeply interested in this matter. To what extent may their services be utilized under the present language of the bill?

Mr. LANHAM. Their services will be utilized and used very liberally indeed. I tried in previous remarks to make a full explanation of that. I think they will be used much more liberally under the terms of this bill than if the amendment to which the gentleman referred and which many of us have received is included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection, to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) so much of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, as precedes subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In order to provide housing for persons engaged in national-defense activities, and their families, and living quarters for single persons so engaged, in those areas or localities in which the President shall find that an acute shortage of housing exists or impends which would impede national-defense activities and that such housing would not be provided by private capital when needed, the Federal Works Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') is authorized."

(b) Section 1 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the next to last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the cost per permanent family dwelling unit shall not exceed an average of $3,750 for all types of construction for those units located within the continental United States nor an average of $4,250 for those located elsewhere (exclusive of Alaska), and the cost of no family dwelling unit shall exceed $4,500 within the continental United States or $4,750 elsewhere, except in the Territory of Alaska, where the cost shall not exceed $7,500, exclusive of expenses of administration, land acquisition, public utilities, and community facilities, and the aggregate cost of community facilities shall not exceed 3 percent of the total cost of all projects: *Provided further*, That where the Administrator shall consider that there is no reasonable prospect of disposing of such housing to meet a need extending beyond the emergency he shall construct temporary units."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (a) the following: ": *Provided*, That any proceedings for the recovery of possession of any property or project developed or constructed under this title shall be brought by the Administrator in the courts of the States having jurisdiction of such causes and the laws of the States shall be applicable thereto."

SEC. 3. So much of section 3 of such act, as amended, as precedes the proviso therein is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purpose of this title, in accordance with the authority therein contained and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, including transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (Public, No. 839), and regulations promulgated thereunder, not to exceed the sum of $600,000,000, to remain available until expended in such amounts as the Congress from time to time shall make appropriations therefor."

SEC. 4. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 3 the following new section:

"SEC. 4. It is hereby declared to be the policy of this title to further the national defense by providing housing in those areas where it cannot otherwise be provided by private enterprise when needed, and that such housing shall be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposing of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may, in his discretion, upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments such housing constructed under the provisions of this act as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy."

SEC. 5. Clause (b) of section 301 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(b) property acquired or constructed under this act (including schools and hospitals), which has not been previously sold or disposed of, shall be disposed of as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest."

SEC. 6. The second proviso of section 304 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: *"Provided further*, That the Administrator shall fix fair rentals, on projects developed pursuant to this act, which shall be based on the value thereof as determined by him, and that rentals to be charged for Army and Navy enlisted personnel shall be fixed by the War and Navy Departments:".

SEC. 7. Section 305 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 305. In the construction of defense housing under this act the Administrator shall act through the Public Buildings Administration, or, in his discretion, the War Department and Navy Department: *Provided*, That any other agency lawfully designated by the Administrator to construct projects for which funds were available at the time of designation may continue such projects to completion: *And provided further*, That the Public Buildings Administration may utilize the services of local housing authorities in such construction herein authorized; and in carrying out the other provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to utilize and act through the Federal Works Agency and other Federal agencies and any local public agency, with the consent of such agency. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this act for defense housing or for defense public works and equipment therefor shall be available for transfer to any agency authorized in this section to construct the same. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the employment or utilization of the professional services of private persons, firms, or corporations. Consultation shall be had with local public officials and local housing authorities to the end that projects constructed under the provisions of this act shall, so far as may be practicable, conform in location and design to local planning and tradition."

SEC. 8. Section 306 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. The Administrator shall pay from rentals anual sums in lieu of taxes to any State and/or political subdivision thereof, with respect to any real property acquired and held by him under this act, including improvements thereon. The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall approximate the taxes which would be paid to the State and/or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation, with such allowance as may be considered by him to be appropriate for expenditure by the Government for streets, utilities, or other public services to serve such property."

SEC. 9. Section 309 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Preference in such employment shall be given to qualified local residents."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 4, line 24, after the word "Navy", strike out the word "enlisted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 4, after line 12, insert a new section as section 5: Amend section 204 of the act by striking out the figures "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$300,000,000."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I may say in explanation of this amendment that this is the community-facilities amendment which was discussed in general debate.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment in order to clarify the RECORD. This is the amendment to title II which a point of order might be raised to because we are amending another title of this act.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not absolutely certain whether the point of order would be good or not, but it might be, and it was for that reason that I sought the judgment of the Members before introducing the amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR. This is the $150,000,000 to take care of the facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 3, line 16, strike out "$600,000,000" and insert "$450,000,000."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the bill now provides $600,000,000 for houses, and we have the $150,000,000 we just put into the bill for facilities. In other words, the bill now authorizes the expenditure of $750,000,000.

The records, I believe, will prove my statement this afternoon that we have constructed 11,977 permanent houses and 1,406 temporary houses that are still vacant, making a total of 13,383 that are constructed but yet vacant. The houses under construction number 7,458 permanent and 3,764 temporary, making a total number under construction of 11,222. Adding this to the number of houses that are vacant, you will find there are 24,605 houses vacant and under construction.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has arrived when we can save $150,000,000. Congress will be in session from day to day, and there is no need to make an authorization of $300,000,000, twice as much as we have ever made before for this particular project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any testimony before the gentleman's committee that the amount in the bill is the amount required to meet the demand?

Mr. McGREGOR. I recommend the hearings to the gentleman, and this is an analysis of the hearings. They have never given figures before the committee of the number of houses in the various locations that are needed. Colonel Gilmore and Mr. Johnson gave the committee a fine detailed statement of the facilities needed, a matter about which we heartily agreed a few minutes ago; they showed us the need and the amount of money to be expended. I would like to ask any member of this committee why we should spend $300,000,000 now when we have this enormous number of houses yet vacant. There is a need for a certain number of houses, but there is certainly no need for expending $300,000,000 when you have this excess number of houses vacant and others under construction.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DOWNS. Is it not true that Mr. Palmer, the Housing Coordinator, in testimony before the committee presented each member of the committee with a list of the houses to be constructed under this program, giving the names of the various communities at which they were to be located, and did he not state to the committee that the need had been established?

Mr. McGREGOR. A need was established as far as the total number of houses is concerned, but, to the best of my knowledge and belief, he certainly did not break it down, as did Colonel Gilmore and Mr. Johnson, who appeared before our committee the other day in regard to facilities. If such is the case, why would we have 24,605 houses yet vacant and under construction, and then come in and ask for $300,000,000 more?

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to leave the impression with the House that on his travels over the country on his inspection tour he saw 25,000 vacant houses in defense areas?

Mr. McGREGOR. We visited on our inspection tour a very, very small percentage of the projects; I would specifically say less than 10 percent of the projects.

Mr. HÉBERT. I would ask the gentleman to answer my question. Did he see 24,000 vacant houses on our tour?

Mr. McGREGOR. I would answer the gentleman that I saw, in proportion to the number of projects we visited, what, in my opinion, would be better than 24,000.

Mr. HÉBERT. Where did the gentleman get his figures?

Mr. McGREGOR. We got the figures from the report, as I stated in my formal speech today, from the Executive Office of the President, the Office of Management Division, dated as of November 25, 1941. It is an official program.

Mr. HÉBERT. I know the gentleman does not want to leave the House with the wrong impression.

Mr. McGREGOR. Indeed not.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman did not mean to say that those are vacant houses; he meant to say that they are units not yet completed.

Mr. McGREGOR. I gave the gentleman the figures on the amount of vacant houses and the amount of units not yet completed. The total amount of vacant houses that is, houses constructed and ready for occupancy but vacant, was 11,977 permanent and 1,406 temporary houses, making a total of 13,383 houses complete and ready for occupancy but vacant. These figures are taken from the report of the Office of Management Division, the Executive Office of the President, and are up to and including November 25, 1941.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, I have observed that there is some misapprehension here that houses to be constructed under the terms of this bill are only to go in so-called congested areas. The fact is that all national-defense centers in which acute housing shortages would retard defense activities, and where private capital will not provide the needed houses, are eligible for projects under this bill. The President has to determine these facts: First, whether there is an acute housing shortage that will retard defense activities; and, second, whether or not private capital will fill the need for houses.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Would areas which are designated as defense areas, and which are 35 or 40 miles away from places where the workers live who commute to work in the defense areas, come under this bill?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. That is my understanding of the bill.

Thus, any community or area in which a defense plant is situated may obtain a housing project under this authorization.

Now, as for the need of the $300,000,000 which has been referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] and which he seeks to reduce to $150,000,000, it was shown to the committee's thorough satisfaction that even a greater sum than $300,000,000 might well be used.

The expanded program of production for war against three nations, upon which we now have embarked, will tremendously increase the housing need and inevitably mean further legislation. But, under this bill, requests for appropriations will have to be justified before the Appropriations Committee. There has been some indication here of a misapprehension that this bill authorizes $600,000,000 for more housing. The fact is that it authorizes only $300,000,000 additional. But even this smaller amount is not to be appropriated in one sum. The expressed intent of the bill is that the Appropriations Committee shall bring in the appropriations only in the amounts for which definite and justifiable need is shown.

The national policy, made necessary by the modern methods of warfare, is to erect munitions plants far inland. Most of these new plants, as well as the expanded factories, will need houses. You cannot operate a factory without workers. You cannot bring in workers without houses. In many places houses are not, and will not, be available.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us not take some action here today that may cripple or handicap our war-production efforts. Let us not begin to quibble unwisely at the most critical moment in the Nation's history, when the need for war production is the greatest this Nation ever has faced. In this grave hour of peril we cannot afford to put any shackles on those upon whom we must rely to win this war and save this Nation. I trust this vital bill may pass and this amendment be defeated.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HEALEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if these projects are not usually initiated by the local people themselves and that the place where the housing is to be located is arrived at only after consultation with the local officials?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. In a great many instances that is true, and where the Government is going to establish a plant, it makes a survey, in consultation with the local authorities, to determine if houses will be needed, and then the request eventuates from that survey.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] a moment ago made a statement to the effect that there were some 24,000 units vacant or under construction and vacant or completed

and not completed. How many units did the Defense Housing Authority say would be necessary to carry on this program?

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. I regret I have not the figure in mind, and would have to refer the gentleman to the chairman, who has the record. My information was that all these houses would be occupied within a reasonable time, and there still would remain a tremendous need for additional houses.

Mr. HOUSTON. I may say that in my district alone we could utilize approximately 20,000 of the 24,000.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. The President said that war production in this country must be doubled and, perhaps, quadrupled. Obviously, this will mean a great increase in the number of workers who must have houses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to reduce the appropriation by $150,000,000.

There was conclusive evidence brought to our committee that at least $300,000,000 more would be needed for this defense housing program. I think every Member of the House, if he has made a survey of his own district, fully realizes the extent of the expansion of industrial activities in his district. Of course, this is greater in some districts than in others, but the evidence presented by Mr. Palmer, the Coordinator, showed that we need, in addition to those now under construction and those accupied now and those authorized to be constructed, approximately, 131,750 units. This is in addition to what private capital will build in these various areas. For instance, if you will look at the situation in the State of Michigan, you will see that this plan, in addition to what is already being constructed, calls for 11,000 more units in that State. Evidently, we are not going to break the State down into communities and throw their plans out promiscuously so that real estators or financial manipulators can go out in a community and take over this property and come back and sell it to the Government at a huge profit.

We are breaking it down into State units. In Pennsylvania there are 13,650 units, in Ohio, 10,150 units, in California, 7,800 units.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOLMES. Wait until I have finished my statement. In New York, 7,700 units and in New Jersey, 7,200 units. In Indiana there are 5,400 units; in Kansas, 3,500 units; in Washington, 3,600 units; and in Texas, 3,500 units. Those are the 10 leading, besides all of the other States, which make up one-hundred-and-one-thousand-plus for increased plant expansion. Then it is estimated that an additional 30,000 units will be needed in further plant expansion. We find ourselves now with three wars on our hands, and these plants have to be materially enlarged to take care of the munitions to be manufactured, and we are going to need in those plants three times the number of men to turn out the munitions, the shells, the cannon, the tanks, and we want to provide for these people proper places in which to live. I hope this House will stand by what the committee has recommended and support this bill for $600,000,000.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Has the gentleman found any place in his travels more in need of this legislation than in the vicinity of the great Martin plant? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] should not be surprised if before long we find we need more than $300,000,000 to take care of the men and their families in providing places to live. I trust that the gentleman will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the contribution of my distinguished colleague from Maryland. These plants are going to be continually expanded from time to time and I know that $300,000,000 will not be enough unless private capital comes to the rescue of the country.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It is a plain case of straining at a gnat at the present moment when you will probably have to swallow a camel a week from now.

Mr. HOLMES. There is no question but what we will need more than $300,000,000.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment, and want to give what logic I can in behalf of my opinion. First, I compliment the chairman of the committee for the presentation of the amendment dealing with title II. I am very much pleased that it has been adopted. It would be remiss upon the part of this House if we did not take occasion here to compliment Colonel Gilmore, of the Public Works Administration, on the splendid work that that Department has done in the handling of applications for facilities and utilities. If as much could be said for the housing, I would support any reasonable amount in this bill, but as much cannot be said for housing. This has been admitted by the members of the committee from what I have heard this afternoon. I think it would be well for this House to cut this amount on housing, even if we do have to come back at an early time and increase it again. It might be notice served on that administration that waste is not the order of the day in public housing, nor is interference with private enterprise an order of any day. The housing part of this thing could well take a lesson from the Public Works Administration in accordance with the method in which they have consulted local authorities and local conditions before attempting to foist on any locality, something that is not needed. As a matter of fact, they have made it most difficult for most localities to obtain some of the things that are necessary, and I think that is a healthy thing.

I know it applies particularly to my own district, wherein I have had a lot of experience with Colonel Gilmore's department. In the surrounding area of the Twelfth Missouri District we are spending probably a billion dollars on defense production, and we have many immediate needs under title II facilities and utilities and very few under housing. I know that as soon as this bill is passed, and they have more money than they think they can spend in a few hours, they will be trying to build public housing in places where it is not needed. That has been a common failure with many of the bureaucrats during these times. One gains the impression from their acts that it is their purpose to compete with private enterprise.

The distinguished chairman of the committee will receive my everlasting admiration if he can stop these bunglers.

I do certainly hope that adequate assurance has been provided for the services of private architects. In my opinion, the bill should be more specific.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this housing is needed, and much needed. It was needed when this bill was reported out. It was needed even back at the time when the message came to us. We have all heard the statement of the President that we are going to work on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week, and that we must double or even quadruple our production.

Certainly housing is going to be more and more necessary under circumstances existing today than when this bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Let me say furthermore that regardless of the amount that is appropriated here there is a direct and distinct provision in this bill, which is only an authorization measure, that the appropriations will be made only from time to time, under this authorization, as definite and distinct need is shown to the Committee on Appropriations. Consequently, the $300,000,000 here provided for is not to be turned over to anybody to be spent at his own will and pleasure, but to be spent in accordance with the direction of this Congress as they go before the Appropriations Committee and show a definite and urgent need for that defense construction.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it the committee's intention to act as administrator in the disbursing of these funds?

Mr. LANHAM. No; the Appropriations Committee, just as we have done for years and years with reference to all Federal construction. When it comes to building post offices we pass a blanket authorization of a sum of money from the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, under the present law, and then under that authorization they must go to the Appropriations Committee to get a specific and definite appropriation for each particular place. They will have to do the same thing under this act.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. You used the words "specific appropriation," after the authorization has gone through.

Mr. LANHAM. That is the intent of the act. We consulted with counsel with reference to the provision here. You

will see that this money will be used only as appropriations are made from time to time under the authorization, as Congress may direct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But I used a word that you used, "specific" appropriation. Do you object to inserting the word "specific" in this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. It is not necessary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There is no harm in putting the word in there if it is the general practice of the Appropriations Committee, is there?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, if the gentleman does not have confidence in the Appropriations Committee and in the purpose and intent of the act, I think it is surplusage and unnecessary. We have certainly made the intent of the act very clear.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If those who are in doubt on this floor knew that this act was going to be administered by the splendid and able chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee there would be no doubt on this floor this afternoon.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that very much from my distinguished friend. I will say further that it is the purpose of this committee, by reason of criticism that has been heaped upon it because of some abuses for which it is in no way responsible, to follow through and see that such criticisms cannot be made in the future.

Mr. DONDERO. And I am confident it will be done.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman is always fair and he knows I think he is one of the finest men in this Congress, but the analogy hardly runs true, where the gentleman compares post-office buildings with this appropriation. A post-office building will be in town A and will cost $150,000, but this will not go through like this. This will have to be so much to a certain community. You do not know how many units there will be.

Mr. LANHAM. But the need for so many units, the need that can be met through private capital, must all be shown to the Appropriations Committee before the appropriation is made. Now, that is very definite. That is very clear. The Committee on Appropriations so understands it and I have conferred with several of its members with reference to it. That is the reason we put this provision into the law, that there should be this supervision, and that we would not have vacancies that were unpardonable; that we would not have duplication of some miserable eyesores that have been constructed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to reply to my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] and to try to answer for him one of the reasons why there are vacancies existing in a place even like San Diego.

It so happens that there are nearly a thousand vacancies in that large unit which you gentlemen visited there this year, but the reason for it is this: A young man comes from Oklahoma, Texas, or Carolina, or New York, or from somewhere throughout the country, and he gets a job in the aircraft industry in San Diego. He has no money. He goes out to this housing project and they say, "You have to put down a month's rent. You will have to buy some furniture to put into this house." He does not have it, so what does he do? He goes down to one of the shacks that he can rent from day to day for a dollar, and he puts his family in there. As soon as we reach that person we show him the advantages of going out there, and now we are trying to get the aircraft industry to advance him the money, or on some basis that will permit him to have decent housing. They tell me it is only a question of time before all these houses will be taken up by people now in the industry. That numbers today only about 40,000. It will be 80,000 6 months from now. So you see we will have need not only for the houses that are vacant today but for many thousand more. I do not know whether the Government is going to put any of these units in my district or not. If they find that private capital will do the job, I know they will not, and I would not ask them to.

I have heard San Diego mentioned several times today. I have not injected myself into the debate. It was unfortunate that when the committee came to my district I was out inspecting with the Naval Affairs Committee and could not be there. However, I know that the committee went thoroughly into the situation in San Diego and I have only the finest reports from the civil authorities out there on the fine impression this committee made. I know we can depend on the recommendations of the committee as to the need for this housing and the need for the facilities that our municipalities must have help in in order to provide hospitalization, water, fire, and police protection, and all those things that go with a modern city.

I certainly trust that the original amount contained in the committee's recommendation will go through without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported every measure that has come before the Congress this year for the defense of our own country, and if I thought this entire sum were necessary at this time I would gladly support the bill as it now stands. This is a serious time. Our Republic faces graver dangers today than ever before in its history. When we entered the first World War our national debt was approximately $1,000,000,000. Today we are entering the second World War with a debt more than twice as great as the national debt was at the end of the first World War and it behooves us to be careful about the appropriation of money. Just so long as we continue to listen to the suggestions of a bunch of congenital spenders we are going to be on the toboggan toward financial ruin.

Much has been said this afternoon about the Glenn Martin plant. I was over to visit that plant a few days ago. They had a little more than 30,000 employees. It is my judgment considering the age of the employees there that not 25 percent of them are married men. They are mere boys. A large percentage of the workers in these defense industries are what we refer to as suitcase employees. The Congress is in continuous session. If it develops a little later that this entire sum is needed we can make the authorization.

There is too much waste in our war efforts. Last week I visited Nevada, Mo. There the Federal Government has an investment of more than $3,000,000 in Camp Clark. The buildings are in fine condition. There is a railroad line into the grounds, which consist of more than 1,200 acres. If necessary, additional acreage can be secured, I am assured by the Chamber of Commerce of Navada, Mo., for not to exceed $30 per acre. Camp Clark is on two transcontinental highways, 54 and 71. It is on a great railway system; it is adjacent to a town where a great many houses are now vacant because the people have left to take jobs in other sections of the country. I have pleaded with the War Department to use those splendid buildings and facilities at Camp Clark. Last week this House appropriated more than $8,000,000,000 for defense purposes.

I understand that additional camps are to be built, that additional airfields are to be provided, but so far I have not been able to interest the Department in the great Federal holdings at Camp Clark, Mo. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we need to exercise a little business judgment under these very serious conditions confronting our Nation. If this House continues to authorize appropriations as requested, whether really necessary for national defense or not, then we are going to be bankrupt before we get well into this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "make", insert the word "specific."

Page 5, line 23, after the word "authorities", insert the words "to ascertain the needs of additional housing facilities."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wholly approve the recommendations of the committee so far as the appropriations are concerned that are requested in the authority sought in this bill. I want to say, furthermore, that I believe the committee has done a very excellent piece of work in the inspection they have carried out and the very critical report they made to the House. I am somewhat familiar with housing projects, particularly pertaining

to naval facilities, and the naval needs of the country. I believe the House is under a debt of gratitude to the members of this committee for their constructive criticism of the program that has been carried out heretofore.

The amendment I offer here this afternoon simply provides that where an attempt is made by Federal authorities to institute a new housing program they first shall consult with the authorities of the city or community to ascertain the need for additional housing facilities. Furthermore, in view of the recommendations of the committee this afternoon and the free criticism of the administration of this work, I believe we ought to have an additional safeguard in the bill that would make it necessary for the Appropriations Committee, after this authorization bill becomes law, specifically to approve each project.

I have in my hand, Mr. Chairman, a letter signed by the city manager of Long Beach, Calif., and also a letter signed by the mayor of the city of Long Beach, Calif.

It seems to me that before the Federal authorities go into any community and spend a tremendous sum of money in the construction of additional housing facilities, the recommendations and the point of view of the local officials ought to be taken into consideration.

The mayor of the city of Long Beach had this to say in a letter addressed to the committee, copy of which I have in my hand:

Government housing project, which we tried to stop when you were here with your committee, is going ahead. Long Beach is particularly anxious that no such project be located here as we pointed out to you. Can anything be done to eliminate this unnecessary housing project? They are actually breaking ground at the moment and immediate action is necessary.

The city manager of the city of Long Beach had this to say, and this letter is dated only a short while ago:

There is absolutely no need for Government-built houses in Long Beach. In behalf of Long Beach I therefore respectfully request you cancel approval of projected 800 defense-housing units and advise me accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, when we are about to embark on a tremendous program seeking to carry out the cost of this war, when the debt of this Nation is reaching skyward, when we are asked to institute expenditures that are going to rest on the taxpayers of this Nation, it seems to me it is imperative that the need for the project be first determined by consultation with the local authorities before the Federal authorities step in in the manner they have before and are doing now and spend millions of dollars of public money where there is no need or occasion to do so.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman say that the need does not exist at Long Beach?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes. Here is the letter.

Mr. LANHAM. They said the need did not exist there, but did at San Pedro. We had a hearing on that before the committee, and we had the Representative from that district before the committee, who said that they needed it, and they finally asked for it to be located in the place where it was originally intended.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. He says:

There is absolutely no need for Government-built houses in Long Beach. Our citizens, developers, and builders are adequately providing all homes necessary. With the additional thousands of home units in the process of construction and projected to be built, all future needs will be amply provided for all defense workers.

That is from the city manager of the city of Long Beach. My amendment makes it imperative that the Appropriations Committee approve each specific appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. Chairman, may I say to my good friend from Massachusetts that those of us who were at Long Beach and attended the hearings can appreciate the need of that community. They need more houses, but fortunately Long Beach is in a position where it is amply able financially to build thousands and thousands of units. They were under the impression that they could take care of the influx or their needs. In order that the Members of the House may have the complete picture of this territory, originally this land was purchased for the Navy. The Navy acquired the property and built 400 houses for the Navy employees—that is, civilian employees. When those houses were completed, there was a tremendous demand for more naval houses and units in San Diego. At that particular time the fleet, which was stationed at Long Beach, was ordered to sea, which did away with the pressing need for the Navy; therefore, the need for additional houses for the Navy was temporarily eliminated, but there was just as great a demand from the civilian employees working in the navy yards, in other factories, including munition factories, and so forth, so that another unit acquired the land to build the houses for civilian employees in the industrial plants.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not a fact that we had the Representative in Congress from that district before our committee?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes. We agreed with the city manager that under those conditions the houses should not be built. However, the Government owned the land and the authorization to build 800 units had been issued. Then we got this demand. However, we asked the representative from Long Beach to come and sit in with our committee when we had this last telegram from the mayor telling us that construction was continuing and was there not something Congress could do to stop the construction. The representative from that city told our committee emphatically that there was no question at all about Long Beach needing the houses and to him it did not make much difference whether they stopped there and lost practically $400,000 which had already been spent and moved across the line about three-quarters of a mile into San Pedro or not. At the present time they are contemplating building in San Pedro 1,600 units. Adding these 800 units to the 1,600 units allocated to San Pedro would make 2,400 units about three-fourths of a mile from this location. We called up the city manager, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DOWNS], and myself talked with him on the telephone, after which he wired back stating that they saw no objection to the construction of these units provided they will be turned over to the Navy when the Navy needs them in the future. We know definitely the Navy is going to need them. The thing was settled to the satisfaction of the city manager and I believe to the satisfaction of the community. They told us definitely at the hearing held at Long Beach that if the Navy were going to use those houses they would not have offered one voice of objection, and the gentleman representing that district told us the same thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 1, which amendment is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEYER of Maryland: On page 2, before the colon in line 24, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this act, all defense housing (except temporary units) constructed pursuant to this act shall be either (1) constructed and managed by public housing agencies eligible for assistance under title II of the act of June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," or under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, by means of loans or other authorized assistance to such agencies, or (2) constructed and managed by the United States Housing Authority in cases where such housing cannot be constructed by means of a loan or other authorized assistance to a public housing agency. Loans to such public housing agencies shall bear interest at such rates as the President may determine."

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as well as all Members of Congress, has been confronted with criticisms emanating from one source or another as to the need for change in the administrative set-up for carrying out our defense housing program. This criticism has not entirely been directed against any particular agency or official but has rather been directed against the mechanics of the present method of administration. As my contribution toward the solution of the problem and clarification of the administrative set-up, I had proposed to my committee an amendment to pending legislation which would place responsibility for and control of the program in the various local housing agencies, and, in their absence,

in the United States Housing Authority. On December 2, 1941, the Baltimore Sun printed the following editorial entitled "Remote Control Is Bad in Federal Defense Housing":

[From the Baltimore Sun of December 2, 1941]

REMOTE CONTROL IS BAD IN FEDERAL DEFENSE HOUSING

Representative MEYER'S recommendation that all Federal defense housing activities be placed under the control of the United States Housing Authority is timely and opens a subject discussion of which is particularly welcome in Baltimore. At the present time the United States Housing Authority is building defense houses, but only in the capacity of agent for the Federal Works Agency. The latter holds the reins and distributes the money under the provisions of the Lanham Act.

This system is not working well in Baltimore. To date the Federal Works Agency, through the United States Housing Authority and the Federal Public Buildings Administration, has authorized 7 housing projects, with a total of 2,304 dwelling units, within the city limits. Under the Lanham Act these projects can be pushed without reference to local laws and regulations designed to protect the public health and safety. Whether the plans for the projects do, in fact, violate local laws and regulations is not readily determinable. Suffice it to say that municipal officials are dissatisfied and fear that the way is open for serious difficulties in the future.

Representative MEYER claims that the trouble arises from the fact that the Federal Works Agency has little knowledge or appreciation of local conditions and that close cooperation between the agency and municipal officials is impossible. He feels that this situation would be remedied if the United States Housing Authority took over because it would be represented locally by the Baltimore Housing Authority, the heads of which are Baltimoreans with a thorough understanding of local conditions.

Mr. MEYER'S plan has a plausible sound and deserves full consideration. A better procedure for defense housing activities is surely needed. A change would be timely because Congress has before it a bill authorizing a second appropriation of $300,000,000 for defense housing. This means that there are more Federal housing projects in store for Baltimore and, under the present system, more headaches.

The committee rejected this amendment but has in turn recommended to this House amendment of present legislation placing control in the Public Buildings Administration with discretion in that agency to utilize the services of local housing authorities. I am now pressing my amendment on the floor in lieu of the committee's amendment, which I consider as a compromise on my amendment.

I have here clippings from the New York Times and the Washington Times-Herald, both dated December 3, 1941, carrying criticism by Mr. Charles F. Palmer, Defense Housing Coordinator, of the committee amendment; and, in my opinion, impliedly, if not expressly, endorsing an amendment such as mine. These clippings report that "Mr. Palmer, despite his disagreement with Nathan Straus," protested against the committee amendment. Mr. Palmer wrote as follows:

Not simplification but further confusion will be created if any agency other than the United States Housing Authority undertakes to supervise and channel Lanham Act defense housing to local housing authorities.

We must bear in mind Mr. Palmer's unquestioned ability and integrity and the high office which he holds in relation to the defense housing program.

1. PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT

It would provide that all defense housing, except temporary housing, shall be undertaken by local housing authorities with funds obtained through repayable loans from the Government. Where no such local housing authorities exist, such housing would be undertaken by the United States Housing Authority, the agency with years of experience and success in public housing.

2. DECENTRALIZATION AND USE OF LOCAL AGENCIES

Housing is a local problem and should be handled by local government and local citizens who know the local conditions. It is not wise to concentrate in a bureau or administrator in Washington all the decisions on a Nation-wide housing program, so that everything from the selection of sites and the selection of architects to the selection of tenants is dictated from Washington.

The proposed amendment will tend to bring about a closer cooperation between the local authorities representing the Federal Government and local municipal and State authorities, and so forth. This should bring about an elimination of the sort of friction that developed in Baltimore City recently, when Federal authorities, acting under instructions from Washington, ignored, or were about to ignore, the building code of Baltimore City. This disregard of local laws and regulations naturally results in strained relations between Federal and local authorities and governments. It also results in popular resentment among the local population against the Federal Government and its agencies. At a time like this unity and harmony should prevail. Any legislation effecting structural changes which tend to alleviate strained Federal-local relations should be welcome and would be a boon to domestic tranquillity and will promote the general welfare. Local agencies of the Federal Government are bound to work more amiably with local authorities than Federal agencies far removed from the local scene. The local housing authorities have, by time and experience, gained the confidence of local authorities and have a first-hand knowledge of local problems, laws, regulations, and local feeling. Common sense seems to indicate that the housing authorities are best fitted to carry on the work of defense housing.

3. ELIMINATION OF EIGHT DUPLICATING AND COMPETING HOUSING AGENCIES

Instead of continuing the use of eight duplicating and competing housing agencies with resulting overlapping and waste, there should be one Government agency responsible for all public-defense housing except temporary housing. This whole problem of defense housing should be handled by a single trained and competent agency, the one which on the record has done the job best. The U. S. H. A. has a record of successful achievement on defense housing which has been publicly acclaimed by the special Senate committee investigating the defense program. It is the agency which is best equipped to do the job, working—as it always does—with local housing authorities who know local conditions. Typical of the relative efficiency of U. S. H. A., and the newer agencies engaged in defense housing, is the fact that defense-housing projects constructed and managed by local housing authorities with assistance from U. S. H. A. under Public, No. 671, have an occupancy of 97 percent of the dwellings available for occupancy, as against an occupancy of 70 percent in the case of projects managed or supervised by the Division of Defense Housing under the Federal Works Administration.

4. FINANCING BY REPAYABLE LOANS TO LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES INSTEAD OF DIRECT FEDERAL BUILDING

Fully repayable loans would be made to local housing authorities. These local housing authorities would operate the projects on the basis of collecting rents which would be applied toward repayment of the loans obtained to construct the projects. Under this plan of loans and ownership and operation by local housing authorities, there will be local responsibility and a greater assurance that the Government will recover the funds expended for defense housing.

5. PROTECTION AGAINST DEMORALIZATION OF REAL-ESTATE MARKET

By the use of local housing authorities and the U. S. H. A., it will be possible to avoid glutting the real-estate market after the emergency, which would otherwise result from the unloading of housing for rental or sale to those whom private industry can and should serve Instead, under this amendment, projects initiated during the emergency would be transformed through the medium of the local housing authorities and the U. S. H. A. into projects for the rehousing of slum dwellers once the emergency is over. By making the projects available to slum dwellers whom private industry cannot serve, local housing authorities and U. S. H. A. will be protecting private industry from disastrous competition and would avoid the demoralization of real-estate markets at a time when their protection will be most important.

In conclusion, I call attention to the testimony of Mr. John M. Carmody, former administrator of the Federal Works Agency, now a member of the Maritime Commission, before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds presented on Friday, July 11, 1941, reported at page 54 of the Report of Hearings on the pending appropriation. Mr. Carmody is well known for his integrity and candor. He said:

Then we have the United States Housing Authority—U. S. H. A.—a constituent unit of the Federal Works Agency. They have built housing projects in approximately 200 cities in the United States. And they have relationships with local officials and local housing authorities. These local housing authorities are made up of businessmen or professional men, and in some cases local officers. They know a good deal about their needs.

In all fairness, I might state that he also went on to pay tribute to the Public Buildings Administration, but, as he pointed out, this agency—

has to do with the management of post offices and courthouses and public buildings all over the United States.

We must not lose sight of the fact that here we are dealing not with construction of office buildings but with the construction of low-cost defense housing. The United States Housing Authority and the local housing authorities are geared to handle this type of job. We must not lose time in turning the job over to an agency which, while performing splendid service in its field, would have to be geared for this new job. Time is of the essence. Let us make the best use of our existing agencies today. This is no time to risk the inefficiency that is inherent in gearing an existing agency for a job to which it is not accustomed, particularly when an agency exists properly geared and ready to go into action on a moment's notice.

I wish to make it clear to the House, just as I have made it clear to my committee, that I shall vote for this bill, regardless of the fate of my amendment, as I am fully aware of the critical need for defense housing in our defense areas, including the greater Baltimore area.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been agreed by all, including the Administrator of the agency to which my distinguished colleague from Maryland refers, that there should be one central agency looking after this construction. We have provided in the committee bill for the one we think is the correct one, and I think that meets with the approval of the House. I ask for a vote on the amendment, and I hope it will not carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 6, line 1, after "shall" strike out "so far as may be practicable."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I read from page 5 of the bill:

Consultation shall be had with local public officials and local housing authorities to the end that projects constructed under the provisions of this act shall, so far as may be practicable, conform in location and design to local planning and tradition.

In my amendment I am striking out the words "so far as may be practicable"; in other words, it will force those in charge of Federal Housing to take into consideration the local people and make the buildings conform in design to local planning and tradition. I leave it to your vote.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Does the gentleman believe the Federal Government should be hamstrung by the provisions of some local city council in constructing houses in these defense areas, so that the houses might not be suitable for the workers?

Mr. McGREGOR. Using the gentleman's word "hamstrung," may I say that if we would hamstring the Federal Government more and give more self-control to the local people, we would be better off.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, merely to say that I think the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] answered the argument for this amendment in his remarks in opposition to it. I adopt those remarks as my own, and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take occasion to address the House at this time rather than force this body into a record vote on this bill; I have that strong feeling from my experiences.

I went through the World War period and had a good bit of experience in seeing a great many of the units of housing, and so forth, that were erected by the Federal Government. I am not in sympathy with the philosophy of having the Government of the United States go into every community and undertake to build houses for men who go there to fill jobs. We have the Tolan committee, which set out to find the reasons why people migrate to different communities in order to find jobs, and now we find ourselves with that committee finding out why men go to communities where they have jobs.

Mr. Lamb, investigator for the Tolan committee; Mr. Palmer, of the Defense Housing Authority; Mr. Truesdale and Mr. Houser, representatives of the Alley Dwelling Authority, and unit after unit went before the Bureau of the Census to have the Bureau of the Census go to the W. P. A. Administrator to attempt to get $56,983 this year to take another census of housing and of the increased population in the city of Washington and the surrounding counties in Virginia and Maryland, 1 year after it was covered in the sixteenth decennial census. This was nothing less than furtherance of an ambitious program, to feather the nests and promote the policies those gentlemen were advocating and advancing to perpetuate their own employment.

Howard Hunter, of the W. P. A., refused the money. We have developed the situation in hearings on a bill under consideration in the Committee on the Census.

Finding myself in opposition to this legislation, rather than ask for a record vote, I asked for this time in order to record myself against the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that one of the amendments with reference to community facilities is a new section, I ask unanimous consent that the sections following that be properly renumbered in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BEAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," pursuant to House Resolution 382, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 6135 and House Resolution 386 with reference to housing facilities in defense areas be laid on the table, in view of the fact that the provision therein contained was incorporated in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and any other Members who may desire to do so may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM IN RELATION TO SMALL BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 384) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294 incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national-defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $20,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, attorneys, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of

the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution (H. Res. 385) by direction of the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That further expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 188, and House Resolution 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional $15,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution which I received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from a local paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mrs. J. W. Kirchhoff, Jr., the wife of the past commander of the Shoemaker Post, American Legion, Bridgeton, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and any other special orders, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein certain statistics from the F. S. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of certain facts in respect to 4–H Club work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution of the Northern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects in connection with defense housing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, after conferring with Mr. Max Singer, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am introducing this bill which they have suggested and with which I am heartily in accord. On September 16, 1940, this Government provided for the induction of millions of our young men into the armed forces of the United States. On October 8, 1940, we provided, in Public Act No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, for the issuance of national life insurance to these men. It is not necessary to remind this body that prior to the dastardly and treacherous action of the Imperial Japanese Government, on December 7, 1941, many Americans failed to realize the imminent danger to our country, and that many in the armed forces were among them. Feeling, as they did, that they would be required to serve for only a short time not more than about one-third applied for this insurance. We are now at war. This bill proposes to extend the time limit for application for United States national life insurance for 120 days, and it further proposes to grant, as a small measure of gratitude to the dependents of those brave men who were victims of the undeclared war of the European members of the Axis, especially those men on the U. S. S. *Kearney*, torpedoed on October 17, and the U. S. S. *Reuben James*, sunk on October 31, the same type of automatic insurance as was provided by the Congress on October 6, 1917, for members of our armed forces, and/or dependents of the crew of the *Cyclops* prior to the formal declaration of a state of war in 1917. These men gave their lives for their country, in combat with the most powerful enemy ever to challenge the United States. For the dependents of our heroic dead, this bill provides a small measure of justice to the dependents of these dead. It affords an opportunity for the living members of our armed forces, regardless of their present physical condition, to take advantage of the insurance benefits offered them; and let it be remembered, that if they are physically sound to fight, they are entitled to a presumption that they qualify physically, mentally, and morally as insurance risks. We are at war and they are our national insurance. They will not let us down; we cannot let them down.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] may have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a declaration of the International Workers Order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I secured unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD the annual address of the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, delivered at Chicago on Tuesday. I am apprised that it is one page in excess of the space permitted and that the cost of publication will be $135. I therefore ask unanimous consent for leave to so extend my remarks notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I say for the information of the House that it is our expectation to have the conference report upon the third supplemental defense bill ready to present to the House on Monday. And in response to inquiries from Members, I am glad to say also that, so far as we know at this time, the Committee on Appropriations will have no further business to bring before the House until after the holidays.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. FULMER, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. HOPE.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know many Members, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], have been interested in finding out the program for disabled men and women of the present World War. I would like to report, after consultation with General

Hines, that the board of hospitalization has that very much in mind; there are a number of available beds today in veterans' facilities, and he will ask for a larger appropriation in order to provide more beds in January.

I know the House is very glad to have that information. Tomorrow I will give a statement to the House regarding certain pending bills for wartime compensation for disabilities incurred in line of duty.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. For the information of the gentlewoman, I introduced such a bill in the House several weeks ago, and it is now being considered by the Veterans' Committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but the veterans cannot immediately avail themselves of the provisions of your bill. I am glad for the gentleman's interest. I know we all are.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is entitled to recognition for 30 minutes.

THE BIRTH OF INDIANA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that Indiana is 125 years old today. Our State was born on December 11, 1816, when an act of Congress admitting Indiana to the sisterhood of States was signed by the President.

The advancement of our people toward the cherished goal of statehood was painfully slow, due to the long time consumed in meeting the population requirements. The ordinance of Congress for the government of Indiana Territory had provided that—

> When there shall be 60,000 free inhabitants therein, this Territory shall be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States.

The census taken by authority of the Territorial legislature in 1815 showed that the number of free white inhabitants of the Territory was then 63,897, or more than the required number specified in the ordinance of Congress. Meeting in the old State capitol in Corydon on the first Monday in December 1815, the Territorial legislature adopted a memorial to Congress, praying the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled to order an election to be held in the several counties of Indiana Territory on the first Monday in May 1816 to select delegates to a convention to meet at Corydon, the seat of Territorial government, on June 10, 1816, to decide whether it was expedient to form a State government; and if so, to prepare and adopt a State constitution. The memorial was sent to Jonathan Jennings, the Territorial Delegate then in Washington; and pursuant thereto, Congress, on April 19, 1816, passed an enabling act empowering the people of Indiana Territory to adopt a constitution and otherwise prepare for statehood.

The convention that framed the original constitution of Indiana met at Corydon on June 10, 1816, and completed its deliberations on June 29. Then there were 13 counties in Indiana, now there are 92. All 13 were represented by a total of 43 delegates. They were hardy pioneers, without education and polish, but for the most part sound thinkers and deeply consecrated to the important task assigned to them. The old State capitol building, which is still well preserved, was hot and stuffy and restricted in its space accommodations, and on extremely warm days the sessions of the convention were held under the spreading canopy of a nearby gigantic elm which is still standing and which is known in Indiana legends and history as the constitutional elm. The first act of the convention was to adopt an ordinance of acceptance, in which it was said:

> That we do, for ourselves and our posterity, agree, determine, declare, and ordain that we will and do hereby accept the proposition of the Congress of the United States.

THE PRINCIPLES OF LIBERTY

Then our Hoosier forefathers proceeded with the details of drafting the first Constitution of Indiana. The first article they adopted breathes the spirit of men who were determined under any and all circumstances to be free. It reads as follows:

> That the general great and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and unalterably established, we declare that all men are born free and independent and have certain natural, inherent, and inalienable rights, among which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty and of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

THE SLAVERY ISSUE

The great, outstanding, absorbing issue before the convention was whether Indiana should come into the Union slave or free. Beside it, all other issues paled into insignificance. It was the one paramount question before the people, discussed and debated in every settlement and every log-cabin home.

The slavery pronouncement finally agreed upon was as follows:

> There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in this State, otherwise than for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.

Describing the fervor created over this issue Jacob Piatt Dunn in his History of Indiana—1905—says:

> Naturally the interest of the people was absorbed in the convention. It was the great event of the period. But, more than all else, they were anxious to know just what would be done in regard to slavery. An estimable lady of Lawrenceburg, who preserves her faculties unimpaired at the advanced age of 85 years, informs me that she remembers clearly the day when the news of the final action reached that place and that the message which passed from mouth to mouth was, "She has come in free! She has come in free!"
>
> Other matters were not of so much importance and there was a quiet faith that they had been properly cared for.

The constitution that was finally adopted may have been crude in some respects but it served the needs of the times very well and on the whole was an example of practical wisdom. It laid the foundation for a system of education ranging from primary schools to a State university and for the spreading of knowledge through libraries. The Congress of the United States saw nothing in the document that was objectionable or inharmonious with the spirit of our institutions. It was favorably received by Congress and Indiana proceeded toward statehood as rapidly as the slow-moving, congressional machinery could function, and 125 years ago today the process of her admission was completed.

AMAZING GROWTH OF POPULATION

From a population of 63,897 at the time of her admission to the Union, Indiana has grown until it has a population of 3,427,796, as shown by the 1940 census. At the time of Indiana's admission there was not a town of 2,000 in the Territory, and the site of the present State capital—the great city of Indianapolis, which for 13 years I have had the honor to represent in Congress—was covered by an unbroken forest. Now the capital city has more than 6 times as many people as the entire Territory had in 1816 when it was admitted as the nineteenth State of the Union.

It is not my purpose to yield to the impulse of a native-born to wax eloquent in describing the great strides which Indiana has made since she donned the robes of statehood. No glorification is needed to prove that she stands out as one of the brightest gems in the diadem of States, for she speaks for herself. She is the heart of the continent, the cross roads of America. The fact that for decades she has had in her borders the center of population shows that she is close to where the country's heart throbs. Her Americanism is pure and crystal clear, free from the slightest taint of corroding foreign ideology. In respect to our foreign relations she asks nothing more than that our country shall forever maintain its traditional role of a good neighbor and as far as possible keep out of foreign entanglements.

To those of us who live in Indiana, it seems that the skies are brighter, the air is balmier, the camaradiere is warmer and more genuine in Hoosierland than in any other State of the Union.

MY HUMBLE TRIBUTE TO THE INDIANA PIONEERS

But it was not to boast of our resources, enormous as they are, or to mention the patriotism of our sons of Indiana which has been demonstrated on every battlefield of every war in which our country has engaged; or to extol the genuineness of our people, fine and warmhearted as they are, that I sought time to speak today, but my main purpose in rising to my feet was to pay my sincere and humble tribute to the pioneers of Indiana, who made our State what it is today. In Indianapolis, we have many fine examples of monuments and statuary that commemorate virtuous accomplishments and heroic deeds of the State's distinguished sons. To these I would add another, and I hope our legislature will some time make an appropriation to create it.

STATUE SUGGESTED TO HONOR PIONEERS

I would place in the most prominent spot on the front plaza of our State

capitol at Indianapolis a statue of the Indiana pioneer, showing him just as he was, in hickory shirt and overalls and with all of his rugged characteristics. I would hope that the artist who molds the statue might be able to catch and put into enduring bronze the fortitude, the strength of mind and character that made the Indiana pioneer a great servant of mankind in a vital and picturesque stage of our progressive civilization that has vanished from the earth and on which God has closed the books forever.

My own experience is deeply rooted in the pioneer life of Indiana. My earliest and most affectionate recollections are centered there. Through the mists of years I can see the old log cabin in Fayette County, Ind., where I was born, surrounded by stately forests of oak and poplars and beeches and sugar trees and the beautiful wild flowers that everywhere blanketed the earth in spring and summertime, all combining to make a panorama of supreme primeval loveliness. The golden strands of memory lead me back to the little country graveyard in Indiana where my beloved father and mother sleep. My mother was born 17 years, and my father 21 years, after Indiana was admitted to statehood. They did their worthy part in conquering the wilderness and set for those who came after them a noble example of courage and devotion. No better people ever lived than my father and mother. God bless their memory!

And what can be said of them can be said generally of the pioneers of Indiana. Fine as my parents were, true as they were, genuine as they were, they typified the Indiana pioneer spirit, the indomitable spirit of those brave souls who tackled the hardships of the frontiers with songs in their hearts, who knew not the meaning of defeat, who never faltered or became faint-hearted, as they faced with courage and determination the problems of their time, laying deep and strong the foundations of our matchless Commonwealth.

SARAH T. BOLTON'S POEM A CAMEO OF LITERATURE

As one who first saw the light of day in Indiana at a time when the wilderness was more a fact than a memory; who grew from a toddling babe to manhood's estate within her borders, and who hopes to find a resting place in her loving bosom when I die, may I venture the opinion that among all of the encomiums that have been showered by tongue or pen on Indiana, the most inspiring and beautiful is that of Sarah T. Bolton—

Though many laud Italia's clime
And call Helvetia's land sublime,
Tell Gallia's praise in prose and rhyme,
And worship old Hispania;
The winds of heaven never fanned,
The circling sunlight never spanned
The borders of a better land
Than our own Indiana.

GOVERNOR SCHRICKER'S LETTER

Today the Governor of Indiana and many distinguished citizens of our State are meeting under the old elm tree at Corydon where the birth pains of the State of Indiana occurred 125 years ago and by appropriate ceremonies they are celebrating the events that marked the beginning of our Commonwealth. In recognition of the fact that Congress by its enabling act and its act of admission made it possible for Indiana to enter the Union our Governor has sent me a letter with permission to read it to you my colleagues in Congress today as an addition to my remarks. It is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *November 27, 1941*
The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am happy to write you as our Representative from the Twelfth Indiana District and dean of the Indiana congressional delegation for the purpose of calling attention to the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of Indiana's statehood. By congressional and Presidential approval on December 11, 1816, Indiana was formally declared a member of our great family of commonwealths as the nineteenth State. Consequently, on December 11, 1941, we shall celebrate our one hundred and twenty-fifth birthday. I think it would be very fitting for you to call the attention of the National Congress to the significance of this historical event.

The admission of Indiana into the Union was the climax of 16 glorious years of territorial preparation. When Indiana Territory was formed in 1800, with young William Henry Harrison as the first Governor, the fair name of Indiana covered about four-fifths of the old Northwest—the heart of America. By progressive steps during territorial days, Indiana was formed with its present boundaries as the heart of the old Northwest.

The story of the formation of our first constitution in the summer of 1816 is a graphic drama of the progress of constitutional government. Forty-three delegates, elected from our 13 counties, prepared this constitution at the new territorial capital of Corydon. Some of them wore buckskin and carried rifles. As worthy exponents of the rugged young democracy they were chosen to represent they did their work well—and promptly. They were in session just 19 days—June 10 to June 29, 1816. Some of their meetings were held in the Capitol and some under our famous old constitution elm. The old stone capitol has been restored as a treasured memorial unit, and the trunk of the old elm tree is being faithfully preserved. Appropriate ceremonies will be observed at these historic sites on the coming anniversary.

I am sure that all America will felicitate us upon this celebration of our birth and progress as a State. We are applauding modestly the pure and simple democracy of the organic instrument by which our statehood was effected. I feel justified in quoting the following significant expression of one of our Hoosier historians, Dr. Logan Esarey, concerning our first constitution:

"The most notable innovation in the Indiana Constitution was article IX, dealing with the subject of education. It has been noted that all the material differences between the Indiana and other constitutions were in favor of a wider democracy. Ohio had taken a short, halting step in the direction of public education, but the Indiana convention is entitled to the distinction of having first recognized the governmental obligation of educating all its citizens. Of all the sections of the constitution the one requiring that the general assembly provide by law for a general system of education, ascending in a regular scale from township schools to a State university, wherein tuition shall be gratis and equally open to all, was most democratic and forward looking."

We rejoice in the fact that Indiana has sustained ably for a century and a quarter all of its high traditions in the promotion of free public education along with all other essentials of true democracy. I feel that special tribute should be paid to the then rising young statesman, that stalwart champion of freedom and democracy, Jonathan Jennings, who presided over the constitutional convention and became the first Governor of our new State. He served America well, both as our first Hoosier Governor and as a Member of the National Congress, ever championing the cause of better education and truer freedom.

Indiana is fittingly recognized throughout the world today as the crossroads of America—a genuine domain of democracy and a strategic stronghold both in war and peace. It is no accident that the State of Indiana is at this time the fitting center of our national-defense program. At the same time we are proud of what we have done and are now doing to memorialize our outstanding accomplishments in peace as well as in war.

Indiana is today the stage of two memorial movements of national interest—the New Harmony shrine to idealism and the President Benjamin Harrison memorial to a great Hoosier President and a famous family—the Harrisons—that has furnished 10 generations of patriotic American leaders, including two Presidents.

Assuring you that your loyal constituents, together with all other admiring Hoosiers, will appreciate whatever comment you may see fit to make before the National Congress upon the happy associations connected with our one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversay, I am,

Yours very truly,
HENRY F. SCHRICKER,
Governor of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks a letter from the Governor of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. OSMERS (at the request of Mr. EATON), indefinitely.

To Mr. BATES of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. CHAPMAN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KIRWAN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY), 3 days on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 217. An act to authorize the town of Jupiter, Fla., to lease certain land patented to such town pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 673. An act authorizing the conveyance to Sandoval County, N. Mex., of the public land comprising part of the site of the county courthouse; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 828. An act to increase the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State of Idaho for educational purposes by the act of July 3, 1890; to the Committee on the Territories.

S. 950. An act for the relief of Dora Thompson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1240. An act designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1412. An act to amend the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1630. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1850. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps to accept such medals, orders, decorations, and presents as have been tendered them by governments of the Western Hemisphere, other than Canada; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1927. An act to reserve certain public lands in California for the benefit of the Manchester Band of Pomo Indians of the Manchester Rancheria; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1943. An act to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to Thomas Orgo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1957. An act to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1961. An act to eliminate the prohibition against the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1974. An act for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1995. An act to amend the act approved June 23, 1938, entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2011. An act for the relief of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2026. An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2028. An act to amend section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), so as to transfer the administration of the naval supply depot, Oakland, to the commandant, twelfth naval district; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2032. An act to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2047. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2090. An act to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to such other persons as may be specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 527. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 529. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 2297. An act to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions;

H. R. 2799. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

H. R. 3149. An act providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty;

H. R. 4495. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 4854. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 4871. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4993. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida;

H. R. 5074. An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5377. An act to amend section 11, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5476. An act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5509. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase or accept as gifts motorboats, yachts, and similar vessels for Coast Guard use;

H. R. 5694. An act to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization;

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1248, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.;

S. 2093. An act to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. A resolution removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States";

S. J. Res. 119. A resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same; and

S. J. Res. 120. A resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 12, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1154. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1155. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 26, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Waccamaw River, N. C. and S. C., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1156. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 4, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel or channels across Padre Island, Tex., from Laguna Madre to the Gulf of Mexico, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1157. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 26, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of the Arkansas River and tributaries, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, water power, or irrigation, and particularly with a view to constructing dams on the upper section of the South Canadian River, N. Mex., Tex., and Okla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 15, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1158. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey on the watershed of Codorus Creek, Pa. and Md.,

a tributary of the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 386. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6135, a bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1494). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6208. A bill to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 384. Resolution providing the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Joint Resolution 294 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1496). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 385. Resolution providing the expenses of continuing the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 128, and House Resolution 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6206. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. R. 6207. A bill to amend section 2405 of the Revenue Act of 1941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6208. A bill to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6209. A bill to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 6210. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances Beach Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 6211. A bill for the relief of Abraham Sperak; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 6212. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary Fortune, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 6213. A bill for the relief of Ray L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 6214. A bill for the relief of John Henry McVey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1941

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Most Merciful and Compassionate Father, from whom nothing can be hidden, for Thou dost read our inmost thoughts: Enable us to put off all pretense so that from henceforth we may live a life of freedom and sincerity. In these solemn days of national trial, do Thou make known to us the blessedness of service, the joy of those who bear the Cross that others' lives may be enriched. Redeem the days that we have wasted, lift from our hearts the burden of our mistakes, and reveal to us the true meaning of the life we have so nearly lost, that, by Thy Grace which doth renew the souls of men, we may be comforted and gladdened as we face the future.

May we feel a Hand in ours, may we find a Companion on the weary way, and as we are led through the deeps of our own nature past the gateways of our thought, grant that in gazing upon the Face of the Eternal, we may never fear the face of man. And, finally, we ask Thee to preserve us from all evil, now and forevermore, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 11, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

On December 11, 1941, at 3:05 p. m., E. S. T.:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

On December 11, 1941, at 3:06 p. m., E. S. T.:

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FULMER, Mr. FLANNAGAN, and Mr. HOPE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4854. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 5074. An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barbour	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Herring	Schwartz
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smathers
Brooks	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bunker	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CAPT. COLIN KELLY, JR., FIRST HERO OF THE WAR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the first casualty list reported that among those who gave their lives in the present struggle with Japan was a young man by the name of Colin Kelly, Jr., of Tampa, Fla., a member of the Air Corps who lost his life at Pearl Harbor.

Today the United Press carried a story of commendation as follows:

FIRST HERO OF WAR—SANK JAP BATTLESHIP

MANILA, December 12.—Army Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., became America's first hero of the second World War today.

He gave his life in diving in close over the 29,330-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* off Luzon to send it and its crew of 1,200 to 1,500 men to the bottom. He scored.

Kelly was 26, a native of Florida. He graduated from the University of Florida and then went to West Point, from which he graduated 4 years ago.

In 1938 he finished the primary flying school of the Army and the advanced flying school bombardment course in 1939.

He was accepted as a combat pilot in September 1940, and served in Hawaii until he was assigned to the Philippines.

This elicited the following commendation from Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander of the Far Eastern Army. I quote what appears in a Manila dispatch dated December 12, which appears in the Evening Star, as follows:

General MacArthur announced with great sorrow the death of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., who so distinguished himself by scoring three direct hits on the Japanese capital battleship *Haruna*, leaving her in flames and in distress.

Mr. President, we could say nothing that would more highly express our sympathy for those who sorrow for the passing of their loved ones than to paraphrase the words of the Scripture, and say that they fought the good fight of a soldier's faith, they have gone to lay hold on life eternal, whereunto their God and their country have called them.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a few days ago, when I was unavoidably absent from the Senate, a number of my distinguished colleagues paid merited tribute to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on the occasion of his having completed 30 years of service in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. I very deeply regret that I did not then have an opportunity briefly to express some of my impressions as to the individual attainments of the Senator from Tennessee and the character of the distinguished service he has rendered his country in these two bodies.

I regard the senior Senator from Tennessee as possessing courage of a very high order. According to my estimate of public service, courage is the finest quality that a public servant can possess. A great many men possess ability; but if a man does not have the courage to pursue the course his ability dictates, the value of his service is greatly decreased.

In addition to the fine public service the Senator from Tennessee rendered in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and which all men know from the record, it was my peculiar privilege at one time to live with Senator MCKELLAR and share an apartment with him. I thus came to know him not alone on the floor of the Senate but in those intimate personal relationships which are frequently more revealing than the floodlight which constantly beats down upon the head of an eminent Senator such as the Senator from Tennessee.

I happen to know something of the high and affectionate regard in which he is held by the people of the State of Tennessee. On numerous occasions I have visited that Commonwealth, and I know that there is no living man who even approximates the political strength, the wide support, the deep confidence that the people of Tennessee have in Senator MCKELLAR. I realize that in all those respects the people of Tennessee are eminently correct.

I desire to say that I entertain for the senior Senator from Tennessee a very keen personal affection. I know no one on the floor of the Senate for whom I have a higher personal regard.

I could say many other things that would be vindicated by the record and by the facts; but I shall content myself with the statement that the 30 years during which the senior Senator from Tennessee has served the Commonwealth of Tennessee and the people of the United States in the House of Representatives and in the Senate have been years filled with usefulness, ornamented by brilliant achievements, strengthened and steadied by persistent and careful regard to his high duty as a Senator and by devotion to the interests and the noblest and loftiest aspirations of his great constituency.

JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

On December 11, 1941, the Vice President signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States," which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CABLEGRAMS FROM PAN AMERICAN REPUBLICS IN RESPECT TO THE EXISTING WAR SITUATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram signed by the President of the House of Representatives of Peru, stating that that House had adopted a resolution reaffirming American solidarity, condemning the Japanese aggression, and giving their pledge of keeping promises made at the Habana and Lima Pan American conferences, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a cablegram signed by the President and Secretary of the House of Representatives of Uruguay, stating that that body, by unanimous vote, had approved a resolution expressing to the United States Congress its deepest sentiments of solidarity, its sympathy with the American Government and the American people at this time when the United States has become involved in war in the defense of its great destiny and that of the Western Hemisphere, by unprovoked aggression in violation of the principles of international law, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a cablegram signed by the President and Secretary of the Senate of the Republic of Uruguay, expressing on behalf of that body to the American Senate its condemnation of the aggression which has been perpetrated on the United States, and invoking the principles of international justice and humanity, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A telegram from the officers of Major Cramer Auxiliary, United Spanish War Veterans, of Cleveland, Ohio, pledging the loyal support and service of that auxiliary to the Nation in the existing crisis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution by members of Everhart Van Eimeren Post, No. 27, the American Legion, of South Milwaukee, Wis., pledging the support of the post to the successful prosecution of the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

On December 11, 1941, Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 894) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 895).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1047. A bill to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; with amendments (Rept. No. 896).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1889. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the county of Macon, Ala., in a strip of land located at Veterans'

Administration facility, Tuskegee, Ala., without amendment (Rept. No. 897);

S. 2012. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, to the State of Maine for road-widening purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 898);

S. 2080. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 899);

H. R. 4692. A bill relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 900);

H. R. 4787. A bill to provide that the unexplained absence of any ex-service man for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 904);

H. R. 4853. A bill to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 901);

H. R. 4905. A bill to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition; without amendment (Rept. No. 902); and

H. R. 5305. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 903).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 11, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment, those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization;

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard Station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post No. 1248, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.;

S. 2093. An act to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States;"

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same; and

S. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2118. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war; and

S. 2119. A bill to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2120. A bill to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2121. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2122. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2123 (by request). A bill to amend section 606 (c) of the Communications Act for the purpose of including communications by wire; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. LEE introduced Senate bill 2124, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WALSH introduced Senate bill 2125, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to introduce a bill sent me by the Navy Department to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. The importance of the bill, in view of present conditions, will be fully realized when I state what the bill may do in the way of naval expansion.

The bill authorizes an increase of 900,000 tons in the combatant strength of the Navy. It does not specify the categories of ships to be built. Under normal conditions the cost of this program would be approximately $3,000,000,000. Under present conditions the cost probably will be much more. The bill as yet has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

The present authorized strength—not necessarily all under construction—of the Navy in combatant vessels is as follows:

Battleships, 1,045,000 tons.
Aircraft carriers, 454,500 tons.
Cruisers, 899,024 tons.
Destroyers, 478,000 tons.
Submarines, 172,956 tons.
A total of 3,049,480 tons.

The proposal in this bill will provide an increase of 900,000 tons, or approximately 30 percent, to the present authorized strength of the Navy.

No information is available as to the types or kinds of ships which will be constructed if the bill is enacted. Merely for comparison purposes, I will illustrate that under this authority it would be possible to build 7 or 8 45,000-ton battleships, 6 or 7 20,000-ton aircraft carriers, 26 or 27 10,000-ton cruisers, approximately 80 destroyers of 1,800 tons, and approximately 47 submarines of 1,100 tons. Approximately 166 vessels of 900,000 tons will be added to our Navy when this construction is authorized and the Navy is built. The bill has not yet been approved by the Budget and they may reduce the amount as present facilities may necessitate.

I ask permission, out of order, to introduce the bill to which I have referred, and have it referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 2125) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

WALTER M. ANDERSON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1428) for the relief of Walter M. Anderson, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JULIUS YUHASZ AND ARVID OLSON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1055) for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson, which was, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "$4,182.66" and insert "$8,686."

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

C. D. HENDERSON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 904) for the relief of C. D. Henderson, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTOR VEHICLES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him for delivery at the twenty-fifth convention of the Detroit Automobile Club, under the auspices of the American Automobile Association, at the Hotel Statler, Detroit, Mich., in relation to motor vehicles and national defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RALPH MORRIS AT TOMB OF UNKNOWN SOLDIER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Ralph Morris, national councilor, Junior Order United American mechanics, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery, Va., November 9, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO SENATOR BANKHEAD BY AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Montgomery Advertiser of December 11, 1941, relative to the award to Senator Bankhead of the Distinguished Service Medal of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRY AND LABOR IN THE WAR EMERGENCY—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of December 12, 1941, under the headline "To industry and labor," which appears in the Appendix.]

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL-DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6159, making supplemental appropriations for the national defense, and known as the third supplemental national-defense appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendments, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the order to consider committee amendments first was made quite properly, of course, at the request of the able Senator from Tennessee. I observe, however, that the bill has been raised in excess of a billion dollars over the amount approved and passed by the House. I think the Senator should make a general statement concerning the bill, and particularly with reference to the increases.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. President, as the bill came from the House it carried $7,650,041,531. The net increase by the Senate committee was $1,367,809,174. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $9,017,850,705.

The reason for increasing the appropriations is that since the bill was passed by the House, as we all know, three wars have been declared, and the Navy Department and the War Department and some of the other departments have appeared with supplemental estimates for appropriations, and many of which have been allowed. They were allowed to the extent of $1,367,809,174. In addition to that, the Senate granted authority to incur contractual obligations of about $500,000,000 more. I may say, in passing, that these contractual obligations are largely for building airplanes; and I know the Senate will agree that the departments ought to be allowed to incur such obligations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How much of the $9,000,000,000 total is for expenditure during the present fiscal year—all of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. All of it may be expended during the present fiscal year; but there are quite a number of items that are made available to later dates; of course, within the constitutional limitation of 2 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I am trying to contemplate is what the immediate burden is as a result of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is $9,000,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the expenditure is not all to be made during this fiscal year, the immediate burden is not $9,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. All of it is authorized to be expended this year; and, unfortunately, we may have to authorize additional expenditures for this year before the war is over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I am getting at is that we are constantly piling up these authorizations to points that frequently scare people needlessly, because so often a great deal of the authorization is not for current expenditure, and I was trying to get that division of the $9,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nearly all the amount is intended primarily for current expenditure. We have acted on the bill rather rapidly, as the Senator knows; and I shall have to get the exact amount that is to be spent before July 1, 1942, and the amount that may go over.

One of the items provided is $125,000,000 for expediting the production of various war implements, and, of course, that ought to be done. I think every Senator will agree that that should be done.

We also added an amount of $125,000,000 as a contingent fund to be put in the hands of the Chief of Staff. Of course, an accounting for that fund is to be made by the Chief of Staff. It was done during the last war. I do not recall that a similar amount was appropriated, but a fund was furnished during the last war for this purpose, and it is necessary that such provision be made at this time.

We added, in round figures, $221,000,000 to the appropriation for the Quartermaster Corps. That had to be allowed.

We allowed $390,000,000 for the Army for additional construction for the Air Corps.

In the appropriation for the Signal Corps we added $18,085,000.

In the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers we added $110,100,000 for special equipment required in field operations.

Under the Ordnance Department, for the building of all kinds of ordnance, we added the tremendous sum of $1,254,899,000.

The total of these sums for the War Department is $2,248,378,931.

Under the Navy Department, at the request of the President, we added for the naval emergency fund, $40,000,000.

We also added for public works at the navy yard at Boston, Mass., receiving-ship facilities and housing for crews of ships, $1,665,000.

Under the appropriation for the Naval Air Station, New York, for the acquisition of Floyd Bennett Field and the development of aviation facilities, we recommend an appropriation of $18,750,000.

We added $15,000,000 for the naval supply depot at Mechanicsburg, Pa., and that site was selected because of its being a safe site, where supplies could be safely stored.

For temporary and emergency construction we recommend an increase of $300,000,000.

The total under the Navy is $335,415,000.

Under the item for the Bureau of Aeronautics it is recommended that the contract authorization for the production and purchase of new airplanes be increased from $140,000,000, as allowed by the House, to $640,000,000. It must be apparent that the increase is necessary, and I am sure that the Senate will agree that, under the circumstances, we must have the additional planes.

In the Coast Guard appropriation there are several small items, such as that for the Office of the Commandant, $8,755; pay and allowances, $4,285,537; general expenses, $4,785,000; construction of vessels and shore facilities, $8,717,300; establishing and improving aids to navigation, $869,135. We recommend a total increase of $18,665,727.

Then there is a general provision, which it is recommended that the appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, shall be available for the pay and other expenses of not to exceed 50,000 men inducted into the naval service and not to exceed 10,000 men inducted into the Marine Corps under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. This is absolutely necessary in order to give a full complement of men to the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to invite his attention to page 9 of the bill before he starts on a new title?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. In lines 2 and 3, on page 9, we find that the committee has amended the bill to provide "for all expenses incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners of war," and, notably, "other persons in Army custody whose status is determined by the Secretary of War to be similar to prisoners of war." That is new language, apparently, and I should like to have the Senator explain what other class of persons there may be in Army custody whose status is similar to that of prisoners of war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Enemies who are found in this country are taken up by the Army, and they have to be provided for. It was testified that at times it was very necessary to arrest civilians and to provide for their care.

Mr. DANAHER. I have not the slightest doubt that it is necessary. Is there existing law under which they are at present being taken up by the Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Army did not want to take a chance about it.

Mr. DANAHER. Is there any existing law under which such persons are today being taken up by the Army and being held as prisoners?

Mr. McKELLAR. The advice to the committee was that there is not, and in order to make it absolutely sure the committee thought there should be such a provision, and this provision was inserted. I am quite sure the Senator will, under the circumstances, agree that it should be included in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I have not the slightest question that it is absolutely necessary that certain classes of persons be taken up, not allowed to roam at large to our detriment. There is no question as to that. All I wish to know is where authority to do that is found in the law. Is their status defined? Under what circumstances may they be taken up? If there be no such authorization anywhere, then I think we should very promptly and properly direct our attention to such a field. We certainly are not going to authorize it merely by providing in an appropriation bill for an allotment of money to be paid after they are taken up.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator misunderstands me. The appropriation is not to pay for their being taken up, but it is to maintain them and to keep them safely after they are taken up, by whatever authority, that this appropriation is recommended.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator feels he is quite correct in saying that up to now there is no authorization provided by statute for their being taken up by the Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no authorization for taking care of them and feeding them and imprisoning them, and no place to imprison them, as I understand.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The next item was one of $135,000, which the Federal Power Commission desired for national-defense activities. The committee was of the opinion that it should be allowed, and it was allowed.

The next item is for "Sites for and construction of general office buildings, Washington, D. C., $25,000,000." That was inserted at the request of Mr. Reynolds, of the Federal Works Agency. He stated, and the committee thought the facts justified his statement, that there is a very great dearth of office space in this city. Many thousands of people are coming in all the time, and it is absolutely necessary to have more space. The authorities hope they can locate some of the offices farther out, and aid the situation in that way. At any rate, $25,000,000 was recommended for that purpose.

The next item deals with the Tennessee Valley Authority. For Holston River Dam, $10,000,000; for Watauga River Dam, $10,000,000; and for completion of steam plant at Sheffield, Ala., $4,000,000, or a total for the Tennessee Valley Authority of $24,000,000.

This item was put in the bill for the purpose of affording the necessary electricity for the T. V. A. and to enable the Government to make aluminum. The proof submitted was that two of these dams could be completed early in 1943, and the committee so believes. Therefore, this item was put in the bill.

The grand total for independent agencies is $49,135,000.

There are several items in the bill covering the District of Columbia: For Administrator of Rent Control, $22,570; for the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, $7,700; for street improvements, $1,911,000; for Washington Aqueduct, additional amount for construction of a covered reservoir, $130,000—making a total for the District of Columbia of $2,071,270.

The next item deals with the Department of Commerce. For the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics there are three separate items: For technical development, $223,702; for establishment of air navigation facilities, $7,792,290; and for landing areas, $9,115,300. Total for the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $17,131,292. The committee thought those items should be allowed, and they were allowed.

To the Weather Bureau, for observations, warnings, and general weather service, $325,300, to be spent principally in Alaska.

The total amount for the Department of Commerce is $17,456,592.

Next we come to the Interior Department. For the Bureau of Indian Affairs for suppressing contagious disease of livestock on Indian reservations, $150,000. Many horses on Indian reservations are afflicted with very dangerous diseases and will have to be killed.

Under the Bureau of Reclamation there is an item for the Boulder Canyon project of $150,000, and for the Boise project, Idaho, an item of $2,500,000.

The next item is for the Bureau of Mines. For manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research, $578,000, and for investigation and research on processes for production of potassium carbonate and sodium carbonate from trona and wyomingite rock, $77,400.

The total for the Department of the Interior is $3,455,400.

Next we come to the Department of Justice. For the special national-defense unit in that department, salaries and expenses, there is an item of $180,000, and for Immigration and Naturalization Service, for salaries and expenses, $1,100,000. The total for the Department of Justice is $1,280,000.

War Department—Civil functions. Corps of Engineers. Flood control, general. For Bluestone reservoir, $2,150,000. For Center Hill and Dale Hollow reservoirs, Cumberland River, $4,000,000. For Markham Ferry, Okla., $1,500,000. For Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla., $300,000. Total, War Department—Civil functions, $7,950,000. All of this appropriation is to be used to increase the electric output of the country.

The total increase is $2,924,305,420.

On the last page of the report will be found certain decreases. Under Defense aid—title III, it will be found that there is a decrease of $830,507,246 made with respect to ordnance and ordnance stores. With respect to tanks, armored cars, automobiles, and so forth, there is a decrease of $583,139,000. There is a decrease with respect to miscellaneous military and naval equipment of $17,850,000, and with respect to facilities and equipment, there is a decrease of $125,000,000. The total decrease, under Defense aid—title III, is $1,556,496,246.

I should like to state to the Senate the reason for this decrease, and what I shall now say will about end what I wish to say with respect to the measure unless questions are asked, which I shall be glad to answer. The House divided items known as lend-lease items from the general appropriations, but the War Department and the Navy Department both pointed out that when items were set aside for lend-lease purposes they could not be used for any other purposes, but if they were put in the general fund they could be used indiscriminately for both lend-lease purposes and for home-defense purposes. In the opinion of the committee, especially in view of the war, it was felt that that power ought to be left in the Army and Navy and in the other departments, and that an accounting be kept, and it was so provided in the bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wish to interrogate the Senator with reference to an item appearing at the bottom of page 11 and at the top of page 12 in connection with which an appropriation of $18,750,000 is provided for the development of aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories, and the acquisition of Floyd Bennett Field in New York. The Naval Affairs Committee yesterday considered and today favorably reported a measure providing for the authorization of $310,000,000, and included therein is the sum of $10,000,000 for the acquisition of this particular field, and the construction thereon of certain facilities. Under what authorization is the appropriation of $18,750,000 made in the pending measure for the same purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. We have a budget estimate for it, in the first place, and in the second place it was made perfectly clear to the committee that that field was necessary for the defense of that section of the Nation. Inasmuch as the New York Harbor is so important the committee felt that that work ought to be begun at the earliest possible moment. For that reason the item was placed in the bill and, of course, if it is kept in the bill it should be eliminated from the bill to which the Senator from Iowa referred.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; there ought not to be a duplication.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; there must not be a duplication.

Mr. GILLETTE. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee in his preliminary statement covered the point, but will the Senator give to the Senate information with respect to the necessity for the providing of an executive assistant to each Senator at a salary of $4,500 a year?

Mr. McKELLAR. That provision was offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], as I recall. It is contained in the bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. The bill contains a provision for the appointment of an executive assistant to each Senator, at the rate of $4,500 per year?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. But that is merely for the period of the war.

Mr. GILLETTE. For each Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; during the war.

Mr. GILLETTE. Was any information presented to the committee—of course there must have been—to justify such an expenditure?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that any evidence was produced on the subject, except the evidence given by Senators who themselves came before the committee. Some of them said that, with the vast volume of business now arising in their offices, an absolute necessity existed for such executive assistants, and the item was placed in the bill as representing a real necessity.

SPECIAL EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT FOR SENATORS

Mr. WALSH and Mr. LUCAS addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. With reference to the subject matter of the inquiry made by the Senator from Iowa I should like to have Senators representing the Appropriations Committee state to the Senate how, in view of widespread appeals throughout this country for cutting down expenditures for nondefense purposes, the committee feels justified in recommending the appointment of an additional clerk for each Senator at the rate of $4,500 per year. It seems to me such action will be treated by the public as a repudiation of any attempt at reduction of expenditures for nondefense purposes. If we are to set the example for cutting down appropriations for nondefense purposes there may be a necessary reduction of personnel and salaries. It is now proposed that we appropriate for ourselves—and, of course, the House will follow—a large sum of money to pay salaries greater than those which any of us now pay to any clerks. It is proposed to furnish an executive assistant for each of us, whether we need him or not. I need additional clerks as much as does any other Senator, but I do not need the assistant suggested at $4,500. I wish to protest it in the name of the taxpayers of the country, who want us to confine our expenditures to national defense, and to the purposes of waging the war. The war will add many more burdens to all of us, but it will also bring burdens and sacrifices to all our people, including especially the enlisted personnel in the Army and Navy, who will make tremendous sacrifices, involving health, wages, and even life.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amount involved in dollars and cents for the remainder of the present fiscal year is $216,000. I did not initiate the proposal. It was argued and debated in the committee, and the committee was of the opinion that it ought to be allowed. A majority voted for it, and it is reported to the Senate for its consideration.

Let me say in further reply to the Senator that I agree with him that nondefense items should be cut down to the greatest degree possible. The Vice President was good enough to appoint me on a committee for that purpose. That committee is holding hearings almost daily. It is presided over by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and we are making every effort toward that end. I believe that the Senate and the country will approve the findings of that committee. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts will do so.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator states that the appropriation to cover this item for the remainder of the fiscal year would be $216,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be twice that much for a year.

Mr. WALSH. And for how many years?

Mr. McKELLAR. Only during the emergency.

Mr. WALSH. I merely wish to register my protest.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I rise to discuss this amendment. I greatly regret that I must disagree with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts on this question. I am not in accord with the way in which the amendment is worded. However, Mr. President, I come from a large State. As many Senators know, for a considerable time there has been a movement on foot to obtain more help for Senators from the larger States, who have to handle an unusual volume of correspondence through their offices. I am not in favor of paying one assistant $4,500 per year. I do not want a $4,500 assistant. I should like to see the amendment changed so that a Senator would have the right to employ executive assistants—if that is the correct term—to the extent of not to exceed $4,500 a year. Perhaps we could get along with $4,000, or even $3,600. If we are to keep up with the people back in our States, I think we should be able to employ additional clerks to do the necessary routine work in our offices.

At the present time, Mr. President, I am receiving thousands of letters which I cannot answer because I have not the personnel in my office to do so. As a matter of fairness to Senators from the larger States, it seems to me that they are entitled to some relief in handling the correspondence which comes to their offices. There is not a day that my office is not filled with people from the city of Chicago and other parts of Illinois, discussing priorities, defense contracts, and even the mere question of how to get into one of the departments to ascertain to whom they might talk in the effort to obtain a little relief.

I am very serious in saying that this provision in the form in which it is should not be adopted, but provision should be made so that Senators will be able to employ additional clerical help. That is what I need in my office. I do not want a special executive assistant telling me what to do in my office. I merely want an opportunity to take care of and keep up with, if I possibly can, the many laborious duties which devolve upon a Senator in a great emergency such as we now confront.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad this subject has been brought up for discussion. For the past 3 or 4 months, to a great extent, and before that to a lesser extent, a number of Senators from the larger States of the Union have asked me, as chairman of the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to provide them with additional clerks. For example, the load which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has been carrying has been exceedingly heavy. His colleague [Mr. WAGNER] has been ill for several months, and the junior Senator, to a large degree, has been representing one-tenth of the people of the United States. He has no more clerical help than has a Senator from the smallest State in the Union.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, that is not correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. He may have one more clerk.

Mr. BRIDGES. He has two more.

Mr. TYDINGS. Two more for New York for example, in comparison with New Hampshire, is not a very happy comparison, considering the volume of work.

If we provide for the proposed special executive assistant it will be difficult to provide extra clerks for Senators from the larger States. It will not be very feasible to come along later and give additional clerks to Senators, as well. So the issue ought to be whether we want one highly paid clerk at $4,500 a year for every Senator, or whether, because of the great industrial areas in Illinois, New York, and some other States, and the great populations of those States, we ought to authorize the legislative subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to provide some extra help for Senators who really need it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought the Senator from Tennessee had the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. He has; but he has yielded to me. I shall be glad to afford the Senator from Wisconsin the opportunity to ask a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All I wish to do is to point out that in part the point raised by the Senator from Maryland is

taken care of by the provision which was inserted in the regular Legislative Appropriation Act, under which Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange and change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees. I have consulted the Legislative Counsel, whose opinion would be controlling in this matter if any question should arise about it so far as the disbursing office is concerned, and the opinion of the Legislative Counsel is that the language on page 17 would fall under the provision of the Legislative Appropriation Act to which I have just referred. Therefore, each Senator would be enabled to adjust the salaries in his office, including the one proposed in this bill, in the same manner as he now has authority with respect to his regular employees.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be true, Mr. President. All I wish to do is to place the facts before the Senate. The provision under discussion would give to a Senator from a State with a very small population the same amount of help which would be given to the Senator from New York, for example. In these times I believe that fairness dictates that we ought to make some revision of the system of clerk hire, not on the basis of States but on the basis of need during the present emergency. I think that a Senator who represents New York, Pennsylvania, or Illinois, with the very great industrial problems which those States have, and with the number of important letters which such a Senator receives from the whole country, ought to receive more consideration than some other Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not finished. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator should not confine his remarks to New York or Pennsylvania.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to include Texas and California.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have a large constituency, and they have very inquisitive minds. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I should certainly include California and Texas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should certainly include the Senator from Texas, who represents a territory much larger than the average territory represented by a Senator, and whose problems are greater. He is entitled to additional consideration if he asks for it. However, I do not think it is wise to make a blanket provision when we shall have to provide for the larger States in addition. I want the Senate to know the facts, and not to criticize the legislative appropriation bill when it comes before the Senate. I do not want the Senate to take action today which will tie our hands in the consideration of this problem.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, according to the argument of the Senator from Maryland, the fact that Maryland has a larger population than New Mexico has should entitle Maryland to have more Senators than New Mexico has; but that was not the scheme of things that the originators of our Government had in mind. The responsibility which we took yesterday, when we voted for war against Germany, was just as much a responsibility for New Mexico as it was for Maryland or any other State of the Union; and I, for one, am not going to proceed on the assumption that in carrying on this war or any other war the State of Maryland has any more responsibility than the State of New Mexico has. I venture to say that some of the boys from New Mexico whom I happen to represent have already made the supreme sacrifice; and certainly I will not agree that because some other State has a larger population than my State has it should have more to say in the United States Senate than the State of New Mexico has. I assure the Senator of that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate what the Senator has said, and I thoroughly agree with him; but that is not what we are debating. We are debating the question whether some Senators need additional help and others do not need it. If the Senator from New Mexico makes out a case that he cannot handle the work from his State, that is something for us to consider, and we will give him more help with which to do it, but I think it is not fair to draw a straight line, and to say that Senators representing New York or Pennsylvania have no more work to do than Senators representing Maryland or New Mexico. I think we should consider the matter, and should ascertain just what are the respective needs.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think that statement is fair. The distinguished Senator from Maryland knows, as does every other Senator, that there are Members of this body who contribute in varying degrees to the work of the Senate. If a Senator from New Mexico is a member of 16, 17, or 18 subcommittees and two or three special committees, and if he attends regularly to the work of those committees, and if a Senator from a larger State for one reason or another is not so conscientiously concerned with the work of the subcommittees, obviously the Senator from New Mexico is entitled to special consideration. I do not know how we can measure that particular work; but when a Member of the United States Senate can conscientiously stand here and say—and let me point out that I did not initiate this proposal—that he has all the time he needs, without an executive assistant, to attend the numerous committee meetings which we are compelled to attend, I am amazed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will; yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am disappointed in my friend, the Senator from Maryland, because this is not the consideration which I had expected on this question. Last year I had something to do with originating the consideration of this matter on the floor of the Senate. I have been here a little more than 2 years, and during that time nine Senators have died. Some of them have died from overwork, and I think it is a shame. Other Senators know as well as I know that some of them have deliberately sought to serve their people to such an extent that they have carried their papers home at night, and literally have buried themselves under stacks of papers.

I do not care whether the Senator from Illinois would prefer to have clerks rather than assistants; and let me say that no assistant in my office dictates to me. I do not know whether any assistant does so in any other Senator's office; but no assistant in my office dictates to me, and I am not going to have any come in my office and do so. But I should like to have some help, and I know that many other Senators need help; and I am not afraid to vote for the help that we need in order to put ourselves in a position to be of greater service to our people.

The Senator from Maryland will recall that he made a point of order against this matter last year.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. But the Senator from Maryland stated that if we would come around to his committee, he would see that the matter was given consideration; and I think we are entitled to more than we are getting.

If the Senator from Illinois wants two or three clerks for his office in lieu of the suggested assistant, I think the pending measure will take care of the matter. I think Senators can do as they please about it. If any Senator does not want to avail himself of the benefit of the services of such an assistant he does not have to do so. If he does not think it is patriotic to accept the money with which to pay such an assistant, he can give it back.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In just a moment. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that there is now pending a measure proposing to give an additional clerk to Senators representing States having larger populations. That measure is not so much for the purpose of providing assistants, such as Senators have been talking about, but for the purpose of providing stenographers who can answer the mail which is piling up and piling up.

The Senator from Illinois, who has a very difficult constituency to represent in a time such as this, receives thousands of letters which he has not had the facilities to answer. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], whose colleague has been ill for 3 or 4 months, has had to ask New York friends working in the departments to assist him in the evenings in order partly to keep up with his mail.

What I am attempting to say is that we should do either one thing or the other. We should either deal with this matter on the basis of need, or we should adopt the general scheme to handle it as it is set out here.

I do not say that Senators from the more populous States work any harder or any less in the committees, that the responsibility on them is any greater or any less, but I do say what everyone

knows, that they have more office work to do than Senators who represent the less populous States have, and they should have a chance to do that work so as to free themselves for committee work. I think that proposition is sound, I think that it is a truthful statement, and I do not believe any Senator will take issue with it.

Senators cannot do both. They cannot take the money which is needed to help them transact their office business and put it in places where it may not be needed without running up an expenditure that will set at nought the efforts of Congress to reduce expenditures so that all the country's resources will be available for the purpose of properly prosecuting the war.

Mr. MALONEY and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut. Then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I wish to take issue with the Senator from Maryland. I am fearful that someone on the outside may derive the impression that the important part of our work here is conducting a correspondence school. Of course, we have a great deal of mail; sometimes it is burdensome; but we are not here primarily for the purpose of answering correspondence. We are here to legislate on matters of great importance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course we are.

Mr. MALONEY. Now we are considering a tremendous appropriation bill. We have had appropriation bills before involving billions of dollars. We have one such bill before us today, and we shall have others in the future. There is not a Member of the Senate who is properly familiar with this appropriation bill, because we have not the necessary time, we have not the necessary research assistants; the committee has not experts sufficiently able, in the time available and with the size of its staff, to equip itself with the information we need to act properly on this bill.

I do not want that statement to be considered a reflection on the committee or its very splendid staff; but they are only a few persons, while we are dealing with thousands and thousands of persons downtown, a great number of agencies, tens of thousands of items, and are willing in some instances to try to make ourselves believe that we are legislating intelligently. We cannot do it; we are not doing it; and providing this so-called special assistant is only a mild approach to doing a decent job.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, and then I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to call to the attention of the Senator from Maryland the fact that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has been on his feet for some time, trying to get the Senator from Maryland to yield to him.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, that does not make any difference.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not understand that the Senator from Virginia wished to ask me a question. I understood that he wished to obtain the floor in his own right when our colloquy should be finished.

Mr. GLASS. No; I did not wish to ask a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I wish the Chair would be a little more careful about giving me a rebuke concerning something that did not happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair certainly did not intend to give a rebuke to the Senator. He merely did not wish to have the Senator from Virginia overlooked.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course; and neither do I. I am as devoted to the Senator from Virginia as is any other Member of this body.

Mr. GLASS. I can stand on my feet and talk less than any other Senator here. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to yield to him for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am perfectly willing to wait until I can speak in my own right.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the natural assumption is that the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who is also a member of the Senate subcommittee which considered this bill, would know every item in the bill; but that is not true, because I have had to attend other important committees upon imperative business, and I did not know this item was in the bill. Had I known it, I would have voted against it in committee. I do not think it ought to be adopted. I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was precisely right, that it is already taken care of in the legislative bill. I think it is the most useless proposition that was ever presented to the Senate, so far as expenditures are concerned.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced a bill which provides for two additional clerks at $1,500 per annum for Senators coming from States with a population in excess of 6,000,000. I introduced that bill because it is my judgment that, no matter how we figure, no matter what yardstick we set up, no one can deny that the Senators from the States of the largest populations have the greatest volume of mail to answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the Senator's bill, what States would get the benefit?

Mr. MEAD. All States having a population in excess of 6,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. But what States are they?

Mr. GUFFEY. I can answer that question.

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. The States are New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, Ohio, and California.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, when I was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the House of Representatives I made a survey of the volume of mail received here at the Capitol. I have had occasion to break that down by observation and by investigation since that time, and I know that some Senators may receive as few as a hundred letters on a given important measure, while other Senators may receive as many as 10,000 letters on the same measure.

I do not desire to go into the details of that subject, but when Senators rise and offer a word of objection to a measure such as is now proposed on the theory that the mail is not the important question, I want to bring out the fact that our mail is important, I do not want the country to think that we look lightly upon the avalanche of mail that comes to our offices when we are considering important matters of legislation.

Mr. President, on one vital question pending before the Senate I received 20,000 letters a day for 7 days in succession. Some Senators may say, "Well, that was mostly mail propaganda. Just consign that to the wastebasket." But every one of those letters had to be opened; each one had to be examined. Many of them may have been personal letters—all letters of importance to the individual who wrote them.

I wish to say, Mr. President, while I am not averse to this item in the pending bill, while I certainly have no objection to Senators from large or small States having adequate personnel to take care of their work, I still maintain—and the record will prove—that Senators coming from the States of the largest populations have a greater volume of office work and of mail to take care of than do Senators from the small States.

Remember the Senator whom I succeeded and the diligence with which he tried to carry on the voluminous tasks of his office; recall my present colleague and the work he attempted to do over the years of his service and Senators will realize the importance of the statement made by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] when he referred to Senators who are "casualties" as a result of the burdens which are placed upon them.

I am stressing the importance of the mail, but not because I personally want these additional clerks. The clerks I now have are on a 7-day-week basis. Sundays and holidays of necessity are the days when we produce the greatest amount of work; but I can only keep my office open from 9 a. m. to 12 o'clock noon. I should like to open my office every day throughout the entire day except Sunday. I cannot do so with the seven clerks assigned to me. I want additional office help to enable me to give the people of my State the representation they deserve.

I now have at least 12 or 14 clerks; I am paying extra clerks, and I cannot remain in the Senate long and support this financial burden.

I believe Senators ought to have research assistants, and I am for them, but I think other Senators ought to take a little compassion upon many of us who would like to devote more time to subcommittees and full committees and the sessions of the Senate, but we cannot do so and at the same time take care of the work in our offices.

New York is a large State; it has approximately 14,000,000 population; but, in addition to that, it is the headquarters of more industrial and financial organizations and institutions than is any other State, all of which means work for the Senators from that State.

I think we ought to take care of the duties and the tasks that come to our offices. Above all, we ought to be considerate of each other. I am one who is willing to do my utmost to see to it that the offices of other Senators are properly supplied with personnel. I am not asking that clerical assistance be put on a population basis; but everyone, I believe, will upon investigation agree with me that the States with a population in excess of five or six million could very easily use another stenographer or two at this time.

My mail is very important; it ought to be considered; every constituent of mine who writes to me ought to have his letter considered, and I should like to be able to make a reply to it; but I cannot do so, because I have not been given sufficient personnel.

The executive departments of the Government have added thousands to their rolls, and, surely, as their business and their work and their burdens have increased, so have ours.

I am not concerned with this particular proposal; unless under previous legislation I can employ more stenographers at ordinary salaries, I will still be left in the same position. What I want is more clerical help; that is my greatest and first need, but if the majority of the Senate feel that the adoption of the pending amendment will aid them in their consideration of legislation and in their attendance upon the meetings of subcommittees and full committees and will help them legislate better for the Nation, as I think it will, then I am for it, but I hope that they will give equal consideration to legislative proposals which affect Senators from the larger States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has described his office force. I should like to ask him how he handles the matter of dictation.

The Senator, of course, has obligations which take up all of his time, if he does his duty. I was in attendance yesterday on three important committee meetings—a conference committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency on price control, and the Committee on Appropriations on the bill we now have before us. I know that the Senator from New York has similar obligations.

What I desire to ascertain from the Senator is this: He seems to emphasize the necessity of more clerical workers. I feel the other way about the matter. I feel the need of somebody to help me direct the clerical force. How does the Senator do that? Does he not need more help qualified to dictate to the stenographers and to go to the departments? His secretary, of course, cannot do all of that. Does he not feel the need in his office of some high-class employee who can go through his mail, tell what subjects should be submitted to the Senator in person, arrange for conferences with visiting constituents, with departments, and all matters of that sort which the Senator, in carrying out his senatorial duties, cannot do? Does the Senator find that one stenographer who is his secretary, a high-class, experienced person in his office, can properly handle all the visitors, all the business with departments, all the correspondence, and leave him any real time for performing his senatorial duties?

I hope the Senator will give us an explanation of that matter. That is my problem. My problem is obtaining high-class help.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I believe, with reference to the Senate as a whole, that the contention of the Senator from Alabama is correct—that somebody is needed in the office of a Senator to make him more efficient by assuming some of his burdens, some of his tasks. That is the real need; but in my case, because of the number of persons who call each day, and because of the large number of letters received by my office, my first duty is to see to it that those tasks are taken care of. Once they are taken care of, I can easily agree with the Senator that the recommendation contained in the bill is important. I believe it ought to be enacted; but I also ask for the consideration of the States of greater population so far as taking care of the mail problem is concerned.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that the Senate is indulging in its usual procedure of discussing a matter which is not at this time before it; but, since the discussion has gone thus far, I think I shall exercise my own right to violate orderly procedure. I wish to say a few words about this amendment and about the fundamental issue which I think it raises.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was wondering if we could not have unanimous consent to vote on this matter at the end of the discussion. The discussion is wholly out of order, for we have not even passed on the first amendment contained in the bill; but, inasmuch as the subject has been discussed, when we get through the discussion can we not have a vote on it while it is fresh in the mind of everyone?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to have that done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may vote on this item, out of order, when the discussion on it shall have been finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I repeat, I desire to speak briefly on this amendment, and on the fundamental issue which I think it raises.

As Senators know, if I may be pardoned for a personal reference, I have either been a United States Senator or I have been in the employ of the United States Senate for a number of years. I was here during the last war as an employee in my father's office. I saw all the clerks in the legislative branch of the Government, as well as those in the executive branch of the Government, suffer during that period because of a rapid increase in the cost of living. I saw thousands of persons in this community who had their standard of living undermined because they were on a fixed-salary basis. I believe that before the present war is over, and it should be very soon, the Congress, in all justice and humanity, should give consideration to the plight of employees of the Federal Government; but I want more particularly to speak of what has been my long experience with the attitude of the Senate toward itself and toward its responsibilities as a part of one of the coordinate branches of the Government.

In my own personal experience, Mr. President, I have seen a constantly rising curve of responsibilities, of increased duties placed upon the shoulders of Members of the House as well as Members of the Senate; and yet there has always been some sort of what I shall call, for want of a better term, an inferiority complex on the part of Members of the House and Members of the Senate with regard to their willingness to come out into the open and publicly acknowledge the burdens which were placed upon their shoulders, and the inadequacy of their staffs to meet those burdens.

Mr. President, I do not believe the American people will be averse to equipping their Representatives here in Congress with sufficient and efficient staffs to meet the increased burdens which have been placed upon us during the emergency, and which will grow hourly as the war progresses. We have already enacted a program calling for the expenditure of $66,000,000,000 for national-defense purposes. This program in all its ramifications has an impact upon every State in the Union, upon every hamlet, every community, every farm in the United States, either directly or indirectly; and, as we go on in this war, defense appropriations and the segments of the economy of this country which the Government of necessity must take under its direction will grow by geometrical progression where, I ask, can the constituents of any Senator or any Representative in Congress go when they feel that they have not had a proper hearing, when they feel that they have not had fair treatment, when they do not know where in this mystic maze of executive organization to find an individual who can give them an answer to their simple or com-

plex problem? Where, I ask, shall they go if they do not go to their Senators and to their Representatives in Congress?

Mr. President, a statement has been made here to the effect that our office staffs should be organized on the basis of the burdens which rest upon Senators from particular States. I should be the first to say, and I acknowledge at the outset of my statement, that Senators coming from the more populous States, by the very nature of things, have a larger volume of mail, they no doubt have more constituents who come and seek to call upon them in person; but, Mr. President, in my opinion, there is not a Senator in this Chamber, whether he comes from a more populous or a less populous State, who can rise and say that the burdens which he conscientiously seeks to discharge from day to day and from week to week, in accordance with his responsibility and his obligation for efficient service to the general public and to his constituency in particular, are not beyond his capacity with his present staff. I think that in this emergency no one should hesitate to stand on this floor and to say what each and every one of us knows in his mind and in his heart to be true. We have sat here year after year, in large measure giving to every branch of the Government all the clerical assistance, all the expert advisers, all the technical staffs for which they have asked; and yet what has Congress done for itself as the mounting burden of Federal activity has grown and grown and grown? It has added a clerk here or a clerk there, it has provided each Senator from a State with a population of three million and over one additional clerk at a certain minor salary.

I wish to emphasize the point that it is true that Senators from the larger States have more constituents, that they therefore receive more mail, and perhaps to a greater extent constituents seek to interview their Senators personally; but I say, with all due respect to the chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the legislative appropriation bill, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the other members of his subcommittee, it is my firm conviction that it is not possible by fixing a population basis to come to any sound decision as to what the burdens are upon individual Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to conclude my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

If a population limit is fixed at 3,000,000, then the Senators from the States with populations just under that figure will be denied any additional assistance. Yet who would deny that since 1933 the burden upon every Senator and every Representative has been represented by a steadily rising curve until it is taking a toll in the form of casualties to Members of Congress who because of their experience can ill be spared at this time.

While I do not wish to make any invidious comparisons, I can say that, so far as my service in this body goes, I can testify that I do not know 95 other men in the United States in any walk of life who are more conscientious, who give more of their time and their energy to their duties than do the 95 other Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

We have had an inferiority complex about something else of which I wish to speak. We do not trust ourselves to use the long-distance telephone. No Senator in this body can make an official long-distance telephone call, no Member of the House of Representatives can make one, at Government expense. Yet year after year we appropriate without question millions upon millions of dollars to pay the official long-distance telephone bills of the executive branch of the Government. If we can trust a subordinate in one of the numerous agencies of the United States Government to make a long-distance call from Washington, D. C., to San Francisco, Calif., why can we not trust each other, why cannot Members of the House of Representatives trust each other, to make long-distance telephone calls, and not to abuse that privilege for personal or political purposes? I say, Mr. President, that if we have such a low opinion of ourselves and our honor, how can we expect the people of the United States to have great respect for us?

So far as I am concerned, after all these years of experience, I am sick and tired of observing that Members of Congress do not have the courage to come out and tell the public what they need for the efficient discharge of their public responsibilities.

Now we come to the pending amendment. Looked at from the standpoint of ascertaining what the relative burdens of public responsibility are upon the 96 Members of this body, no legislative provision will ever serve the ends of justice. Who is to say which Senator is the more heavily burdened? Are we to enter the field of putting responsibility on any man or any group of men, I care not how conscientious they may be, of saying that the two Senators from a particular State are working harder, that they are more conscientious, that they are more overburdened, than the two Senators from another State?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I now yield to the Senator from Maryland, and beg his pardon for not yielding before.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with the Senator from Wisconsin in his premises, but I wish to point out one result which would follow. The amendment provides an appropriation for an executive assistant for each Senator. In my judgment, the law as it now stands permits the use of the amount of money proposed to be provided for the employment of several clerks. Let me state what the mechanics of the proposition in execution would be. Senators who do not need extra clerks as badly as some others will probably have executive assistants. Probably the Senators from New York, the Senators from Pennsylvania, the Senators from Illinois, the Senators from Texas, and those from some of the other larger States, who need extra clerks, will not have executive assistants, and they will use the money provided under the authorization passed at the last session for the employment of additional clerks.

The net result will be that some of the Members of the Senate will have executive assistants, while the others, those from the larger States, will not have executive assistants, because they will utilize the money provided for the employment of extra clerks. That is the picture I am attempting to place before the Senate, if we are to set up a system which will apply to only a part of the body. It is true that each Senator will have the option as to what he will do, but the necessities in some cases will practically deny the employment of executive assistants, because Senators will need the money provided to hire extra clerks.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was just about to go into that phase of the matter when the Senator interrupted me. I started my statement by saying that no man and no group of men in this body, I do not care how conscientious they may be, are qualified, nor do they have the means at their command, to ascertain where the relative burdens of labor fall in this Chamber.

I have already referred to the fact that, generally speaking, population is not a fair test. If I am forced to cite an example, I will cite the example of the most recent casualty in the Senate, the late senior Senator from Colorado, Senator Adams. He came from a State with a relatively small population; but will any Senator here who knew the Senator from Colorado, will any Senator who watched him work, say that the Senator from Colorado was not as heavily burdened with public responsibility as any other Member of this body? I never saw the Senator from Colorado at any time, either going to or coming from the Capitol, when he did not have a brief case in his hand. I care not what may have been the Senator's attitude as a member of the Committee on Appropriations toward this general problem. I can cite him as an example which is known to every Senator to prove that we cannot test this problem solely on the population basis. We have to get a formula more complex in its logarithms than the equation utilized to determine the parity base for farm payments if we are to ascertain the relative burdens of Members of this body.

It is therefore my contention that we cannot ascertain where the burdens fall on a population basis, and we must adopt some formula, if we are willing to afford any assistance at all, which can be adjusted to the needs of the individual Senator's offices, and the type of work they perform.

Mr. President, I contend that the amendment now pending meets that question, because, under existing law, if the amendment shall be agreed to and become law, a Senator may designate some individual as his executive assistant and pay him $4,500 a year, or at least $4,500 from the 1st of January until the 30th day of next June. If that is the most crying need in that Senator's office or in a group of Senators' offices, why not trust

them to expend moneys properly in the public interest and to improve their service to their constituents and to the country? Why make the provision ironclad? Why say that some appropriations committee or somebody else must say just exactly what each Senator shall have and how he shall utilize it? If, however, there is need in a particular office for additional clerks—as, I may state, no doubt there is in the office of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]—he may utilize this money for that purpose. Or there may be in the offices of some Senators employees who are working unconscionably long hours, and who are now, under the limitation of total expenditure, receiving such small salaries as to make the individual Senator ashamed to look them in the face each time he goes into his office. He may desire to help meet the increased cost of living and the increase in responsibility of some of the persons already in his office by increasing the salaries of some of the lower-paid groups in his office.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that we have waited a long time for a solution of this problem, and on each occasion when any proposal has been advanced it has always been attacked on the ground that it was not perfect. I can testify that the Members of this body believe that they have now gone through a serious period of overwork and of being overburdened. I predict that in the time that lies ahead of us the period we have just gone through will seem like a period in which we were less burdened than we have ever been in our lives.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Am I to understand it to be the contention of the Senator from Wisconsin that if this amendment should be adopted, each Senator would have the privilege and could exercise the privilege of spending the $4,500 for a couple or for three clerks?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; and I will tell the Senator why. I have the opinion of the only controlling legal advice that will be compelling in this situation, namely, the Legislative Counsel's office, which will be binding upon the legislative employees of the Senate. If this provision shall be adopted, it will fall under a paragraph in Public Law No. 145, the legislative appropriation bill for this fiscal year, which I will read for the Senator's benefit:

> Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law or Senate resolution: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen, on or before the 1st day of the month in which such changes are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office, which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

Mr. GILLETTE. Is it the Senator's contention that the General Accounting Office will apply that existing law to this specific provision?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is not my contention, Mr. President, but it is the contention of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, whose opinion will be binding upon the legislative disbursing office, and so far as I know that is always accepted by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say one more word, and then I am done. I realize that we may have differences of opinion upon this proposition, and I do not, of course, wish to be placed in the position of not according to every other Senator the right to take a different view. But I do say in all seriousness that the time has come when the public interest requires that Members of Congress shall be, insofar as it is humanly possible, equipped with a staff that will make it possible for them to discharge the overwhelming burden which rests upon the shoulders of every Senator in this chamber, and every Member of the other body.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if this debate had taken place 4 or 5 or 6 months ago it seems to me it would have been a matter in the consideration of which we properly might have indulged ourselves at that time. But may I point out what every Member knows, that this country is now at war with three other nations? That war will probably last several years. It will probably mean the raising of a tremendously large army and its maintenance during all that period. It will mean a period of the most severe taxation the Nation has ever had to bear in its history. It will mean a national debt that may go to $200,000,000,000, or more, perhaps, before the war is over. It will mean that we will have to work harder than we have ever worked before. It will mean that we will receive more mail than we have ever received before. It will mean that we will have more visitors than we have ever had before. All those things, we must concede, are going to wear down our health and resistance considerably. But at the same time there will be men on the battleships of the United States and in the front line trenches, some of whom were previously making as much as $10,000 a year, who will be working for $30 a month. Most of the men receiving $30 a month will not theretofore have made salaries as high as $10,000 a year, but there will be a considerable number of men in that category who will have made such a sacrifice. They will not work 8 hours a day. They will work 24 hours a day when the necessity demands. They will eat what they can get their hands on, and they will get a drink of water if one is available, and they will not always be warm at night when they go to bed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All that is true, but does not that same argument apply to every other agency and department of the Government? The War Department, for example, has expanded tremendously. It has expanded so much in personnel that across the river we are going to build one of the largest office buildings in the world to provide office space for the increased personnel. We have granted all those increases. Why? Not because there were soldiers working at $30 a month in the Army, but because the Department's business had increased. Why should not the Senate or the House of Representatives take the same position with respect to itself?

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. MALONEY rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I cannot yield until I shall have finished my statement.

We are now in the first week of this war. We had some very bad news last Monday morning. Thank God, we have had better news since then. But there is nothing in sight now that would lead us to believe that the war's end is close at hand.

When we vote on the tax bill—and we are going to vote on such a bill not only once but perhaps twice next year—it will be difficult for us to realize that we have come to the point of inflicting some of the taxes we are going to inflict. The businessmen who are running the little businesses in the country will be hardest hit, because in many cases they are not going to be able to get the materials to keep their plants open. In this war effort up to date about 85 percent of the war orders have been given to about 10 percent of the industrial organizations because the little businesses were not equipped to do the work. The big fellows got almost all the orders. The little fellows now cannot even obtain equipment. The man who handles tires, the man who makes bathtubs, cannot get the necessary materials and equipment. His taxes are going to be higher than ever. He has a hard job to hold things together. All his life's work will be threatened by this war effort.

I concede that certain Members of the Senate are entitled to consideration in these particular times. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is the most outstanding example. First of all, his colleague [Mr. WAGNER] has been ill for 3 or 4 months, and he has had to carry on the burden of representing a State containing about 10 percent of our total population. It is no flattery to say that the Senator from New York is as hard-working a man as there is in either branch of the Congress. If he did not have the constitution of an athlete, he could not stand up under the load. His office is filled with people. His desk is filled with letters. He is conscientious in attending to his committee work. He is an all-out Senator in every sense of the word. I think that in his case and in other cases which I shall not detail, we ought to provide additional help.

But, if I may be permitted to say so, I believe that it borders on extravagance for us, willy-nilly, to put an executive assistant at $4,500 a year at the disposal of each Senator.

Senators from the larger States will not have executive assistants, although they need them most. They will take the $4,500 and employ three clerks with it. In some offices where extra clerks are not needed there may be executive assistants. The net result will be that perhaps in some cases executive assistants will be given to Senators representing the smaller States, whereas in the offices of Senators representing the larger States, for the most part there will be no executive assistants. So the thing is not a straightout proposition when we examine its mechanics.

I know that times will be harder on every one of us. There is no doubt about it. I do not want to be personal, but many of my constituents live only a few miles from Washington. I could be a better Senator if I could attend committee meetings every morning and every afternoon, but I cannot do so. My constituents are in my office in too great numbers every day. Tens of thousands of Government employees live in nearby Maryland. Baltimore, the eighth largest city in the country, is only a short distance away. Seventy cents will bring anyone here from Baltimore. The roads are good between Washington and Baltimore. I am not complaining, but I say that it is absolutely impossible to get my work done, for no other reason than the number of people who are in my office every morning demanding personal interviews.

There is merit in the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. This amendment might have been proper 6 months ago, but I do not believe that it meets the need of this body at this time. We need to relieve those who are carrying the heaviest loads. I do not put myself in that class. I am referring for the most part to Senators who represent the larger constituencies.

In conclusion, I believe that if we vote for this amendment we shall have reason to regret it before 6 months shall have passed, because I do not believe that any of us, by the furthest stretch of his imagination, can conceive the economic impact which must eventually come not only on the country but on our tax system and on all the correlated departments of the Government. A long and difficult war will drain our resources to the limit. This is only a drop in the bucket, it is true; but drops will become precious very soon.

Over and above that, even when the war is over and we win it, when millions in the war industries are thrown out of employment, as they are certain to be, and try to readjust themselves in the pursuits of peace, many billion dollars more will be required over a long period of years to take up the slack. In view of that picture, and without discounting the difficulties which beset many Senators, this whole problem ought to be restudied, and we ought to base our appropriation on a pure standard of actual need.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator says that this is a drop in the bucket, and makes many other arguments against the proposal. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. I assume he has read the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I have not.

Mr. MALONEY. That in itself is sufficient reason for me, Mr. President, to believe that we need additional assistance.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; it is not.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to go further.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many bills which are passed by the Senate does the Senator read?

Mr. MALONEY. I try to read all of them.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator tries to read all of them. So do I. Even if we should have a hundred executive assistants, the day would never come when we could read every bill which passes the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to take the floor in my own right.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I do not think any further argument is needed for this proposal than the admission of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. Earlier this year, and I think last year, I said that the principal reason for the need for this assistance was the fact that we did not have time to give sufficient attention to the proposals which come before us. An experienced and able Senator, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, says that he has not had the time to read the bill. I can understand that. This bill appropriates billions of dollars.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator calls the appropriation involved in the pending amendment a drop in the bucket, but a dangerous one, because of the imminent tax burden.

Mr. President, after the very able speech of the Senator from Wisconsin, I feel presumptuous in rising to speak on the amendment. I shall be brief. However, I wish to point out that in this bill there is page after page, unread by Senators, of salary increases and supplementary salary increases for the various departments of the Government. There is page after page after page of them, and we are so busy that we have not had time to read them. No investigation has been made; and when we seek assistance to permit us to make inquiry so that we may be more efficient as legislators the claim is made that the proposal is ridiculous.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Connecticut has taken his seat so soon, because I think he should have explained to the Senate in greater detail just what he was referring to. It is true, as he stated, that there is page after page of the items of salary increases. When we talk about drops in the bucket, let me ask Senators to turn to page 54 of the bill. There we find that the increased deficiency appropriations carried in the bill for the executive office and independent establishments amount to $1,063,910.

Let me give a few of the items:

For "Salaries and expenses, Office for Emergency Management, 1942," $13,012.

For "Federal Power Commission, 1942," $20,000.

For "Salaries and expenses, National Archives, 1942," $11,382.

For "Salaries, National Labor Relations Board, 1942," $20,310.

For "Salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, 1942," $642,125.

For "Salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, 1942," $26,315.

In the Department of Agriculture:

For "Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor, Department of Agriculture, 1942," $22,860.

So, Mr. President, as we go through the bill, as the Senator from Connecticut has so well said, there is page after page of additional allowances for salaries and expenses to the executive departments, amounting to considerably more than $1,000,000. It is true, of course, that these items have been inserted in many instances at the direction of Congress to provide for administrative pay increases, promotions which had been withheld. They are, however, advances to the executive.

But that, Mr. President, is not the consideration which moves me in supporting the amendment which has been brought here from the committee. Much more important, I think, is the argument which was made by the Senator from Wisconsin. The truth of the matter, as we all know, is that the importance of the legislative branch of the Government has been constantly decreasing, whereas the importance and the power of the bureaus and the departments have been constantly increasing—all because Members of the Senate and Members of the House do not have the time or a sufficient number of assistants to enable them to devote enough attention to the multitudinous duties devolving upon them if they are to investigate the legislative matters which come before them. For expert advice they must depend upon the executive and that is not a desirable condition.

Of course, I am concerned with the matter of having mail answered. I endeavor to answer every letter which comes into my office, and I know that many of the letters can be answered in a sentence or two. Our correspondents are considerate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. With reference to the items to which the Senater adverted a moment ago, carried in this bill—specific items of salary increases—I should like to ask him how, even if I had 10 special executive assistants or legislative assistants or clerical assistants, or whatever it might be decided to call them, I could familiarize myself with those items and the necessity for their approval, prior to coming on the floor

of the Senate today and noting the report of the Appropriations Committee? What could they have done to assist me in understanding those items?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think that an executive assistant appointed by a Senator not a member of the Appropriations Committee would devote himself to that matter.

Mr. GILLETTE rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Iowa will pardon me for a moment, I will answer him. The Senator has asked for a response to his question, and I will give it to him.

Mr. GILLETTE. But I can listen so much better on my feet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That will be quite satisfactory to me; I hope the Senator will not get tired.

Mr. GILLETTE. I never get tired listening to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Iowa is certainly very generous.

Mr. President, the sad fact is, as the Senator from Connecticut pointed out a moment ago, that even some members of the Appropriations Committee have not had the time to read and to study this bill. There are many items in the measure which the committee and its members have not been able to study, and they have taken the judgment of the House upon those items. But if there were an executive assistant for each of the Senators on the Appropriations Committee, then I would have no hesitation in saying to the Senator that the report of the committee could be accepted with a great deal more confidence by the Senator from Iowa and by other Senators. But it is not appropriations alone we should consider; it is every legislative proposition which comes before the Congress.

Now let me ask the Senator from Iowa to turn to pages 19 and 20 of the bill. There we have a provision appropriating $246,500 for the Board of Investigation and Research. This is an authorization of funds to expand the work of another executive bureau doing things which the legislative body might be able to do and should be able to do. The Interstate Commerce Commission was created 50 years ago to undertake legislative duties; and by a recent act recommended by the Committee on Interstate Commerce there was set up another bureau—a bureau to investigate matters and facts having to do with rail transportation, motor transportation, and water transportation—all a legislative matter. The work was delegated by the legislative authority to an executive branch because the legislative authority had not equipped itself to do its own work.

The proposal here is that the members of the legislature shall be equipped with staffs which will enable them to be advised about the matters before them for consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the item on page 26 relating to the Civil Service Commission, a deficiency appropriation of $781,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from New Mexico has called attention to it. Of course, the reason for it—and I have approved it myself, and good judgment supports it—is the fact that in the present emergency the Civil Service Commission must do additional work in order to obtain the employees the Government must have.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not true that this is the only proposal made to date for increasing the number of assistants for Members of Congress, which means the services to be rendered to the members of the legislative body?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only proposal in this bill; yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to call attention to the testimony of Mr. Knudsen, which appears on page 306 of the hearings held by the Senate committee in connection with the bill. At the bottom of that page it appears that Mr. Knudsen said:

> We have at the moment 5,695 people here in Washington, and we estimated by June we will have 14,412.

Those figures are only symbolic of what is going on in the other departments. I think this increase is the largest, because perhaps the O. P. M. is the most active bureau. But if it is consistent and proper to increase the personnel of that branch from 5,000 to 14,000 in the next 6 months, it occurs to me that the added duties which will come to the Members of Congress will justify at least the employment of one additional assistant.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I am told by the disbursing clerk of the Senate that the minimum allowance to each Senator for his office personnel is $13,920 a year. In addition to that, many Senators are chairmen of committees, and have additional clerks available for the work in their offices, as well as the work of the committees. In addition to such clerks, each Senator from a State having a population of more than 3,000,000 has an additional clerk.

What is proposed now is an increase of the $13,920 minimum to $18,420, which would be an increase of 33 percent in the cost of the office personnel of every Senator. And, of course, it means a permanent increase. Let us not deceive ourselves with the thought that we are doing this only for the duration of the emergency. This will be a permanent increase, and it will perhaps be followed by a similar increase on the part of the House of Representatives.

Some apparent justification for this extravagance—and I think it is a great extravagance—is attempted to be made on the floor of the Senate by the statement that the executive departments of the Government are extravagant. Of course we know they are extravagant, and grossly extravagant; but, Mr. President, the fact that the departments are extravagant is no excuse for the Senate setting such an example of extravagance at this time, when every dollar of nondefense spending should be conserved for the needs of national defense wherever possible. So I challenge any Senator to call attention to any department of the Government—as extravagant as the departments are—which has increased its personnel and overhead cost by 33 percent by one appropriation bill. I do not think it would be possible to find any such department. I do not think it would be possible to do that.

Then, Mr. President, it is a farfetched idea, to my way of thinking, that the health of Senators can be conserved simply by providing for each one an executive assistant at $4,500 a year. The thought seems to exist in the minds of some of my colleagues that we can transfer the responsibilities of a United States Senator to an executive assistant. With such an idea I want very completely to disagree. We have these great responsibilities; we must bear them as best we can in the troublous days that now confront our country. Those responsibilities cannot be transferred to a $4,500 clerk. I hope this item of appropriation will not be adopted, because it would be an incentive and a suggestion to every department of the Government to ask for increased personnel in line with action of the Senate in increasing its clerical force; but, if it should be adopted, I make the prediction that the secretaries of Senators will be appointed to the positions as executive assistants and receive the increased salary; that if the secretaries are not appointed, then other clerks will be added, and in very few instances will there be appointed a person who can be considered a research expert, because, as a matter of fact, such experts are not available at $4,500 a year. If we can employ assistants to perform the duties of Senators for $4,500 a year, then we do not deserve the $10,000 a year which we ourselves are drawing out of the Treasury of the United States.

I enter my protest, Mr. President, that the Senate should embark on the extravagance of increasing by 33 percent the cost of the personnel in our offices at this time of great peril to our country, when every dollar of financial security of America should be conserved in order to pay the most colossal cost the Nation has ever conceived of, for not only are we fighting a desperate war with three other countries, but we are guaranteeing to underwrite the costs incurred by 14 other countries that are now fighting aggressions wherever they may be anywhere in the world. So, the cost of this war may not stop at $150,000,000,000, as some have suggested, but it may go to $200,000,000,000. No man can foretell what the cost will be. Now is the time to conserve the resources of our country and for the Senate to set an example to the departments and to refuse to vote ourselves a 33-percent increase in our own personnel costs.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for several years; I have

tried to do my duty there faithfully and honestly; but I venture to say that, under the present conditions, I do not know whether the Committee on Appropriations are doing their duty or not.

We have now before us for consideration a bill appropriating over $9,000,000,000; the full Committee on Appropriations was called yesterday afternoon at 3:30 o'clock to pass on a bill to be reported to this body today, containing appropriations of $9,000,000,000. I doubt whether it is wise economy; I doubt whether we are doing our duty to those who have already fallen in this war if, because of conditions connected with our offices, we are unable to analyze the $9,000,000,000 appropriation properly. It was reported with little opportunity for consideration.

Mr. President, I feel that the Senate of the United States has as much responsibility in carrying forward the war to a successful conclusion as has the Navy or the Army. They will actually do the fighting; they will actually do the dying; but they expect, when appropriations of billions of dollars are made, that we shall make the appropriations at least with some knowledge as to what the appropriations are being made for.

I feel that it would be poor economy to deprive any Senator in this body of the help necessary in order that he may at least be advised of what is contained in a particular bill which he has to vote on, either in the committee or on the floor.

I feel that, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated, the Senate has long neglected making proper provision for its own Members and has long had an inferiority complex when it comes to insisting on having those things which the American people expect Senators to have, so that they may perform their duties honestly and intelligently. Half the time when we vote on legislation—and I venture to say that I am not different from any of the other 95 Senators—we simply inquire of someone else what is the vote on, and frequently are not advised as to the particulars of the proposal.

It seems to me, so far as the Senate is concerned, that money would be saved to the people of the United States if each Senator had in his employ someone who could inform him, for instance, that a particular appropriation bill contained such and such items and proposed to do such and such things.

I have been an advocate for years of employing an expert who would devote all his time to the Committee on Appropriations and aid the chairman of that committee. Under present conditions when a bill comes over from the House of Representatives and goes to a subcommittee and is considered by it, who appears to make a showing as to particular items of appropriation and generally trying to advocate increasing appropriations? It is the representatives of the departments. Every bureau, every division appears before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to convince, if possible—and sometimes they are logical—the subcommittee that what they say is correct. But did you ever hear, Mr. President, of a single expert, either at the instance of the subcommittee or the whole committee, appearing on behalf of the taxpayers? I doubt if anyone has ever heard of that happening.

I have sat for days in the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and have heard experts from the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior or from other departments tell us the reasons why they must have certain increased amounts, and we never say "no," but not once have I ever heard anyone representing a committee or the people of the United States to state why such action should not be taken.

I have been an advocate of giving the chairman of the committee a real expert who could advise him in such matters. It appears to me that in this instance we have made a start, at least, so that the average Senator may be advised as to why he is voting for appropriations such as those contained in the pending bill, aggregating $9,000,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement made at the request of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the question is upon the committee amendment found on page 17, commencing in line 17, and following through to line 21, inclusive.

Mr. GILLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barbour	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Herring	Schwartz
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smathers
Brooks	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bunker	Kilgore	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	White
Doxey	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1623) to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum; and

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 138. An act granting a pension to Mary Jane Blackman;

S. 201. An act for the relief of Henry Kotila;

S. 501. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith;

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of William Corder;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mary S. Gay;

S. 1550. An act for the relief of Carl Chalker;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells;

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick; and

S. 1870. An act for the relief of John Paul Murray.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it has been said on the floor in this debate that Senators do not give any attention to their own business and their own official work; that we give large increases of every kind for all the departments, but that we have an inferiority complex in regard to ourselves.

I hardly think that statement can be justified. We have before us an appropriation bill carrying several billion dollars. We have been on that appropriation bill all day, and 90 percent of the work of the Senate has been on this item providing a little more patronage for ourselves. There is no inferiority complex. We are looking after ourselves now.

I think I should be justified in expressing the opinion, without getting dissent from any Senator, that we have devoted more time to this little item of patronage for Senators than we have devoted or

will devote to this entire bill appropriating several billion dollars. So I do not think we ought to worry about not giving any attention to ourselves; and yet I believe there are a great many things connected with our offices and our assistants that we ought to improve if we can.

Mr. President, I think we are undertaking here to do something that is impossible. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] earlier in the debate said that he did not want an executive assistant; he wanted some more stenographers. Well, Senators, suppose each of you had 25 stenographers; would that help you? Would that relieve you of any responsibility? Could you use so many stenographers? All of us have a great amount of correspondence, and a good many Senators look upon this as an opportunity to relieve ourselves of that responsibility; but we dictate to stenographers.

Is there anyone here who claims he could perform the duties of his office as Senator any more efficiently if he had 50 stenographers to whom to dictate? Talk about working 24 hours a day; one would have to work 70 hours a day to do his work. The stenographer takes the dictation, and a Senator has to be there to do the dictating, if he does not have an executive assistant. What would become of his consideration and reading of the different bills if he did that? By dictating all the forenoon one probably can keep his stenographers working for the remainder of the day, so that he may come to the floor of the Senate and perform his legislative duties, but if he had twice as many stenographers, he would not get here at all; he never could be on the floor. He not only would not read the bills, but there would not be any use reading them. He would be dictating in his office.

It is suggested that we make the population of the States the test: and I have no doubt that suggestion has some merit; but this question cannot be determined on the basis of the population of a State. There are two Senators from New York, and it is said that one of them is ill and cannot be here, and that the burden on the other Senator is thereby increased. Undoubtedly it is, and that would be true under similar circumstances of New Mexico or Nebraska or Kansas, though probably not to the same degree. The problem cannot be solved by any legislation, as I see it.

We hear talk about working long hours and the greater burden on a Senator from a populous State in comparison with that on one from a less-populous State. Yet, in the next sentence we are told of the work of Senator Adams, of Colorado, who has unfortunately passed away. He was a hard worker, as we all know. But could he have worked any harder if he had come from New York City? It is said that Senators have been killed by hard work; and perhaps that has sometimes happened. But will that condition be relieved if we give a Senator 50 more clerks in his office?

Then there is the other angle, that if we do not appoint clerks, we will appoint executive assistants, as they are called, extra secretaries, perhaps—"deputy Senators" would be a better name. Is that going to relieve us of any responsibility resting heavily upon our shoulders? I do not think it will. If such an executive assistant would help a Senator, he would take the responsibility from him, it seems to me, and the Senator would not know what was being done. If one wants to know what is in every letter he sends out from his office, an executive assistant will not help. If a Senator is going to dictate to all these extra stenographers, an executive assistant will not do him any good.

It is said that Senators are overworked because they are on so many committees. That is their own fault, and it is the fault of the Senate. If Senators are on too many committees, let them retire from some of them. That is what should be done. We have tried several times to adopt a resolution reducing the number of committees on which any one Senator may serve; but we get right back again. Apparently every Senator wants to get on as many committees as possible. Yet the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if he does his duty, has no time to spend with any other committee. It will take more time than he can possibly give to it, if he gives all the time he has.

As has been suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, when a Senator is on 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 subcommittees, he has a burdensome task which wears him down. But it is the fault of the Senate, it is the fault of the individual Senator. It is a burdensome thing, often an impossible condition, and a course which should be followed in regard to legislation is often blocked by the fact that a Senator is on half a dozen committees, and when 2 or 3 of the committees are in session at the same time, it is pretty difficult for the Senator to attend all the meetings and thus perform the duties placed on his shoulders with his consent.

The adoption of the pending amendment would not help. I think Senators will be disappointed if they think it will help them. It is not the size of a State which brings about correspondence, necessarily. In some years the correspondence from some particular section of the country is vastly increased. The chairman and members of a committee such as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for instance, having to do with something which affects a goodly share of the population in a certain section of the country, will have their work increased during some particular year. The next year the same conditions may not prevail in that section, and the work of the members of the committee may be decreased very materially.

The work of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Foreign Relations, is at this time doubled and trebled over what it is in ordinary times. We cannot help that by letting each Senator appoint a great many more clerks, or an executive assistant. He cannot shift his responsibility. It is impossible to do it. His difficulties are increased by the conditions of the emergency, the wars in which we are now engaged. But that is true of every citizen of the United States. We cannot help that by having a great many more clerks or executive assistants.

I was forcibly impressed by what the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said. In effect he stated, "Do not abuse your minds with the idea that this will be temporary. If you ever get the nose of this camel under the tent it will stay there until the camel goes clear through the tent." More often than not the extra clerks for whom we provide, to work during a session, are made permanent by subsequent resolutions. The more we increase our office force beyond what one man can attend to, the more we take on responsibility which it is impossible for us to meet.

Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment. If we are to enact provisions such as this, to increase the number of assistants for each Senator, we will not be in position later on to object if everyone else wants an increase in his help or in his salary. We will not escape in the future, either, the wrath of the people, who will in time learn what we are doing, increasing the expenses of our own office forces, when millions of our citizens are going to be compelled to work from patriotic motives, without salary, or at salaries which are much less than the salaries we are asked to provide for our own assistants, to serve in the trenches, or in airplanes or tanks, or on the fighting naval vessels, even to give up their lives, thousands and thousands of them.

I do not think that by increasing our pay or the pay of our asisstants we could relieve ourselves from any of our responsibilities, which I say and believe are great beyond expression, and probably are growing greater. We cannot shift the responsibility. We shall have to bear it. We shall not bear it any more easily if we increase the pay of all our help by any amount whatever.

Mr. President, I think danger exists in the proposed legislation. If the people of the country get the idea, as, in my opinion, they will, if we continue along the line we are going that we shall continue to keep these highly paid assistants after the emergency is ended, as we shall, a time will come when the matter will be an issue before the people of the United States, and those who have been engaged in bringing it about will be left out of official position, just as Members of Congress were in connection with what is known as the salary grab. That salary grab went on for some time, but the day came when, rightly or wrongly, a suffering people got the idea that the so-called salary grab was wrong, and the membership in the House of Representatives, the only legislative body in the Nation which at that time was elected directly by the people, was absolutely changed in one campaign. I think an injustice was done in many cases to Members who were defeated.

Mr. President, what is now proposed to be done will result in establishing a precedent, the chickens will come home to roost, and result in the defeat of Members of the Senate and of the House of Rep-

resentatives, because, as has been very well said here, this action on our part will be followed by similar action in the House of Representatives. Why should it not? What is now proposed to be done only temporarily, will no doubt be made permanent. I do not believe any Senator seriously doubts that it will be made permanent.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. While I am opposed to the amendment, and shall vote against it, I confess to a distressing apprehension that many Senators are going to decline to run again and are going to retire from the body because they are not going to get increased pay.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know of any who are going to decline to run for that reason. Perhaps some are.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had not intended to speak on this matter particularly, but when the Senator from Nebraska scolds the Senate of the United States and makes the suggestion that the measures and the means necessary to the efficient performance of our duties will be repudiated by the people as a steal—which is in effect what the Senator from Nebraska said—I should like to ask the Senator whether the President of the United States hesitated in the least to recommend necessary additional assistants in the Executive Office of the Government, and whether the Senator from Nebraska himself did not vociferously support that measure?

Mr. NORRIS. I have supported most such measures. It does not follow, however, that I am going to support every proposal for increase in salary or increase in personnel of the different executive departments.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator further permit me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The point I was making was that the Senator has intimated or has stated in effect that to provide additional clerical assistance for Senators is a steal.

Mr. NORRIS. No, Mr. President; I have not intimated anything of the kind, and the Senator does not have any right to draw that conclusion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator said that Senators and Representatives who took this action would be repudiated by the people as Representatives were repudiated in the case of the "salary grab."

Mr. NORRIS. Perhaps they will be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator permit me a further word?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I said, Mr. President, is that I think the Congress of the United States has as much right to determine for itself the amount of assistance necessary for the efficient performance of the work of the Congress as the President very properly had when he suggested to the Congress that he needed additional Executive assistants, which the Congress gave him.

Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said a little while ago, that there is no reason for the Senate or the House to be in the slightest degree mealy-mouthed about stating the necessity for additional help that exists for the efficient performance of their duties. Since I have been a Member of the Senate, in one Sunday morning's mail I received 7,000 letters. Most of them were propaganda letters which I threw in the wastebasket and did not take the trouble to answer at all, but it took the girls in my office all of 1 day to open the letters. I say that the matter of determination of what we need is purely a question of fact and that the Senate ought not to be backward in appropriating for all the assistance that is necessary to perform efficiently the work of this body.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with that statement, Mr. President. What causes me regret is the statement of the Senator from Missouri that I am in the attitude of scolding the Senate. Nothing is further from my intention. I am not questioning the honor or the honesty of any Senator. But I believe the proposed action is wrong. Have I a right to believe so? Have I a right to oppose it? Should I incur the animosity of other Senators simply because I want to economize in the expenditure of Federal money? Is the fact that someone else is extravagant any excuse for our being extravagant?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator has any idea from my interruption of a moment ago that he had incurred or could possibly incur any animosity on my part I apologize most profoundly, because my respect and affection for the Senator from Nebraska are such that he could not possibly incur my animosity. I said that the Senator was scolding the Senate, and I could not draw any other conclusion from his analogy of the defeat of everyone who voted for what he said was a "salary grab" with what would occur to those who support this particular measure to provide more assistance. If the Senator believes that this proposed action is in any way to be likened to a "salary grab," he does right to vote against it. But I say that when the Senator attributes to other Senators a course of conduct similar to that involved in the so-called salary grab, he is scolding the Senate, and is attributing to us motives which I do not believe any Senator has.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not believe that any Senator who wants to be fair, who wants to treat me with the courtesy with which he should like to be treated, can rightfully charge me with any bad motive in this discussion. That is practically what the Senator has done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not attributing any bad motive to the Senator. I have denied any such imputation. I simply stand on any fair construction of what the Senator from Nebraska said.

Mr. NORRIS. So will I stand on any construction, fair or unfair; it is quite immaterial to me. I realize that much of it will be unfair and that I will be charged with being a demagog and that I ought to be put out of the Senate. I realize that if I were running for the office of Senator I would have to meet such a charge in the next campaign. I do not know how I could escape such a charge. I should like to if I could.

Mr. President, if we were to try to act on a proposal of this character in accordance with the populations of the various States we would get into difficulty. That has already been demonstrated. Because a Senator represents a State having a small population, it does not follow that his burdens are not so great as those of a Senator representing a State having a large population. Other causes besides the matter of population bring about increased correspondence, work, and investigation. A year or two ago a Senator representing a rather small State had a tally kept by his office force for 3 weeks to see where his mail came from. Less than one-third of the mail he received came from his own State. The situation may be different with respect to other Senators. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], representing great States which have in them large cities like Chicago and New York, undoubtedly receive a great amount of mail from those cities. But a large population is not the only cause for mail. Other things being equal, I think an older Senator is likely to receive more mail than a new Senator. That is not always true, but as a general rule I believe it to be true. Yet we would not want to give an older Senator two employees when a new Senator has only one. We cannot meet all the conditions. They are constantly changing. We cannot do absolute justice. We cannot be absolutely fair. We must come as near to it as we can. I think the Senator from Missouri, who received 7,000 letters in 1 day, would have received the same amount of mail if he had had a hundred stenographers, or if he had had a dozen assistants. The passage of this bill will not decrease that burden. There is a limit to what a Senator or any other man can do. When he does all he can, as I believe Senators do, increasing his office force will not help a particle.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two on this subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want the Senator to have the opportunity to say what he has to say; but let me appeal to the Senate.

This is a very important bill. The Army and Navy are urging us to go forward with it. Let us have a vote on this amendment as soon as we can. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator who is on his feet; but let me appeal to all other Senators to talk less and vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not believe there is another Member of the Senate who talks less on the floor than I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not complaining of the Senator. What he says is true. I hope the Senator will not think that I am trying to take him from the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it so happens that I come from one of the smaller

States, a State which has a population of a little more than 500,000. It also happens that I have in my office all the stenographic help I need. I do not require any more stenographic help in my office to take care of my work. I should like very much to obtain for my office, to assist me in some of the perplexing problems which confront us today, the services of someone who is really an expert, and who has the time to devote himself to the study of questions which I do not have the time to study.

Sometimes after the work in the Senate is over and I go back to my rooms at night I like to pick up some work on philosophy or some other subject far removed from the questions of the day. Only the other day I was reading a work of this kind.

Sometimes I think, with Robert Burns:

Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as ithers see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
And foolish notion.

I wish to take the time of the Senate to read something which may cause Senators to think a little more seriously about the question we are now discussing. We vote for appropriations, and we provide for the Agricultural Department and all the other agencies and branches of Government all the experts and all the money they need. They come before us and tell us what to do, because they say we do not have the necessary information and knowledge, or the time to look into those things.

Let me read to the Senate what I read the other night, from The Mansions of Philosophy, by Mr. Will Durant. The title is "Is Democracy a Failure?"

Elections become a contest in fraud and noise; and as sound arguments make the least sound, truth is lost in the confusion. Add to this the gerrymandering of city districts to keep the power with conservative rural communities; the vast floating population which is disfranchised by its mobility; the riot of dishonesty and violence at the polls—and you get democracy. Under such conditions "a vote becomes as valuable as a railway ticket when there is a permanent block on the line." Is it any wonder that the proportion of actual to legal voters decreased from 80 percent in 1885 to 50 percent in 1924; or that intelligent men refuse to stand in line an hour for the privilege of registering, and then again an hour for the privilege of voting, that is to say, the privilege of choosing between A and B, who both belong to X? The country is becoming conscious of the democratic farce.

This is the point I am getting at:

Nevertheless, suppose that we have voted. The election is over, stocks rise, and the elected Senators and Representatives go down to Washington * * * to form our Congress, our Parliament or Talk-Shop, our National Palaver. Nothing could be more disconcerting than the surprises which meet these elected ladies and gentlemen. It is not merely that when men come together in assemblies their ears instantly grow longer. They have been chosen for political ability in the American sense—i. e., the ability to get themselves nominated, advertised, applauded, and elected; they possess that sort of ability in a highly developed and specialized form.

Again I say, with Burns:

Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursel's as ithers see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
And foolish notion.

Continuing with the quotation from Mr. Durant:

Normally they are subservient people, amenable to discipline, elastic of conscience, and free from dangerous originality or genius; nothing would so readily disqualify them for office (or for the devious approaches to office) as genius of any kind—above all, genius in statesmanship. It should be apparent by this time that a man has a better chance of arriving at high office if he achieves a reputation for mediocrity.

Now suddenly our representative finds himself assailed by problems all the world away from the kind he has solved on the road to power. Those were problems of politics; of patient loyalty to the ward and district and county leaders; of underground influences and secret understandings; of speeches and charges and denials and manipulated publicity; of contributions inconspicuously solicited, and spent with one eye on the law; of favors done to the powerful, and promises made to the rest. But these problems that fall upon him in Washington and overwhelm him in a thousand bills, are problems of economics; they have to do with land ownership, raw materials, coal mines oil wells, water power, production, competition, transportation, navigation, aviation, arbitration, distribution, marketing, and finance.

I ask the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] whether I should also add old-age assistance.

Mr. DOWNEY. Social security.

Mr. HATCH. Does any Senator doubt that those statements are true, and that we are all confronted with those problems every day of our lives?

Continuing the quotation:

They involve esoteric details intelligible only to a specialist and painful beyond bearing to a man whose specialty is wire-pulling. Our Representative takes refuge in his newspaper, and votes as (sometimes) he is told.

As government becomes more complex elected officials become less and less important, selected experts more and more.

I want Senators to listen to this. They complain about having expert assistants.

The Executive encroaches upon the legislative power because the Executive is armed and buttressed with expert committees.

He has his Federal Reserve Board, his Federal Trade Commission, the Labor Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and all the other boards, for all of which we in the Congress appropriate not hundreds but thousands and even millions of dollars to pay for experts to serve the executive branch of the Government.

The author also says:

During President Harding's administration the Members of Congress were shocked to find themselves, in a parade, behind the members of certain of the aforesaid commissions. The Senate protested with 10 whereases and two therefores, and Mr. Harding answered with that kindly suavity which had sufficed to make him President. But the straw had shown the wind. "Representative government" had broken down, democracy had found no way of electing brains to office.

I do not know whether we can elect brains to office; but I say to Senators that the amendment which is offered contains a provision which is intended to provide for the Members of Congress to have additional help, and perhaps to provide some brains, and they should have it. I am very jealous of the legislative branch of the Government, and I am very strong in my belief that we do ourselves an injustice—more than that, we do the country an injustice—if we fail to provide ourselves with all the essential sinews which ought to make us good Representatives and good Senators for the Nation at large.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

For a special executive assistant for each Senator at the rate of $4,500 per annum, fiscal year 1942, $216,000, for the period starting January 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1942, such positions are authorized for the period of the emergency only.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—53

Bankhead	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hatch	Overton
Bilbo	Herring	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Reynolds
Bridges	Hughes	Russell
Brooks	Kilgore	Schwartz
Brown	La Follette	Shipstead
Caraway	Lee	Smith
Chandler	Lucas	Spencer
Chavez	McCarran	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Okla
Connally	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	Maybank	Truman
Davis	Mead	Tunnell
Downey	Murdock	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murray	Wallgren
Green	Nye	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Daniel	

NAYS—30

Aiken	George	McKellar
Austin	Gerry	McNary
Ball	Gillette	Norris
Barbour	Glass	Radcliffe
Bunker	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Holman	Tydings
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Vandenberg
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh
Capper	Langer	Wiley
Doxey	Lodge	Willis

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Taft
Bailey	Reed	Tobey
Bone	Rosier	Wagner
Bulow	Smathers	White

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—War Department—Military Activities—Expediting Production," on

page 2, line 14, after the word "defense", to strike out "$263,000,000" and insert "$388,000,000: *Provided*, That expenditures from appropriations under this heading may hereafter be made without securing the specific approval of the projects by the President".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Staff Corps", on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

CONTINGENT FUND, CHIEF OF STAFF

For contingent fund, Chief of Staff, $125,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 3 months, shall make to Congress a detailed statement of expenditures made from this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Finance Department—Pay of the Army", on page 3, line 14, after the figures "$314,000,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be subject to any limitation as to the number of selective trainees who may be paid therefrom."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Travel of the Army," on page 3, line 18, after the figures "$10,000,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading may be applied to the payment of money allowances in lieu of transportation, or transportation and subsistence, at the rate of 3 cents per mile to enlisted men regardless of the mode of travel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army Transportation," on page 4, line 11, after the word "transportation", to strike out "$148,285,000" and insert "$370,079,085, of which amount not to exceed $30,000,000 shall be available for the procurement from the United States Maritime Commission of five Army transports."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Military Posts," on page 4, line 21, after the word "posts", to strike out "$434,320,000" and insert "$827,820,000."

EXPANDED AIR FORCE NECESSARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which amendment does the Senator refer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To the amendment the clerk has just read, on page 4, line 21.

In connection with this amendment I should also like to call attention to the amendment on page 39, line 20. I speak now on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself to urge an increase in both these items.

The appropriation on page 4, line 21, includes an increase of $390,000,000 above the House figure for the construction of aviation facilities by the Army. As it was justified to the Appropriations Committee, this item of $390,000,000 included $75,000,000 for the housing of 54,000 men of a technician program upon the completion of training; $100,000,000 for housing to complete the first aviation objective; and $215,000,000 for the completion of 14 skeletonized fields included in the estimates.

Mr. President, I think everyone will agree that the events of the last few days have demonstrated beyond any possibility of challenge that the most effective arm of the Military Establishment is the aviation arm; the most effective method of both defense and attack in warfare is by the use of the airplane. I have heard Senators upon this floor speak with a good deal of feeling with respect to the terrible disaster that occurred last Sunday at Pearl Harbor, and there was a disposition upon the part of some to feel that the Navy was possibly at fault in that disaster; but what happened a few days later at Singapore when the mighty new British battleship, the *Prince of Wales*, was sunk and the mighty cruiser *Repulse* was also sunk demonstrated to my satisfaction, at least, that the fault at Pearl Harbor lay not with the personnel upon any of our naval vessels but to the fact that the new weapon of warfare, the air force, which is capable of executing tremendous destruction, has not been sufficiently developed by this Nation. We in Congress must accept some blame for our lack of preparation. The British battleship *Prince of Wales* and the British cruiser *Repulse* were not taken unawares. Yet they suffered exactly the same fate that was visited upon some of our vessels in Pearl Harbor.

Not only is it true that the American and British Navies have suffered great losses from attacks by enemy airplanes, but it is now known to us and to all the world that the Japanese Navy has likewise suffered from the attacks of our planes. A Navy flyer, Captain Kelly, of Florida, lost his life only yesterday in a daring attack upon a Japanese battleship, an attack which resulted in the sinking of that vessel. Other flyers, notably a flying officer named Wagner, helped to revenge our losses at Pearl Harbor by the destruction of enemy airplanes; and the gallant defenders of Wake Island, through the use of aviation, have sunk two Japanese vessels.

Mr. President, to me this means but one thing, namely, that if we desire to perfect our defenses, we must make certain that we shall have an adequate air force. The sad truth is that we have been building up our air defense by little bits and pieces instead of undertaking to build it thoroughly and completely.

A year or two ago we began with 16 groups for the Army and then we increased it to 36. A little later we increased it to 54; and now we are increasing it to 84. I know that in the judgment of the experts of the War Department we ought to have an air force of 150 units, and yet in this bill, which comes to the floor of the Senate after the disaster at Pearl Harbor, after the disaster at Singapore, we are still appropriating for only 84 units. This is a program that was adopted before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator knows that we have appropriated for the Air Service just what we were requested to appropriate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. We cannot go over the heads of the departments; that would be unwise; but certainly we have appropriated for every airplane for which they have asked us to appropriate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my point is that the War Department should not attack this problem in bits and pieces, and that the Congress of the United States should not be content to have them attack the problem in bits and pieces. The evidence which was submitted to the committee shows clearly that $100,000,000 included in the $390,000,000 is for housing to complete the first aviation objective. Why should we stop with the completion of the first aviation objective? It seems to me, Mr. President, to be quite clear that we should tolerate no delay whatsoever in carrying out as full a program as it is possible to carry out.

A year or more ago the Civil Aeronautics Authority came to the Congress with a recommendation for the building of certain auxiliary air fields. That recommendation was followed partially in the House of Representatives, but when it came to the Senate it was rejected. I stood upon this floor at that time, Mr. President, urging that it was a mistake to reject the recommendations of the C. A. A., because I was then and am now convinced that the defense of the Nation demands that we have the largest possible number of air fields in the shortest possible time.

If there is one thing certain it is that an air force cannot be used efficiently unless there are sufficient fields from which planes may rise and upon which they may alight. An air force without a large number of air fields cannot realize its full effectiveness.

The bill which the committee brings in calls for 104 auxiliary air fields. I know that the experts of the Civil Aeronautics Authority are of the opinion that we ought to have 240 additional auxiliary air fields; so the amendments which I am offering on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and myself provide for an increase of $100,000,000 in the item on page 4 for the Army, and an increase of $68,000,000 in the item on line 20, page 39, for the Civil Aeronautics Authority. If we are to defend our Nation, we must have the greatest air force on earth.

Mr. President, without further argument upon this point, I move to amend the committee amendment on line 21, page 4, by substituting for the figure reported by the House, which was $434,320,000, the sum of $927,820,000, so that the Army may have an opportunity to proceed with its program beyond the first objective; on page 39, line 20, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$127,115,300", and at line 21, strike out "$2,375,000" and insert "$3,815,450."

country for the purpose of bringing such war to a successful termination, the financial resources of the country should be mobilized and made available for the prosecution of the war by means of a mandatory investment plan.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and directed to cause to be taken a census of the net wealth and income of every citizen of the United States, every resident alien, and every nonresident alien having any wealth in the United States. Upon the completion of such census, the President shall cause to be computed each such person's ability to lend to the Government and shall classify all such persons according to their ability to lend to the Government.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever during the existence of any war declared by the Congress it becomes necessary for the Government to borrow money for the prosecution of such war, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, from time to time, determine the sums which are necessary for the prosecution of such war and shall issue bonds in convenient size and denominations for such sums. Such bonds shall not be transferable, shall bear interest at a rate not in excess of 1 percent per annum, and shall not be tax exempt either as to principal or interest.

(b) The President shall prorate among the persons covered by any census taken pursuant to this act the sums which such persons are required to invest in each separate issue of such bonds. Such proration shall be on a graduated scale similar to that of the graduated income tax, so that each person shall be required to invest according to his ability. This proration shall be repeated from time to time so long as it is necessary for the Government to borrow money to prosecute such war.

(c) Each such person shall purchase such bonds in the amounts so allotted and within the time so prescribed.

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized, in his discretion, to provide, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the acceptance by the United States of property or services which are valuable for the prosecution of war in payment for the bonds provided for by section 3 of this act. Such rules and regulations shall provide for the method of valuation of any such property or services.

(b) The President is further authorized to provide, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the acceptance from any person, in payment for the bonds authorized by section 3 of this act, of notes or other obligations of such person, bearing interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum and adequately secured by liens upon specified property.

SEC. 5. (a) The President is authorized to establish such boards, agencies, and tribunals and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) The President is authorized to employ such officials and employees and to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever shall knowingly violate any rule or regulation promulgated by the President under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Whoever shall willfully refuse or fail to purchase the principal amount of bonds which he is required to purchase under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], on page 4, line 21, in the committee amendment in lieu of "$827,820,000" to insert "$927,820,000"; in the committee amendment on page 39, line 20, in lieu of "$59,115,300" to insert "$127,115,300"; and on the same page, in the committee amendment, line 21, in lieu of "$2,815,450" to insert "$3,815,450".

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments, as amended.

The committee amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 5, at the end of line 3, to increase the appropriation for the Signal Service of the Army from $239,074,852 to $257,160,452.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 5, line 17, after the name "Army", to strike out $19,122,000" and insert "$129,222,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, after the name "Army", to increase the appropriation for ordnance service and supplies, Army, from $2,464,984,000 to $3,719,883,246.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army of the Philippines," on page 7, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "and regulations" and insert "Executive orders and regulations which were in effect November 1, 1941,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 11, in the subhead, after the word "General", to strike out "Provision" and insert "Provisions."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 20, after "(Public, No. 11)" and the period, to strike out "The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under authority of this paragraph shall not exceed $500,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I offer an amendment to strike out all the language in section 102, so as to send the matter to conference. That involves the lend-lease matter which has been referred to previously, and, in order to send it to conference, section 102 should be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 102, being lines 12 to 22, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Tennessee offered an amendment to strike out lines 12 to 22, inclusive, on page 8?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. I will say to him that the purpose of the amendment is that we may act with greater clearness and precision about the lend-lease matter, so as to put the whole thing in conference. There is no intention of materially changing that language. The substance of it will be preserved.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the next amendment commences at the bottom of page 8, at the beginning of line 23, and runs to page 9, line 5, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Earlier I questioned the Senator from Tennessee about the intendment of the language, particularly so much thereof as appears in lines 2 to 5, inclusive, on page 9. Apparently it was his thought, as he answered me, that that matter was completely new. Since I first questioned him I have taken occasion to look up the sections of the statute which I felt were being implemented by the proposed appropriation. I think the particular section should appear in the RECORD at this point, in order that it may supplement the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and me earlier when this matter was under consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. DANAHER. Pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, I call attention to title 50, section 21, of the United States Code, and subsequent sections, but particularly to section 21. Inasmuch as it is brief, I shall read it:

SEC. 21. Restraint, regulation, and removal: Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government, or any invasion or predatory incursion is perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States by any foreign nation or government, and the President makes public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being of the age of 14 years and upward, who shall be within the United States and not actually naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured, and removed as alien enemies. The President is authorized, in any such event, by his proclamation thereof, or other public act, to direct the conduct to be observed, on the part of the United States, toward the aliens who become so liable; the manner and degree of the restraint to which they shall be subject and in what cases, and upon what security their residence shall be permitted, and to provide for the removal of those who, not being permitted to reside within the United States, refuse or neglect to depart therefrom; and to establish any other regulations which are found necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

I understand that since the first of the week the President has in fact issued proclamations under the authority of the section just quoted, and that so much of this section as applies to prisoners of war and those whom the Secretary of War may deem to be similar in status to prisoners of war, is comprehended within the terms of the proclamations that are ap-

plicable outside the immediate territorial limits of the United States. In view of the fact that that important section does implement both the statute and the proclamations issued pursuant thereto, I feel that it is important that the RECORD should show what the situation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 22, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 103. The Secretary of War is authorized to utilize any appropriation available for the Military Establishment, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for all expenses incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners of war, other persons in Army custody whose status is determined by the Secretary of War to be similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in Army custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 6, to change the section number from 103 to 104.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Navy Department—Naval emergency fund," on page 9, line 24, after the word "landings", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "aids", to insert a comma and "and such other objects as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary to further the preparedness of the United States Navy", and on page 10, line 1, before the words "to remain", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

For the following public works and public utilities projects, including the acquisition of necessary land, at a cost not to exceed the amount stated, $335,415,000, which amount, together with unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made under this heading, shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590), shall be applicable to the work under this appropriation:

Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.: Receiving ship facilities and housing for crews of ships, $1,665,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 22, to insert:

Naval air station, New York, N. Y.: For the development of aviation facilities including buildings and accessories, and the acquisition of Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities, $18,750,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are we considering the amendment at the bottom of page 11, beginning in line 23?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to say a few words in regard to that amendment before it is voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last June there was presented to the Naval Affairs Committee the proposition of acquiring Floyd Bennett Field, which I understand belongs to the city of New York. At the time the Naval Affairs Committee was asked to authorize an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the acquisition of that airfield, and during the discussion, as a member of the committee I raised the point that the airfield had been built virtually from moneys furnished by the Federal Government through the W. P. A. and other Federal agencies. I do not know if it was as a result of my opposition, but the bill presented to the committee was not enacted.

I am wondering whether the Federal Government should be called upon today to purchase this airfield and not receive credit for such sums as it spent in its development.

Yesterday, in connection with Senate bill 2096, the Naval Affairs Committee considered an authorization of $310,000,000. In that authorization was a proviso for the purchase of Floyd Bennett Field. Again $10,000,000 was asked for the purchase of adjacent lands and buildings and improvements thereon.

I notice in the amendment that we are about to vote upon that the amount has been increased from $10,000,000 to $18,750,000. Last May when that item was considered I asked for information with respect to the amount of money spent by the Federal Government on this field, and all I received was a statement from J. J. Ballantine, commander, United States Navy. A memorandum was sent to my office. Yesterday when the question came up in Naval Affairs Committee I asked the witness—I cannot recall his name at the moment—to give us some facts in regard to this airfield, and there were none available. I did not know at the time that a memorandum had been sent to my office, but I was informed yesterday that a memorandum had been sent to me, and I have it before me.

The memorandum shows that in 1928, when Jamaica Bay Channel was dredged, the Federal Government spent $2,200,000 for that purpose, and the spoil from that river was placed on the land which now forms a part of Floyd Bennett Field.

The memorandum further shows that in 1935 the city of New York obtained from W. P. A. $4,856,000 for various developments in the city of New York, and that of that amount $4,736,000 was spent for the development of Floyd Bennett Field.

The third paragraph of the memorandum states that it is thought that out of a bond issue floated by the city of New York for W. P. A. work, the city spent $3,564,000, and that there is no way to tell how much of that was spent on Floyd Bennett Field. It may have been $100,000. It may have been $1,000,000. We do not know. I believe that before the Senate is called upon to vote on that item we ought to have the facts before us. I do not want to delay the passage of the bill. However, the Federal Government is now in possession of the Floyd Bennett Field under a lease. The Government is now paying $60,000 a year to the city of New York for the use of that field; and it strikes me that we ought to have a little more information in the matter before we appropriate $18,750,000 for its purchase and further improvement. If we cannot await the submission of data on the subject, then I would suggest an amendment to this amendment, providing that the Federal Government shall not pay to the city of New York any more money than the city of New York has spent for the purchase of the land and for its improvement. In other words repay to the city of New York such sums as may have been expended by it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the Senator and the Senate the facts as they appeared before the committee. Admiral Moreell said:

Under this appropriation it is planned to purchase the field, including appurtenances, and provide additional seaplane operating facilities, shop facilities, storage facilities, mess hall and officer accommodations, extend service connections, remodel present structures, improve the landing field, and extend existing runways.

He also gave an all-inclusive description of what is proposed to be done there, which description I desire to have put in the RECORD.

For the purchase of the land $9,750,000 is asked. The tract comprising Floyd Bennett Field amounts to 420 acres. In addition it is proposed to acquire 587 acres of city-owned land to the north and 250 acres of city and privately owned land to the south, or a total of 1,275 acres. For dredging, bulkheading, filling, clearing, and grading, $1,500,000 is asked. If the Senator from Louisiana would like to have the details I have a statement of a page and a half which I will have put in the RECORD, and which adds up to the sum of $18,750,000.

It is true that this item is included in a bill which is now before the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is a member of the committee—as is the Senator from Louisiana—inquired about the matter this morning. Of course, if the amendment is agreed to the item will be eliminated from the Naval Affairs Committee bill; but because of the particular advantages of that field and the danger to one of our greatest cities; the item is asked for by the Navy Department; and it seems to me we should approve it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning at all the need for acquiring the field, but I am questioning the price being paid for it. As I have just indicated, I am informed that the field has been built almost entirely with funds of the Federal Government, money which we appropriated, to the extent of over $6,000,000. How much more, I do not know; we have not been able to obtain the figures. I think it is wrong for the Government to be called upon now to purchase that land from the city of New York and pay full price. Down in New Orleans we have spent millions of dollars in order to erect the New Orleans airport. We have leased it to the Government, together with considerable land around it, for $1 per year as a contribution to the defense program.

On the other hand, here is a tract of land which has been built almost entirely as I have previously stated, from

Mr. President, I suggest that it might be a very advisable thing for the chairman of the subcommittee to accept this amendment and take it to conference, where he will have an opportunity to discuss the matter fully with the War Department, and see whether or not this is a desirable thing to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike more than I can say to disagree with my good friend from Wyoming, who has been so greatly interested in this bill and all its provisions, and has looked at it in such an intelligent way; but I feel that I must do so.

We cannot direct the administrative officers of the Government and say that they need more than they have asked for. I am sure supplemental appropriations on this subject will very soon come before us. I entirely agree with the Senator about the necessity of building as many planes as it is possible to build, but I do not feel that we ought to appropriate more money than our executive officers ask for. After all, we have to depend on the administrative officers to do this job. We ourselves cannot do it.

For that reason I cannot accept the amendment, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point is that by offering this amendment I am not asking the Army to do what it does not intend to do. The Army intends to do this. The Army is of the opinion that instead of having only 84 air fields we should have 150 air fields; and I am merely asking the Members of the Senate now to provide funds so that the Army may more nearly approximate the number of air fields that it believes to be necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what the Army intends to do. We can determine what their intention is only when they make recommendations to the Congress.

As I recall, I have voted for every appropriation which has ever been made for airplanes during my entire service in this body; and if the Army wants more I shall help them in every way in the world. They may come in at any time and get them; but when we have appropriated $390,000,000 more than the House appropriated, and that is what the Department asked for, it seems to me we ought not to go beyond that amount.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the expressions of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] must of necessity appeal to those who are interested in our national defense from the standpoint of air defense.

It has been proven beyond all doubt that in order for us to have a successful national defense, and to carry on the war successfully, we must have an adequate air force. In order to have an adequate air force, it is absolutely imperative that at once—not by delayed process, but at once—we go about building that air force from the standpoint of adequacy.

That being true, the Army has looked forward; but the Army must come through the Budget Bureau in order to get to Congress, and on many occasions requests on the part of the Army are curtailed by the Budget Bureau. I am not saying that that has been done in the case of this item, but I know and we all know how it operates. If we, as the Congress of the United States, are interested in building our air force from the ground up, we should be interested in building it at once; not piecemeal, not a little at a time, but grossly, if you please, and determinedly.

We now have throughout the length and breadth of this country only a few air bases. Hundreds and thousands of young men every day are applying to enter military aviation. It is not very long since my attention was drawn to the fact that a whole contingent of trained pilots, men who held pilots' certificates to go into the air, were denied the right even to take hold of a plane, and were held in a camp in the South where they could not have access to a plane. That complaint was brought to me by young men who were in that camp, who were ready, willing, competent and trained, and held pilots' certificates to go into the air, but they were denied the right. Why? In all probability because the facilities were not available.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming in conjunction with myself is to make immediately available training bases and other bases for aviation purposes, so that our young men who are crowding into that side of our military defense may be afforded the opportunity. If, on the other hand, we do this only by piecemeal, eventually it will be asked, "Why did you not prepare by air, for air is the greatest arm of defense?"

I think this is the time for the Congress to act and urge our experts in the Army to go forward. We say to them by this amendment, "We are affording you the money. You have set up the plan, or, if you have not set it up, you should set it up, and you should go forward at once."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he knows about the time of the Budget's recommendation upon this point. That is to say, had the United States been assaulted by Japan? Had the demonstration of the supremacy of the air forces been made before the Budget Bureau made its recommendations?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am inclined to believe—and in this matter the Senator must take merely my conjecture by way of answer—that the Budget Bureau had passed on this item before the incident to which the Senator refers. I come to that conclusion merely by taking events as they have come along, and because of the bill having come through the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly what was done was this: The House appropriated $434,320,000 before war was declared. After war was declared, the Army came in with an additional estimate of $393,500,000 and the Senate committee has reported $393,500,000 additional. In other words, this has been done by the Senate committee since the declaration of war, and it has been done during the past 2 or 3 days.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, just one last expression on this matter. I think it has been demonstrated, as I have before stated, that the arm of our military defense based on air development is perhaps our most potential arm. That being true, and the demand in our armed forces for training being so great, and training bases for the use being so necessary, we should not hesitate to say to the Army, "We are affording you all of the money which will be required to install 150 air bases, or 150 units. Now go forward under the plan you have set up, or any plan you will set up."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know the Senator understands that I am greatly interested in the development of the air arm in both civil and military aeronautics. But the question which seems pertinent, or one which occurs to me, at least, is whether the Budget Bureau learned from the military department, from those who should know, that any larger sum of money could be used practicably at this time in that branch of the service.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not advised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to be able to say to the Senator from Vermont that it is the intention of the War Department to seek larger appropriations for this very purpose, but in the few days which elapsed between the day the bill was passed in the House and the attack upon Pearl Harbor the War Department laid before the Bureau of the Budget only the program for this so-called first objective. The purpose of the amendment is to enable the War Department to begin to go forward at the earliest possible date with the program with which they intend to go forward.

It will be said that the matter will be taken care of when the Budget Bureau sends up some new estimates to be included in another deficiency bill. My point is that there is no sense in waiting. Let us act now, and let us indicate to the people of the country that we intend to sustain the efforts to expand our air forces.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to say that the War Department has asked for $390,000,000 at this time with which to increase the air bases, and to meet the attendant expenses, for the purpose of providing housing, and to care for the number of new units for which they have prepared. They have a carefully prepared plan, they have prepared for so many units, and the number was in-

creased recently. It was 54 units, now it is 84, and this bill provides for the air bases for those 84 units.

The committee will be open at all times, I assure both Senators, and whenever the Department makes the recommendation for additional units and for additional appropriations, we must appropriate according to their plans. We cannot make the plans for them, it seems to me, and I say to my two distinguished friends that it would be better to wait until the Department sends in its recommendations. Whenever it does, I am sure the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will call the committee together, and if necessary we will have hearings, and will pass on the matter immediately, or as soon as possible.

I agree with the Senator as to the importance of airplanes, and we are doing everything the Department asks. But let us not outrun them in the matter, because it is their business to arrange the plans and specifications for what should be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not advocate outrunning them, but I do advocate making the pace whereby they may carry out their own program, and their own program calls for approximately 150 units, of which 84 are provided for in the bill before us. It seems to me that it behooves Congress, in view of what has happened, in view of the example we have set, not to outrun them, but at least to keep up with the Army and give them adequate means for carrying out the program which they have already established. If that is done we cannot be blamed.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield further, I assure him we will keep up with them, and when they make recommendations for the planes and bases they need the money will be furnished quickly, and they can go to their task.

Mr. McCARRAN. Now is the time to furnish the money so they may proceed with the program.

MOBILIZATION OF FINANCIAL AND CREDIT RESOURCES

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is now considering a bill to provide for the registration of all manpower from 18 to 45 years of age, perhaps 65 years, an all-out plan to make available the manpower of this country. We are here now considering a bill making appropriations of $10,000,000,000.

What is going to happen to this country when we reach the point when we cannot raise money by the present method? The sale of our bonds is not keeping up with our appropriations of funds. Three things are necessary to prosecute a war successfully—men, materials, and money. We have made provision for supplying the men and the materials, and I am about to offer a bill which will make provision for supplying the money, by mobilizing the financial and credit resources of the United States under a mandatory investment plan.

The advantage of this plan would be several fold. In the first place and most important of all, it would supply us with the sinews of war as they were needed. If we do not have some plan of this kind, we will reach the same point other nations have reached, when they could no longer raise money by a voluntary plan, and were forced to turn to the inflationary printing press method of raising money.

This plan has another advantage, namely, the preventing to a great extent of inflation, which certainly will come unless we have some method of preventing it.

Economists tell us that we have wealth in the United States to the amount of $350,000,000,000. If before inflation gets into full swing we can systematically and methodically lay down a plan for utilizing the wealth of the Nation as the backlog of credit and at the same time a plan which will prevent inflation, we will then be able to finance the war without a financial debacle overtaking us.

Many economists have recommended a forced saving plan. My plan is one which requires the people of the United States to purchase bonds in proportion to their ability to purchase them. It is patterned after the income tax, that is, it employs a graduated scale, which would require people to purchase bonds in proportion to their ability to purchase those bonds.

It provides a method of making liquid the nonliquid assets of the United States, so that they can be used in paying our war bills.

Under the provisions of this bill these bonds would not be transferrable. They would be like the soldiers' bonus bonds. The important point is that after the war, when the day arrives to redeem the bonds, the money would go back to the source from which it was collected, instead of going to New York City, or to the other financial centers. It would go back to the "grass roots," it would go back into every little community where it was raised in the first instance, and that would go a long way toward preventing an after-war depression. It would go a long way toward preventing the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, which always means misery for the many.

The first paragraph of this bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that in view of the existence of war which has necessitated the drafting of manpower and in view of the fact that the Congress in declaring war has pledged all of the resources of the country for the purpose of bringing such war to a successful termination, the financial resources of the country should be mobilized and made available for the prosecution of the war by means of a mandatory investment plan.

I shall not read the remainder of the bill, but ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, here is a sane and calm approach with respect to financing this war. We have already voted larger appropriations than were ever voted by any Congress in the history of the Nation. Therefore, we must look to some mandatory method of financing, because the voluntary method will not provide a sufficient amount of credit to meet the appropriations we are making.

When we go to a mandatory savings plan—and that is what it would be—we are merely seeking to utilize the wealth of the United States as the backlog of credit for financing this war effort. We are seeking to do that by distributing the burden according to the financial ability of each individual. There are those who say that we can take the money from the income stream, but we cannot. No nation has ever been able to pay for a major war as it fought that war. It is necessary for us to borrow either against the savings of the past or against the potential wealth of the future. In addition to the money raised by a steep tax, it is going to be necessary for us to borrow. What is going to happen when we reach the time, which we shall, after voting these appropriations, when the Treasury tells us it cannot write another check to pay for another contract, that it cannot get the money by borrowing? It certainly is to be hoped that we will not be forced to resort to the strong-arm method of raising money and selling bonds that we had to resort to before. This war is so much larger than the other that I do not believe the financing of it could be done even in that way.

Is there anything wrong in asking a man to lend his credit to the Government—even in compelling him to do so in proportion to his ability? Shall we hesitate to do that when at the same time we are asking men to go out and face death; when we are compelling them to take their place in the armed forces? Certainly, if we are drafting men for war, the most hazardous job in the world, we should not flinch from the other part of our task, which is to ask people to help finance the war according to their ability.

My bill provides the method of translating the nonliquid assets of America into liquid assets which the Government can use without requiring the owner of such property to liquidate it. The Government simply says to a man who has nonliquid property, "We want you to lend us the use of your credit, supported by your property as a backlog of credit for financing this war." That is provided in this bill. I thought it appropriate while considering this $10,000,000,000 appropriation measure to offer the bill now and to make this explanation of it.

I now introduce the bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2124) to provide for mobilizing the financial and credit resources of the country under a mandatory investment plan, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that in view of the existence of war which has necessitated the drafting of manpower and in view of the fact that the Congress in declaring war has pledged all of the resources of the

country for the purpose of bringing such war to a successful termination, the financial resources of the country should be mobilized and made available for the prosecution of the war by means of a mandatory investment plan.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and directed to cause to be taken a census of the net wealth and income of every citizen of the United States, every resident alien, and every nonresident alien having any wealth in the United States. Upon the completion of such census, the President shall cause to be computed each such person's ability to lend to the Government and shall classify all such persons according to their ability to lend to the Government.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever during the existence of any war declared by the Congress it becomes necessary for the Government to borrow money for the prosecution of such war, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, from time to time, determine the sums which are necessary for the prosecution of such war and shall issue bonds in convenient size and denominations for such sums. Such bonds shall not be transferable, shall bear interest at a rate not in excess of 1 percent per annum, and shall not be tax exempt either as to principal or interest.

(b) The President shall prorate among the persons covered by any census taken pursuant to this act the sums which such persons are required to invest in each separate issue of such bonds. Such proration shall be on a graduated scale similar to that of the graduated income tax, so that each person shall be required to invest according to his ability. This proration shall be repeated from time to time so long as it is necessary for the Government to borrow money to prosecute such war.

(c) Each such person shall purchase such bonds in the amounts so allotted and within the time so prescribed.

SEC. 4. (a) The President is authorized, in his discretion, to provide, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the acceptance by the United States of property or services which are valuable for the prosecution of war in payment for the bonds provided for by section 3 of this act. Such rules and regulations shall provide for the method of valuation of any such property or services.

(b) The President is further authorized to provide, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, for the acceptance from any person, in payment for the bonds authorized by section 3 of this act, of notes or other obligations of such person, bearing interest at a rate not to exceed 3 percent per annum and adequately secured by liens upon specified property.

SEC. 5. (a) The President is authorized to establish such boards, agencies, and tribunals and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) The President is authorized to employ such officials and employees and to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever shall knowingly violate any rule or regulation promulgated by the President under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Whoever shall willfully refuse or fail to purchase the principal amount of bonds which he is required to purchase under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], on page 4, line 21, in the committee amendment in lieu of "$827,820,000" to insert "$927,820,000"; in the committee amendment on page 39, line 20, in lieu of "$59,115,300" to insert "$127,115,300"; and on the same page, in the committee amendment, line 21, in lieu of "$2,815,450" to insert "$3,815,450".

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments, as amended.

The committee amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 5, at the end of line 3, to increase the appropriation for the Signal Service of the Army from $239,074,852 to $257,160,452.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Corps of Engineers—Engineer Service, Army," on page 5, line 17, after the name "Army", to strike out $19,122,000" and insert "$129,222,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, after the name "Army", to increase the appropriation for ordnance service and supplies, Army, from $2,464,984,000 to $3,719,883,246.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Army of the Philippines," on page 7, line 18, after the word "law", to strike out "and regulations" and insert "Executive orders and regulations which were in effect November 1, 1941,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 11, in the subhead, after the word "General", to strike out "Provision" and insert "Provisions."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 20, after "(Public, No. 11)" and the period, to strike out "The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under authority of this paragraph shall not exceed $500,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I offer an amendment to strike out all the language in section 102, so as to send the matter to conference. That involves the lend-lease matter which has been referred to previously, and, in order to send it to conference, section 102 should be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, it is proposed to strike out all of section 102, being lines 12 to 22, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Tennessee offered an amendment to strike out lines 12 to 22, inclusive, on page 8?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. I will say to him that the purpose of the amendment is that we may act with greater clearness and precision about the lend-lease matter, so as to put the whole thing in conference. There is no intention of materially changing that language. The substance of it will be preserved.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the next amendment commences at the bottom of page 8, at the beginning of line 23, and runs to page 9, line 5, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Earlier I questioned the Senator from Tennessee about the intendment of the language, particularly so much thereof as appears in lines 2 to 5, inclusive, on page 9. Apparently it was his thought, as he answered me, that that matter was completely new. Since I first questioned him I have taken occasion to look up the sections of the statute which I felt were being implemented by the proposed appropriation. I think the particular section should appear in the RECORD at this point, in order that it may supplement the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and me earlier when this matter was under consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. DANAHER. Pursuant to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, I call attention to title 50, section 21, of the United States Code, and subsequent sections, but particularly to section 21. Inasmuch as it is brief, I shall read it:

SEC. 21. Restraint, regulation, and removal: Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government, or any invasion or predatory incursion is perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States by any foreign nation or government, and the President makes public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being of the age of 14 years and upward, who shall be within the United States and not actually naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured, and removed as alien enemies. The President is authorized, in any such event, by his proclamation thereof, or other public act, to direct the conduct to be observed, on the part of the United States, toward the aliens who become so liable; the manner and degree of the restraint to which they shall be subject and in what cases, and upon what security their residence shall be permitted, and to provide for the removal of those who, not being permitted to reside within the United States, refuse or neglect to depart therefrom; and to establish any other regulations which are found necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

I understand that since the first of the week the President has in fact issued proclamations under the authority of the section just quoted, and that so much of this section as applies to prisoners of war and those whom the Secretary of War may deem to be similar in status to prisoners of war, is comprehended within the terms of the proclamations that are ap-

plicable outside the immediate territorial limits of the United States. In view of the fact that that important section does implement both the statute and the proclamations issued pursuant thereto, I feel that it is important that the RECORD should show what the situation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 22, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 103. The Secretary of War is authorized to utilize any appropriation available for the Military Establishment, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for all expenses incident to the maintenance, pay, and allowances of prisoners of war, other persons in Army custody whose status is determined by the Secretary of War to be similar to prisoners of war, and persons detained in Army custody pursuant to Presidential proclamation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 6, to change the section number from 103 to 104.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Navy Department—Naval emergency fund," on page 9, line 24, after the word "landings", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "aids", to insert a comma and "and such other objects as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary to further the preparedness of the United States Navy", and on page 10, line 1, before the words "to remain", to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 10, to insert:

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

PUBLIC WORKS, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

For the following public works and public utilities projects, including the acquisition of necessary land, at a cost not to exceed the amount stated, $335,415,000, which amount, together with unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made under this heading, shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590), shall be applicable to the work under this appropriation:

Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.: Receiving ship facilities and housing for crews of ships, $1,665,000;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 22, to insert:

Naval air station, New York, N. Y.: For the development of aviation facilities including buildings and accessories, and the acquisition of Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities, $18,750,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are we considering the amendment at the bottom of page 11, beginning in line 23?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to say a few words in regard to that amendment before it is voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last June there was presented to the Naval Affairs Committee the proposition of acquiring Floyd Bennett Field, which I understand belongs to the city of New York. At the time the Naval Affairs Committee was asked to authorize an appropriation of $10,000,000 for the acquisition of that airfield, and during the discussion, as a member of the committee I raised the point that the airfield had been built virtually from moneys furnished by the Federal Government through the W. P. A. and other Federal agencies. I do not know if it was as a result of my opposition, but the bill presented to the committee was not enacted.

I am wondering whether the Federal Government should be called upon today to purchase this airfield and not receive credit for such sums as it spent in its development.

Yesterday, in connection with Senate bill 2096, the Naval Affairs Committee considered an authorization of $310,000,000. In that authorization was a proviso for the purchase of Floyd Bennett Field. Again $10,000,000 was asked for the purchase of adjacent lands and buildings and improvements thereon.

I notice in the amendment that we are about to vote upon that the amount has been increased from $10,000,000 to $18,750,000. Last May when that item was considered I asked for information with respect to the amount of money spent by the Federal Government on this field, and all I received was a statement from J. J. Ballantine, commander, United States Navy. A memorandum was sent to my office. Yesterday when the question came up in Naval Affairs Committee I asked the witness—I cannot recall his name at the moment—to give us some facts in regard to this airfield, and there were none available. I did not know at the time that a memorandum had been sent to my office, but I was informed yesterday that a memorandum had been sent to me, and I have it before me.

The memorandum shows that in 1928, when Jamaica Bay Channel was dredged, the Federal Government spent $2,200,000 for that purpose, and the spoil from that river was placed on the land which now forms a part of Floyd Bennett Field.

The memorandum further shows that in 1935 the city of New York obtained from W. P. A. $4,856,000 for various developments in the city of New York, and that of that amount $4,736,000 was spent for the development of Floyd Bennett Field.

The third paragraph of the memorandum states that it is thought that out of a bond issue floated by the city of New York for W. P. A. work, the city spent $3,564,000, and that there is no way to tell how much of that was spent on Floyd Bennett Field. It may have been $100,000. It may have been $1,000,000. We do not know. I believe that before the Senate is called upon to vote on that item we ought to have the facts before us. I do not want to delay the passage of the bill. However, the Federal Government is now in possession of the Floyd Bennett Field under a lease. The Government is now paying $60,000 a year to the city of New York for the use of that field; and it strikes me that we ought to have a little more information in the matter before we appropriate $18,750,000 for its purchase and further improvement. If we cannot await the submission of data on the subject, then I would suggest an amendment to this amendment, providing that the Federal Government shall not pay to the city of New York any more money than the city of New York has spent for the purchase of the land and for its improvement. In other words repay to the city of New York such sums as may have been expended by it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the Senator and the Senate the facts as they appeared before the committee. Admiral Moreell said:

Under this appropriation it is planned to purchase the field, including appurtenances, and provide additional seaplane operating facilities, shop facilities, storage facilities, mess hall and officer accommodations, extend service connections, remodel present structures, improve the landing field, and extend existing runways.

He also gave an all-inclusive description of what is proposed to be done there, which description I desire to have put in the RECORD.

For the purchase of the land $9,750,000 is asked. The tract comprising Floyd Bennett Field amounts to 420 acres. In addition it is proposed to acquire 587 acres of city-owned land to the north and 250 acres of city and privately owned land to the south, or a total of 1,275 acres. For dredging, bulkheading, filling, clearing, and grading, $1,500,000 is asked. If the Senator from Louisiana would like to have the details I have a statement of a page and a half which I will have put in the RECORD, and which adds up to the sum of $18,750,000.

It is true that this item is included in a bill which is now before the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is a member of the committee—as is the Senator from Louisiana—inquired about the matter this morning. Of course, if the amendment is agreed to the item will be eliminated from the Naval Affairs Committee bill; but because of the particular advantages of that field and the danger to one of our greatest cities; the item is asked for by the Navy Department; and it seems to me we should approve it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning at all the need for acquiring the field, but I am questioning the price being paid for it. As I have just indicated, I am informed that the field has been built almost entirely with funds of the Federal Government, money which we appropriated, to the extent of over $6,000,000. How much more, I do not know; we have not been able to obtain the figures. I think it is wrong for the Government to be called upon now to purchase that land from the city of New York and pay full price. Down in New Orleans we have spent millions of dollars in order to erect the New Orleans airport. We have leased it to the Government, together with considerable land around it, for $1 per year as a contribution to the defense program.

On the other hand, here is a tract of land which has been built almost entirely as I have previously stated, from

funds put up by the Federal Government, and now we are being asked to appropriate millions of dollars to purchase it.

Mr. President, I am not objecting to the acquisition of this field; but I believe that if we are to acquire it we should limit the purchase price to whatever the city has spent in its development, and stop at that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. This discussion came up in the Committee on Naval Affairs. I take it the Senator from Louisiana is trying to keep the Government from buying property which it owns.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; to some extent. Although the Federal Government spent the money to rebuild the land, title remains in the city of New York.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Louisiana has pointed out the fact that the Federal Government has spent $6,000,000 to develop the field, which enhanced its value; and now we are to purchase the whole thing with improvements.

Mr. ELLENDER. And at a big price.

Mr. SMITH. It seems to me that we should know whether or not that amount has been deducted from the purchase price, putting the property back in the condition in which it was before the Government spent any money on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, even though this item be stricken from the bill, the Government will not suffer at this time, because it now has the field under lease. Let us get the facts, or else accept an amendment whereby the amount to be spent for this field by the Federal Government shall not exceed the amount which the city of New York has spent for land and improvements.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only trouble about that suggestion is that those matters have all been settled.

Mr. ELLENDER. By whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. By the Government; the Government is now renting the field. It belongs to the city of New York, and the Federal Government is now renting the field and paying so much a year for it.

The purpose of this provision is to do away with that lease, buy the property, and develop it. The development of it will cost many times as much as the rent.

Floyd Bennett Field comprises only 420 acres out of 1,257 acres which are to be purchased and made into a flying field. Therefore, it seems to me that the matter ought to be threshed out in conference. I think it should go to conference. Whatever we do about it we should do quickly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that necessary in this case, when the Government has the field under lease? We have possession of it; and a few days' or a few weeks' delay will cause no harm. All I am asking is the opportunity to get the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would hurt to this extent: I do not think the Senator would want the Government to spend about $10,000,000 for dredging, piers, seaplane ramps, and other facilities on leased land. We should buy it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me ask the Senator this question: Is it fair for the Federal Government to buy land today and pay millions of dollars for it when, as a matter of fact, the Federal Government itself developed that land for the city of New York?

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what Admiral Moreell said:

> At the present time the Navy Department is leasing Floyd Bennett Field, the lease expiring at the end of the emergency. Activities are necessarily limited, due to the lack of operating personnel and storage facilities, and extended construction on leased property is contrary to naval policy.

While it may be that some money has been spent on this field, it was not for purposes for which the Navy now wishes to use it. I believe that the Senator will find that the purposes set out here are proper and that no injury will be done to the Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the breakdown show how much money will be paid to the city of New York for its portion of the land comprising Floyd Bennett Field?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it does not. But the $9,750,000 is for the purpose of acquiring the tract comprising Floyd Bennett Field—a tract of 420 acres—and also 587 acres of city-owned land to the north and 250 acres of city and privately owned property to the south, or a total of 1,257 acres.

Mr. President, I desire to have included in the RECORD at this point a detailed statement showing how every dollar of the money will be spent.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Naval Air Station, New York, N. Y.: Development of aviation facilities, including buildings and accessories and acquisition of land	$18,750,000

At the present time the Navy Department is leasing Floyd Bennett Field under an agreement expiring at the end of the emergency. Activities are necessarily limited due to the lack of operating, personnel, and storage facilities, and extended construction on leased property is contrary to naval policy.

The directive for the 15,000-plane program provides for the establishment of an air station at New York for the maintenance and operation of 2 patrol squadrons, 1 inshore patrol squadron, and 1 carrier group. Activities at Floyd Bennett Field now include the following: Preliminary flight training at the Reserve base, the East Coast Ferry Service, and the final servicing and installation of strategical parts on newly acquired Navy planes. This work will be continued along with regular air-station operations as proposed for this location.

Under this appropriation it is planned to purchase the field, including appurtenances, and provide additional seaplane operating facilities, shop facilities, storage buildings, mess hall and officer accommodations, extend service connections, remodel present structures, improve the landing field, and extend existing runways. The specific projects, with estimates of cost, are as follows:

Purchase of land (The tract comprising Floyd Bennett Field amounts to 420 acres; in addition it is proposed to acquire 587 acres of city-owned land on the north and 250 acres of city and privately owned property to the south, or a total of 1,257 acres.)	$9,750,000
Dredging, bulkhead, filling, clearing, and grading	1,500,000
Marginal pier	$450,000
Seaplane ramps (2)	180,000
Night and field lighting facilities	50,000
Seaplane parking area (40,000 square yards)	160,000
Seaplane hangar (1)	800,000
Repairs to landplane hangars	200,000
Landing-field grading, drainage, and irrigation	200,000
Extensions to landplane runways (150,000 square yards)	400,000
Barracks and mess hall (1,000)	600,000
Barracks and mess hall for chief petty officers (75)	45,000
Marine barracks and mess hall (100)	60,000
Quarters for bachelor officers (100)	200,000
Quarters for senior officers (10)	75,000
Quarters for married enlisted men (10)	35,000
Recreation buildings and facilities for enlisted men	100,000
Recreation building and facilities for officers	25,000
Repairs and improvements to existing administration and operations building and facilities for radio receiving and aerology	100,000
Radio transmission building and towers	125,000
Dispensary (30 beds)	150,000
Station maintenance shop, truck gasoline facilities and garage	100,000
Power plant building and equipment	275,000
Cold storage and laundry building and equipment	200,000
Gatehouse and fencing	100,000
General storehouse	400,000
Paint and oil storehouse	40,000
Gasoline storage and distri ution system (200,000 gals.)	100,000
Fuel oil storage and distribution system (5,000 bbls.)	25,000
Electric distribution system	180,000
Telephone system	50,000
Crash and fire alarm system	50,000
Steam distribution system	250,000
Water supply system	150,000
Fire protection system	100,000
Sewerage system and treatment plant	200,000
Drainage system	100,000
Roads and walks	100,000
Incinerator	25,000
Boathouse	50,000
Ammunition storage facilities	100,000
Torpedo shop and storage	40,000
Bombsight shop and storage	30,000
Engineering surveys and investigations	20,000
Collaterals: Furniture, machine tools and equipment	480,000
Contingent, contractors' fees, etc	380,000
Total	18,750,000

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement to which the Senator from Tennessee refers is inserted in the RECORD for the purpose of showing that of the entire amount of land which will be purchased almost 1,000 acres belongs to the city of New York?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the field itself belongs to the city, and also five hundred and some acres adjacent to it belong to the city. The point I have made is that the thousand acres of land and improvements have been built almost exclusively with moneys furnished by the Federal Government, and now we are being asked to buy the same land and improvements from the city of New York.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that he offer an amendment providing that in the purchase of the land called Floyd Bennet Field the improvements made on it by the Federal Government must be taken into consideration. Why will not that cover the matter?

Mr. ELLENDER. That will amount to the same thing that I have been urging, I believe, provided no further additions are made to the agreed purchase price.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will offer that kind of an amendment I will accept it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before we get to that, I should like to ask the Senator one more question. When this matter was presented to the Naval Affairs Committee last May the sum of $10,000,000 was asked, and when it was presented to the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on December 8, $10,000,000 was asked. Why is the amount now $18,750,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. More was asked of the Committee on Naval Affairs than was asked on this bill. The amount of $9,750,000 is provided by the pending measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. For land only?

Mr. McKELLAR. To acquire land.

Mr. ELLENDER. But in the pending item—

Mr. McKELLAR. In connection with the $18,000,000 appropriation, if the Senator will listen to me for a moment, there is an itemized statement showing that exactly $9,000,000 are to be expended for improvements which have to be made in order to put the field in shape as a naval airport.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me read the provision in Senate bill 2096 with respect to Bennett Field. I quote:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities at a cost not to exceed $10,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The pending amendment provides $9,750,000 for the same items. So, the amount is $250,000 less than in the bill before the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment which I have proposed is to this effect—I jotted it down hurriedly, but it might be sent to conference in this form:

"Provided, That in the purchase of this field of New York shall not be in excess of the sum actually expended by it for the land and improvements claimed by it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would be very much wiser, as it has to be done right away, to put the proviso in this language to come in on page 12, line 2, after the numerals "$18,750,000":

Provided, That in the purchase of this field the Navy Department must take into consideration the improvements put thereon by the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLENDER—

And any amounts expended by the Federal Government in developing the airfield or the property in question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The amendment of Mr. McKELLAR to the amendment as agreed to is as follows:

In the committee amendment on page 12, line 2, after "$18,750,000", to insert:

"*Provided*, That in the purchase of this field the Navy Department shall take into consideration the improvements put thereon by the Federal Government and any amounts expended in developing the field."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD memoranda addressed to Commander Saunders by J. J. Ballentine, commander, United States Navy, dated June 4, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER SAUNDERS
SENATE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Subject: Floyd Bennett Field, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Federal expenditures in development of.

1. The actual development of the Floyd Bennett site on which Floyd Bennett Field is located began about 1910. At this time no thought of an airport was in mind and the site was developed as a result of the depositing of spoil from Jamaica Bay channel dredging projects. Projects for Jamaica Bay channel dredging from that date until 1928 were included in the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Acts and totaled approximately $2,200,000. Indirectly, part of these funds may be charged as a cost of the development of the field but the Army Engineers have stated that the site of Floyd Bennett was the most economical for providing spoil area.

2. The project for WPA work was issued to New York City in 1935 totaling $4,856,000 for various aviation developments in the New York City area. WPA headquarters in New York City state that approximately $4,736,000 of this money was spent on the development of Floyd Bennett Field as an airport. This money was spent in construction of runways, shop buildings, grading of field, enlarging of field, and other miscellaneous items. No PWA funds, as far as can be determined, have been spent on Floyd Bennett Field.

3. In connection with the development of Floyd Bennett, New York City floated a bond issue in the amount of three and a half million dollars. It has not been possible to determine whether all or only a portion of this money was actually spent on Floyd Bennett but the best information available indicates that $3,564,000 approximately have been invested by the city of New York in this development.

J. J. BALLENTINE,
Commander, United States Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire to speak on the pending amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. President, the Naval Affairs Committee in May last had presented to it by the Navy Department a request to purchase Floyd Bennett Field in New York as a naval airport. Hearings were held. Later the Navy Department asked us not to press action on the bill at that time. It appears that the reason why the Navy Department presented the bill was for the purpose of obtaining a good trade with the city of New York for a lease. When the lease was consummated at $60,000 per annum the Navy Department said:

We are satisfied to lease this property, and the bill for purchase need not be pressed.

Last week a bill was presented by the Navy Department authorizing a general works program calling for an expenditure of $310,000,000. The proviso attached to that bill which was read by the Senator from Louisiana but which need not have been attached, authorized an appropriation of $10,000,000 for Floyd Bennett Field. The Navy Department very properly put that proviso into the general authorization bill, which includes many activities of the Navy, so as to call our attention to the fact that it was going to make the purchase, but it need not have put it in at all because they could purchase under the authority we would give them under the $310,000,000 authorization.

The war has come on since that time. The Navy Department not only wants to purchase Floyd Bennett Field, which is now under lease to the Navy Department by the City of New York, but it wants to purchase additional land and additional equipment and additional facilities to develop that field. Am I correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct, including buildings and dredging and filling and grading, amounting to a million and a half dollars, and various other items which have been put in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. So the Senator is correct in calling attention to the fact that, while the bill before our committee limited the purchase to $10,000,000 in a separate bill, the $310,000,000 authorization would authorize all these other things.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely; and the committee is going to strike out the proviso in the $310,000,000 authorization bill, so as to permit the Navy Department to purchase this field and other land and equipment under the $310,000,000 authorization.

Mr. WALSH. I assume this appropriation bill fixing the amount for that field and its development at $18,000,000 includes the purchase from the city of New York of additional land aggregating 500 or more acres—is that the number of acres?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is the difference between 420 and 1,257, or a little more than 800 acres.

Mr. WALSH. Very well; and also for building and constructing an airport there.

So I think the Senator from Louisiana is somewhat misled by the fact that the bill before the Naval Affairs Committee which provided $10,000,000 did not include some of the items contained in this bill, for this bill includes not only the present Floyd Bennett Field but additional facilities and additional land to complete the work there.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct, but I think it very wise to put in the amendment which has been suggested.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know whether we are getting a good trade. Evidently the Senator from Louisiana is under the impression that perhaps we are paying too much, in view of the sums of money which have been spent by the Government in developing that field for use, all of which, I assume, was considered in making the lease at $60,000 a year; but,

in any event, the Navy now feels that they need the amount provided in the appropriation; that it will clean up the whole matter and permit the purchase of additional land and provide the other facilities.

I hope I have contributed somewhat to an understanding of what seems to be a difficulty to the Senator from Louisiana as to the difference between the amount in the bill before the Naval Affairs Committee and the amount in the appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I may say that in connection with the colloquy which took place I read a provision from Senate bill 2096, which was before our committee.

Mr. WALSH. Which has now been stricken out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Because, in all fairness—and it was good practice—the Navy Department said, "While this is a very general sort of authorization, and names the different things, we feel that we ought to put a proviso in it, because you have had this bill before you, and we want you to know that that is an important undertaking, and that you ought to have special knowledge of that fact." As a matter of fact, they did not need to do that, because the $310,000,000 would have included all this and any other undertakings.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, the $10,000,000 was for the purpose of purchasing adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, and so forth, and did not include further additions.

Mr. WALSH. What does the amendment provide?

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighteen million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. WALSH. What is the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not been put in language. It was merely stated orally here.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator wish to press that amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 2, after "$18,750,000", it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That in the purchase of this field the Navy Department shall take into consideration the improvements put thereon by the Federal Government, and any amounts expended in developing the field.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand the amendment as now read, the Senator from Louisiana simply wants to serve notice on the Navy Department that they should not pay for that field a price which does not take into consideration expenditures already made.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. I see no harm in the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it ought to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment to the amendment has already been agreed to. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 13, beginning in line 3, to insert:

Naval supply depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: For the development of storage facilities, including buildings and accessories and acquisition of land $15,000,000;

Temporary and emergency construction: For temporary and emergency construction or acquisition of buildings and facilities, including the acquisition of land, at localities inside and outside the United States, needed by the Navy, as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, including collateral items, $300,000,000.

The provisions of section 4 of the Act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590–592), shall be applicable to all public works and public utilities projects provided in this Act, regardless of location: *Provided*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract hereafter entered into under the authority of this provision shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Aeronautics," on page 13, line 3, after the words "excess of," to strike out "$140,000,000" and insert "$640,000,000, including not to exceed $50,000,000 for additional plant facilities in public and private plants."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 5, to insert:

COAST GUARD

Office of Commandant: For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, subject to the conditions specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1942, $8,755.

Pay and allowances: For an additional amount for pay and allowances, Coast Guard, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, $4,285,537, and the limitation of $69,008 under this head in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, on the amount which may be expended for recreation, amusement, comfort contentment, and health of enlisted men is hereby increased to $76,746.

General expenses, Coast Guard: For an additional amount for general expenses, Coast Guard, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, $4,785,000, of which $35,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby allocated for the breaking of ice on the Illinois River.

Construction of vessels and shore facilities, Coast Guard: For an additional amount for additional and replacement vessels and their equipment, and the construction, rebuilding, or extension of shore facilities, including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, $8,[illegible],300, to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed 4 percent shall be available for administrative expense in connection therewith, including personal services in the District of Columbia.

Establishing and improving aids to navigation: For an additional amount for establishing and improving aids to navigation and other works, including the acquisition of sites therefor, $869,135, which sum shall be available for all expenditures directly relating thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

GENERAL PROVISION

SEC. 202. The appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, shall be available for the pay and other expenses of not to exceed 50,000 men inducted into the naval service and not to exceed 10,000 men inducted into the Marine Corps under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 9, to change the section number from 202 to 203.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 10, to strike out:

TITLE III—DEFENSE AID

SEC. 301. To enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, further to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, and for each and every purpose incident to or necessary therefor, the following sums for the following respective purposes, namely:

(a) For the procurement, by manufacture or otherwise, of defense articles, information, and services, for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and the disposition thereof, including all necessary expenses in connection therewith, as follows:

(1) Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and components thereof, $830,507,246.

(3) Tanks, armored cars, automobiles, trucks, and other automotive vehicles, spare parts, and accessories, $563,139,000.

(5) Miscellaneous military and naval equipment, supplies, and materials, $17,850,000.

(6) Facilities and equipment for the manufacture, production, or operation of defense articles and for otherwise carrying out the purposes of the act of March 11, 1941, including the acquisition of land, and the maintenance and operation of such facilities and equipment, $125,000,000.

(b) In all, $1,556,496,246, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

(c) Each of the foregoing appropriations shall be additional to, and consolidated with, the appropriations for the same purposes contained in section 1 (a) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, and section 101 (a) of the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942, and the proviso in section 101 (f) of such latter act shall be applicable to such consolidated appropriations.

SEC. 302. Any defense article procured pursuant to this title shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine, in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign government, whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby.

SEC. 303. This title may be cited as the "Second Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading on page 17, line 7, after the word "Title," to strike out "IV" and insert "III," so as to make the heading read:

Title III—General appropriations, legislative.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 8, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Elizabeth M. Adams, widow of Alva B. Adams, late a Senator from the State of Colorado, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 11, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to employ an assistant in the Senate Library from January 1 to June 30, 1942, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, to be paid from the appropriation for Salaries of Officers and Employees of the Senate for the fiscal year 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 16, to insert:

For a special executive assistant for each Senator at the rate of $4,500 per annum, fiscal year 1942, $216,000, for the period starting January 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1942, such positions are authorized for the period of the emergency only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 2, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to prepare a suitable depository for the valued documents of the two Houses of Congress since the organization of the Government, fiscal year 1942, $25,000, to remain available until expended. The Architect of the Capitol is directed to prepare suitable space directly beneath the crypt in the central portion of the Capitol Building for this purpose, and without reference to sections 3709 and 3744 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to make necessary expenditures for labor, materials, equipment, and any other item necessary in connection therewith.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Emergency Funds for the President", on page 19, after line 7, to insert:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION

Board of Investigation and Research: For an additional amount for all necessary expenses of the Board of Investigation and Research, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until September 18, 1942, including in addition to the objects specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, an investigation of and report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States, and including expenses incident to attendance at meetings or conventions of societies or associations concerned with the problem of the Board; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $500 for periodicals and newspapers, rents in the District of Columbia; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board, $246,500: *Provided*, That said report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States shall be submitted to Congress not later than June 30, 1942.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment on page 19 be transposed so as to come under the head of "Independent agencies," which appears on page 25, line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that change will be made.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency funds for the President," on page 21, after line 7, to insert:

Emergency fund for the President: To enable the President, through appropriate agencies of the Government, to provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense and for each and every purpose connected therewith, and to make all necessary expenditures incident thereto for any purpose for which the Congress has previously made appropriation or authorization and without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service, such as section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the civil-service and classification laws; and any waiver hereunder of the provisions of any law regulating such expenditure or such employment shall not be exercised by any agency unless the allocation to such agency or subsequent action of the President in connection therewith permits any such waiver to be availed of; $100,000,000, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That, when deemed proper, the President may authorize, in amount stipulated by him, but not exceeding in the aggregate $10,000,000, unvouchered expenditures, and report the gross sums so authorized not itemized: *Provided further*, That an account shall be kept of all expenditures made or authorized hereunder, and a report thereon shall be submitted to the Congress on June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the consideration of the amendment I offer on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 14, inclusive, on page 22, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Defense housing: For an additional amount to enable the President of the United States to provide temporary shelter in localities where for any reason arising out of the war a shortage of housing exists, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified under this head in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, approved March 1, 1941, $300,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is a matter which was very carefully discussed, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who has offered the amendment and, so far as I am able, for myself and for the committee. I may say that we should be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to know how the money would be spent, by what agencies of the Government. Is that provided for?

Mr. MALONEY. I was about to make a brief explanation of the amendment.

The amendment comes as the result of a message of the President of December 10, in which recommendations were made for the appropriation of specified funds for defense housing. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations prepared amendments, which were before the committee yesterday. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the full committee, and I am also a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

I was fearful that the amendment which was before the Committee on Appropriations might in part duplicate sections of the so-called Lanham bill, which was yesterday before the House of Representatives, or might in some way trespass upon the language and purposes of that bill. I asked the Committee on Appropriations to give me an opportunity to discuss the matter later last night, and this morning, with the Housing Coordinator, with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and with the Bureau of the Budget, in order to make certain that the amendment was in proper shape. I did that, and as a result I now offer a simple amendment, which merely provides funds with which the President may authorize existing agencies to erect very badly needed temporary shelter.

In answer to the able Senator from Louisiana, I should like to point out that the money will go directly to the President for disbursement, and that he may delegate any proper agency of the Government, to provide the various defense housing units which are needed.

Mr. HILL. In other words, if the President sees fit, he may use the F. H. A., or any other agency now engaged in housing activities, to do this work. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. I am not entirely sure that that is correct. It continues whatever language is in the existing law. I cannot at the moment remember just what limitations exist. I do think it provides that the President may delegate the work to any agency which has heretofore engaged in housing construction.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator be a member of the conference committee on the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Connecticut will be surprised if he is one of the conferees. I am not a member of this particular subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and this matter did not come to my attention until late yesterday afternoon. It was entirely new to me. I was very much concerned with the subject because of the so-called Lanham bill, which was being considered and which did finally pass the House yesterday. That fact prompted me to make sure that this suggestion was not in conflict, or that confusion did not result. I am chairman of the Senate

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it carries out, in sum and substance, the purpose of the Lanham bill which passed the House yesterday, that bill being an authorization measure, and this being a direct appropriation. Instead of the Lanham bill passing through the Senate and then the officials coming in for an appropriation, the Senator's amendment would provide for the appropriation. Is not that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. No; that is not the case. In Public Law No. 73, we provided an appropriation of $15,000,000 for an additional amount to enable the President of the United States to provide temporary shelter in localities where, by reason of national-defense activities, a shortage of housing existed. There had before that been a small appropriation in Public Law No. 9. Under the Lanham bill there are provided certain rules and regulations and specifications and amounts. This money, as I understand it, might be used for the purchase of buildings, or the purchase of trailers, or for the construction of dormitory dwellings, or other types of temporary shelter which can be provided quickly and moved from place to place if necessary. The principal purpose is that there may, without delay, be provided for defense areas, immediate and necessary housing, of the "shelter type" if I might be colloquial. As the Senator knows, the Lanham bill provides for a more permanent type of construction.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Can the Senator enlighten the Senate as to what assurances he has received, or what information he has been able to gather since the meeting of the committee yesterday afternoon, which changes his viewpoint about this expenditure of money?

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Massachusetts will recall that I had no fixed viewpoint, but rather a fear of confusion.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. I talked with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and it was necessary that I do that, because the House did not until yesterday afternoon act on the so-called Lanham bill. I asked him if this amendment was in conflict with the Lanham bill, and he told me that it was not in any way in conflict with it, that this was entirely apart, and for a somewhat different but supplemental purpose. I have not had an opportunity to see what the House did yesterday, except that I do know it passed the Lanham bill, and that it did include therein what we had expected would be a so-called community services bill. I have not had opportunity to examine it as yet, but I do have the word of the chairman of the committee that there is no conflict. I have the assurance of the Housing Coordinator that there is no conflict, that this amendment was not intended to do what has heretofore been done under the Lanham bill, and what would be done under the measure as it passed the House of Representatives yesterday. This is to give wide latitude to the President in the emergency. I might point out that the amount has been increased by $290,000,000 only because of the greater emergency, a greater need for rapid plant expansion, possible new needs caused by the war.

I might say that the amendment which I offer on behalf of the committee takes into account the existing situation, which has become so intense in the last few days.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have before me House bill 6128, which is the so-called Lanham bill, and I notice that in the title of the bill it is stated that it is a bill "to amend the act entitled 'an act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes.'"

Does the Senator's proposal have the same purpose?

Mr. MALONEY. The same general purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it all for defense?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why would the Senator say that it is different from the Lanham bill? In what respect does it differ, in other words?

Mr. MALONEY. Some time ago we appropriated money which, for example, authorized the Farm Security Administration to quickly build shelter buildings and dormitories and to provide trailers near defense plants. There were no specific directions as to how much money might be put into those buildings. There was a provision that with the money granted to the President trailers could be purchased for housing, in addition to the building of dormitories. In other words, the Lanham bill is more specific, and the language of my amendment, I believe, will authorize the President to expend the money as he feels it should be expended, because of the intensity of the emergency situation. The Senator from Louisiana knows, I am sure, that there are about 13 agencies of government——

Mr. ELLENDER. Entirely too many.

Mr. MALONEY. Engaged in the defense housing program. I agree with the Senator, of course, that there seem to be too many. But I also agree with those who contend that this hour of emergency might be an unfortunate time to consider making great changes. The need at the moment is speed. These workers in the defense areas, which are now going to be multiplied, I hope, and magnified, are tremendously important. While I had the thought yesterday that this proposal ought to go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in order that we may have a more clear idea of what is proposed to be done, I did not then want, nor do I want now, to assume the responsibility for a delay, when the agencies of Government who are concerned with housing, and the Bureau of the Budget, and the President, believe that this appropriation should be made today. I am sorry that I am not so completely well informed on this matter as I probably ought to be, or might be, but my committee has not dealt with this particular legislation. It came to my attention only yesterday afternoon, and I held it up because I had similar fears or doubts to those which may be in the Senator's mind. Now, however, the immediate need, and the wisdom of the adoption of the amendment is clear. There will be no trespass or infringement on the Lanham bill, and there will be no confusion, so far as the amendment is concerned. There will be no conflict with any of the existing housing laws. The amendment simply provides additional money, under whatever restrictions exist in the present statutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand, then, that those restrictions are written in the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. MALONEY. No; there are no restrictions written into the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, excepting this:

> Subject to the conditions specified under this head in the original deficiency appropriation act of 1941.

So we operate under the limitation of existing law.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Then I take it, of course, that the Senator's committee proposes to proceed to consider the Lanham bill even though the Senator's amendment is agreed to?

Mr. MALONEY. Yes. There is no relationship between the two, except that they both take care of defense housing.

Mr. HILL. That is the thought I wanted to bring out. The adoption of the Senator's amendment will in no way hinder or delay the committee in holding hearings on the Lanham bill?

Mr. MALONEY. No. We shall proceed to hold hearings on that measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] on page 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 14, to insert:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for the Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1942, including the objects for which the appropriation under this heading in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is available, and subject to the provisions and limitations thereof, except as hereinafter otherwise specified, and including 3 cents per mile for travel performed by employees on official business in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, but not within the District of Columbia, $100,000,000: *Provided*, That moneys from this appropriation made available to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (successor to the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics), together with moneys previously made available to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, shall, without regard to the limitation of $1,600,000 specified in the second proviso clause in the ap-

propriation to the Office for Emergency Management contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941 (which proviso is amended in accordance herewith), be available to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, for the purpose of (a) furthering the national defense, (b) taking such action as may be necessary under the existing state of war, and (c) strengthening the bonds between the United States and the other American republics by (1) grants to governmental and private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics, (2) the free distribution of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture films, educational material, and such material and equipment as the Coordinator may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out his program, (3) such other gratuitous assistance as he deems advisable in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, the radio, the press, and the cinema, (4) employing in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States and abroad, experts, special advisers, and other persons, who are not citizens of the United States, and paying their salaries or other compensation and expenses, including the expense of transporting them, their dependents, and their effects from their homes to their place of employment, and (5) causing corporations to be created under the laws of the District of Columbia, any State of the United States, or any of the other American republics, to assist in carrying out the Coordinator's program, and capitalizing such corporations: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of the moneys made available to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs from this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Coordinator, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified: *Provided further*, That moneys from this appropriation shall be available until June 30, 1943: *Provided further*, That of the sums allocated to the Office of Scientific Research and Development from the appropriation herein or heretofore made under this heading, there may be paid to the National Academy of Science a sum not exceeding $81,000 for the administrative and overhead expenses incurred by said academy during the fiscal year 1942 in carrying out research projects for Federal agencies, and said sum shall be in addition to any reimbursement otherwise provided for. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 529), in the expenditure of any funds heretofore or hereafter allocated to it, contracts entered into by the Office of Scientific Research and Development may provide for payments in advance of the rendering of the service or the delivery of the article contracted for, subject to such limitations as the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development may prescribe. Where any Federal agency now or hereafter has funds available for scientific or technical research, development, testing, construction of test models, experimental production, or the provision of facilities therefor, it may, in its discretion, make transfers of those funds, in whole or in part, to the Office for Emergency Management for allocation to the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and the funds so transferred may be expended for all the objects and by all the methods authorized under this heading.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Agencies," at the top of page 28, to insert:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

National-defense activities: For an additional amount for national-defense activities, Federal Power Commission, fiscal year 1942, including the objects for which the appropriation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, is available, $135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 29, after line 6, to insert:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Sites for and construction of general office buildings, Washington, D. C.: For the lease or purchase of sites and for the construction of general office buildings and other structures thereon, including heating plants, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for the construction of such facilities on Government-owned land in the District of Columbia, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without advertising: *Provided further*, That the Board of Commissioners of the United States Soldiers' Home is hereby authorized to lease to the United States, for a period of 10 years and upon the payment of a rental to be fixed by the Secretary of War, a site or sites upon which may be erected some of the buildings herein authorized: *Provided further*, That all funds received for rental or other use of United States Soldiers' Home property, facilities, or supplies shall be immediately available, to the Board of Commissioners thereof for reexpenditure without regard to fiscal year limitations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 23, to insert:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Airplane engine research laboratory: The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is hereby authorized to enter into contracts in connection with the construction of the airplane engine research laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis in accordance with section 4 of the act of April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), except that (1) the fixed fee to be paid hereunder shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of such contracts, exclusive of the fee, and (2) for the purposes hereof the functions vested in the Secretary of the Navy by said section are hereby vested in the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 33, after line 4, to insert:

For an additional amount for the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1942, (1) for a site on the South Fork of the Holston River near Bristol, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 75,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (2) for building a dam on the Watauga River east of Elizabethton, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 60,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (3) for the completion of the uncompleted unit of the steam plant at or near Sheffield, Ala., $4,000,000; in all, $24,000,000. The Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized and directed to begin and build these plants with all possible expedition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 17, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, including personal services and printing and binding, fiscal year 1942, $22,570.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 34, to insert:

MINIMUM WAGE AND INDUSTRIAL SAFETY BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, created by the act of October 14, 1941 (Public, No. 271), amending the act of September 19, 1918, including personal services and printing and binding, fiscal year 1942, $7,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 7, to insert:

HIGHWAY FUND, GASOLINE TAX, AND MOTOR-VEHICLE FEES

The following sums are appropriated wholly out of the special fund created by the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, and the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937:

STREET IMPROVEMENTS

For grading, paving, repaving, surfacing, and otherwise improving streets, avenues, and roads, including curbing and gutters, grade separation and other structures, drainage structures, retaining walls, the replacement and relocation of sewers, water mains, fire-alarm boxes and police-patrol boxes, traffic-control devices and replacement of trees, when necessary, as Federal-aid highway projects under section 1–b of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 633), fiscal year 1942, $487,000, to remain available until June 30, 1944.

For grading, paving, repaving, surfacing, and otherwise improving streets, avenues, and roads, including plans and specifications, curbing and gutters, grade separation and other structures, drainage structures, retaining walls, the replacement and relocation of sewers, water mains, fire-alarm boxes and police-patrol boxes, traffic-control devices, replacement of trees, construction, reconstruction, and relocation of parkway roads, walkways, and such other work as may be necessary, in connection with the improvement of the approaches to the Potomac River bridges, in accordance with plans to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts, fiscal year 1942, $1,424,000: *Provided*, That upon completion and approval of such plans the Commissioners are authorized to submit the projects as Federal-aid highway projects to the Public Roads Administration under the provisions of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 633), and the Defense Highway Act of November 19, 1941 (Public, 295), and upon approval of such projects by the Public Roads Administration the Commissioners are authorized to proceed with the necessary construction and perform necessary incidental work thereto, and pay the cost thereof from the District of Columbia appropriations for Federal-aid and defense highway projects and the allocation of funds to the District of Columbia by the Public Roads Administration authorized by the said Federal-aid and Defense Highway Acts: *Provided further*, That the necessary transfers of jurisdiction of public land is authorized

and directed under the provisions of the Land Transfer Act of May 20, 1932 (47 Stat. 161): *Provided further*, That the Commissioners are authorized to employ necessary engineering and other professional services, by contract or otherwise, without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or civil-service requirements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 13, to insert:

WATER SERVICE

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT

For an additional amount for the construction of a covered reservoir of approximately 20,000,000-gallon capacity on United States Government-owned land adjacent to the present filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan Filter Plant, fiscal year 1942, including the objects and condition specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, $130,000, payable wholly from the revenues of the Water Department, and the authorized limit of cost of said reservoir, appurtenances, and auxiliaries is hereby increased from $490,000 to $620,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 37, to insert:

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," on page 38, after line 22, to insert:

Technical development: For an additional amount for technical development, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1942, and including the purchase and exchange (not to exceed $22,000) of aircraft, $223,702, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 3, to insert:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For an additional amount for the establishment of air-navigation facilities, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1942, and including the purchase and exchange (not to exceed $240,000) of aircraft, $7,792,290, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 24, after the numerals "1942", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That this appropriation and the unobligated balances of the appropriations for this purpose contained in said appropriation act and in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, shall continue available until June 30, 1943"; and on page 40, line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "three" and insert "four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau", on page 40, line 13, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$515,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 41, after line 9, to insert:

Suppressing contagious diseases of livestock on Indian reservations: For all necessary expenses incidental to the suppression of contagious diseases among livestock of Indians under the jurisdiction of the Sells Agency, Ariz., including payment of indemnities for stock destroyed, fiscal year 1942, $150,000, to remain available until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 42, after line 13, to insert:

Advances to Colorado River Dam fund, Boulder Canyon project: For an additional amount for continuation of construction of the Boulder Canyon project, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until advanced to the Colorado River Dam fund, $150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 18, to strike out:

General fund, construction: For continuation of construction of the Central Valley project, California, $3,000,000, to be expended from the general fund of the Treasury in the same manner and for the same objects as specified for projects in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation", fiscal year 1942, to remain available until expended, and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 2, to insert:

General fund, construction: For continuation of construction of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended from the general fund of the Treasury in the same manner and for the same objects as specified for projects in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, under the caption "Bureau of Reclamation," fiscal year 1942, to remain available until expended, and to be reimbursable under reclamation law:

Central Valley project, California, $3,000,000;

Boise project, Idaho (Anderson Ranch), $2,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 12, to insert:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Gaging streams: The limitation of $140,000 on the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from the appropriation "Gaging streams" contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1942 is hereby increased to $160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 18, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

Manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research: For an additional amount for manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, $578,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 44, to insert:

Investigations and research on process for production of potassium carbonate and sodium carbonate from trona and wyomingite rock: For all necessary expenses for investigations, including all necessary preliminary and supplemental laboratory research and procurement of materials therefor, including maintenance and operation of subcommercial plants; construction and equipment of buildings to house testing and subcommercial plant units, including engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the buildings and plant units; purchase of supplies and equipment; expenses of travel and subsistence; personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed $3,100; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment; stationery and supplies; typewriting, adding, and computing machines; professional and scientific books and publications; purchase of such wearing apparel and equipment as may be required for the protection of employees while engaged in their work; fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, $77,400: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice," on page 45, after line 13, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Special national-defense unit: For an additional amount for salaries; special national-defense unit, Department of Justice, fiscal year 1942, $180,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 17, to insert:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1942, $1,100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 46, to insert the following subhead:

Miscellaneous.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain," on page 47, line 13, after the figures "$11,600", to insert a comma and "to remain available until June 30, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Civil Functions—Corps of Engineers", on page 48, line 15, after the numerals "1942", to strike out "$17,800,000" and insert "$25,750,000", and in line 16, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That any appropriation for civil functions under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be avail-

able for contracting in such manner as the Secretary of War may determine to be in the public interest without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or section 3 of the River and Harbor Act of August 11, 1888.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 49, line 22, after the word "Title", to strike out "V" and insert "IV", so as to make the heading read:

Title IV—Classification Act salary advancements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 20, to change the title number from V to IV.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 68, line 21, after the word "Title", to strike out "VI" and insert "V", so as to make the heading read "Title V—General provisions", and in line 22, to change the section number from 601 to 501.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 12, to change the section number from 602 to 502.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 6, to change the section number from 603 to 503.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 48, line 6, in the paragraph dealing with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, making an appropriation of $4,335,446. My amendment is to strike out "$4,335,446" and to insert in lieu thereof "$5,835,446."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator give us an explanation of his amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I will. It will be recalled that in the 1941 Revenue Act certain taxes were imposed, among them use taxes on boats and automobiles, and the Treasury was charged with working out a program for collecting certain of those taxes. Before the House Appropriations Committee the Treasury desired approximately four or five million dollars as an additional appropriation, as I now recall.

An unfortunate controversy arose, and nothing was put into the bill to enable the Treasury to administer that part of the 1941 Tax Act. The Treasury Department has called on the Post Office Department, through which it was authorized and directed to effect the collection of certain of the taxes, particularly the boat-use tax and the automobile-use tax; and the Post Office Department has given an estimate to the Treasury of $1,500,000. This money will be used by the Treasury through the Post Office. The payments will really go to the Post Office Department, but, of course, the Post Office Department will have to increase its personnel and its general overhead in order to handle the certificates showing the payments of the use tax. Today the Treasury advises the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that $1,500,000 is the minimum amount that will have to be paid to the Post Office Department in order to enable it to collect the taxes, the duty of collecting which was imposed upon it by the Revenue Act of 1941.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state what is the difference between the $1,500,000 which is now proposed and the amount which was originally proposed to collect those taxes?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know the total amount, but as I recollect it was between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000. The controversy arose with the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, the amount was $4,302,554.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was quite a large amount I think it was between 5 and 6 percent for the collection of the tax; $1,500,000 is a very greatly reduced sum. It seems to me that the amendment should be agreed to, because the Post Office Department can do this work better than can the Treasury Department, and I think very much more economically.

Mr. GEORGE. I very much hope that the amendment may be agreed to. At least the matter will go to conference, and there will be something in conference on which the committee will have authority to act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, has consideration been given by the Finance Committee to the repeal of the use tax on automobiles?

Mr. GEORGE. Not yet; but in January we shall have an opportunity to consider the whole tax program again.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the meantime the collections will commence.

Mr. GEORGE. As I recall, the tax is effective beginning in February.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then there will be an opportunity to consider the repeal of the tax prior to the time the tax goes into effect?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment is offered at the request of the Navy Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 21, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "four" and insert in lieu thereof "eight".

It is also proposed to strike out, after line 23, "at a total cost of not to exceed $300,000,000" and insert: "as amended by this Act: *Provided further*, That Public Law No. 72, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 24, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words 'five hundred and fifty thousand tons' and inserting the words 'one million three hundred and fifty thousand tons' in lieu thereof: *Provided further*, That Public Law No. 323, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved November 31, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words 'four hundred' and inserting 'eight hundred' in lieu thereof, and by deleting the words 'not to exceed $300,000,000' ".

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to do so. The present authorization acts provide for the construction or acquisition and conversion of not to exceed 400 small vessels as mine craft and patrol craft. In view of recent events, the Navy desires that the number of small vessels for use as mine craft and patrol craft be increased from 400 to 800. That is the principal feature of the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I did not understand as to the amount which was to be provided for those craft. Apparently the $300,000,000 is stricken out. Is some other amount inserted?

Mr. WALSH. No. The statement I have from Admiral Robinson is that—

the inclusion of this language will automatically make available for these purposes any funds under "Increase and replacement of naval vessels."

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand that the Navy Department has the funds in some other appropriation?

Mr. WALSH. I so understand. The amendment simply authorizes the larger number of vessels of the character indicated. I believe there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the letter of Admiral Robinson be printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1941.

Memorandum.

From Chief of the Bureau of Ships.
To J. V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Additional authorization in pending legislation H. R. 6159.

1. In order that the Navy Department may have authorization to cover the acquisition and conversion of vessels now being taken over by the Navy to effect the purposes of war plans, it is requested that the following information be furnished to Senator WALSH as the language to be inserted under the appropriation, "Increase and Replacement of Naval Vessels" in the pending supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 6159:

"*Provided further*, That Public Law No. 72 77th Congress, approved 24 May, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words, '550,000 tons' and inserting the words '1,350,000 tons' in lieu thereof: *Provided further*, That Public Law No. 323, 77th Congress, approved 21 November, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words, '400' and inserting '800' in lieu thereof, and by deletion of the words, 'not to exceed $300,000,000'."

2. The inclusion of this language will automatically make available for these purposes any funds under "Increase and Replacement of Naval Vessels."

SAM ROBINSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Orchard rehabilitation loans: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans, under such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, for the purpose of enabling the borrowers to rehabilitate orchards in the States of Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa which were destroyed or damaged as a result of the extremely cold weather in such States in November 1940, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I was temporarily detained from the Senate when the Senate acted on the amendment on page 2, lines 14 to 17, inclusive. I did not wish to interrupt the orderly process of the bill; but I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee why the Senate committee added the proviso in lines 15 to 17, inclusive, which reads:

Provided, That expenditures from appropriations under this heading may hereafter be made without securing the specific approval of the projects by the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be glad to explain. In that connection I wish to read a letter from Judge Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War. The letter is addressed to me:

DECEMBER 10, 1941.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It will considerably speed up our work on production if the requirement for the approval of the President for expenditure of funds for expediting production can be eliminated.

In past appropriation acts the funds for new facilities, referred to as "Expediting Production" have been conditioned on approval of the President. In the pending bill (p. 2, under heading "Expediting Production"), funds are appropriated, subject to the same limitations and conditions as covered in the Military Appropriation Act of 1942.

I recommend that the condition of the President's approval be deleted.

The matter has been discussed with the Bureau of the Budget, and it has given its informal concurrence. I have also discussed the matter with Mr. Harry Hopkins, and he is in agreement. Due to the pressure of business the President himself has not formally acted on the matter, so far as I know, so that I cannot say definitely what the President's personal view is on the matter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

We have been informally advised that the amendment has the concurrence of the President, and for that reason the committee recommended it. As I am informed, when a large number of these projects is submitted to the President, all he does is to sign his name at the bottom. Actually, he could not examine into each and every one of them. The examination is made by the Department.

Mr. DANAHER. And in that particular the President does exactly what the Senate does in acting on the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. In a sense, in this emergency, what the Senator says its true.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee one other question, please. Granting that the specific approval of the President will not be required for these various projects, whose approval will be required?

Mr. McKELLAR. That of the Secretary of War.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6159) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORTS ON NATIONAL-DEFENSE MIGRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 56), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of each of the reports submitted to the House during the current Congress by the Select Committee To Investigate National Defense Migration, of which 9,000 copies shall be for the use of said committee and 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the nature of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON PRICE-CONTROL BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 57), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives is authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of the hearings held before such committee during the current session, on the bill (H. R. 5479) to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer an amendment to the concurrent resolution, to strike out, in line 6, the word "five" and insert the word "two", so that the number of copies printed will be 2,000 instead of 5,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Printing, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 196, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 196, submitted by Mr. THOMAS, of Utah, on November 17, 1941, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Strikes in Defense Industries," supplementary information to accompany Senate Document No. 52 (77th Cong., 1st sess.), being a statement showing certain basic data for the formulation of a policy toward strikes in defense industries, etc., be printed as a document.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE OF THE DISTRICT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on December 9 the Senate passed a bill (S. 2047) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia," and so forth; and on the same date the House passed an identical bill. Each House, therefore, has passed a similar bill, but neither bill has been passed by both Houses.

I now ask unanimous consent that House bill 5893, which the House has passed, be considered at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—of course, I probably shall not do so—let me ask if the bill has been before a committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I will say to the Senator that it has been considered by committees of both Houses. Identical bills were introduced in the House and in the Senate, and were passed on the same day in the House and in the Senate; but neither bill has passed both Houses. The House bill, which passed the House, having been approved by the House committee, is now before the Senate. I am about to move that the House bill be passed by the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. It is a bill to establish a Board of Public Welfare, is it?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. We passed that bill some time ago. This bill merely provides the manner by which the executive officer of the Board of Public Welfare

shall be appointed—namely, that he shall be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I rose to inquire whether the bills in their material substance are identical; but I have learned that by listening to the discussion, so I have no objection to the requested procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5893) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon the nomination of the Board, are hereby authorized to appoint a Director of Public Welfare, which position is hereby authorized and created, who shall be the chief executive officer of the Board and shall be charged, subject to its general supervision, with the executive and administrative duties provided for in this act. The Director shall be a person of such training, experience, and capacity as will especially qualify him or her to discharge the duties of the office. The Director of Public Welfare may be discharged by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia upon recommendation of the Board. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, upon the nomination of the Board, to appoint such personnel as may be necessary for the efficient performance of the duties of the Board: *Provided, however*, That all employees of the Board, except the Director, shall be appointed in accordance with and be subject to the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States,' approved January 16, 1883, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 638 et seq.), and the rules and regulations made in pursuance thereof in the same manner as members in the classified civil service of the United States, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, however, being authorized in their discretion to give preference to residents of the District of Columbia. The Civil Service Commission is hereby authorized and directed to confer a competitive civil-service status upon those employees performing services for the Board on the effective date of this act who are citizens of the United States and who, within 6 months after the effective date of this act, are certified by the Commissioners, upon recommendation of the Board, (a) as having been appointed from among the highest available eligibles from an appropriate register of the Civil Service Commission or (b) as having rendered active service for the Board prior to the effective date of this act, and who qualify in such appropriate noncompetitive examinations as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, except that as to employees engaged in work in which the Federal Government shares the expense, the Board of Public Welfare shall prescribe such conditions for eligibility to enter appropriate noncompetitive examinations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission as shall conform to the Federal acts providing for Federal financial participation and to rules and regulations of the Federal agencies administering such acts. Any employee of the Board who fails to meet these requirements or who fails to take or pass the noncompetitive examination prescribed by the Commission, or who is not certified by the Commissioners, may continue to serve for a period of not more than 30 days after the establishment of appropriate registers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the day the House passed what is known as the black-out bill, House bill 6208, establishing a system by which black-outs may be effected in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia. The bill was presented to the joint committee of both Houses yesterday evening. Today the bill was passed by the House, and has been sent over to the Senate. It is now before the Senate. It has been considered by the committees of both Houses. It provides a method by which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting in concurrence with the Secretary of War, may effect and carry out a black-out for the Capital City of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia whether the program authorized to be adopted and put into effect by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia is allowed to be sufficiently flexible so that it may be coordinated with the national plan of evacuation and black-outs.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know of no established national plan at this time; but the bill was drafted with the idea that it might afford a model plan for other communities and other centers.

Mr. AUSTIN. That information does not quite satisfy the curiosity I have about the bill. I should like to ask the Senator one other question, if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. I happen to know that plans are under process of formulation having general application; and such little information as I now possess respecting them indicates the wisdom in any legislation the Congress may pass, of permitting the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adapt the plan set up for the District of Columbia to the national plan. All I desire to know is whether the bill reported by the committee is open to that possibility.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the judgment of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia that the bill is susceptible and entirely open to that plan, and that it can be adopted by the Commissioners.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to offer certain amendments to the bill. I send the first amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 8, on page 3, line 25, after the word "designate", it is proposed to strike out: "To carry into effect the provisions of this section."

Mr. McCARRAN. This is merely a perfecting amendment, suggested after the committees had considered the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I send to the desk another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 1, after the word "Commissioners", it is proposed to insert the words "of the District of Columbia"; and after the word "authorized", in line 1, it is proposed to add the words "and empowered."

Mr. McCARRAN. That amendment has the same significance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 3, after the word "and", it is proposed to strike out "to provide by reasonable regulations for reimbursement thereof by such evacuees and their respective fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, and adult children, if of sufficient ability, to employ the services of such volunteers and of such regular employees of the government of the District of Columbia as in their discretion may be necessary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I send to the desk another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 16, after the word "designate" it is proposed to insert: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of section 9, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 9. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered, without regard to the provisions of any other law, and for defense purposes, to borrow money from the Treasury of the United States, to expend the same, to obligate the District of Columbia for the payment of equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, and to employ personnel as the Commissioners in their discretion may deem necessary, not exceeding $1,000,000, and the said Commissioners are further authorized and empowered to use such regular employees of the Government of the District of Columbia as they deem necessary.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to loan to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia such sum or sums as are authorized by this section.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator from Nevada. Within a few moments we adopted an amendment which I understood at the time changed the appropriation from a fixed sum to an indeterminate sum. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did the bill as passed by the House appropriate a definite sum of money?

Mr. McCARRAN. It did not.

Mr. AUSTIN. The amendment which I think was the second amendment before the pending one proposes to appropriate such sum as may be necessary, and as is not already appropriated to other uses, for the purpose of carrying out the terms of this bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is merely an authorization. It does not carry a sum; but the last amendment does carry a limitation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to know what the limitation is on the power to borrow money.

Mr. McCARRAN. The limitation on the power to borrow money is in the Congress. In other words, the Commissioners and the respective committees considered that the time might come when we would not know and the Commissioners would not know how much money might be necessary, but the Commissioners would have to come to Congress to obtain authorization for the payment of the sum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may we have read again the clause which covers that limitation?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the next to the last amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment referred to will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 16, after the word "designate," it is proposed to insert the following words: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not believe that is the one to which the Senator from Nevada referred.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the general authorization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but where is the limitation?

Mr. McCARRAN. The limitation is in the last amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understood the Senator just a moment ago, the limitation is $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is what I wanted to know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment containing the limitation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the last amendment offered.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all of section 9 and in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 9. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered, without regard to the provisions of any other law, and for defense purposes, to borrow money from the Treasury of the United States, to expend the same, to obligate the District of Columbia for the payment of equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, and to employ personnel as the Commissioners in their discretion may deem necessary, not exceeding $1,000,000, and the said Commissioners are further authorized and empowered to use such regular employees of the Government of the District of Columbia as they deem necessary.

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to loan to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia such sum or sums as are authorized by this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that the amendment just read is the pending amendment, and has not yet been adopted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. May I explain the amendment? Perhaps I can save a little time by doing so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. The thought was that the time might arrive when it would be necessary for the Commissioners to have the money available from some source. The first suggestion was that the Commissioners be permitted to borrow from private banking concerns. Then it was considered better and safer that the borrowing power be between the Commissioners and the Treasury of the United States, thus having a check both ways on it, the thought being that the limitation of a million dollars would afford an opportunity for Congress to act and make the proper appropriation to meet the obligations that might have been incurred between the Commissioners, speaking for the District, and the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assume that a million dollars is borrowed tomorrow, and that on the second day after that the million dollars is repaid: Does the Senator interpret his bill so that a million dollars may be borrowed on the fourth day?

Mr. McCARRAN. If the obligation was repaid.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is to say, the authority is a continuing one, and the Senator so interprets it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I so interpret it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is not the limitation merely on the borrowing power?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no limitation as to the appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Congress itself will make the limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do the funds come from the Treasury of the United States, and how will they be repaid?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are to be borrowed from the Treasury of the United States. They will have to be paid out of the money that comes from the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the Treasury of the United States will be in no wise responsible for the amount or contribute to it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Except that if it should be thought best to borrow from the Treasury, there would be a Federal-authority check on the one hand, and the check of the District Commissioners on the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6208) was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to sign, during any recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session, any bills or resolutions that may be ready for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JULIA NEVILLE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1190) for the relief of Julia Neville, which were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$300" and insert "$1,050.43", and to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES C. DYSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 334) for the relief of James C. Dyson, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,500" and insert "$3,000".

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense

for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of sundry cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Arthur S. Carpender to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of October, 1941.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment to temporary rank in the Air Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several senior surgeons to be medical directors in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

JESS H. MILLER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jess H. Miller to be postmaster at Natona, Kans., which had been passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], that this nomination be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be recommitted.

THE COAST GUARD

Mr. WALSH. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], I am authorized by him to report favorably from that committee sundry nominations in the Coast Guard, and to ask that they be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified. These are routine Coast Guard promotions; there is nothing unusual about them, and there is necessity to have favorable action taken today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTER AT VERSAILLES, KY.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Willie A. Roberts to be postmaster at Versailles, Ky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the President has appointed Willie A. Roberts of Versailles, Ky., to be postmaster in that city. That is my home town, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Mr. Roberts be confirmed, and that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be forthwith notified.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as to all other postmaster nominations on the executive calendar, I ask that they be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations, with the exception of the nomination of Jess H. Miller to be postmaster at Natona, Kans., which has been recommitted, and the nomination of Willie A. Roberts to be postmaster at Versailles, Ky., which has been confirmed, are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be forthwith notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 15, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1941:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be ensigns

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard, to rank from the 19th day of December 1941:

William Francis Adams
Roger James Auge
Joseph Garfield Bastow, Jr.
Lawrence DuVal Bradley, Jr.
Stephen George Carkeek
Vincent Joseph Cass
William Edward Chapline, Jr.
David Ross Claxton
Stanley Jay Ellis
Albert Frost
Norman Lewis Horton
Roy Methvin Hutchins, Jr.
William Ambrose Jenkins
Henry Clay Keene, Jr.
Robert Albert Kirstein
James Lane Lathrop
Cecil Eugene Meree, Jr.
John Natwig
Clyde Louis Olson
Henry Atwell Pearce, Jr.
Ellis Lee Perry
Kenneth Lee Peterson
William Freeland Rea 3d
Loy William Arthur Renshaw
John Burton Speaker, Jr.
Louis Frederick Sudnik
John Fawdrey Thompson, Jr.
Charles Edward Vautrain, Jr.
Austin Calvin Wagner
Edward Blanchard Winslow

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1941:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be ensigns

William Francis Adams
Roger James Auge
Joseph Garfield Bastow, Jr.
Lawrence DuVal Bradley, Jr.
Stephen George Carkeek
Vincent Joseph Cass
William Edward Chapline, Jr.
David Ross Claxton
Stanley Jay Ellis
Albert Frost
Norman Lewis Horton
Roy Methvin Hutchins, Jr.
William Ambrose Jenkins
Henry Clay Keene, Jr.
Robert Albert Kirstein
James Lane Lathrop
Cecil Eugene Meree, Jr.
John Natwig
Clyde Louis Olson
Henry Atwell Pearce, Jr.
Ellis Lee Perry
Kenneth Lee Peterson
William Freeland Rea 3d
Loy William Arthur Renshaw
John Burton Speaker, Jr.
Louis Frederick Sudnik
John Fawdrey Thompson, Jr.
Charles Edward Vautrain, Jr.
Austin Calvin Wagner
Edward Blanchard Winslow

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Paul Louis Hebert, Somersville.

KENTUCKY

Jacob Rene Harris, Taylorsville.
Willie A. Roberts, Versailles.

LOUISIANA

Joseph E. Blanchard, Raceland.

MASSACHUSETTS

Marjorie N. Bowman, Cataumet.
Harold A. Daley, Hamilton.
Alice M. Lincoln, Raynham.

MICHIGAN

Charles E. Kinney, Fruitport.
Hilda Webber, Trenary.
Bernice M. Young, Twining.
John W. Corrigan, Union Pier.
Leon B. Akins, Vassar.
Iva Conrad, Vernon.
Rex J. Tuttle, Walled Lake.
Ernest A. Dickson, Watersmeet.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou blessed Saviour of the world, who of old didst come to those by the lakeside, we beseech Thee to come to us, revealing Thyself in the toils and the conflicts which are with us; oh put Thy

seal of disapproval upon the worst enemy of the human race. We praise Thee for Thy undying grace and power, regardless of the age-long errors of man. Thou who art a God of hope, art never silenced in the human breast and never so audible as in the depths of night.

High in the heavens, eternal God,
Thy goodness in full glory shines,
Thy truth shall break through every cloud
That veils and darkens Thy designs.

Thou hast commanded Thy sun and all the hours in the day to serve us; we stand in the folds of divine mercy. How very poor in virtue is the world, so full of imperfections and all manner of violent transgressions. Amid stalking pride and falsehoods unmasked, we pray that America may hold fast to the faith of our fathers. We thank Thee that Thy sway is not over a bruised and broken humanity and Thy dominion is not over the valley and the shadow of death. Glory be to Thy holy name, who dost reign where hope beats the strongest and the banners of God wave where the tempests of the spirit are the most powerful. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2077. An act amending the Department of Agricultural Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payment to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5111. An act authorizing the waiver of the navigation and inspection laws during the national emergency.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of California to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5726) entitled "An act to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMITH, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. AIKEN to be the conferees of the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1548) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum."

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the remainder of the day for the Speaker to declare recesses of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of bills on the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—may I ask what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of asking unanimous consent for recesses during the day is to take action on the supplemental appropriation bill now pending in the Senate if the Senate passes it. It is desired to take action on it in the House, probably sending it to conference. If it is sent to conference and the conferees agree, that matter will come up Monday. Of course, there will also be the call of bills on the Consent Calendar on Monday.

On Tuesday there will be the road bill, I think they call it the pan-American road bill, on which there is a rule pending.

A bill has been introduced today relative to the selective service, changing the ages for registration from 18 to 65 and responsibility for service from 19 to 45. Hearings will start on that bill tomorrow, and if a bill is reported out it will be taken up as quickly as possible next week.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say, if the gentleman will permit, in connection with the announcement just made by the floor leader, that the Military Affairs Committee of the House will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, not 10:30.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that bill is reported out, it will be called up as quickly as possible.

There is a bill pending before the Committee on the Judiciary to revive the powers under the Overman Act of the World War, the so-called Trading With the Enemy Act. If that bill is reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary, it will be brought up as quickly as possible next week.

That is all the information I can convey to the House at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to know when the Military Affairs Committee will hold hearings on H. R. 4906, a bill I introduced in May 1941, which would allow women to enlist in the Army, not for combat service but in order to release men for other duties. The War Department would like to have it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no control over that. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is present and I yield to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to make a statement.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has asked me two or three times about that bill and I have repeatedly assured her that when we get a report from the War Department on it, which has long since been asked for, and when we get rid of some pressing and imperative war legislation, we will take it up. Of course, we are in the war now and everybody ought to realize that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is very important war legislation.

Mr. MAY. Yes. Then we will give an opportunity to the gentlewoman to be heard, as soon as the War Department gives us a report on it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Englishwomen have done a very wonderful piece of work in connection with the men.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS FOR BALANCE OF SESSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of this session Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 6208, to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not propose to object, I think this bill is of sufficient importance for the Members to know something about it, and I ask the gentleman from West Virginia to explain the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reply to the reservation of objection of the distinguished minority leader, and also his request that the chairman of the Committee on the

District of Columbia explain the provisions of the bill, may I say I am gratified to have the opportunity to go into the provisions of this important proposal at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this measure comes before the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on the District of Columbia. I am sure there are certain Members on the floor this afternoon who will perhaps recall more vividly than other Members that a measure similar to this was before the House on April 28, 1941. That bill was defeated on a roll call by 171 to 117. I have no purpose to review that debate or to say, "I told you so." I am desirous, only, of presenting in a very brief but necessary manner the reasons why it is absolutely imperative to give to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia certain powers which they do not now have to conduct in the District of Columbia, with the approval of the War Department, the necessary blackouts, and to grant to the Commissioners certain powers in connection with the defense of the civilian population of the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does this bill give any additional authority to the Commissioners other than simply authorizing black-outs? Does it authorize the District government to encourage and cooperate with fire wardens in warnings and in taking care of fire apparatus, ambulances, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the inquiry of the gentleman from New York. Such powers are given. The bill has been brought up to date, as it were. We are considering it in connection with actual war, rather than the emergency which was spoken of approximately 8 months ago when similar legislation was before us. I desire to explain the provisions of the bill at this time. I am glad to know that the gentleman from New York, who has just returned from Great Britain, is on his feet inquiring as to this measure.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the reason I raise the question. Having actually experienced the awfulness of a black-out, can readily understand the advisability that preliminary steps be taken in order that our people will have greater composure if an actual raid does come. Of course, we all hope that an actual raid will not come, but it is much better to be forewarned and prepared than to be too late, which was the sad experience of the people in England.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is exactly true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the gentleman from West Virginia emphasized the fact that there can be no black-out unless it is approved by the Secretary of War?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I have so stated.

I now go briefly to the provisions of the bill.

Section 1 authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, whenever a state of war exists between the United States and any foreign country or nation, to order black-outs in the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War. This section also authorizes the Commissioners to regulate and prohibit the movement of vehicular traffic on the highways during such period.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Commissioners to negotiate with the proper authorities of the States of Maryland and Virginia for the purpose of synchronizing black-outs in the District with such parts of those States as may be necessary.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. Some time before April, when a similar bill was before the House, I visited El Paso, Tex., and happened to be there on a night they had a black-out. I was not very much impressed with it at the time. While I believe I supported the measure, I was not so much impressed with it. However, after having been in various cities in England for 8 days and seen the black-outs and what they mean, I am very much impressed, and am very much in favor of this measure at this time. I believe it to be advisable and necessary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

Section 3 of the measure simply provides that the Secretary of War is to cooperate with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the execution of all the black-outs that may be called.

Section 4 provides that the District of Columbia shall not be liable for any damage sustained to any person or property during or as the result of an authorized black-out.

Section 5 provides that the statutory penalty for any crime against the United States, other than those punishable by life imprisonment or death committed during an authorized black-out shall be doubled.

Section 6 authorizes the Commissioners during the state of war which now exists to appoint special police without pay from among the residents of the District of Columbia, such special police being given all the powers and privileges and being required to perform all the duties and obligations of the standing police in the force we now have in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. In connection with the double penalty for crimes, why does the gentleman's committee limit this simply to crimes against the Government? Why should not any crime committed during a black-out carry the double penalty?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It was thought the language of the bill covers the situation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's thought that if a burglary or robbery or an assault is committed during a black-out that the penalty for that crime would be doubled?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would probably not.

Mr. COLE of New York. I understood the bill limited this to crimes against the Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Perhaps we should attempt to meet this objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] in view of the dastardly crimes committed in great number in the District of Columbia in the last few months. I think in the case of all of these crimes the penalty should be doubled where it is humanly or legally possible, and also crimes of any kind committed during these black-outs and I think the words "against the Government" should be stricken at that point and just leave it as referring to crimes of any kind.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What provision is made in the bill in case a person fails to cooperate or refuses to comply with the regulations imposed during a black-out? For example, suppose they did not turn out their lights?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let us dispose of this other proposition first, if the gentleman will permit. Will the gentleman from West Virginia agree to offer an amendment letting this double penalty apply to all crimes committed during these black-outs?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I will agree to strike from the bill the words "against the United States."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If the gentleman will agree to offer such an amendment, then I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from New York and thank him for bringing the matter to my attention. It has been our feeling that, of course, in case a crime were committed the penalty would be doubled. I think it is desirable, as the gentleman from Mississippi points out, to strike that limitation of crimes from the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. It was my good fortune or ill fortune to be at Oxford, England, at the time war was declared by Great Britain, and on that day there were yellow banners on every street in every place in the British Isles, directing the public to air shelters. You saw these yellow signs with an arrow on them, and they had the simple words under them, "air shelter" or "bomb shelter," and you would go in that direction until you saw another sign. There was no explanation except the one signal or sign and that took a person into someone's back yard. I recall that I was in one air raid, and

I also recall that those signs were put up the morning after they declared war and in some cases in the afternoon that they declared war. In our particular hotel we were told that we must carry our gas masks with us the next morning. I realize how close they were to their enemies, which makes a different situation from ours, but ours was pretty close last Sunday. This is a matter that should receive immediate attention and I compliment the gentleman on being so alert in bringing it before the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now answer the question I have asked him?

Mr. RANDOLPH. If agreeable I shall go into that provision a little later in connection with further explanation of the bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Some 23 years ago I was in London and I saw where a large projectile had been dropped and had passed through each floor of a schoolhouse, but failed to explode and was deeply imbedded in the basement of the building. Fortunately, it was at an hour when there were no school children in the building. I want to ask the gentleman from West Virginia if ample provision has been made here for drills for the school children and for a program to be put on so they will not be terrified over this thing in advance.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman from New York and, as I said in the beginning of my statement, there is no desire on my part to go back to 8 months ago. I do not want to be put in that position, because I am not criticizing the Congress of the United States or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the officials of the Office of Civilian Defense, but I do say now, as I said during debate here on April 28, there is not a single air-raid shelter in your National Capital.

There were few antiaircraft guns if any, available, then and now. I feel certain, that had we done this in an orderly procedure then, it would have been much better. But we can stop confusion. We must act calmly. It is not the actual black-out, that is, the darkness which descends over the area, that counts, for that lasts only for a few minutes; it is that orderly preparation, that concerted planning and execution, that correlation of effort which makes a black-out valuable. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. Yesterday afternoon the committees of the House and the Senate on the District of Columbia, met with the Army and the Navy and the civilian defense officials, together with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and others, and we went very thoroughly into the war preparation problems that are now imminent. We are attempting here to bring this measure out, not in the form of hysteria, but in a practical manner, which will provide for the actual protection of the population, practically a million, that reside in this great metropolitan district.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. Before I yield at that point I want it clearly understood, and I hope, that my remarks just made are not taken to be harsh. I believe this Congress and all of our people when apprised of the condition will be fully ready to cooperate. There is no criticism implied in any statement that I make. I want that distinctly understood.

Mr. REED of New York. There is one other situation. It just happened that I was in London at the time of the first big air raid, and I saw the devastation following it the next morning. In those days that were many people who thought it was smart not to obey instructions, and who indulged in just a little bravado, but it was not long before even the bravest of these people had sense enough to follow instructions, and get to the point of safety. That ought to be impressed upon the public here.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is certainly true. Certainly none of us is a master of strategy in connection with the prosecution of a war. We do know that oceans are no longer impregnable barriers. Long-range bombers can, with their death-dealing cargoes, fly long distances, at high altitudes, and at terrific rates of speed, and even though but a small percentage get through to an objective, they bring havoc to the population from the standpoint of civilian life as well as military defense.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Under section 8 of the bill, where the Secretary of War has the power to order out of the city whomever he may choose, will they try to find some place to house these people, and is that, under section 9, to make preparation to take care of the people who may be moved out?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; we are providing here for the District of Columbia Commissioners to borrow from whatever source is necessary not to exceed $1,000,000 to take care of just such a condition which might occur.

Mr. RICH. So that if they should authorize an evacuation, it would be up to the Secretary of War or someone to find a place where the evacuees may go?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Simply to make an observation. It has been brought to my attention that where they have had an experimental black-out, so-called, the school children ran out of the schools into the streets and in the way of automobiles, which created a highly dangerous situation. The gentleman has used the word orderly. That prompted my suggestion, and I want that remark put into the RECORD—how careful we must be not to bring about a condition that is highly dangerous, such as this occasion to which I have referred.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his observation. Instructions have already gone to all of the teaching staffs in the schools in the District of Columbia as to just how they should send the children home, and how to cope with other conditions which may be aggravated if an air warning should occur. Continuing with the other sections of the bill I shall come to the question rightly raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. Section 7 authorizes the Commissioners, while a state of war exists, to accept volunteer service for the government of the District of Columbia. Of course that would cover many activities as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]. Section 8 authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War to prepare for and to effect the evacuation from the District of Columbia of such persons as they shall determine to be necessary. Section 9 of the bill, and I think this is highly important, authorizes and empowers the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in the event of an emergency, and without regard to provisions of other laws, to borrow money and expend the same, and obligate the District of Columbia for the payment of any and all supplies, equipment, materials, food, and whatever else may be necessary for the purpose of preventing and alleviating suffering of the persons in this District. The amount to be borrowed would not exceed $1,000,000.

Section 10 of the bill authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe reasonable penalties for the violation of any regulation promulgated pursuant to this act, prosecution for such violations to be on information in the police court by the corporation counsel for the District of Columbia.

I think that answers the question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. It does, with one exception, and that is that the public will not know what those penalties are unless they are published. If the penalties are to exist in regulations, then, of course, they will be no part of the legislation before us, but will be in a subsequent paper. It seems to me the public should be made aware of what their penalties might be if they did not cooperate with the authorities when a black-out was ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The bill states that a fine not to exceed $300 or 90 days imprisonment, or both, could be meted out to those convicted.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. With regard to section 9, which authorizes the Commissioners to borrow money in order to obtain supplies, equipment, and materials for the people in distress to the extent of $1,000,000, there is no connection between that borrowing authority and the black-out requirements?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; except indirectly.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it intended that this borrowing authority in section 9 shall be limited solely to materials and supplies incidental to the practice of the black-out?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would say to the gentleman that it would be connected to the black-out, but there are certain circumstances that I can envision where there can be uses for this money other than those in connection with the actual black-out itself or situations which would occur following a black-out.

Mr. COLE of New York. But it is intended that this borrowing authority is to supplement authority given to the Commissioners under this bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In running over the bill I do not notice any language which has reference to equipment, in the way of antiaircraft guns and other facilities. In the gentleman's conference with the Commissioners, what developed in connection with that, and was it determined whether or not we have equipment that can be used for that purpose?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not be in a position to say what the Army proposes to do in connection with the defense of Washington, except that I want it kept clearly in the minds of all Members that the protection of the civilian population of the District of Columbia is entirely different from the plan of defense which our Army would have for this section in the event we are actually under attack. I have no doubt—in fact, we are told that there have been plans laid out very carefully by the War Department for the defense of Washington, not just particularly because it is this city, but certain areas of the country are in certain zones of defense plans which have been made. Washington is included, of course, in such preparations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My question goes to this point: Has it been divulged to the gentleman in his important capacity and to the Commissioners whether or not equipment is available for that defense?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certain equipment not now available in the District of Columbia is being brought to this area.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. I would like to ask whether your bill will clearly make in order standardized equipment to be used on cars that do travel during the black-out hours.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We are just beginning to untangle the jumble here. The gentleman knows that. It is true also in other parts of the country, from the standpoint of standardized equipment.

Mr. MAAS. Has anything been done to provide standardized specifications for the black-out lighting of cars and prohibiting any car from being used that does not have that equipment during the dark hours?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. Colonel Bolles, Director of Civilian Defense for the District of Columbia, has been working on that, and as I understand they are ready now to put those regulations in force.

Mr. MAAS. We found particularly in England that one of the greatest values of the black-out is not that the city cannot be seen by planes but no precision bombing can take place. It becomes so costly to the invader that they just quit doing it. If it is done effectively, it really is effective.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In running over the bill I do not notice any provision for the establishment of shelters. Will an additional bill be brought in later providing for that?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. There is a plan now to provide funds to take care of air-raid shelters. As I said, there are none in the District of Columbia at this time. The need for this bill is imperative now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But this bill puts us in the process of educating ourselves what to do when the equipment and shelters are provided?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is a proper observation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I remember the gentleman's foresightedness in trying to secure the passage of some such legislation months ago. If we had passed that legislation then, it would not be necessary to have it today. I think the gentleman is very much to be commended on his foresight.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts very much.

Mr. DONDERO. And I wish to add my own to that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman also.

Mr. DONDERO. When this bill was before the House once before this thought arose: Has any effort been made to get the surrounding communities or States to cooperate with the city of Washington? It so happens that we are encircled. If they keep their lights on and Washington takes its off, it would furnish a black dot inside of a ringed circle of light and present a splendid target to the enemy to bomb the city of Washington.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for bringing out that point. A reading of the earlier debate will disclose that the gentleman from Michigan brought that to the attention of the House when we discussed this legislation last April. Conferences have been held with the authorities in Arlington County, Va., that is, Alexandria, and the suburban sections; with Bethesda, Rockville, and Hyattsville authorities, and the authorities of other communities adjacent to the District of Columbia. We have reason and knowledge to know there will be the fullest cooperation of those municipalities with the District of Columbia in a synchronization of black-out efforts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, whenever a state of war exists between the United States and any foreign country or nation, to order black-outs in the District of Columbia at such times and for such periods of time as they may deem desirable, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, to regulate and prohibit the movement of vehicular traffic on the highways during such periods and to make such regulations as they may deem necessary to insure the success of the black-outs and to protect life and property during said periods.

SEC. 2. The Commissions are authorized to negotiate with the proper authorities of the States of Maryland and Virginia with a view to effecting a synchronization of black-outs in the District of Columbia and such parts of those States as may be necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is authorized to assist and cooperate with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the execution of black-outs in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area.

SEC. 4. The municipality of the District of Columbia shall not be liable for any damages sustained to person or property during, or as the result of, an authorized black-out.

SEC. 5. The statutory penalty upon conviction of any crime against the United States, other than those punishable by life imprisonment or death, committed during any authorized black-out shall be doubled.

SEC. 6. During the existence of a state of war between the United States and any foreign country or nation, the Commissioners may appoint, for specified times, as many special police, without pay, from among residents of the District of Columbia as they may deem advisable. During the terms of service of such special police they shall possess all the powers and perform all the duties of privates of the standing police force of the District of Columbia, and such special police shall wear an emblem to be provided by the Commissioners.

SEC. 7. During the existence of a state of war between the United States and any foreign country or nation, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept volunteer service for the government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 8. During the existence of a state of war between the United States and any foreign country or nation, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, are authorized to prepare for the evacuation from the District of Columbia or from any part thereof of all such persons as they shall determine, and for this purpose shall negotiate with the proper authorities of any State of the United States or of any subdivision thereof to provide for the reception, housing, maintenance, and care of evacuees, shall prepare all necessary plans for the conduct of such evacuation, and may, when in their judgment the public interest or the safety of such persons creates the necessity therefor, order and compel, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, the evacuation from the District of Columbia of any such persons to such place or places as they may designate. To carry into effect the provisions of this section the Commissioners are authorized to obligate the District of Columbia for the payment of all necessary costs and to provide by reasonable regulations for reimbursement thereof by such evacuees and their respective fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, and adult children, if of sufficient ability, to employ the services of such volunteers and of such regular employees of the government of the District of Columbia as in

their discretion may be necessary, to make such regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and, for the purpose of compelling evacuation, may authorize custody by the regular or special police of any person or persons, which custody shall be effective until the point of destination has been reached, and the powers of such police for such purpose are hereby declared to extend to any point within the United States that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate.

SEC. 9. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered in the event of an emergency and without regard to the provisions of any other law to borrow money and expend the same and to obligate the District of Columbia for the payment of any and all supplies, equipment, materials, food, and whatever else may be necessary for the purpose of preventing and alleviating suffering to persons in said District, not exceeding $1,000,000.

SEC. 10. The Commissioners shall have the power to prescribe reasonable penalties for violation of any regulation promulgated pursuant to this act, not exceeding a fine of $300 or 90 days' imprisonment, or both. Prosecution for such violations shall be on information in the police court by the corporation counsel or his assistants.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Page 2, line 17, after the word "crime", insert a comma and strike out the words "against the United States,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. H. C. BIVENS ET AL.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irwin Tatum, for printing under the rule.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1548) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$1,000" insert "$1,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

LLOYD SPENCER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of the sum of $1,743.25 to Mrs. H. C. Bivins, of Rural Free Delivery No. 1, Eliaville, Ga., the sum of $105 to Henrietta Bivins, and the sum of $350 to Irvin Tatum, for personal injuries and property damages sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a truck being used in connection with the Soil Conservation Service in hauling supplies from the quartermaster, district B, Civilian Conservation Corps, to commanding officer, Company 4450, Civilian Conservation Corps, Wewahitchka, Fla. The Senate reduced the amount to be paid to Mrs. H. C. Bivins from $1,743.25 to $1,000.

At the conference a compromise of $1,100 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1548) for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irwin Tatum, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED PIERCE, SR., AND MARY PIERCE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce, for printing, under the rule.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5584) entitled "An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$2,500" insert "$3,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES M. TUNNELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference of the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill as it passed the House provided for the payment of the sum of $4,405.11 to Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce of Clermont County, Ohio, on account of the death of their son, Fred Pierce, Jr., who was killed when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a Work Projects Administration truck on United States Highway No. 50, near Monterey, in Clermont County, Ohio, on May 27, 1941. The Senate reduced the amount to be paid to Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce, from $4,405.11 to $2,500.

At the conference a compromise of $3,750 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
ROBERT RAMSPECK,
J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there obection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF EXPORT TAX AND REDUCTION OF QUOTAS, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1623) to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object as I understand, this bill suspends for 1 year the export tax on certain commodities which have heretofore been shipped from the Philippines to the United States.

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And it also suspends the progressive reduction in the exportable quota of certain other commodities, and this suspension I believe is for the period of 1 year.

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this is a temporary suspension of both the export tax and the progressive reduction in the export quotas?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true, and so understood by the committee. It is a temporary measure to help relieve the Philippines of the situation that exists today by reason of world-wide conditions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the showing made before our committee was to the effect that if the exports from the Philippines of these commodities moved in a normal manner which, of course, now is not expected, the total involved in this particular instance would amount roughly to around $4,000,000?

Mr. McGEHEE. Between $3,500,000 and $4,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And with the cessation of exports, the reduction of exports which had taken place before——

Mr. McGEHEE. Including 1940.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The volume of exports and the tax applicable thereto was very materially reduced, below the $3,500,000.

Mr. McGEHEE. In fact, almost 50 percent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. McGEHEE. Yes, a unanimous report.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what evidence did the committee have indicating the attitude of the Philippine Government toward this resolution?

Mr. McGEHEE. The Philippine Government requested it; and also it is approved by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. COLE of New York. So the basis for the request made by the Philippine Government is the present war conditions?

Mr. McGEHEE. That is my understanding.

Mr. COLE of New York. This suspension of the tax, therefore, has no relationship whatever to economic conditions in the Philippines other than as may be reflected in current war conditions.

Mr. McGEHEE. That is true.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the imposition and collection of the export tax prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes" (48 Stat. 456), as amended by the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1226; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 48, sec. 1236), shall be suspended for a period commencing on and after the date following the approval of this act and ending on December 31, 1942.

On January 1, 1943, the imposition of such export tax shall be resumed, the tax rate effective for said calendar year to be the same as the rate in effect at the time the tax was suspended; on each succeeding January 1 thereafter the export tax shall be increased progressively by an additional 5 percent of the United States duty, except that during the period January 1, 1946, through July 3, 1946, the export tax shall remain at 15 percent of the United States duty.

SEC. 2. That the progressive reduction of the quotas of the Philippine articles of a class or kind in respect of which a quota is established by subdivision b, subsection 6, section 6 of the said act of March 24, 1934, as amended, shall be suspended for a period commencing on and after the date following the approval of this act and ending on December 31, 1942; the original quotas established by that subdivision for the year 1940 shall be in effect during the suspension.

On January 1, 1943, the progressive reduction of the quotas provided for in subdivision 3, subsection b, section 6 of the said act of March 24, 1934, as amended, shall be resumed, the rate of reduction effective for said calendar year to be the same as the rate in effect at the time the said quotas were suspended; for each calendar year thereafter through the calendar year 1945, each of the said quotas shall be the same as the corresponding quota for the immediately preceding calendar year, less 5 percent of the corresponding original quota.

For the period January 1, 1946, through July 3, 1946, each of said quotas shall be one-half of the corresponding quota specified for the calendar year 1945.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall change in any respect not herein expressly provided for the provisions of the act of March 4, 1934, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR RESOLUTIONS VOTE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday when the votes were taken declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and the United States and that a state of war exists between Italy and the United States. If I had been present, of course, I would have voted "Aye." I was absent on important business in western New York, speaking to American workmen working on defense orders. It was my responsibility to urge them to let nothing interfere with production. I stressed the fact that this war will be won in the factories, in the mines, and along the assembly lines of America. Also that, inasmuch as America has become the arsenal of democracy and has to produce war machinery for all nations fighting the Axis, we have undertaken an almost superhuman program of production; therefore it is essential that nothing be permitted to handicap or slow up the work. From the reaction of those men, I feel assured that the workingmen of America will do their part in winning this war. It is as essential to have an all-out production program as it is to have an all-out war program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the suddenness of yesterday's vote, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star referring to the activities of some of the Members who were absent at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

WAR RESOLUTIONS VOTE

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday when the House voted on the two resolutions declaring war on Germany and Italy. If I had been here, I would have voted in favor of those resolutions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech I made last night over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]?

There was no objection.

CONDITIONS IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time only to advise the Members that in this speech I made last night pertaining to South America there is probably much data that the Members would like to read. I may say that a week ago or before the declarations of war it would have been impossible to say the things and point out the things that I said in this speech, which were things that our committee discovered on its trip to South America. I think it will be reading you will like. May I say further that a full and complete report, about 50 pages long, will be filed, probably on Tuesday, giving you a complete report on the committee's trip and activities in South America, and I should like to have the Members read that report also.

WAR RESOLUTIONS VOTE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed in reaching the Chamber yesterday at the hour when the vote was being taken on the resolutions declaring war on Germany and Italy. It was my purpose to vote for the adoption of both resolutions, and I regret that I could not have been so recorded.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of today's business I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes after the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has spoken today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by J. Louis Ransom, of Topeka, Kans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address which I shall make tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Illinois State Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Coshocton (Ohio) Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHEPPARD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill S. 1623, which we passed a few moments ago, and include therein a letter I have received from Mr. C. J. Bourg relative thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I had vowed and determined that I would not vote for war in Europe or Asia. Circumstances were such that when we were attacked I had to vote for the three resolutions for declaration of war against Japan, Germany, and Italy. We are faced with a dreadful situation; notwithstanding the fact that it was stated previous to our declaring war that you were voting $69,000,000,000 for the purpose of keeping us out of war, that hope has proved erroneous. I thought by your actions that it would. That is water over the dam now, so we must forget it if we can. Now, I am for spending every dollar we can to prosecute this war, but the most serious need that confronts this Congress is to keep out of here every bill that requires the waste of funds that does not pertain directly to the prosecution of the war. It is your duty and your responsibility, so let us put our shoulders to the wheel and see that we win through to victory. Let us not do anything that will in any way hinder it by breaking down our financial structure. We must have more taxes, more money, the sale of more bonds. We must have an end to extravagance, an end to waste, an end to inefficiency. The President and the Congress must say "No" to those things that are not essential to our national defense and to our national economy. If our Treasury goes bankrupt, we will fall—we must maintain our credit. We must all work. We want no misplays or misfits in government. Clean out the Communists, the dreamers, and the inefficient in government. All work together for the common good of the Constitution, of the people, of the flag, and of country. God bless and keep America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, commenting on the "build a bond" day campaign that was inaugurated in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and that may be of value to some other cities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects—in one to include an address, and in the other to include an address by Wayne Coy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICITY BUREAUS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the defense authorities need raw materials to perfect our national defense and prosecute the war. I notice a drive is now being conducted to secure wastepaper throughout the country. I suggest to those in charge of the drive and to the administration that they can secure an abundance of good paper, not wastepaper, if they will stop the propaganda agencies here in Washington from sending out tens of thousands of tons of propaganda to the American people. This propaganda machine should be stopped. These publicity hounds who are trying to sell their schemes to the American people, and to give us a new order, should stop their activities now. We should have a united America. It is time that we all worked together to solve the difficulty in which we find ourselves.

I reiterate. Stop all waste and propaganda publicity put out by New Deal agencies and our defense organization will secure large supplies of paper and other materials for national defense.

WARTIME COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITIES INCURRED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on page 9700 of yesterday's RECORD appear certain remarks of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] in which she states that she is going to make a statement to the House today regarding certain pending bills for wartime compensation for disabilities incurred during the present national crisis.

I assure the gentlewoman that my bill, H. R. 6009, which has been passed by the House and favorably reported by the Senate Pension Committee provides all of the pension legislation that is needed at this time for those in our armed forces and their dependents. The only additional legislation that may be needed is with reference to hospitalization, and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has jurisdiction over legislation of that character. All other work has been completed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When the gentleman's bill was introduced we were supposed to be at peace. I commend the gentleman very much for his foresight.

Mr. LESINSKI. I thank the gentlewoman. I might add that the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I have the

honor of being chairman, is the oldest pension committee of the Congress and has jurisdiction over all pension legislation predicated upon service in our armed forces, either in wartime or peacetime, except service rendered during the Spanish War, Boxer Rebellion, Philippine Insurrection, and World War No. 1. For pensionable purposes service in the Spanish War is from April 21, 1898, to April 11, 1899; in the Boxer Rebellion, from June 20, 1900, to May 12, 1901; and with reference to the Philippine Insurrection from April 12, 1899, to July 4, 1902; and as to veterans only to July 15, 1903, if their service was in the Moro Province. For compensation and pensionable purposes service in World War No. 1 is from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, except as to service in Russia, and the ending date for that service is April 1, 1920. However, if a veteran reenlisted on or after November 12, 1918, and before July 2, 1921, and had prior service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, it is considered World War No. 1 service for compensation and pensionable purposes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a clipping from the Dallas News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF WAR BY MEXICO

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, we on the Pacific coast were intensely gratified yesterday to note the quick declaration of war by the Government of Mexico. The significance of this is that the only known concentration of enemy forces on the west coast near our borders has been on the coast of Lower California. Japanese fishing boats have been congregating there. We have known it for many, many months. Some of them are easily convertible into carrying one or two airplanes. The Government of Mexico very quickly rallied to the cause. The gentleman from California and I were also glad to note that the two governments have already agreed to transport troops through United States territory into Lower California, and all these Japanese will be driven out. They were the most serious threat to southern California.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unannmous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRODUCTION OF FOOD AND FIBER

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to read a short message I have sent to the Secretary of Agriculture:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 12, 1941.*

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WICKARD: I agree with you that to win this war it is necessary to produce food and fiber not only to feed and clothe 130,000,000 of Americans but also millions now engaged in a World War in other countries, fighting to the last ditch for the preservation of democracy, liberty, freedom, and religious rights.

It is a known fact that those engaged in agriculture in the various countries in Europe, because of their participation in the war—whether they like it or not—and because of their financial condition, will not be able to produce farm products, including such major products as wheat and cotton.

In this country, because so many have been drafted from the farms and because of the labor situation, many of the wage earners having left the farms to engage in industrial employment on account of higher wages, it is going to be necessary for our people, without any restrictions, to produce to the limit.

Therefore I call upon you to remove all restrictions on acreage or production, so that the farmers of this country, one of the most patriotic groups in America, may be able to proceed to do their part in winning this war.

If legislation is needed to lift the restrictions on the acreage or the production of cotton, wheat, corn, and peanuts, my committee stands ready to give prompt consideration to such legislation and we would be glad to have you submit same at the earliest possible moment.

Very sincerely,
H. P. FULMER,
Chairman, House Committee
on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, in producing to the limit certainly I have no thought of not continuing our loan program and the assurance of parity prices to farmers, not only during the war but after the war.

THE PENDING RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

This morning I presume 25 Members have asked me, "Can I go home now; will it be safe for me to go home?" My answer to everyone is that I do not think it is safe for any Member to absent himself from Washington on any day when the Congress is in session until we adjourn sine die.

The Chair will have the bells rung 15 minutes before the reconvening of the House and now declares a recess of the House.

Accordingly, at 1:05 p. m., the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Speaker.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, at 5 o'clock and 15 mintes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COOPER.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson; and

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6159, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

I also ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have authority to agree to the Senate amendments, with or without amendment, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

I also ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may file a conference report on the bill on Saturday, December 13, and that such report, when received by the Clerk of the House, shall be printed as a House report as of that date, and that such report, if so filed, may be considered on Monday, December 15, 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is the request that was submitted to me an hour or so ago?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is in the form discussed with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It simply provides that we disagree to the Senate amendments and go to a conference, and that we have the right to file a report during tomorrow, and to bring the conference report up for consideration on Monday. Also, it gives the conferees the right to bring a complete report with reference to Senate amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. In the main, it merely provides for compliance with the rule for printing of conference reports and authorizes agreement to Senate amendments, notwithstanding clause 2 of rule XX.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman in a position to advise as to whether or not any Senate amendments outside of the amendments of the committee, were adopted?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I understand a number of amendments were offered and adopted from the floor after the adoption of the committee amendments.

Mr. TABER. I had an understanding as to two of the amendments, that they should be brought back in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, I may say to the gentleman at this time that any amendment which he wishes to bring back to the House for a separate vote will be brought back.

Mr. TABER. Very well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DITTER.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the vote yesterday on the two war resolutions I was not present on the floor. Had I been present, it is obvious that I would have voted for the two resolutions. I was elsewhere transacting business for the Fourth District of Florida.

THE LATE COLIN KELLY, JR.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Florida and America was saddened today through the following press report appearing in the daily paper:

MANILA, December 12.—Army Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., became America's first hero of the second World War today.

He gave his life in diving in close over the 29,330-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* off Luzon to send it and its crew of 1,200 to 1,500 men to the bottom. He scored.

Kelly was 26, a native of Florida. He graduated from the University of Florida, and then went to West Point, from which he graduated 4 years ago.

In 1938 he finished the primary flying school of the Army, and the advanced flying school bombardment course in 1939.

He was accepted as a combat pilot in the Philippines, 1940, and served in Hawaii until he was assigned to the Philippines.

Captain Kelly, a native Floridian, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Kelly, of Madison, Fla., and the grandson of the late Congressman Mays, of Florida. In his home community and during his school life he was an exemplary young man. At the University of Florida he was an outstanding student and was loved by the entire student body and each member of the faculty. His tenure at West Point added to his strong character and high qualifications for distinguished service in the United States Army. He leaves in the memory of all who knew him the best traits of character of a high and noble American. His few hours in armed conflict best indicate his superstrength, patriotism, courage, ability, and heroism. His name shall stand at the top of the list of American heroes who gave their lives that liberty and freedom may live.

It is my intention a little later at a more appropriate time to ask for proper and lasting recognition of the supreme contribution made by Captain Kelly in the defense of our Republic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter which appeared in today's issue of the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHAFER of Michigan was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address made by the mayor of Atlanta.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OUR WAR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are at war with the most powerful military machine ever conceived and created by the mind of man. Those who sought and insisted upon intervention in the second World War have won. We are in.

In every conceivable, honorable way, with all my strength, I fought for a policy which would keep us out; against the things which were certain to, and did, involve us. For that course I have no apology. Having lost that battle, every ounce of my strength, every bit of my intelligence, every moment of my time, persistently and determinedly will be devoted to aiding in the effort to win that war in the shortest time, with the least possible loss of life.

If, in the dark days to come, anyone in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan knows of anything that I can do that I am not attempting to do, of any way of increasing the value of my services as their Representative here in Washington, it is the duty of that person to advise me.

UNITED WE SHALL WIN

I have no fear that we shall be defeated by enemies from abroad. True, they will probably inflict tremendous, almost unbelievable, losses upon us. But if we possess—and I believe we do—the spirit, the faith, the courage, the ability, the determination of those who, preceding us, fought for, established, and have maintained our independence, we will win again.

We cannot win by boasting of our power; by condemnation of our enemies; by resolutions of high purpose; or the appropriation of billions of dollars. Our enemies have no respect for, nor fear of, words or fine speeches. They have only contempt for declarations of our might, of our military power; for our inefficiency, wastefulness, disunity. Only sacrifice and work—work intelligently and unselfishly directed—can win.

To the interventionists, to those who supported the policy which involved us in this war, to all those who wanted to carry the four freedoms to the uttermost corners of the world, even though that course meant war, I say to you, your

policy has been adopted. It resulted as we expected. We are in the war. It is now our war.

If the interventionists will work as hard to win this war as they did to get us in and as we, the noninterventionists worked to keep us out and as we, formerly the noninterventionists will now work to win the war, there can be no doubt as to the outcome.

The fact that millions wanted to stay out, that millions believed we could stay out, matters not at all. This is not your war. This is not my war. This is our war.

There is war aplenty for all of us, and our first purpose should be the winning of the war, the preservation of America, the perpetuation of our form of government, of our civilization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a telegram I received on December 11 from the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The telegram is as follows:

WARRENTON, N. C.,
December 11, 1941.

Hon. JOHN McCORMACK,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives:

The vote today on war resolutions surprised me. Can't get a plane for Washington. Distressed at not being there to record my vote on this measure. You know full well how I would have voted.

JOHN H. KERR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting letter that appeared in the Boston Globe recently, of a very inspirational nature, being a letter written by a young man when he enlisted in the service a few days ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is entitled to recognition for 10 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour and due to the fact that many Members want to adjourn, I ask permission to vacate the order and postpone it until Monday, after the disposition of the regular business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is entitled to recognition for 2 minutes.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a copy of the bill (H. R. 4906) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill with a view to having women enlist, not to be drafted, in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, for noncombatant service in the Army of the United States, for the purpose of making available to the national defense the knowledge, skill, and special training of the women of this Nation. I understand the War Department favors this bill. I am told that the Budget favors the bill with certain minor modifications. I know that the gentlemen of the Congress who have returned from England can testify as to the very splendid work done by the women in England. In the World War I saw the work of women with the British forces; some of them did work with our Army. Many men can be released for other duty. Women can take the place of cooks, waiters, telephone operators, and chauffeurs. They can take places as hostesses, librarians, in technical positions, in radio, in the Signal Corps, as dietitians, and physiotherapists. They can join the corps and thereby release men to go back to do vital defense work in industry. This bill will release men for work of vast importance in our national defense. There are many positions that women can fill, the Army believes, that will be of great benefit to the Army as the need arises. Many women have expressed eagerness to enlist in an auxiliary corps of this kind. The women of America are anxious to serve their country. They are intensely patriotic.

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, for the Army to have the supervision of women doing work in conjunction with the Army. It is vital to the Army to guide their activities, and their activity should be full time.

This does not in any way interfere with volunteer work without pay, but it does allow a great group of women to enlist who could not afford to do patriotic national-defense work for nothing. Mr. Speaker, the women of America want to make every sacrifice; they want in every way to aid, in this war, the march to victory.

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for noncombatant service with the Army of the United States for the purpose of making available to the national defense the knowledge, skill, and special training of the women of this Nation.

SEC. 2. From women citizens of the United States, the Secretary of War is authorized to appoint the Director and such Assistant Directors as he from time to time may deem necessary or advisable, all of such appointees to serve during the pleasure of the Secretary. The Director shall receive a salary of $3,000 per annum, together with such other allowances as may be provided for hereinafter. The Director, under the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, shall advise the War Department on matters pertaining to the establishment of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; shall operate and administer the corps in accordance with normal military procedure of command and administration and such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War; shall make recommendations as to plans and policies concerning the employment, training, supply, welfare, and discipline of the corps; and shall perform such other duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Each Assistant Director appointed pursuant to this act shall receive a salary of $2,400 per annum, together with such other allowances as may be provided for hereinafter. Each Assistant Director shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by regulations published by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to establish and maintain such number of schools as he may consider necessary for the purpose of training candidates for officers of the corps. The Secretary may establish by regulation the qualifications for entry into such schools, the course of study to be pursued, and the requirements for graduation therefrom. Candidates for such schools may be selected from women volunteers who are citizens of the United States and during their attendance at such schools shall be furnished living quarters, uniforms as hereinafter provided, medical and dental service, medicines, medical and hospital supplies, hospitalization, subsistence, texts, necessary school supplies, and pay at the rate of $50 per month. The Secretary may appoint officers in such numbers as he may deem necessary for the proper administration of the corps in the grades of first officer, second officer, and third officer and with such responsibilities as he may direct: *Provided*, That the whole number of officers so appointed initially shall not exceed 750, together with the Director and Assistant Directors; but the Secretary is authorized to increase this number when he deems such action necessary. The pay of officers so appointed shall be $2,000 per annum for each first officer, $1,575 per annum for each second officer, and $1,500 per annum for each third officer, together with such allowances as may be hereinafter provided.

SEC. 4. The Director, each Assistant Director, and each officer of the Corps shall receive allowances in lieu of rations at the rate of 60 cents per day and adequate quarters: *Provided*, That when adequate quarters are not furnished, the Director shall receive in lieu thereof the sum of $100 per month, an Assistant Director shall receive in lieu thereof the sum of $80 per month, and all other officers shall receive the sum of $40 per month. The adequacy of quarters furnished shall be conclusively determined in accordance with such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to have enrolled initially in the corps, in addition to the Director, Assistant Directors, and officers hereinabove provided for, by voluntary enrollment, not to exceed 25,000 women of excellent character in good physical health, between the ages of 21 and 45 years and citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary may enroll additional women and increase the size of the corps to such extent as he deems necessary. From the personnel of the corps so enrolled there shall be selected pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary, 100 first leaders, 1,000 leaders, and 2,500 junior leaders. From the remainder of the corps there may be appointed not more than 1,200 auxiliaries, specialist first class, not more than 2,400 auxiliaries, specialist second class, and not more

than 3,600 auxiliaries, specialist third class, subject to regulations of the Secretary who shall have complete authority to define the qualifications for all such leaders and specialists: *Provided*, That the number of leaders of each grade and the auxiliary specialists of each class may be increased by the Secretary. The pay of first leaders shall be $864 per annum, of leaders $720 per annum, of junior leaders $648 per annum, and for auxiliaries not otherwise classified $21 per month for the first 4 months of service and $30 per month thereafter. Specialists of the first class shall be paid, in addition to their base pay, the sum of $15 per month, specialists of the second class shall similarly be paid $10 per month, and specialists of the third class shall similarly be paid $5 per month.

The Secretary shall provide quarters for the members of the corps so enrolled either on established Army posts, camps, or stations, or on those to be established, or in such other places as he may direct, and may use any of the facilities of the Army for such purpose: *Provided*, That when quarters are not available the Secretary may provide by regulation to pay allowances in lieu thereof to members other than the Director, the Assistant Directors, and the officers at the rate of $1.15 per day.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall procure and furnish subsistence to all members of the corps, exclusive of the Director, Assistant Directors, and officers, which shall conform so far as is practicable to the subsistence of the Army: *Provided*, That when subsistence in kind is not furnished, the Secretary, by regulation, shall provide payment of allowances in lieu thereof.

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall prescribe the form of oath which shall be required of all the members of the Corps and shall by regulation provide for the induction, including fingerprinting, of all members of the corps. The term of service for all members of the corps shall be 1 year: *Provided*, That the Secretary may discharge any member for cause or for the convenience of the Government: *And provided further*, That in time of war, or of national emergency declared by Congress or the President, the Secretary may, by order, extend the term of service to include the period of the war or national emergency plus not to exceed 6 months, and each contract of enrollment or certificate of appointment shall contain a statement to that effect.

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall prescribe uniforms, insignia, accessories, and equipment for the corps and shall procure and furnish to all members thereof, including the Director, Assistant Directors, and officers, such uniforms, headpieces, shoes, ornaments, insignia of rank and accessories, as well as such organization equipment and supplies, as may be required. The responsibility and accountability of the various individuals and officers for individual clothing and equipment, and for organization equipment and supplies, shall conform so far as is practicable, to the laws and regulations pertaining to the Army in like cases.

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for travel and for the payment of travel allowances, including travel allowances from the place of discharge to the place of acceptance for enrollment or appointment, and such regulations and allowances shall be similar to those for travel of the Army.

SEC. 10. The Secretary shall provide medical and dental services, hospitalization, medicines, and medical and hospital supplies for each member of the corps for injuries, sickness, and disease during the time such member is actually serving her enrollment or appointment, such services to conform as nearly as practicable to similar services rendered to the personnel of the Army; and the facilities and personnel of the Army may be used for such services.

SEC. 11. If any member of the corps is physically injured in line of duty while on active duty or when engaged in authorized travel with or without pay or if any member dies as the result of physical injury, she or her beneficiary shall be entitled to all the benefits prescribed by law for civilian employees of the United States who are physically injured in line of duty or who die as a result thereof, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission shall have jurisdiction in such cases and shall perform the same duties with reference thereto as in the cases of other civilian employees of the United States so injured: *Provided*, That the benefits shall accrue to any such member or her beneficiary whether the disability or death is the result of sickness or disease contracted in line of duty, while on active duty, when such sickness or disease is proximately caused by service on active duty: *Provided further*, That employee's compensation under this act shall not be paid concurrently with active-duty pay or pension based upon active service: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of determining the benefits to which they are entitled under the provisions of this act, members of the corps physically injured when engaged in authorized training without pay will be held and considered as receiving the pay and allowances they would have received if in a pay status.

The Secretary, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may authorize and require the hospitalization, medical and surgical treatment, and domiciliary care so long as any or all are necessary for members of the corps injured as hereinabove set out and the Secretary is authorized to incur obligations with respect thereto without reference to their line of duty status: *Provided*, That this shall not apply to members of the corps who are treated in private hospitals or by civilian physicians while on furloughs or leaves of absence in excess of 24 hours. Members of the corps who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty while on active duty or while engaged in authorized training without pay shall, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, be entitled at Government expense to such hospitalization, rehospitalization, medical and surgical care in hospital and at their homes as is necessary for the appropriate treatment of such injury or disease until the disability resulting from such injury or disease cannot be materially improved by further hospitalization or treatment, and during the period of such hospitalization or rehospitalization, but not for more than an aggregate of 6 months after the termination of the prescribed tour of active duty or training in any case, to the pay and allowances, whether in money or in kind, that they were entitled to receive at the time such injury was suffered or disease contracted and to the necessary transportation incident to such hospitalization, rehospitalization and return to their homes when discharged from hospital; and for any period of hospitalization or rehospitalization when they are not entitled to pay and allowances under the preceding provision they shall be entitled to subsistence at Government expense. In the event any member of the corps dies during her period of enlistment or appointment, the necessary expense for the recovery of the body, its preparation for burial, including the use of such of the uniform and articles of clothing issued to her as may be required, interment or cremation, and transportation of remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort to her home or the place where she received orders or enrolled or was appointed, or to such other place as her relatives may designate provided the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to her home, shall be paid by the United States.

SEC. 12. The corps shall not be a part of the Army but it shall be the only women's organization authorized to serve with the Army, exclusive of the Army Nurse Corps. Nurses shall not be enrolled in the corps and nothing in this act shall be construed to affect or change the Army Nurse Corps as now established by law.

SEC. 13. The corps shall be administered by the Secretary through the channels of command of the Army, pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary may promulgate. The Secretary is hereby authorized to prepare and issue any and all regulations, rules, or orders and to employ any and all of the facilities of the War Department and of the Army of the United States to carry into effect the provisions of this act. The Secretary is further authorized to utilize the services of the United States Employment Service to determine the qualifications of applicants for admission into the corps.

SEC. 14. The members of the corps shall be subject to such disciplinary regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, including provisions for the punishment of major infractions by summary discharge from the corps, and shall be subject to the Articles of War pursuant to the second article thereof when applicable.

SEC. 15. The Secretary is authorized to constitute and establish an Aircraft Warning Section of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and is authorized to enroll in this section, for service in their local communities, women residing therein and being citizens of the United States, who volunteer for such service. A member of the Aircraft Warning Section of the corps shall perform active duty, as directed by the Secretary, only when ordered to such active status and for such periods as may be prescribed by the Secretary from time to time. During the time such women perform duties assigned to them while on active service, all the provisions of this act relating to the corps shall be applicable to the Aircraft Warning Section, except that they shall be provided with quarters, subsistence, and travel or payment of allowances in lieu thereof only when authorized by the Secretary.

SEC. 16. The Secretary is authorized to constitute and establish additional sections of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps to be used in connection with the national defense, to enroll women members therein in such numbers as he may consider necessary and to prescribe regulations for the administration, government, and operation of such sections. In establishing such additional sections the Secretary shall further prescribe under what circumstances the members thereof shall be provided with quarters, subsistence and travel, or payment of allowances in lieu thereof.

SEC. 17. Provisions for leave now applicable to the Army of the United States shall also apply to members of the corps. In the case of any person who has left or leaves a position in the employ of the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the District of Columbia, to join the corps, such person shall, upon the termination of her period of service in the corps, be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay, such restoration to be without loss of seniority; she shall further be entitled to participate in all benefits pursuant to established rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence.

SEC. 18. Promotion in all grades of officers who have established or may hereafter establish their qualifications for such promotion shall be made under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 19. Members of the corps while not on active duty shall not by reason solely of their appointments, oaths, commissions, enlistments, or status as such, or any duties or functions performed, or pay or allowances received as such, be held or deemed to be officers or employees of the United States, or

persons holding any office of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 20. The first sentence of section 125 of the National Defense Act, as amended, down to the first proviso thereof is further amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person not an officer or enlisted man of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to wear the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or any distinctive part of such uniform or a uniform any part of which is similar to a distinctive part of the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; and it shall likewise be unlawful for any person not a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps to wear its duly prescribed uniform or any distinctive part thereof, or a uniform any part of which is similar to a distinctive part thereof."

SEC. 21. Section 101 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (Public, No. 861, 76th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The term 'persons in military service' and the term 'persons in the military service of the United States,' as used in this act shall include the following persons and no others. All members of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and all officers of the Public Health Service detailed by proper authority for duty either with the Army or the Navy. The term 'military service,' as used in this act, shall signify Federal service on active duty with any branch of service heretofore referred to or mentioned as well as training or education under the supervision of the United States preliminary to induction into the military service. The terms 'active service' or 'active duty' shall include the period during which a person in military service is absent from duty on account of sickness, wounds, leave, or other lawful cause."

SEC. 22. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 138. An act granting a pension to Mary Jane Blackman;

S. 201. An act for the relief of Henry Kotila;

S. 501. An act for the relief of Lieut. Col. Gordon Smith;

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of William Corder;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mary S. Gay;

S. 1550. An act for the relief of Carl Chalker;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells;

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick; and

S. 1870. An act for the relief of John Paul Murray.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 527. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 529. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 2297. An act to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions;

H. R. 2799. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

H. R. 3149. An act providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty;

H. R. 4495. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 4854. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 4871. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4993. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida;

H. R. 5074. An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio-communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5377. An act to amend section 111, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5476. An act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5509. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase or accept as gifts motorboats, yachts, and similar vessels for Coast Guard use;

H. R. 5694. An act to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Mich., to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 15, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1159. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1160. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1161. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1162. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1163. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 21, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Chatham Harbor, Mass., with a view to determining the advisability of providing a deeper channel from Nantucket Sound to Stage Harbor, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 19, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 456); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1164. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the reclamation report on the Palisades Dam projects on the South Fork of the Snake River near Idaho Falls, Idaho (H. Doc. No. 457); to the Committee on Irrigation and reclamation and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 1548. A bill for the relief of H. C. Bivins and others (Rept. No. 1498). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and others (Rept. No. 1499). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5569. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the World War, and of their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1500). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 6159. A bill authorizing supplemental appropriations for national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1501). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6215. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNS:

H. R. 6216. A bill to extend the benefits of title 11 of the Social Security Act, as amended, to certain hospital employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 6217. A bill to amend section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 6218. A bill to grant automatic national service life insurance benefits to dependents of recently deceased members of the armed services of the United States and to extend the time limit for filing applications for said insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6219. A bill to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 6220. A bill to amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 6221. A bill to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 6222. A bill to provide for compensatory time off or additional compensation for employees of navy yard and naval stations who are required to work on holidays or on days when the departments and establishments of the Government are closed by Executive order; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6223. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6229. A bill to provide liberalized benefits for disabled American veterans of the World War and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6230. A bill to amend section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, so as to define the term "agricultural laborer;" to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 6231. A bill to amend section 606 (c) of the Communications Act for the purpose of including communications by wire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 6232. A bill to amend the act approved June 28, 1940, entitled "An act to expedite the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended, in order to make more effectual the power to establish priorities and to allocate material; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. Res. 387. Resolution to amend clause 40, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. Res. 388. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the benefits which have resulted from the stabilization of China's currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6224. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary McMenamin Shepherd; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6225. A bill for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6226. A bill for the relief of B. H. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Winston Holder; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2150. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of Local 28 of Post Office Clerks, E. E. Henriksen, president, Seattle, Wash., pointing out that it is imperative that we forestall inflation; alleging that the buying of nonessentials for Christmas diverts money from the indispensable program of combating inflation; reminding us that the Federal Government is urging the people to buy defense bonds and stamps as a method of supplying ready funds with which to prosecute our major war with three great nations; therefore recommending that the American people be urgently requested to engage universally in the giving of defense bonds and stamps for Christmas this year in place of the usual gifts that are given; to the Committee on Ways and Means

2151. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Logansport, Ind., expressing their views in respect to House bill 4000 and similar bills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2152. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of the Woman's Missionary Society of the First United Presbyterian Church of Farrell, Pa., urging national prayer, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2153. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mrs. H. Ver Merris, of Grand Rapids, Mich., recommending that there be a national day of prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2154. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of the Topeka Third Presbyterian Church and the Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Topeka, Kans., requesting immediate enactment of a just and adequate pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2155. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Native Sons of the Golden West, requesting that the proposed cantonment, now designated as the Marysville project, in Yuba County, Calif., be designated as Camp Far West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2156. By Mr. TALLE: Resolution of the Luther College of Decorah, Iowa, expressing confidence in, and pledging full support to, the Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2157. Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Mason City, Iowa, expressing confidence in, and pledging full support to, the Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2158. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York Fight for Freedom Committee to Defend America, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to investigation of the abuse of the franking privileges of Members of Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2159. Also, petition of the World Citizens Association of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their help to the United States in our state of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2160. Also, petition of the Parent-Teachers Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to naturalization of noncitizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2161. Also, petition of the American Legion, Everhart Van Eimeren Post, No. 27, South Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their manpower to successfully carry on the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2162. Also petition of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2163. Also, petition of the New Jersey Women Lawyers' Club, Newark, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1941

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, who art the ever-present and all-seeing One, with whom we always have to do, though sometimes, by our grievous fault, Thou seemest very far from us: As we bow before Thee at this morning hour mindful of our sins and our shortcomings, we humbly ask that Thou wilt speak to us to the finer chastening of our spirits, as Thy whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain. Grant in these momentous days that we may have a sound judgment in all things, relying wholly upon our God, for, without belief in Thee, justice is but a vacant hope, and, apart from the way of Christ, no kingdom of righteousness can be established

Dispel from our midst every trace of national complacency, and give to us that invincible spirit of courage which is born of true penitence, the spirit conscious of its own tremendous need yet sharpened to discern the unveiling of God's purpose to redeem his world out of the tyranny of oppression and might into the glorious sovereignty of love and true brotherhood.

We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 12, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Lucas	Tobey
Chavez	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ADAMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHIEFTAIN, PUEBLO, COLO.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, at this point in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Alva Blanchard Adams," which appeared in the Chieftain of Pueblo, Colo. The editorial appeared in a leading publication of the home town of the late distinguished senior Senator from Colorado. It expresses the feeling of warm affection and high regard in which he was held by those who knew him best—his neighbors.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chieftain, Pueblo, Colo., of December 2, 1941]

ALVA BLANCHARD ADAMS

One of the saddest facts we have ever had to realize is that Pueblo's and Colorado's favorite son, Alva Blanchard Adams, has passed away. His sudden and unexpected death just doesn't register, but it is nevertheless lamentably true.

It is only when death strikes at our very doors without warning that we stop to realize the full significance of the scriptural reference to death that "ye know not the day nor the hour," and so it was with the departure of one of Colorado's leading citizens.

Senator Adams was the outstanding representative of the Centennial State in the halls of the greatest legislative body in the world, and he was a true representative of his native State in every sense of the word. Not once since he was elected to represent Colorado in the Senate of the United States did he ever neglect to stand up for the interests of the people who gave him their confidence and authority to act for them in any and all matters affecting the welfare, the developments, and the progress of the State. And he was just as sincere and just as consistent in opposing policies of government which he and many other people felt would be harmful to Colorado and the West.

Senator Adams was just naturally of a thrifty and economical disposition. Thrift was born in him from the teachings of his illustrious father and mother. Waste and unnecessary extravagance in any form worried him, worried him a great deal more than he permitted those close to him to realize and, in our opinion, worry over policies which he could not control is what got him down.

While he belonged to many organizations where he received deserved recognition, he was made a thirty-third degree Mason owing to his devotion to his lodge and to his State.

The lamented Senator had a keen sense of the duty and of the obligations of government. He was selected the unanimous choice of the Senate Appropriations Committee as chairman of its Subcommittee on Appropriations, and few Federal appropriations got the approval of the Senate unless it first received the approval of his subcommittee. So when one stops to consider what a tremendous responsibility this duty imposed it becomes somewhat easier to comprehend why he was worn down in a sincere desire to do the right thing under such trying conditions. The Senator was also a member of other important committees, especially committees which had to do with the extensive interests of the Rocky Mountain region. He was also mentioned by leading eastern Democrats as a possible nominee for Vice President, but declined the honor in order to continue to serve his State in the Senate.

Another responsibility which Senator Adams assumed was never to flinch as the roll was called on important Senate measures, where he was always the first man to vote. He had no chance to wait to see how close the vote was going to be, nor to learn how some other Senators were going to vote; he voted without hesitancy and he never backtracked once he had registered his considered opinion. He was one of the outstanding men of the Senate, where he commanded the respect and confidence of both Republicans and Democrats for his clear and straightforward thinking.

Senator Adams was a family man in every sense of the word. He was proud of his family, and deservedly so, and did everything an appreciative father could do to provide for their pleasure and comfort. The Senator was a benevolent man. Many are the charities which felt the warmth of his purse and many are the individuals who received encouragement and aid during hours of discouragement, for he was a Christian man. The Senator was admittedly one of the leading lawyers of the West and took equal rank in the business world, where he had extensive interests. In brief, Alva Adams was a constructive factor in our scheme of things; he goes to his reward as an outstanding citizen of whom Pueblo, Colo., and the entire West was justly proud. So when his record is examined and it comes time to pay him a deserved tribute, who is there among us who will gainsay to him the following quotation from the Bible:

"Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will set thee up over many things. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On December 12, 1941:

S. 165. An act to provide for continuing in the service of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States beyond the term of their enlistment those suffering from service-connected disease or injury, and in need of medical care or hospitalization until recovery through such medical care and hospitalization; and

S. 1916. An act to authorize the conveyance of the old Coast Guard station building at Two Rivers, Wis., to the Eleven Gold Star Post, No. 1248, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Two Rivers, Wis.

On December 13, 1941:

S. 2093. An act to provide for the extension of enlistments in the Navy in time of war, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Los Angeles Chapter, Rainbow Division Veterans, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against ratification by the Senate of any treaty of peace with the Imperial Government of Japan until responsible members of the present Japanese Government have been summarily dealt with; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of George R. Mitchell, a citizen of the United States, praying that article I of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution be amended so as to read, in its first and last parts: "Congress shall make no law * * * increasing the profit of the producer at the cost of the consumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A memorial signed by members of the Maryland and District of Columbia Industrial Union Council (Congress of Industrial Organizations), remonstrating against the enactment of pending labor legislation affecting strikes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of tax legislation establishing a withholding tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., signed by Arch N. Booth, general manager, praying that the Senate Committee on Education and Labor promptly report to the Senate for consideration the so-called Smith antistrike bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A letter from the Leavenworth (Kans.) Business and Professional Women's Club, signed by Minnie Courtney, chairman, endorsing the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE SOYBEAN INDUSTRY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the American Soybean Association in Chicago last week, and request that it be included with my remarks in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the farmers of the great Midwest Soybean Belt, like all other branches of agriculture, desire to serve the best interests of the Nation in this period of emergency; and

Whereas the Government has recommended that they produce approximately 1,000,000 additional acres of soybeans in 1942; and

Whereas great uncertainty as to the carrying out of this program has been created by reason of recent action of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation in asking for offers on a vegetable shortening with specifications limiting same to cottonseed oil only, despite the fact that some 54 percent of the soybean oil produced in the Nation last year went into shortening, which is the largest single outlet for soybean oil; and

Whereas such action on the part of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation would seem to endanger the future of the soybean as a continuing profitable cash crop; and

Whereas the action was unjustified for the reason that there is a definite shortage of cottonseed oil, which is reported to have attracted attention of large speculators and some in political circles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the American Soybean Association, the society of growers established and in continuous operation since 1919, do hereby call upon the officers of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation to make known immediately future policies with respect to, inferentially at least, barring soybean oil from its major market; and that Mr. George M. Strayer, secretary of the association, send from the secretary's office at Hudson, Iowa, a copy of this resolution to the Director of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation; to Mr. R. M. Evans, Agricultural Adjustment Administration; to the chairmen of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees; to the Presiding Officers of the House and the Senate; and to the Secretary of Agriculture, respectfully requesting that the situation be clarified without further delay, to the end that confusion and uncertainty among soybean growers may be eliminated. The secretary is further instructed to publish copy of the resolution in the official organ of the association, with the suggestion that members inform their Congressmen of the serious problem which has arisen.

Mr. President, for years the soybean industry has been assiduously developed by the farmers. At first it was looked upon largely as a more or less useless crop, and the farmers could not be convinced of the need for planting it because there was no particular development in manufacture.

As time passed it was discovered that soybeans could be used to advantage for fertilizer, forage, pasture, manufacture of meal, oil, food, and 34 different commodities.

Today, according to the Department of Agriculture, Illinois plants and harvests a larger acreage of soybeans than any other State. The report for July 1941 indicated that 2,912,000 acres had been planted to soybeans by Illinois farmers, and the September report showed that 2,405,000 acres would be harvested. Heavy rains throughout the State caused large loss.

It has been stated that the Government has recommended the planting of 1,000,000 additional acres of soybeans in 1942. On the other hand, the American Soybean Association quotes the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as—

Asking for offers on a vegetable shortening with specifications limiting same to cottonseed oil only, despite the fact that some 54 percent of the soybean oil produced in the Nation last year went into shortening, which is the largest single outlet of soybean oil.

To exclude or limit soybean oil is to endanger the future of this profitable crop, as inferentially the limitation would bar soybean oil from its major market.

It is apparent that this situation is so vital to the soybean farmers that it should be brought to the attention of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, in the hope that a change in its policy may be considered, and considered quickly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution presented by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of Miss Alma Binzel, a representative of the Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions and a memorandum adopted by the State conference with respect to old-age pensions.

One resolution, which endorses House bill 1036, was adopted by the State conference at Madison, Wis., on February 22 and 23, 1941. The other resolution was adopted on June 15, 1941.

The memorandum which accompanies these resolutions indicates the views of the Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation with reference to social security. It will be noted that the Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation feels that the existing Social Security Act has demonstrated its inadequacy in both its old-age assistance grant and old-age insurance sections.

It will be noted further that the conference presents these resolutions and their statements so that their position on Federal pensions may be definitely understood as it is outlined in the resolutions.

I ask unanimous consent that this material be incorporated in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation, at its State conference held at Madison, February 22 and 23, 1941, adopted a resolution endorsing H. R. 1036, which would provide for old-age pensions for persons over 60 years of age, based on a 2-percent gross income tax on all incomes over $250 per month.

At a conference on the rising cost of living and taxation held June 15, 1941, in Milwaukee, the following resolution was adopted on old-age pensions:

"Whereas there has been for the citizens of the United States for years, away back to the Civil War, the question of the lack of income for large numbers of senior citizens; and

"Whereas there have been before the Congress of the United States at practically every session proposals to answer that question with an adequate Federal pension for all senior citizens at the age of 60 or 65 years; and

"Whereas this rich country has only achieved pensions of greatly varying amounts for the very few small groups able to bring pressure to bear upon city, county, State, and Federal legislative bodies; and

"Whereas the inadequacy of the Social Security Act and its amendments is recognized by all economic groups (as expressed in this editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce: 'The amounts of retirement income provided by the social-security law are entirely inadequate for employees in the medium- and large-income groups and it is to supplement those incomes that (private corporations) pension plans have been devised.' And in a postscript by Editor Sherman J. Baimbridge, of the Townsend National Weekly (p. 12, Saturday, June 14, 1941): 'People from low-income groups also find the social-security allotments inadequate'; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this session of the Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation record its hearty approval of H. R. 1036, Representative O'CONNOR'S National Recovery Act, which has been "pigeonholed" in the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative DOUGHTON, chairman; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the conference ask for the early and prompt passage of H. R. 1036 in order that:

"1. Recovery be promoted in the markets of consumers' goods and services; and

"2. Justice be done to the senior citizens whose jobs and savings have been wiped out periodically by depressions not of their making; and

"3. Unity be fostered between labor, management, and the Government by the removal of the fears of insecurity after the sixtieth birthday is passed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Senators LA FOLLETTE, and WILEY, and Wisconsin representatives, and the Chairman of the National Defense Mediation Board."

The conference, at its State conferences, has consistently gone on record for adequate old-age pensions, supporting all legislation that would help to achieve this aim until a really equitable and liberal old-age pension system would be adopted by the Congress of the United States.

In accordance with this position, the Wisconsin State Conference on Social Legislation has also supported the liberalizing and improvement of social security, so as to allow a minimum of $60 per month with a supplementary allowance for wives up to a maximum of $90 per month for each married couple with an age limit of 60 years.

EFFECT OF PRICE-CONTROL LEGISLATION ON FARMERS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, during the past few days the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture from a great number of States have been in Washington. They have been conferring relative to the possible effect of price-control legislation upon agricultural prices. These commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture have adopted a resolution on that subject, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, together with the statement regarding it, be printed in the RECORD at this place, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture of the States last met in Washington on October 9th and 10th, at which time consideration was given to problems affecting the citizens of all of the States, including price-control legislation, and the possibility of having ceiling prices placed over farm commodities, other momentous developments have taken place. The world is at war.

Nothing, however, has transpired since our last meeting in Washington that would justify any material change in the position the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture have taken as a group and in cooperation with other farm groups, relating to the question of price control. Said price-control bill, now before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee for consideration, is a matter of great concern because of its effect upon the producers of farm commodities.

The matter of outstanding significance in this legislation is that representatives of agriculture make clear to the Congress and to the country at large:

1. That price parity remains a goal.

2. That this goal cannot be measured from the depth price levels reached in August 1939.

3. That on the average prices received by farmers for several years did not reach so-called parity until August 1941.

4. Price movements in general during the last 5 years have not been an indication of inflation.

5. While price parity is a goal, it should be constantly emphasized that it is not the only goal. Per capita income parity is a more complete guide and a satisfactory method of measuring this goal can be devised.

6. Since the maintenance of price parity must be included as a feature of any price-control legislation, if it is to be effective, it is equally important to control prices paid by farmers for commodities as to control prices received by farmers for agricultural products. Since wages, coal, rents, taxes, profits, etc., are the big factors involved in cost and in turn in prices of commodities farmers buy, and since these items are so largely controlled by Government action, it seems highly desirable to consider the possibility of writing into the pending legislation a provision tying the ceiling established, if one must be established for agricultural products, to the wages of industrial workers.

By this admission of facts we do not in any way relent in our opposition to price-control legislation. If it becomes necessary to bow to the inevitable and submit to price control, it behooves us to recognize the principles upon which the establishment of ceiling prices for agriculture could be fixed on an equitable basis with all other groups of our citizens. Three fundamental facts bearing upon agriculture's place in this program to be kept in mind are:

1. Not once in 20 years has agriculture's income reached parity. On the contrary, the farmers' proportionate share of the national income has declined alarmingly, substantial increases in prices being necessary to bring farmers' purchasing power back to normal.

2. With farmers receiving substantially less than half of the consumers' dollar, there is no justification for passing on to the consumer any increase further than the increase received by the farmer, unless justified by some other valid cause.

3. Since agriculture has approximately six and one-half million producing units, farmers are the least likely of all producers to exact monopolistic prices from consumers.

Because of these and other facts, the Commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture favor the application of economic devices as the best means for holding down inflationary tendencies rather than arbitrary price-control legislation.

Recognizing the fact that price-control legislation now pending may be passed by the Congress without due consideration of its effect on agriculture, because of the present emergency and because of arbitrary action by the Price Administrator as of December 13, 1941, placing ceilings over certain fats and oils, the following resolution is offered:

"Whereas the influence of price-control legislation, particularly the placing of ceilings over farm commodities, has been given insufficient attention and consideration in the bill now pending in Congress; and

"Whereas Mr. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator, has established ceilings over certain farm commodities pending the passage of legislation embodying the Government's permanent policy on these questions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture, as a group, and in cooperation with other farm groups, endeavor to obtain:

"1. Delay the passage of H. R. 5990, the pending price-control legislation, until its effect on agriculture can be more fully determined.

"2. That the temporary ceilings over fats and oils, among agricultural commodities and products established by the Price Administrator, be suspended pending legislation relating to same; be it further

"*Resolved*, That in order to carry out the objectives of this resolution, the chairman appoint a committee of five commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture, with full power to act as the exigencies in their judgment warrant."

H. K. THATCHER,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1936. A bill to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 905); and

S. 2111. A bill to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense; without amendment (Rept. No. 906).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5988. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 907).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 5558. A bill increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949; with amendments (Rept. No. 908).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1111. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 909).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2119. A bill to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 910).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2082. A bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of Selective Service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 911).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 12, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 138. An act granting a pension to Mary Jane Blackman;

S. 201. An act for the relief of Henry Kotila;

S. 501. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith;

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of William Corder;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witchere;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mary S. Gay;

S. 1550. An act for the relief of Carl Chalker;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells;

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick; and

S. 1870. An act for the relief of John Paul Murray.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2126. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

S. 2127 (by request). A bill amending section 6 of the act entitled "An act granting to the city and county of San Francisco certain rights-of-way in, over, and through certain public lands, the Yosemite National Park, and Stanislaus National Forest, and certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and the public lands in the State of California, and for other purposes," approved December 19, 1913 (38 Stat. 242); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS) introduced Senate bill 2128, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2129. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2130. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE HOUSING—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to refer to House bill 6128, relating to housing, which, as I recall, passed the House of Representatives last Thursday, and which, when it came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. This is the so-called Lanham bill. Heretofore such bills have been considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Included in the bill was an authorization for an appropriation of $150,000,000 for community services. The authorization for the appropriation for that purpose has always been handled by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Upon inquiry, I am informed that the reference to the Committee on Education and Labor was made as the result of a request by a member of that committee. I think he was misinformed, because

I am told that he was of the understanding that the Committee on Education and Labor had heretofore handled Lanham Act legislation and the community-services legislation. The Senator who made the request was the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I tried to reach him without success this morning, and I note that he is not now in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, I wish now to serve notice that tomorrow I shall ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from further consideration of this proposal, and that the matter be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I am assuming that that request will be sufficient, and that the Senate will want to have the proposed legislation considered by the appropriate committee. Should the need arise, I shall make a motion at the proper time that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from further consideration and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think a word should be said in relation to the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is detained from the Senate Chamber because he is now in a committee hearing.

Mr. President, I think it necessary to refer briefly to Senate history in order to see why this apparent conflict has come about, a conflict which I do not relish, and which previously I knew nothing about. I do not wish to make the situation more complicated than it now is.

Legislation dealing with housing has been handled by the Committee on Education and Labor since the Government went into the housing business. The Committee on Education and Labor held hearings on an education bill which included an authorization of $150,000,000. The provision for that authorization was later included in the Lanham bill. When the so-called Lanham bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States it was referred, and logically referred, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

I do not object to any committee considering any bill which it feels able to consider better than any other committee; but if we are to have continuity, if Congress is to be informed about what is being done, it is better that a committee which generally handles a certain type of legislation should handle related matters. It is better, for example, that the Committee on Military Affairs handle bills dealing with military matters. It is better that the committee which has heretofore been handling housing legislation should handle bills relating to housing. I think everyone realizes that confusion will result from taking from a committee which had already considered it a bill dealing with defense housing, which was joined with an educational measure, and putting the proposal into another bill and having it considered by an entirely new committee. The proposal in that connection to set up new machinery of government will cause a break-down of some of the housing facilities already put into operation by previous law. By taking such action we shall introduce confusion into the administrative branches of our Government.

Mr. President, I shall not object to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut when it is made, because his committee did handle the original Lanham bill, and it has handled one or two modifications of that bill since then. The mistake was made in the beginning, and as the result of that mistake our country has not been benefited, as is proved by the investigations which have been carried on with respect to housing.

I think, however, that no action should be taken until the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is present, because he is the chairman of the subcommittee which has for the last 2 or 3 years handled the housing legislation on behalf of the Committee on Education and Labor.

ENLARGEMENT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 207), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That that part of paragraph numbered 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to the standing committees, which reads as follows: "Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-three Senators," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the word "twenty three" and in lieu thereof inserting "twenty-four."

SERVICE ON THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations.

PROCEEDING IN RELATION TO SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HATCH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 81, agreed to March 10, 1941, and Senate Resolution 167, agreed to September 15, 1941, and Senate Resolution 186, agreed to November 1, 1941, all of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, relating to the proceeding now pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine whether WILLIAM LANGER is entitled to retain his seat in the Senate, is hereby increased by $6,000.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] be excused from further service or the Committees on Indian Affairs and Manufactures, and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys; and that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] be assigned to service on the Committees on Rules, Immigration, and Printing.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT, DECLARATIONS OF WAR, ETC. (S. DOC. NO. 148)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also as a Senate document, the address delivered by the President of the United States on December 8 before a joint session of the Congress, the various declarations of war, the proclamations relating to war and alien enemies, the law amending the National Defense Act removing the restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, and the resolution adopted by the Republican conference of the Senate on December 11, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The President of the United States addressed the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.

The United States was at peace with that nation and, at the solicitation of Japan, was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, 1 hour after Japanese air squadrons had commenced bombing in Oahu, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and his colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message. While this reply stated that it seemed useless to continue the existing diplomatic negotiations, it contained no threat or hint of war or armed attack.

It will be recorded that the distance of Hawaii from Japan makes it obvious that the attack was deliberately planned many days or even weeks ago. During the intervening time the Japanese Government has deliberately sought to deceive the United States by false statements and expressions of hope for continued peace.

The attack yesterday on the Hawaiian Islands has caused severe damage to American naval and military forces. Very many American lives have been lost. In addition American ships have been reported torpedoed on the high seas between San Francisco and Honolulu.

Yesterday the Japanese Government also launched an attack against Malaya.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Hong Kong.

Last night Japanese forces attacked Guam.

Last night Japanese forces attacked the Philippine Islands.

Last night the Japanese attacked Wake Island.

This morning the Japanese attacked Midway Island.

Japan has, therefore, undertaken a surprise offensive extending throughout the Pacific area. The facts of yesterday speak for themselves. The people of the

United States have already formed their opinions and well understand the implications to the very life and safety of our Nation.

As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy I have directed that all measures be taken for our defense.

Always will we remember the character of the onslaught against us.

No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people, in their righteous might, will win through to absolute victory.

I believe I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger.

With confidence in our armed forces—with the unbounded determination of our people—we will gain the inevitable triumph—so help us God.

I ask that the Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 8, 1941.*

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH JAPAN

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration without reference to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed unprovoked acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

On the morning of December 11 the Government of Germany, pursuing its course of world conquest, declared war against the United States.

The long known and the long expected has thus taken place. The forces endeavoring to enslave the entire world now are moving toward this hemisphere.

Never before has there been a greater challenge to life, liberty, and civilization.

Delay invites greater danger. Rapid and united effort by all the peoples of the world who are determined to remain free will insure a world victory of the forces of justice and of righteousness over the forces of savagery and of barbarism.

Italy also has declared war against the United States.

I therefore request the Congress to recognize a state of war between the United States and Germany and between the United States and Italy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 11, 1941.*

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Germany and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provison to prosecute the same, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Germany has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Germany; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH ITALY

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Italy has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Italy which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Italy; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BROADCAST FROM THE WHITE HOUSE ON DECEMBER 9, 1941

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered last evening by the President of the United States over a Nation-wide radio hook-up.

The PRESIDENT: The sudden criminal attacks perpetrated by the Japanese in the Pacific provide the climax of a decade of international immorality.

Powerful and resourceful gangsters have banded together to make war upon the whole human race. Their challenge has now been flung at the United States of America. The Japanese have treacherously violated the long-standing peace between us. Many American soldiers and sailors have been killed by enemy action. American ships have been sunk, American airplanes have been destroyed.

The Congress and the people of the United States have accepted that challenge.

Together with other free peoples, we are now fighting to maintain our right to live among our world neighbors in freedom and in common decency, without fear of assault.

I have prepared the full record of our past relations with Japan, and it will be submitted to the Congress. It begins with the visit of Commodore Perry to Japan 88 years ago. It ends with the visit of two Japanese emissaries to the Secretary of State last Sunday, an hour after Japanese forces had loosed their bombs and machine guns against our flag, our forces, and our citizens.

I can say with utmost confidence that no Americans today or a thousand years hence, need feel anything but pride in our patience and our efforts through all the years toward achieving a peace in the Pacific which would be fair and honorable to every nation, large or small. And no honest person, today or a thousand years hence, will be able to suppress a sense of indignation and horror at the treachery committed by the military dictators of Japan, under the very shadow of the flag of peace borne by their special envoys in our midst.

The course that Japan has followed for the past 10 years in Asia has paralleled the course of Hitler and Mussolini in Europe and Africa. Today, it has become far more than a parallel. It is collaboration so well calculated that all the continents of the world, and all the oceans, are now considered by the Axis strategists as one gigantic battlefield.

In 1931 Japan invaded Manchukuo—without warning.

In 1935, Italy invaded Ethiopia—without warning.

In 1938, Hitler occupied Austria—without warning.

In 1939, Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia—without warning.

Later in 1939, Hitler invaded Poland—without warning.

In 1940, Hitler invaded Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Luxemburg—without warning.

In 1940, Italy attacked France and later Greece—without warning.

In 1941, the Axis Powers attacked Jugoslavia and Greece and they dominated the Balkans—without warning.

In 1941, Hitler invaded Russia—without warning.

And now Japan has attacked Malaya and Thailand—and the United States—without warning.

It is all of one pattern.

We are now in this war. We are all in it—all the way. Every single man, woman, and child is a partner in the most tremendous undertaking of our American history. We must share together the bad news and the good news, the defeats and the victories—the changing fortunes of war.

So far, the news has all been bad. We have suffered a serious set-back in Hawaii. Our forces in the Philippines, which include the brave people of that Commonwealth, are taking punishment, but are defending themselves vigorously. The reports from Guam and Wake and Midway Islands are still confused, but we must be prepared for the announcement that all these three outposts have been seized.

The casualty lists of these first few days will undoubtedly be large. I deeply feel the anxiety of all families of the men in our armed forces and the relatives of people in cities which have been bombed. I can only give them my solemn promise that they will get news just as quickly as possible.

This Government will put its trust in the stamina of the American people, and will give the facts to the public as soon as two conditions have been fulfilled: First, that the information has been definitely and officially confirmed; and, second, that the release of the information at the time it is received will not prove valuable to the enemy directly or indirectly.

Most earnestly I urge my countrymen to reject all rumors. These ugly little hints of complete disaster fly thick and fast in wartime. They have to be examined and appraised.

As an example, I can tell you frankly that until further surveys are made, I have not sufficient information to state the exact damage which has been done to our naval vessels at Pearl Harbor. Admittedly the damage is serious. But no one can say how serious, until we know how much of this damage can be repaired and how quickly the necessary repairs can be made.

I cite as another example a statement made on Sunday night that a Japanese carrier had been located and sunk off the Canal Zone. And when you hear statements that are attributed to what they call an authoritative source, you can be reasonably sure that under these war circumstances the authoritative source was not any person in authority.

Many rumors and reports which we now hear originate with enemy sources. For instance, today the Japanese are claiming that as a result of their one action against Hawaii they have gained naval supremacy in the Pacific. This is an old trick of propaganda which has been used innumerable times by the Nazis. The purposes of such fantastic claims are, of course, to spread fear and confusion among us, and to goad us into revealing military information which our enemies are desperately anxious to obtain.

Our Government will not be caught in this obvious trap—and neither will our people.

It must be remembered by each and every one of us that our free and rapid communication must be greatly restricted in wartime. It is not possible to receive full, speedy, accurate reports from distant areas of combat. This is particularly true where naval operations are concerned. For in these days of the marvels of radio it is often impossible for the commanders of various units to report their activities by radio, for the very simple reason that this information would become available to the enemy, and would disclose their position and their plan of defense or attack.

Of necessity there will be delays in officially confirming or denying reports of operations, but we will not hide facts from the country if we know the facts and if the enemy will not be aided by their disclosure.

To all newspapers and radio stations—all those who reach the eyes and ears of the American people—I say this: You have a most grave responsibility to the Nation now and for the duration of this war.

If you feel that your Government is not disclosing enough of the truth, you have every right to say so. But—in the absence of all the facts, as revealed by official sources—you have no right to deal out unconfirmed reports in such a way as to make people believe they are gospel truth.

Every citizen, in every walk of life, shares this same responsibility. The lives of our soldiers and sailors—the whole future of this Nation—depend upon the manner in which each and every one of us fulfills his obligation to our country.

Now a word about the recent past—and the future. A year and a half has elapsed since the fall of France, when the whole world first realized the mechanized might which the Axis nations had been building for so many years. America has used that year and a half to great advantage. Knowing that the attack might reach us in all too short a time, we immediately began greatly to increase our industrial strength and our capacity to meet the demands of modern warfare.

Precious months were gained by sending vast quantities of our war materials to the nations of the world still able to resist Axis aggression. Our policy rested on the fundamental truth that the defense of any country resisting Hitler or Japan was in the long run the defense of our own country. That policy has been justified. It has given us time, invaluable time, to build our American assembly lines of production.

Assembly lines are now in operation. Others are being rushed to completion. A steady stream of tanks and planes, of guns and ships, of shells and equipment—that is what these 18 months have given us.

But it is all only a beginning of what has to be done. We must be set to face a long war against crafty and powerful bandits. The attack at Pearl Harbor can be repeated at any one of many points in both oceans and along both our coast lines and against all the rest of the hemisphere.

It will not only be a long war, it will be a hard war. That is the basis on which we now lay all our plans. That is the yardstick by which we measure what we shall need and demand—money, materials, doubled and quadrupled production, ever increasing. The production must be not only for our own Army and Navy and air force. It must reinforce the other armies and navies and air forces fighting the Nazis and the war lords of Japan throughout the Americas and the world.

I have been working today on the subject of production. Your Government has decided on two broad policies.

The first is to speed up all existing production by working on a 7-day-week basis in every war industry, including the production of essential raw materials.

The second policy, now being put into form, is to rush additions to the capacity of production by building more new plants, by adding to old plants, and by using the many smaller plants for war needs.

Over the hard road of the past months we have at times met obstacles and difficulties, divisions and disputes, indifference and callousness. That is now all past, and, I am sure, forgotten.

The fact is that the country now has an organization in Washington built around men and women who are recognized experts in their own fields. I think the country knows that the people who are actually responsible in each and every one of these many fields are pulling together with a teamwork that has never before been excelled.

On the road ahead there lies hard work—gruelling work—day and night, every hour and every minute.

I was about to add that ahead there lies sacrifice for all of us.

But it is not correct to use that word. The United States does not consider it a sacrifice to do all one can, to give one's best to our Nation, when the Nation is fighting for its existence and its future life.

It is not a sacrifice for any man, old or young, to be in the Army or the Navy of the United States. Rather is it a privilege.

It is not a sacrifice for the industrialist or the wage earner, the farmer or the shopkeeper, the trainman or the doctor, to pay more taxes, to buy more bonds, to forego extra profits, to work longer or harder at the task for which he is best fitted. Rather is it a privilege.

It is not a sacrifice to do without many things to which we are accustomed if the national defense calls for doing without.

A review this morning leads me to the conclusion that at present we shall not have to curtail the normal articles of food. There is enough food for all of us and enough left over to send to those who are fighting on the same side with us.

There will be a clear and definite shortage of metals of many kinds for civilian use, for the very good reason that in our increased program we shall need for war purposes more than half of that portion of the principal metals which during the past year have gone into articles for civilian use. We shall have to give up many things entirely.

I am sure that the people in every part of the Nation are prepared in their individual living to win this war. I am sure

they will cheerfully help to pay a large part of its financial cost while it goes on. I am sure they will cheerfully give up those material things they are asked to give up.

I am sure that they will retain all those great spiritual things without which we cannot win through.

I repeat that the United States can accept no result save victory, final and complete. Not only must the shame of Japanese treachery be wiped out, but the sources of international brutality, wherever they exist, must be absolutely and finally broken.

In my message to the Congress yesterday I said that we "will make very certain that this form of treachery shall never endanger us again." In order to achieve that certainty, we must begin the great task that is before us by abandoning once and for all the illusion that we can ever again isolate ourselves from the rest of humanity.

In these past few years—and, most violently, in the past few days—we have learned a terrible lesson.

It is our obligation to our dead—it is our sacred obligation to their children and our children—that we must never forget what we have learned.

And what we all have learned is this:

There is no such thing as security for any nation—or any individual—in a world ruled by the principles of gangsterism.

There is no such thing as impregnable defense against powerful aggressors who sneak up in the dark and strike without warning.

We have learned that our ocean-girt hemisphere is not immune from severe attack—that we cannot measure our safety in terms of miles on any map.

We may acknowledge that our enemies have performed a brilliant feat of deception, perfectly timed and executed with great skill. It was a thoroughly dishonorable deed, but we must face the fact that modern warfare as conducted in the Nazi manner is a dirty business. We don't like it—we didn't want to get in it—but we are in it and we're going to fight it with everything we've got.

I do not think any American has any doubt of our ability to administer proper punishment to the perpetrators of these crimes.

Your Government knows that for weeks Germany has been telling Japan that if Japan did not attack the United States, Japan would not share in dividing the spoils with Germany when peace came. She was promised by Germany that if she came in she would receive the complete and perpetual control of the whole of the Pacific area—and that means not only the Far East, not only all of the islands in the Pacific but also a stranglehold on the west coast of North, Central, and South America.

We also know that Germany and Japan are conducting their military and naval operations in accordance with a joint plan. That plan considers all peoples and nations which are not helping the Axis Powers as common enemies of each and every one of the Axis Powers.

That is their simple, and obvious grand strategy. That is why the American people must realize that it can be matched only with similar grand strategy. We must realize for example that Japanese successes against the United States in the Pacific are helpful to German operations in Libya; that any German success against the Caucasus is inevitably an assistance to Japan in her operations against the Dutch East Indies; that a German attack against Algiers or Morocco opens the way to a German attack against South America.

On the other side of the picture, we must learn to know that guerilla warfare against the Germans in Serbia helps us; that a successful Russian offensive against the Germans helps us; and that British successes on land or sea in any part of the world strengthen our hands.

Remember always that Germany and Italy, regardless of any formal declaration of war, consider themselves at war with the United States at this moment just as much as they consider themselves at war with Britain and Russia. And Germany puts all the other republics of the Americas into the category of enemies. The people of the hemisphere can be honored by that.

The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers; we are builders.

We are now in the midst of a war, not for conquest, not for vengeance, but for a world in which this Nation, and all that this Nation represents, will be safe for our children. We expect to eliminate the danger from Japan, but it would serve us ill if we accomplished that and found that the rest of the world was dominated by Hitler and Mussolini.

We are going to win the war, and we are going to win the peace that follows.

And in the dark hours of this day—and through dark days that may be yet to come—we will know that the vast majority of the members of the human race are on our side. Many of them are fighting with us. All of them are praying for us. For, in representing our cause, we represent theirs as well—our hope and their hope for liberty under God.

[ALIEN ENEMIES—JAPANESE]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WAR WITH JAPAN—A PROCLAMATION

Authority

Whereas it is provided by Section 21 of Title 50 of the United States Code as follows:

Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government or any invasion or predatory incursion is perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States by any foreign nation or government, and the President makes public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being of the age of fourteen years and upward, who shall be within the United States and not actually naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured, and removed as alien enemies. The President is authorized in any such event, by his proclamation thereof, or other public act, to direct the conduct to be observed, on the part of the United States, toward the aliens who become so liable; the manner and degree of the restraint to which they shall be subject and in what cases, and upon what security their residence shall be permitted, and to provide for the removal of those who, not being permitted to reside within the United States, refuse or neglect to depart therefrom; and to establish any other regulations which are found necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

and

Whereas by Sections 22, 23 and 24 of Title 50 of the United States Code further provision is made relative to alien enemies:

PROCLAMATION

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as president of the United States, and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, do hereby make public proclamation to all whom it may concern that an invasion has been perpetrated upon the territory of the United States by the Empire of Japan.

Conduct to be observed by alien enemies

And, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the said sections of the United States Code, I do hereby further proclaim and direct that the conduct to be observed on the part of the United States toward all natives, citizens, denizens or subjects of the Empire of Japan being of the age of fourteen years and upwards who shall be within the United States or within any territories in any way subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and not actually naturalized, who for the purpose of this Proclamation and under such sections of the United States Code are termed alien enemies, shall be as follows:

All alien enemies are enjoined to preserve the peace towards the United States and to refrain from crime against the public safety, and from violating the laws of the United States and of the States and Territories thereof; and to refrain from actual hostility or giving information, aid or comfort to the enemies of the United States or interfering by word or deed with the defense of the United States or the political processes and public opinions thereof; and to comply strictly with the regulations which are hereby or which may be from time to time promulgated by the President.

All alien enemies shall be liable to restraint, or to give security, or to remove and depart from the United States in the manner prescribed by Sections 23 and 24 of Title 50 of the United States Code, and as prescribed in the regulations duly promulgated by the President.

Duties and authority of the Attorney General and the Secretary of War

And, pursuant to the authority vested in me, I hereby charge the Attorney General with the duty of executing all the regulations hereinafter contained regarding the conduct of alien enemies within continental United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska, and the Secretary of War with the duty of executing the regulations which are hereinafter set forth and which may be hereafter adopted regarding the conduct of alien enemies in the Canal Zone, the

Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands. Each of them is specifically directed to cause the apprehension of such alien enemies as in the judgment of each are subject to apprehension or deportation under such regulations. In carrying out such regulations within the continental United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska, the Attorney General is authorized to utilize such agents, agencies, officers and departments of the United States and of the several states, territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof and of the District of Columbia as he may select for the purpose. Similarly the Secretary of War in carrying out such regulations in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands is authorized to use such agents, agencies, officers and departments of the United States and of the territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof as he may select for the purpose. All such agents, agencies, officers and departments are hereby granted full authority for all acts done by them in the execution of such regulations when acting by direction of the Attorney General or the Secretary of War, as the case may be.

REGULATIONS

And, pursuant to the authority vested in me, I hereby declare and establish the following regulations which I find necessary in the premises and for the public safety:

(1) No alien enemy shall enter or be found within the Canal Zone and no alien enemy shall enter or leave the Hawaiian Islands or the Philippine Islands except under such regulations as the Secretary of War shall from time to time prescribe. Any alien enemy found in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands, or the Philippine Islands in violation of any such regulations and any alien enemy who enters or is found within any restricted area to be hereafter prescribed by the Military Commanders of each such territory in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands, may be immediately apprehended by authority of the Military Governors in each such territory, or if there be no Military Governor, then by authority of the Secretary of War, and detained until it is determined, under the regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, whether any such alien enemy should be permanently interned following which such alien enemy shall either be released, released on bond, or permanently interned, as the case may be.

(2) The exercise of the power to prescribe restricted areas and the power of arrest, detention and internment of alien enemies in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands or the Philippine Islands shall be under the jurisdiction of the Military Commanders of each such territory, each acting under such regulations as the Secretary of War shall hereafter prescribe.

(3) No alien enemy shall enter or leave Alaska, Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands except under such regulations as the Attorney General shall from time to time prescribe. Any alien enemy found in Alaska, Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands in violation of any such regulations and any alien enemy who enters or is found within any restricted area to be hereafter prescribed by the Military Commanders of each such territory in Alaska, Puerto Rico and by the Naval Commander in the Virgin Islands, shall be immediately apprehended by the authority of the Attorney General acting through the United States Attorney in each such territory and detained until it is determined, under the regulations to be prescribed by the Attorney General, whether any such alien enemy shall either be released, released on bond, or permanently interned, as the case may be.

(4) The Military Commanders in Alaska and Puerto Rico and the Naval Commander in the Virgin Islands shall have the power to prescribe restricted areas.

(5) No alien enemy shall have in his possession, custody or control at any time or place or use or operate any of the following enumerated articles:

a. Firearms.

b. Weapons or implements of war or component parts thereof.

c. Ammunition.

d. Bombs.

e. Explosives or material used in the manufacture of explosives.

f. Short-wave radio receiving sets.

g. Transmitting sets.

h. Signal devices.

i. Codes or ciphers.

j. Cameras.

k. Papers, documents or books in which there may be invisible writing; photograph, sketch, picture, drawing, map or graphical representation of any military or naval installations or equipment or of any arms, ammunition, implements of war, device or thing used or intended to be used in the combat equipment of the land or naval forces of the United States or of any military or naval post, camp or station.

All such property found in the possession of any alien enemy in violation of the foregoing regulations shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture.

(6) No alien enemy shall undertake any air flight or ascend into the air in any airplane, aircraft or balloon of any sort whether owned governmentally, commercially or privately, except that travel by an alien enemy in an airplane or aircraft may be authorized by the Attorney General, or his representative, or the Secretary of War, or his representative, in their respective jurisdictions, under such regulations as they shall prescribe.

(7) Alien enemies deemed dangerous to the public peace or safety of the United States by the Attorney General or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, are subject to summary apprehension. Such apprehension shall be made in the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by such duly authorized officer of the Department of Justice as the Attorney General may determine. In the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands, such arrests shall be made by the Military Commanders in each such territory by authority of the respective Military Governors thereof, and if there be no Military Governor, then by authority of the Secretary of War. Alien enemies arrested shall be subject to confinement in such place of detention as may be directed by the officers responsible for the execution of these regulations and for the arrest, detention and internment of alien enemies in each case, or in such other places of detention as may be directed from time to time by the Attorney General, with respect to continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and by the Secretary of War with respect to the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands, and there confined until he shall have received such permit as the Attorney General or the Secretary of War with respect to the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands shall prescribe.

(8) No alien enemy shall land in, enter or leave or attempt to land in, enter or leave the United States, except under the regulations prescribed by the President in his Proclamation dated November 14, 1941,[1] and the regulations promulgated thereunder or any proclamation or regulation promulgated hereafter.

(9) Whenever the Attorney General of the United States, with respect to the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, or the Secretary of War, with respect to the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands, deems it to be necessary, for the public safety and protection, to exclude alien enemies from a designated area, surrounding any fort, camp, arsenal, airport, landing field, aircraft station, electric or other power plant, hydroelectric dam, government naval vessel, navy yard, pier, dock, drydock, or any factory, foundry, plant, workshop, storage yard, or warehouse for the manufacture of munitions or implements of war or any thing of any kind, nature or description for the use of the Army, the Navy or any country allied or associated with the United States, or in any wise connected with the national defense of the United States, or from any locality in which residence by an alien enemy shall be found to constitute a danger to the public peace and safety of the United States or from a designated area surrounding any canal or any wharf, pier, dock or dry dock used by ships or vessels of any designated tonnage engaged in foreign or domestic trade, or of any warehouse, shed, elevator, railroad terminal, depot or yard or other terminal, storage or transfer facility, then no alien enemy shall be found within such area or the immediate vicinity thereof. Any alien enemy found within any such area or the immediate vicinity thereof prescribed by the Attorney General or the Secretary of War, as the case may be, pursuant to these regulations, shall be subject to summary apprehension and to be dealt with as hereinabove prescribed.

(10) With respect to the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, an alien enemy shall not change his place of abode or occupation or otherwise travel or move from place to place without full compliance with any such regulations as the Attor-

[1] 6 F. R. 5821.

ney General of the United States may, from time to time, make and declare; and the Attorney General is hereby authorized to make and declare, from time to time, such regulations concerning the movements of alien enemies within the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, as he may deem necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

(11) With respect to the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands, an alien enemy shall not change his place of abode or occupation or otherwise travel or move from place to place without full compliance with any such regulations as the Secretary of War may, from time to time, make and declare; and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to make and declare, from time to time, such regulations concerning the movements of alien enemies within the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippine Islands as he may deem necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

(12) No alien enemy shall enter or be found in or upon any highway, waterway, airway, railway, railroad, subway, public utility, building, place or thing not open and accessible to the public generally, and not generally used by the public.

(13) No alien enemy shall be a member or an officer of, or affiliated with, any organization, group or assembly hereafter designated by the Attorney General, nor shall any alien enemy advocate, defend or subscribe to the acts, principles or policies thereof, attend any meetings, conventions or gatherings thereof or possess or distribute any literature, propaganda or other writings or productions thereof.

This proclamation and the regulations herein contained shall extend and apply to all land and water, continental or insular, in any way within the jurisdiction of the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and [SEAL] forty-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-sixth.

FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

[No. 2525]

[F. R. Doc. 41-9233; Filed, December 8, 1941; 3:59 p. m.]

[ALIEN ENEMIES—GERMAN]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

Authority

Whereas it is provided by section 21 of title 50 of the United States Code as follows:

Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government, or any invasion or predatory incursion is perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States by any foreign nation or government, and the President makes public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being of the age of fourteen years and upward, who shall be within the United States and not actually naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured, and removed as alien enemies. The President is authorized in any such event, by his proclamation thereof, or other public act, to direct the conduct to be observed, on the part of the United States, toward the aliens who become so liable; the manner and degree of the restraint to which they shall be subject and in what cases, and upon what security their residence shall be permitted, and to provide for the removal of those who, not being permitted to reside within the United States, refuse or neglect to depart therefrom; and to establish any other regulations which are found necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

And whereas by sections 22, 23 and 24 of title 50 of the United States Code further provision is made relative to alien enemies:

PROCLAMATION

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, do hereby make public proclamation to all whom it may concern that an invasion or predatory incursion is threatened upon the territory of the United States by Germany.

Conduct to be observed by alien enemies

And, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the said sections of the United States Code, I do hereby further proclaim and direct that the conduct to be observed on the part of the United States toward all natives, citizens, denizens or subjects of Germany being of the age of fourteen years and upwards who shall be within the United States or within any territories in any way subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and not actually naturalized, who for the purpose of this Proclamation and under such sections of the United States Code are termed alien enemies, shall be as follows:

All alien enemies are enjoined to preserve the peace towards the United States and to refrain from crime against the public safety, and from violating the laws of the United States and of the States and Territories thereof; and to refrain from actual hostility or giving information, aid or comfort to the enemies of the United States or interfering by word or deed with the defense of the United States or the political processes and public opinions thereof; and to comply strictly with the regulations which are hereby or which may be from time to time promulgated by the President.

All alien enemies shall be liable to restraint, or to give security, or to remove and depart from the United States in the manner prescribed by sections 23 and 24 of title 50 of the United States Code, and as prescribed in the regulations duly promulgated by the President.

Duties and authority of the Attorney General and the Secretary of War

And, pursuant to the authority vested in me, I hereby charge the Attorney General with the duty of executing all the regulations hereinafter prescribed regarding the conduct of alien enemies within continental United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska, and the Secretary of War with the duty of executing the regulations which are hereinafter prescribed and which may be hereafter adopted regarding the conduct of alien enemies in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands. Each of them is specifically directed to cause the apprehension of such alien enemies as in the judgment of each are subject to apprehension or deportation under such regulations. In carrying out such regulations within the continental United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska, the Attorney General is authorized to utilize such agents, agencies, officers and departments of the United States and of the several states, territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof and of the District of Columbia as he may select for the purpose. Similarly the Secretary of War in carrying out such regulations in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands is authorized to use such agents, agencies, officers and departments of the United States and of the territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof as he may select for the purpose. All such agents, agencies, officers and departments are hereby granted full authority for all acts done by them in the execution of such regulations when acting by direction of the Attorney General or the Secretary of War, as the case may be.

REGULATIONS

The regulations contained in Proclamation No. 2525 of December 7, 1941, relative to natives, citizens, denizens or subjects of Japan are hereby incorporated in and made a part of this proclamation, and shall be applicable to alien enemies defined in this proclamation.

This proclamation and the regulations herein prescribed shall extend and apply to all land and water, continental or insular, in any way within the jurisdiction of the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and [SEAL] forty-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-sixth.

FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

[No. 2526]

[F. R. Doc. 41-9237; Filed, December 9, 1941; 9:30 a. m.]

[ALIEN ENEMIES—ITALIAN]

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

Authority

Whereas it is provided by Section 21 of Title 50 of the United States Code as follows:

Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or

government, or any invasion or predatory incursion is perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States by any foreign nation or government, and the President makes public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being of the age of fourteen years and upward, who shall be within the United States and not actually naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured, and removed as alien enemies. The President is authorized in any such event, by his proclamation thereof, or other public act, to direct the conduct to be observed, on the part of the United States, toward the aliens who become so liable; the manner and degree of the restraint to which they shall be subject and in what cases, and upon what security their residence shall be permitted, and to provide for the removal of those who, not being permitted to reside within the United States, refuse or neglect to depart therefrom; and to establish any other regulations which are found necessary in the premises and for the public safety.

And whereas by Sections 22, 23 and 24 of Title 50 of the United States Code further provision is made relative to alien enemies:

PROCLAMATION

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, do hereby make public proclamation to all whom it may concern that an invasion or predatory incursion is threatened upon the territory of the United States by Italy.

Conduct to be observed by alien enemies

And, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the said sections of the United States Code, I do hereby further proclaim and direct that the conduct to be observed on the part of the United States toward all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of Italy being of the age of 14 years and upwards who shall be within the United States or within any territories in any way subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and not actually naturalized, who for the purpose of this proclamation and under such sections of the United States Code are termed alien enemies, shall be as follows:

All alien enemies are enjoined to preserve the peace towards the United States and to refrain from crime against the public safety, and from violating the laws of the United States and of the States and Territories thereof; and to refrain from actual hostility or giving information, aid, or comfort to the enemies of the United States or interfering by word or deed with the defense of the United States or the political processes and public opinions thereof; and to comply strictly with the regulations which are hereby or which may be from time to time promulgated by the President.

All alien enemies shall be liable to restraint, or to give security, or to remove and depart from the United States in the manner prescribed by sections 23 and 24 of title 50 of the United States Code, and as prescribed in the regulations duly promulgated by the President.

Duties and authority of the Attorney General and the Secretary of War

And, pursuant to the authortiy vested in me, I hereby charge the Attorney General with the duty of executing all the regulations hereinafter prescribed regarding the conduct of alien enemies within continental United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska, and the Secretary of War with the duty of executing the regulations which are hereinafter prescribed and which may be hereafter adopted regarding the conduct of alien enemies in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands. Each of them is specifically directed to cause the apprehension of such alien enemies as in the judgment of each are subject to apprehension or deportation under such regulations. In carrying out such regulations within the continental United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska, the Attorney General is authorized to utilize such agents, agencies, officers and departments of the United States and of the several states, territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof and of the District of Columbia as he may select for the purpose. Similarly the Secretary of War in carrying out such regulations in the Canal Zone, the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands is authorized to use such agents, agencies, officers and departments of the United States and of the territories, dependencies and municipalities thereof as he may select for the purpose. All such agents, agencies, officers and departments are hereby granted full authority for all acts done by them in the execution of such regulations when acting by direction of the Attorney General or the Secretary of War, as the case may be.

REGULATIONS

The regulations contained in Proclamation No. 2525 of December 7, 1941, relative to natives, citizens, denizens or subjects of Japan are hereby incorporated in and made a part of this proclamation, and shall be applicable to alien enemies defined in this proclamation.

This proclamation and the regulations herein prescribed shall extend and apply to all land and water, continental or insular, in any way within the jurisdiction of the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 8th day of December, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and [SEAL] forty-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-sixth.

FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

[No. 2527]

[F. R. Doc. 41-9238; Filed, December 9, 1941; 9:30 a. m.]

Senate Joint Resolution 117

Joint resolution removing restrictions on the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, extending the periods of service of such personnel, and amending the National Defense Act with respect to the meaning of the term "Army of the United States"

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, as amended, and of Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended, insofar as they restrict the territorial use of units and members of the Army of the United States, are suspended during the existence of any war in which the United States is engaged, and during the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war.

SEC. 2. The periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of all members of the Army of the United States now or hereafter in or subject to active military service of the United States are extended for the period stated in the preceding section: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from terminating such periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission at an earlier date in any case.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a comma and the following: "and shall include persons inducted into the land forces of the United States under Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress (the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940), as amended."

Passed the Senate December 11, 1941.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 11, 1941]

RESOLUTION OF REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, yesterday I issued a call for a Republican conference. The conference was had this morning, and a resolution was unanimously adopted, which I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Republican conference pledge to the President of the United States its unanimous support in the vigorous and efficient prosecution of the war.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on my own behalf and on behalf of the majority, and I am sure on behalf of the country, I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon, as minority leader, of our deep appreciation, not only of their resolution just presented by him but of his cooperation and that of his Republican colleagues in the prosecution of this war which has been thrust upon the United States.

SALE OF WISCONSIN CHEESE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by himself delivered in December 1941, in collaboration with the Eau Claire Junior Chamber of Commerce in their campaign to promote the sale of Wisconsin cheese, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN TIME OF WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator GUFFEY delivered on Sunday, December 14, 1941, on the subject Civil Liberties in a Nation at War, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND THE WAR—ADDRESS BY R. J. THOMAS

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, which was broadcast on

Wednesday evening, December 10, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS COMES THROUGH—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Raymond Clapper, published in the Washington News of December 12, 1941, entitled "Congress Comes Through," which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTIONS AND STATEMENTS BY ORGANIZED LABOR IN SUPPORT OF WAR PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have a number of statements made by leaders of labor groups which I desire to have placed in the RECORD; and, because of their importance, I should like briefly to make some observations concerning them.

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate at this time to call attention to the overwhelming response that has come from American organized labor in unanimous support of the present war program. It was to be expected. I, for one, have never entertained a thought which would reflect on the unbounded patriotism of organized labor in the United States. Because of the controversies which have raged during the recent past on the so-called labor issue, I believe it is fitting that we take cognizance of labor's attitude in this immediate crisis.

Sidney Hillman, Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management, and former C. I. O. leader, has this to say:

War is upon us. This is a people's war—a war of the common man against old tyrannies and new barbarisms. Labor is more united than ever before in this great war undertaking. All labor has pledged its fullest cooperation and participation. Joined in this high purpose, labor can help not only to crush the Axis aggressors but also to build a new world of peace and security. Labor will never fail the cause of freedom.

From William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, I quote the following:

With America at war the no-strike policy of the American Federation of Labor must be made 100-percent effective," Mr. Green said. "I have every confidence that the 5,000,000 loyal members of the American Federation of Labor will respond to the emergency and give enthusiastic service to our Nation.

Japanese treachery and aggression have aroused in American workers an unconquerable determination to see this fight through to a victorious finish at any cost.

Labor knows its duty. It will do its duty, and more. No new laws are necessary to prevent strikes. Labor will see to that. American workers will now produce as the workers of no other nation have ever produced and they will keep steadfastly on the job of supplying our armed forces with the munitions of war until victory and final peace are won.

From Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations:

So far as the Congress of Industrial Organizations is concerned, all its unions and all its members will go right down the road with President Roosevelt and the Congress. Our Government comes first. Congress of Industrial Organizations members are eager to supply the best possible weapons in the greatest quantity with the least delay.

John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, C. I. O., speaking in New York City, and pledging himself to complete support of the Government, declared:

When the Nation is attacked, every American must rally to its support.

From a statement from Thomas C. Cashen, grand chief of the railroad brotherhoods, I quote the following:

The railroad workers of America will keep the wheels of transportation turning with unparalleled speed and efficiency during every minute and every hour of this war until victory perches on the standard of our beloved country. We have never failed our country and we will not fail our country now.

I desire to read the following series of statements by eight affiliates of the American Federation of Labor:

UNION HEADS THROUGHOUT NATION PROMISE PRESIDENT FULL SUPPORT IN TOTAL WAR PRODUCTION DRIVE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Responding to the war emergency, leaders of American Federation of Labor unions throughout the Nation pledged their organizations and members to refrain from striking for any cause.

President William Green announced a special meeting of the American Federation of Labor executive council will be held here December 15 to make the no-strike policy 100-percent effective.

On the heels of his appeal to American workers "to keep steadfastly on the job," assurances came pouring into American Federation of Labor headquarters from every section of the country that the 5,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor will stand by the President and give full support to the Government. Excerpts from the outstanding messages of support received at American Federation of Labor headquarters follow:

John P. Coyne, president of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, "An official order has been sent to all building and construction trades councils throughout the Nation directing strict adherence to the provisions of the policy that no cessation of work for any reason whatever on national-defense projects be permitted. I have called in the presidents of the 19 international unions affiliated with this department for a special meeting in Washington December 11 to consider how we may best help and support the war program."

Joseph McDonagh, secretary-treasurer of the metal trades department, "The metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor stands 100 percent with the American people in support of the Government in this crisis. We fully approve the position taken by President Green."

Executive board of the bricklayers, masons, and plasterers international union, "During the emergency our organization has conducted itself in an admirable manner and we have been free from strikes and stoppages of work on all defense projects. We call upon all officers and members of our subordinate unions to maintain this record. In the event questions may arise on any defense work which cannot be settled by local arbitration the matters must be referred to this international union and under no circumstances shall there be any stoppage of work."

George Masterton, president, United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters: "The United Association subscribes 100 percent to the policy announced by President Green."

John Locher, president of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union: "We pledge that the loyal members of the American Federation of Labor in the District of Columbia will stay on the job under any and all circumstances. There can be no strikes with our Nation at war. Our men and women are ready to give to the Government of the United States their utmost service for the winning of this war."

C. L. Rosemund, president of the Federation of Technical Engineers and Draftsmen's Unions: "The policy announced by President William Green will henceforth be the policy of this organization. It is directed that all local unions govern themselves accordingly."

Ed J. Brown, president, and G. M. Bugniazet, secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, telegraphed to President Roosevelt: "The members of our brotherhood on the jobs and in uniform will patriotically give—with the enthusiasm of free men fighting for freedom—their unstinted effort and energy to the end that the American way of life shall continue for those worthy of its benefits. The men and means of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers are at your disposal."

The Executive Council of the International Association of Machinists: "Adopted resolution calling on entire membership 'for an all-out effort to make possible uninterrupted production of munitions and implements of war for the duration.'"

I desire to read the following statement from the New York State Federation of Labor:

NEW YORK FEDERATION OFFERS F. D. R. FULL SUPPORT IN WAR AGAINST JAPS—CALLS ON WORKERS TO PRODUCE MUNITIONS FOR ARMED FORCES WITHOUT STINT

NEW YORK CITY.—The New York State Federation of Labor, representing 1,400,000 members of various American Federation of Labor unions in the Empire State, sent the following telegram to President Roosevelt:

"We pledge to you our readiness to cooperate wholeheartedly with you and to accede to any request that you may make of us in helping to protect our country and its allies and our common interests against all our enemies."

Thomas J. Lyons, president of the New York State Federation of Labor, called a special emergency meeting of the executive council of that organization as soon as the word of the Japanese declaration of war was received in the United States.

The executive council met in New York City and adopted a resolution denouncing the Japanese for their "unprecedented treachery," and calling upon the American Federation of Labor workers in New York State to turn out the implements of war "just as fast as it is humanly possible to do so."

"The American Federation of Labor workers of New York State are determined that Japan must be absolutely smashed for her murderous assault upon Americans and American soil," Mr. Lyons said. "We are rolling up our sleeves and we are going to stay on the job and keep turning out the things our Government needs."

The New York City Central Trades and Labor Council, representing 750,000 American Federation of Labor unionists, called an emergency meeting for 10:30 a. m. Wednesday.

Officers of the council pledged the complete cooperation of the American Federation of Labor members of the metropolitan New York area in all measures taken by the American Government. They predicted the unanimous adoption at the special meeting of a resolution, pledging uninterrupted production and a total avoidance of strikes, with the conciliation and mediation facilities being used in the event of differences with employers.

"The American Federation of Labor workers of Greater New York will back up our Commander in Chief to the last man," Secretary James C. Quinn said. "Already we are calling upon all able-bodied men and women belonging to our unions to volunteer for

civilian defense duties. We will do everything possible. Our country has never called upon the American Federation of Labor in vain. We are again responding. The American Federation of Labor workers of New York are ready to give their lives if necessary, just as our brothers did during the first World War."

The following is a statement by Joseph P. Ryan, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, in a telegram to President Roosevelt:

I am very happy to report to you that you have a thoroughly organized unit in every seaport of the United States and Canada to load and discharge cargoes. I have been in telephonic communication with our membership, and the answer has been unanimous. We give you full power to act. Take off the gloves and go to it. No strikes will be tolerated for any reason whatsoever. Whether it is a question of wages or opposing unfair conditions imposed by the employers, they will be submitted to Dr. John R. Steelman, director of the conciliation department of the United States Department of Labor. We will cooperate to the fullest.

John Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, C. I. O., made the folfolwing statement:

Our Nation is now at war. All Americans, especially members of our organization, which is in the forefront of this war, must contribute every effort and sacrifice in support of our Government toward winning this war and the complete defeat of the Axis aggressors, Germany, Italy, and Japan. Toward this end, there can be no interruptions of one of the Nation's most vital services, the merchant marine. Our contracts provide for settlement of any and all disputes through machinery of mediation. All agents are instructed that under no circumstances must there be any interruption of work. All disputes of any nature must be referred to the mediation machinery.

I wish to read also a statement by the United Federal Workers of America, C. I. O.:

We pledge the unqualified support of the Committee for Industrial Organization members in the Government service to President Roosevelt's leadership of the Nation's war against Japan and our fight to stamp out the aggression of the Axis powers.

I also present a statement issued by the National Federation of Federal Employees, as follows:

PLEDGE TO THE PRESIDENT

There follows the text of letter which was delivered on December 8 to the President of the United States, and the text of the reply from the secretary to the President, of the same date.

"The PRESIDENT,
"The White House.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At this gravest hour in our national history, we speak for every member of the National Federation of Federal Employees in pledging to you the fullest possible measure of self-sacrificing service.

"These tens of thousands of employees, serving the Government and the people of the United States in every department and agency from Washington to Guam, from Hawaii to the Panama Canal Zone, from Alaska to the Caribbean, will carry on unfailingly and unfalteringly in the face of whatever dangers and whatever hardships lie ahead.

"We know the confidence that you have in the loyalty and devotion of the men and women who are serving their coutnry in civil stations of public trust and responsibility. We express their deepest emotion when we say to you that this confidence will be justified in ever-increasing measure as the Nation, under your leadership, moves toward the victory which our united people cannot fail to win.

"If there is anything which we as individuals can do to assist you in the tremendous taks which lies before us, will you not let us know?

"Respectfully,
"LUTHER C. STEWARD,
"President.
"GERTRUDE M. MCNALLY,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

Mr. President, the following statement comes jointly from the National Association of Letter Carriers, the Railway Mail Association, the American Federation of Federal Employees, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, the National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Laborers, the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers:

We pledge our utmost effort in support of the Government in this time of stress. We oppose any activities that might hamper the Government either in war or peace. We can and will do our full duty. We realize that the future of the Nation is very intimately our concern.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received the following telegram from the Oil Workers' International Union, C. I. O., of Augusta, Kans.:

AUGUSTA, KANS., *December 12, 1941.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of Augusta, Kans., Local 246, Oil Workers' International Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, in regular session December 11, pledge themselves individually and unitedly to give all assistance within their ability to further national defense and promote the welfare of our armed forces.

REED MOORE, *President.*
LYNN MAHANNAH,
Secretary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have received the following telegram from Marion C. Ledbetter, president of the Phoenix Central Labor Council:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *December 10, 1941.*
E. W. MCFARLAND,
State House, Washington, D. C.:

The Phoenix Labor Council has by unanimous vote instructed me to assure you and our Government of our full support in defense of our State and Nation. Our affiliates are not only advised but urged to refrain from any form of strike or disturbance within defense industry but rather to submit differences to mediation and arbitration. I may safely say that no such deterrent to capacity production will occur within this group. Please be assured of our fullest help and cooperation.

MARION C. LEDBETTER,
President, Phoenix Central Labor Council.

COOPERATION OF CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY AND LABOR IN THE WAR

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I have received from Gov. Robert A. Hurley, of the State of Connecticut, and with it a copy of a letter addressed to President Roosevelt, by Governor Hurley; Mr. Thomas R. Molloy, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations of Connecticut; Mr. James J. Clerkin, president of the American Federation of Labor of Connecticut; and Mr. A. A. Fuller, president of the Connecticut Manufacturers' Association.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of a Labor Compact entered into by the presidents of the Connecticut Manufacturers' Association, Congress of Industrial Organization of Connecticut and the American Federation of Labor of Connecticut, which was put in the form of a letter to the President of the United States.

Realizing that the opportunity for achieving such a compact was at hand, I called these three representatives to my office without previously telling them of the nature of the business which I wished to discuss with them. After 2 hours I was able to secure their signatures to the compact.

The compact is, of course, unique in that it is the first to be achieved in the United States, and I am sure that you will be deeply interested and pleased. It blazes the trail for similar success, not only in other States but in the Nation.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT A. HURLEY,
Governor.

DECEMBER 9, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: All of the industrial might and resources of Connecticut, the full production capacities of our plants, the skills and energies of our workers, are pledged to the service of our country in the war effort against our enemies.

To that end the leaders of organized labor and management in Connecticut, in conference with me today, have pledged to each other and among themselves their mutual confidence and cooperation. Whatever sacrifices are necessary for the final victory will be made.

Both labor and management have agreed that there will be no cessation of work or production, arising from any differences which may interrupt or curtail in any way Connecticut's ability to produce the weapons of victory.

Both labor and management have agreed to submit to me, or to arbiters designated by me, all differences, no matter what their causes, which they are unable to adjust between themselves.

Both labor and management regard this not only as a patriotic pledge but as a solemn compact to be maintained under all circumstances and until victory has been won.

They, together with all the people of Connecticut, stand ready to answer any call for service and sacrifice, resolved that our country will triumph over all the evil forces endangering our freedom and independence.

We subscribe our names to this compact, firm in our faith that victory will be ours and freedom shall survive.

R. A. HURLEY,
Governor of Connecticut.
THOMAS R. MOLLOY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations of Connecticut.
JAMES J. CLERKIN,
President, American Federation of Labor of Connecticut.
A. C. FULLER,
President, Connecticut Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, this agreement, as Governor Hurley points out, is unique. It is a source of pride to the people of Connecticut that the labor and industrial leaders of our State, and the

Governor of our State, have so quickly united in an effort to overcome any possible future differences and disturbances in the relationships between industry and labor. We are proud of this accomplishment of the Governor of our State, and of the complete cooperation which he has received from the leaders of the groups heretofore mentioned. We in Connecticut feel, with Governor Hurley, that the example of the State of Connecticut may prove to be a guiding light to the other States of the Union.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall presently ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection. Before doing so I wish to make a brief comment on the celebration of a day which I am sure is on the minds and in the hearts of all the people of the United States.

Today has been designated as Bill of Rights Day. All over America, in assemblies which I am sure will be largely attended, and in many other ways, the American people are to have their memories refreshed by the history of what we have come to know as the Bill of Rights, as well as the contents of the Bill of Rights.

Following the Revolutionary War, when peace came in 1783, our original Thirteen Colonies came perilously near failing to form a general government. The Constitutional Convention which wrote the Constitution in 1787 provided that if 9 of the States should ratify it, the new nation should be born, and if there was a failure to ratify by 9 States of the 13, the Constitution, of course, was not to become effective. That was not until 1787, 4 years after peace in 1783.

During that 4 years jealousies began to arise among the States. There came a time when each State seemed to be attempting to raise barriers against its sister States, notwithstanding the unity with which they had fought for independence in the Revolutionary War. The State of Virginia, for instance, and the State of Maryland became involved in a very acute controversy over the navigation of the Potomac River. As a result of that controversy, a conference was called in Annapolis with a view to an undertaking that might compose the differences between the two States. As the result of that conference in Annapolis, another one was called, which met later in Philadelphia, and that conference, growing out of the controversy between these two States, and in view of controversies arising among other States as to commerce, navigation, and their relationships one with another, wrote the Constitution of the United States.

It may seem strange that in the original document there were no such provisions as those which have since come to be known as the Bill of Rights. In view of the fact that Thomas Jefferson was very largely the author of the Bill of Rights and in view of the fact that he was absent from this country as minister to France during the sitting of the Constitutional Convention, I think it is well within the truth to say that the failure to include a Bill of Rights such as was later adopted could have been due to his absence, because apparently the only influence he had on the writing of the Constitution was such as he was able to exercise through correspondence with his friends in America and with members of the Constitutional Convention.

The Constitution was submitted to the 13 States. It was finally ratified by the required number, and in 1789 the new government was organized in the city of New York.

There was a general understanding among the Colonies that if the Constitution should be ratified by the required number of States a Bill of Rights would be submitted by the first incoming Congress, to be passed on by the people. Of course, that general understanding could not bind the incoming Congress, which had not even been elected at the time of the ratification of the original Constitution. In some of the States ratification was brought about by the understanding and the promise of those who urged ratification that amendments to the Constitution would be submitted to the people. Such amendments were later submitted and now constitute the Bill of Rights.

Following the organization of the Government, the election of a Congress, and the inauguration of a President, the tentative understanding which was had among the people when the Constitution was ratified was carried out by the submission by the First Congress of the United States to the States of 12 proposed amendments which would constitute the Bill of Rights, the ratification of which we are celebrating all over America today.

I have no desire to make any extended remarks regarding the events which took place in the organization of the Government, the ratification of the Constitution, or the adoption of the first 10 amendments, which constitute the Bill of Rights about which we are talking and thinking. However, I desire to read them as part of my remarks, purely as a matter of emphasis, because most of us are thoroughly familiar with them.

AMENDMENT I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The first article in the Bill of Rights constitutes very largely the fundamentals of our conceptions of democracy—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly. There may be differences and have been differences, among patriotic Americans and in our courts and legislative procedures and enactments, regarding the interpretation of the articles which are the Bill of Rights, even including the first one, guaranteeing the fundamental freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly. But, regardless of our differences as to details, regardless of our various interpretations in the view of history and in the view of our own conceptions of propriety and legality, I believe it can be said, without regard to politics, religion, color, or condition, that the four fundamental freedoms guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution, the first article of the Bill of Rights, have been accepted as the cardinal doctrines of American democracy and freedom.

The second amendment reads as follows:

AMENDMENT II

A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

AMENDMENT III

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

AMENDMENT IV

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

AMENDMENT V

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Amendment No. V in the amendments constituting the Bill of Rights has probably given rise to as much legalistic controversy as any other part of the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENT VI

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district where the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence.

AMENDMENT VII

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

AMENDMENT VIII

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

AMENDMENT IX

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

AMENDMENT X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively or to the people.

As I said at the outset, it may seem a strange oversight that these provisions or similar provisions were not included in the original Constitution as it was written and submitted to the people. But it is to the credit of the founders of our Government, it is to the credit of the First Congress which assembled, and to the credit of the States which had formed the newly created Nation, and of the people of those States that at the very first opportunity those rights were placed in the Constitution, to be effective as if they had been written into it originally. They now constitute what we call the Bill of Rights, which has been in effect for 150 years.

It may be interesting as a matter of history for us to remember and make a matter of record here the fact that the First Congress which assembled and submitted to the people the amendments to the Constitution which were to become the Bill of Rights submitted 12 amendments. Ten of them were adopted and 2 were not adopted. It will be interesting to put in the record the 2 amendments, which were Nos. 1 and 2 as they were submitted by the Congress, which were not adopted by the legislatures of the States.

The first one reads as follows:

After the first enumeration required by the first article of the Constitution, there shall be 1 Representative for every 30,000, until the number shall amount to 100, after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress that there shall be not less than 100 Representatives nor less than 1 Representative for every 40,000 persons, until the number of Representatives shall amount to 200; after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress that there shall not be less than 200 Representatives nor more than 1 Representative for every 50,000 persons.

The proposed amendment was not ratified by the required number of States.

The second proposed amendment which was not adopted provides as follows:

No law varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

That amendment likewise was not ratified by the required number of States.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield in a moment.

Neither of these 2 provisions, it may be said in passing, it seems to me can take its place with the 10 which were adopted, as of equal importance in guaranteeing the individual rights of the people and their protection against tyranny or against injustice of any sort which our forefathers sought to write into the Constitution of the United States, and therefore it is not strange that these 2 proposed amendments were not adopted by the people of the country.

I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it will be interesting if the Senator from Kentucky, in connection with his very interesting remarks, will place in the RECORD, if he is not prepared to give it now, the result of the voting of the States on the two proposed amendments which were rejected, the figures showing how many States voted in each case for the adoption of the amendments, and how many were opposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not that information available, but I shall obtain it and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the suggestion.

Mr. President, we have been living under the Constitution and under this Bill of Rights for a century and a half. When the Constitution of the United States and these 10 amendments were adopted and became part of our fundamental law, the population of our country was between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000—not many more than now live in the city of Chicago, the metropolis of Illinois. Those three or four million people were scattered on the Atlantic seaboard, all the way from Maine to Georgia. The Nation at that time was composed of the Thirteen Original Colonies which had become States, or at least those which had come into the Union. From the standpoint of power, and, it may be, from the standpoint of influence among the nations of the world, the new Republic was a very small and insignificant entity in the family of nations.

In these 150 years, Mr. President, we have grown from 3,000,000 people fringing the Atlantic seaboard until we are now 130,000,000 people. We have grown from 13 weak and jealous and disjointed colonies to 48 great States. We have taken in the body of the mid-continent between Canada and Mexico. We have gone out into the seas, and have gathered in the islands of the seas, wherever our destiny or our requirements made it necessary or advisable to do so. I believe I may say that, without regard to politics or religion or other individual alliances and alinements among our people, the 48 States and all the territory under the flag of the United States and under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are today more united than they have ever been since the organization of this great Government.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has just said that at the time the first 10 amendments were agreed to we had 13 States. I may be entirely incorrect; I have not looked up the matter at all; but it is my recollection that at that time there were not 13 States.

Mr. BARKLEY. My remark is subject to the correction that later all 13 did ratify the Constitution.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. But at the immediate time when the Bill of Rights was submitted, the entire Thirteen Colonies had not ratified the Constitution. The Senator is incorrect about that. I will place in the RECORD here the names of the States ratifying the Bill of Rights and the dates of their ratification.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were ratified by the several State legislatures on the following dates: New Jersey, November 20, 1789; Maryland, December 19, 1789; North Carolina, December 22, 1789; South Carolina, January 19, 1790; New Hampshire, January 25, 1790; Delaware, January 28, 1790; New York, February 27, 1790; Pennsylvania, March 10, 1790; Rhode Island, June 7, 1790; Vermont, November 3, 1791; Virginia, December 15, 1791; Massachusetts, March 2, 1939; Georgia, March 18, 1939, Connecticut, April 19, 1939. (Senate Manual, pages 411–412 (1941 ed.).)

Mr. BARKLEY. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, our Nation was a pauper nation as compared to the other nations of the world. In the period of 150 years we have grown not only in population and in territory but in wealth, until we are today not only the richest Nation that exists now but the richest Nation that ever has existed in the history of mankind. The little flickering light of liberty which our forefathers set upon the mountains to guide our Nation and to guide the world, insofar as it might be influential, has grown in intensity and in effulgence until it has brightened up the dark places of mankind, and very largely has been influential in satisfying the craving of millions upon millions and hundreds of millions of people throughout the world for the enjoyment of what we were pleased to call in the beginning "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

After these 150 years of growth, after these 150 years of history, we find ourselves today compelled to defend by the unsheathing of our sword all the liberties which were guaranteed to us by the original Constitution and by the amendments constituting the Bill of Rights. We are in the midst of a war not only to preserve the integrity of our territory, not only to preserve the traditions of our Nation, but we are in a war which involves, without our desire, and against our will, a stupendous effort to protect our people and our Nation in the enjoyment of the very things which have been handed down to us in the Bill of Rights and in the Constitution of the United States. It is a happy augury, Mr. President, that, without regard to any differences of opinion regarding domestic policy or international policy leading up to the culmination of 1 week ago, which differences were sincere and honest on both sides, in view of the compulsion under which we work and think and act, our Nation is united, without regard to occupation, without regard to previous history, without regard to religion, without regard to politics, without regard to color, without regard to any artificial differences which may divide us either personally, politically, or geographically. We are united in our determination to preserve these things, these fundamental freedoms, these rights which ought to be the rights of all mankind without having to fight for them, because they are natural rights which ought to be the inheritance of mankind everywhere.

I am sure that today, all over the Nation, the American people will rededicate themselves to the principles involved in our Constitution and in our Bill of Rights, and will rededicate themselves to the service, not only of our immediate generation but of the generations that are yet to come, in order that we may hand

down to the children of future generations this blessed and hallowed Nation and its traditions, free, proud, and strong, as we want it to be, and as we are determined to preserve it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I desire wholeheartedly to reecho what has been said by the Democratic leader concerning the liberties of the American people and the liberties that are preserved for us in the Constitution; but I want as well at this time—a time of hysteria and a time when we perhaps forget all that should be done and all that might be done—to utter a little warning—not a great one, merely a little warning—against forgetting a single one of our precious American liberties in the days that are to come.

There will be dark days as well as bright days. There will be days when the temperature will be such as we do not like. There will be days when events probably will occur which we will not like. There will be days of all kinds, good and bad. I want to ask this body, when such days come, not to forget the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. If we forget those, and if we do not see that they are enforced in the days to come, we will have fought this war in vain, and we will have denied the very thing for which we say we are fighting.

So, while I unite in every way with what has been said by the Senator from Kentucky, I also ask my brethren to remember the Bill of Rights in the days to come, to remember the rights it guarantees, and to fight for them if it be necessary, and to preserve them not alone for us but for those who follow us.

AMENDMENT OF EXPLOSIVES ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SCHWARTZ submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 11.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; and agree to the same.

JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
H. H. SCHWARTZ,
H. M. KILGORE,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who are not familiar with the matter, I will say that the conference report is on House bill 3019, to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in the time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes."

When the House bill was before the Senate the Senate adopted 11 amendments. The House has concurred in 10 of the amendments. In one amendment the House refused to concur.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNOBJECTED-TO BILLS—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called for the consideration of unobjected-to bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, pending the agreement, to which I have no objection, may I inquire of the able Senator from Kentucky whether he can give us any dependable information at all regarding the legislative program for the remaining 15 days of the year?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I cannot give him definitely the legislative situation, but I will do it as accurately as I can at this moment.

We may dispose of bills that Senators want to bring up by the call of the calendar. Of course, that is routine business.

The appropriation bill which the Senate passed on Friday last carried two amendments, which, I understand, have to be voted on by the House of Representatives. If they adopt those amendments, then, that controversy will be ended and the bill will go to the White House, subject, of course, to agreement to the report by the two Houses before the bill is transmitted to the President. That may be a routine matter, although it may depend on how the House votes on the amendments of the Senate.

There has been introduced, and there is pending before the Committees on the Judiciary of the two Houses a very simple bill reviving the powers conferred in what has been commonly known as the Overman Act in the World War of 1917, and also reviving the powers contained in the Trading with the Enemy Act of 1917. The bill is pending before the two committees and it is expected it will be reported, perhaps, today or tomorrow. I have not received word from the Judiciary Committee whether it took action this morning.

There is before the Military Affairs Committees of the two Houses a bill extending the age limit under the registration and the draft. That bill has been reported to neither House, so far, but I understand that both committees may report it this week. It is important that that bill be considered as soon as it is ready for consideration.

Those are the important bills that may come in immediately.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is now considering the price-control bill, which came over from the House; hearings were in progress all last week, and will be continued this week until Wednesday night, at which time they will close. It is hoped that the committee will be able to frame a bill and report it back to the Senate at the end of this week. Whether that bill will be taken up for consideration on the floor of the Senate next week, in view of the Christmas holiday in the middle of the week, is doubtful; it is very likely that it will go over until the first of January.

That is the situation with respect to important legislation.

I might also say, in that connection, while I am on my feet—and which I think will be a response to the Senator from Michigan—that there is certain labor legislation which has been proposed. There are two bills on the Calendar of the Senate and another bill has come over from the House and is now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor. The President has called a conference, to meet Wednesday, of all groups of labor and industry, and I think certain representatives probably of the public. They will meet here Wednesday, and would have met today except for the fact that the American Federation of Labor has called an executive council in Washington to meet today and tomorrow, and it was not thought wise to try to duplicate by having both conferences in session at the same time. But on Wednesday the conference called by the President will meet in an effort, which I hope will be successful, in bringing about an understanding and cooperation of all elements of industry and labor, to the end that there shall be not only no interruption in production but that there shall be the largest possible production of which this Nation is capable. Pending that conference, it has been thought probably wise not to attempt to deal with that subject legislatively, hoping that it might work out voluntarily.

That is the situation as best I can picture it to the Senator at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator, of course, has recited a large number of major and controverted measures. That was the precise point of my inquiry, to ascertain if any clarifying information is available, as to what extent the Senator proposes to invade that field prior to a holiday recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, I do not think there will be a holiday recess, I will say to the Senator. I mean by that, I do not think it would be wise for Congress to take a definite adjournment or recess for a given number of days, and I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I quite concur with the Senator; so he will not misunderstand my inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not misunderstand it, and I should have volunteered the statement without having the inquiry made. I did intend to do so later, but I might as well do it now.

We have asked industry and labor and business and everybody in the United States to go on a 7-day week, 24-hour basis, without interruption,

without holidays, even on Sundays. Whether that will apply to Christmas Day, I do not know. It may, if it is deemed necessary. But in view of the fact that we have asked everybody in the United States to go on a 7-day week and a 24-hour day basis, in an effort to produce the maximum of supplies, and to make the maximum effort in order to win this war, and win it as effectively and speedily as possible, I think Congress would make a serious mistake to adjourn or recess for any given number of days and go home while it is asking everybody else to stay on the job.

In view of that situation, and in view of the fact also that the legislation necessary for this war is a day-to-day proposition, and we cannot tell one day what may come the next day as an emergency measure, I think it is wise for Congress to be on the job every day in order that it may attend to whatever business may be necessary on any given day until at least the situation has cleared somewhat from what it is today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, I appreciate and concur in the Senator's last statement, but at the same time the Senator is familiar with the practical fact that many of us who have remained here day after day and day after day have found 15 or 20 Senators in the Chamber because of a gentleman's agreement that there would be no legislation requiring their presence. If there is to be anything of that sort, I think it ought to be generally available information.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator; but all that happened before we got into the war, and there was no need for Senators to be here every day, and many of them took advantage—I being among them—of the opportunity to go home for a week or two and rest and contact our people. We felt at liberty to go, at least, during the period of that gentleman's understanding. But now the situation is different, I think. Many Senators have come to me privately and asked what would be done by way of a recess or adjournment during the next week, Christmas week, and whether they could go home.

I think every Senator must take the responsibility of determining whether he shall leave here at any time when the Senate is in session. My reaction is and my firm conviction is that the people of the United States expect Congress to be here. That means not only Congress as a whole but it means individual Members of both the House and the Senate, unless there is some compulsion that requires them to absent themselves. So I feel that we cannot safely advise any definite recess or adjournment, and I do not feel at liberty to advise any individual Senator that it is safe for him to go home, even during the Christmas holidays; but, of course, I have no control over that, though I am sure every Senator wants to do what he ought to do in regard to that, and will do it without any advice or suggestion from me. That is the situation now as it exists, so far as I can state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be that by the end of the week we shall be able to see a little further; but until then I do not think we can count on anything in the way of a gentlemen's agreement, or a recess, or an adjournment, or anything else that would take Senators away from Washington.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. I assure him I was seeking no release for myself, because I have been constantly here during other releases.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Michigan has been and always is a very faithful public servant.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It just occurred to me that whatever the rule is to be, it ought to be general public property.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct; and the only reason why it has not been made general public property is that I did not have the title to the property so that I could dispense it at my will. I shall keep the Senate advised from time to time as fully as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky for the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 30) amending rule VIII so as to prohibit action by unanimous consent on bills in cases where a Senator has given written notice of his objection to their consideration was announced as first in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) making rule XVI applicable to amendments to relief and work-relief bills was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (and other Senators). Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 357) to provide for the rehabilitation of the anthracite-coal industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4837) to safeguard the confidential nature of Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia case records in all types of relief cases, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1355) to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Santee, Congaree, and Cooper Rivers in the counties of Berkeley, Clarendon, Calhoun, Richland, and Orangeburg, S. C., and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1358) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for rehabilitation and for other purposes" approved February 11, 1936, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1365) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended, for the purpose of providing vocational training in Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the interest of national defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1831) to prohibit the purchase of foreign-grown cotton with public funds was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PENSION BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1095) to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian Wars from 1817 to 1898 and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I object to the pension bills beginning with House bill 1095, Calendar No. 707, down to and including House bill 3312, Calendar No. 733.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills referred to by the Senator from Virginia will be passed over.

CANCELATION OF NOTES ACQUIRED BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 298) to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration is authorized and directed to cancel any notes given for the purpose of acquiring capital stock in the Northwest Grain Association, Minneapolis, Minn., by any person, association, or corporation in the States of Montana, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota which have

been assigned to or otherwise acquired by the United States, or the Farm Credit Administration as an agency of the United States, as security for the payment of any sums now or heretofore owed to the Northwest Grain Association. Upon the cancelation of such notes, all persons shall be relieved of all liability for making any payment of principal or interest upon such notes and of all liability for making any payment upon any judgment which may have been secured in any action based upon such notes.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2051) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of national defense was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 683) to expedite the national-defense program by providing a method for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries without resort to hasty strikes and lock-outs was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT (and other Senators). Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INCORPORATION OF UNION CHURCH OF CANAL ZONE

The bill (H. R. 528) to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have not had a chance to study this bill in its ramifications as much as I should like, and did not know that the calendar was to be called today. When on Tuesday last the matter came up, the occupant of the chair was the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is the chairman of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. I then wished to ask him a few questions concerning the bill. I see that he is on the floor at the present time. I should like to invite his attention to this particular measure, and to ask him whether this proposal to incorporate a church comes within the first amendment of the Constitution, which we have heard discussed this very day.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is my opinion that it certainly does not, or I would not have reported the bill. The bill is simply to provide for the protection of the property of certain union churches which grew up in the Panama Canal Zone during and following the construction of the Canal.

During the construction of the Canal there were a number of chaplains attached to the Canal Commission, serving at small salaries, who established churches in the Canal Zone, where they proceeded to preach on a nondenominational basis to such congregations as assembled. After the construction of the Canal these churches still continued as union churches, in order that there might not be any competition between denominations in the restricted area of the Canal Zone.

A considerable amount of property is now held by those union churches in the shape of buildings and equipment of various kinds. This proposal is simply to provide for the corporate succession and control of those union churches on a purely undenominational basis.

The bill has been very strongly urged by the American Council of Churches, and the provisions are simply that the facilities may be used without any regard to denomination for the evangelical purposes of the churches of the United States. I do not think there could possibly be any suggestion of there being a violation of the constitutional provision with regard to freedom of religion.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. I now ask him, if I may, whether the preamble stated on page 1 and down to line 1 on page 2 is customary in such a matter?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, so far as that is concerned, I personally do not think the preamble is of any importance. It simply sets forth the facts on which the bill is based, and it was reported by the Senate committee merely because it was included in the House bill. So far as I am concerned, I should have no objection to the deletion of the preamble. I personally am not a believer in preambles in legislative matters, except in very rare cases.

Mr. DANAHER. I thought that would be the attitude of the Senator from Missouri, for I have heard him express it hitherto, and wondered why it was in the bill, in view of his pronounced objections in the past to such language.

Mr. President, let me now invite the attention of the Senator to page 5, line 20. I notice that the bill provides there that the local councils shall select their own pastors, who shall be citizens of the United States, "and shall be entitled to receive such privileges of employees of the Panama Canal as the Governor of the Panama Canal may grant." Will the Senator from Missouri tell us what the privileges of the Canal may be which the Governor of the Panama Canal may grant to pastors?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are principally the privilege of buying from the American commissaries operated by the Canal authorities. There are no privately owned stores in the Canal Zone. On the other hand, nobody is allowed to deal at such commissaries except employees of the Canal.

As I understand, this measure is simply for the purpose of permitting such things as the renting of houses, or dealing with the commissary, matters of that sort, necessary for subsistence in the Canal Zone. The Senator understands that all the houses in the Canal Zone are owned by the United States Government, and that the only business enterprises in the Canal Zone are operated in the form of commissaries by the Canal Zone Authority, except a few oil-filling stations, which are operated by special permission in the Canal Zone for the purpose of supplying ships passing through the Canal.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice from the report that the Secretary of War, at one time, at least, thought that such privileges would include steamship transportation, retirement benefits, injury compensation, allotments for living quarters, and the like. Does the Senator understand that the language now used permits of any such construction?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; my understanding is that the restrictions submitted by the Secretary of War in 1939 have been met in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator from Missouri feel that the language might be amended to provide that the pastors shall be entitled to receive whatever privileges the employees on the Panama Canal are granted?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no objection to such an amendment, if the Senator wants the bill sent back to the House. My understanding is that the only pastors in the Canal Zone are the pastors of the church which would be affected. They are the only churches in the Canal Zone, outside the Army posts.

Mr. DANAHER. That may be, for all I know. As I have said, I have had no opportunity, other than as I have been sitting here on the floor reviewing the calendar as it is before us, to find out what is in the bill; but it did strike me as an unusual grant of prerogatives, possibly, in the light of representations made by the Secretary of War in his letter to the committee when the bill was introduced some months ago.

I would ask, respectfuly, since I do not wish to object to the bill, that we pass it over for the time being merely, while I confer with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no personal interest in the bill whatever. I reported it as chairman of the committee because it had the approval of the Department, and was very strongly urged by the American Council of Churches. If the Senator wants it to go over, I have no objection.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not ask that it go over, but merely that it go to the foot of the list for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, at my request House bill No. 528, Calendar No. 883, was passed over on the call of the calendar. I now ask unanimous consent to revert to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 528) to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment is in conformity with my colloquy with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 22, after the word "grant" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert "to such pastors and the pastors of other churches serving American residents of the Canal Zone."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

The bill (S. 2076) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress hereby determines that due to unfavorable weather conditions and insect damage a serious crop failure of cotton, tobacco, and hay and other forage crops has occurred in many States; that it is essential to the national defense and public welfare that every means be taken to keep farmers on the land and to maintain maximum production of farm commodities; and that the provisions of this act are necessary for such purposes and for the relief of distress among the farm population in such stricken areas.

(b) The Congress further determines that substantial amounts of the sums which have heretofore been appropriated for making parity payments will not be needed for making such payments; and it hereby directs that so much of the money appropriated in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, for the purpose of making parity payments as is not used for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury to offset the appropriations made pursuant to the authority of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) In the case of any producer of cotton or tobacco on whose farm the acreage planted to such commodity in 1941 did not exceed the farm-acreage allotment for 1941 under the agricultural conservation program, and who establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Agriculture that, because of drought, excessive rainfall, boll-weevil infestation, or other uncontrollable natural cause, his actual production of such commodity in 1941 was less than 50 percent of the normal production of such planted acreage, the Secretary is authorized and directed, out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 5, to make a payment to such producer in an amount equal to (1) the difference between the actual production of such planted acreage and one-half of the normal production of such planted acreage times (2) the parity price of such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year beginning in 1941.

(b) Payments under this section shall be divided between owners, operators, tenants, and other persons interested in the crop in the same proportion that they were entitled to share in the crop or its proceeds.

(c) When used in this section, terms which are defined in section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall have the same meaning as when used in such act, as amended.

SEC. 3. In the case of any area with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture determines (a) that by reason of drought in 1941 the condition of pastures or the production of hay and other forage crops used in such area to sustain dairy cows is such as to threaten to result in a substantial reduction in the production of milk in such area or to result in the reduction by dairy farmers in such area of their foundation herds, and (b) that milk and other dairy products produced in such area are required for the purposes of "An act to promote the defense of the United States," or needed for other defense purposes, he is authorized, out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 5, to pay, or to make grants to dairy farmers in such area to enable them to pay, the cost of baling and charges for the transportation into such area of needed hay, grain, cottonseed meal, beet pulp, or other feeds used to sustain dairy cows.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to utilize the facilities and personnel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to carry out the provisions of this act, and to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for its purposes.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DEFENSE PUBLIC WORKS AND EQUIPMENT

The bill (S. 1963) authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, calendar No. 921, House bill 5800, is an identical bill, and I ask that it be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5800) authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (herein called the Commissioners) are hereby authorized to accept advancements for the District of Columbia from the Federal Works Administrator (herein called the Administrator), and the Administrator, under and subject to the provisions of the act of June 28, 1941 (Public, No. 137, 77th Cong.), is authorized to advance the sum of $2,500,000, or any part thereof, in addition to any sums heretofore advanced to the District of Columbia, out of funds authorized by law for the Administrator, for the acquisition, purchase, construction, establishment, and development of defense public works and equipment, and all sums so advanced shall be deposited in full with the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The sum authorized by section 1 hereof, or any part thereof, shall, when advanced, be available to the Commissioners for the acquisition by dedication, purchase, or condemnation of the fee-simple title to improved or unimproved land, or rights or easements in land, for the public uses authorized by this act; for the demolition of structures, buildings, and improvements on lands or interests in land acquired under this act; for the construction of buildings, water facilities, sewer facilities, highways, fire-alarm extensions, and other public works, including materials and labor, heating, lighting, elevators, plumbing, landscaping, and all other appurtenances, and the purchase and installation of pipe lines, machinery, furniture, equipment, apparatus, and any and all other expenditures necessary for or incident to the complete construction and equipment for use of the aforesaid buildings, plants, and facilities; and for the making of surveys and the preparation of plans, designs, estimates, models, and specifications; and for architectural, engineering, and other professional services and other technical and administrative personnel without reference to the civil-service requirements, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; for the rental of such office facilities as may in the opinion of the Commissioners be necessary.

SEC. 3. The Federal Works Administrator shall be repaid such portion as may be determined by the President of any moneys advanced under section 1 of this act in annual installments over a period of not to exceed 10 years, with interest thereon beginning July 1, 1942, for the period of amortization: *Provided*, That such interest is to be based upon the average rate of interest paid upon obligations of the United States Government for the 2 fiscal years next preceding June 30, 1941, such rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be necessary for the reimbursement herein required of the District of Columbia, and for the payment of interest, shall be included in the annual estimates of the Commissioners, the first reimbursements to be made on July 1, 1943: *And provided further*, That whenever the District of Columbia is under obligation by virtue of the provisions of section 4 of Public Act No. 284, Seventy-first Congress, and section 3 of Public Act No. 746, Seventy-fifth Congress, reimbursement under those acts shall be not less than $700,000 in any one fiscal year.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to make reimbursement to the Administrator under section 3 hereof for water projects and highway projects respectively, from the water fund and the gas-tax fund of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners shall submit with their annual estimates to the Congress a report of their activities and expenditures under section 1 of this act.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, there is a desire that there be a technical amendment to the bill, at the suggestion of the Treasury Department. So I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 12, it is proposed to strike out:

Provided, That such interest is to be based upon the average rate of interest paid upon obligations of the United States Government for the two fiscal years next preceding June 30, 1941, such rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That such interest shall be at such rate as would, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be the lowest interest rate available to the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act were said District authorized by law to issue and sell obligations to the public, at the par value thereof, in a sum equal to the repayable amounts of such advances, maturing serially over a period of 10 years in approximately equal annual installments, including both principal and interest, and secured by a first pledge of and lien upon all the general-fund revenues of said District:

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in explanation I may say that the amendment is proposed to comply with the request of the Treasury Department that the language relating to interest be simplified. The proposed amendment is, with minor changes, the same as a provision adopted by the Congress in joint resolution approved July 1, 1940 (50 Stats. 706), in connection with P. W. A. loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I may add that the bill is merely to enable the District of Columbia to take advantage of the Lanham Act to the extent of two and a half million dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1963 will be indefinitely postponed.

POWERS OF DISTRICT BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4365) to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 3, line 12, after the word "Act", to strike out "of Congress," and, on page 4, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "of Congress."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

APPEALS BY THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 3, after line 23, to insert, "The Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of practice and procedure with respect to appeals authorized by this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (S. 2049) to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 20 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1807), is hereby amended by striking out the word "shall" in said sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "may", so that said sentence, as amended, will read as follows:

"He may attend or may depute another person to represent him at the meetings of the legislative authorities herein established and may give expression to his views on any matter before such bodies."

CHAMPIONSHIP BOUTS IN ALASKA AND HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 5007) to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM MURRAY, JR.

The bill (S. 1486) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Murray, Jr., a patent to certain land was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to William Murray, Jr., of Plains, Mont., a patent in fee to the north half of the southeast quarter of section 5, township 21 north, range 20 west, Montana principal meridian.

BESSIE WALDEN

The bill (S. 1696) for the relief of Bessie Walden was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Bessie Walden, of Hot Springs, Mont., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, George Walden, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him while assisting employees of the Indian Irrigation Service, Flathead project, Department of the Interior, in the erection of a power pole near Hot Springs, Mont., on November 19, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS ENGAGED IN EXTRA-HAZARDOUS SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6009) to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in the line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while engaged in war.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am informed by General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, that this bill merely puts the pension system for those engaged in the present war on a basis with present pension laws. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the statement given me by General Hines. I make no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 6009, an act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes.

This particular bill is also based upon a study made by the Veterans' Administration in collaboration with the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Pensions of the Senate. A letter was addressed to the chairman of each of those committees November 10, 1941, after notification from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration. The draft of the bill transmitted with those letters is identical with H. R. 6009. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House, passed the House of Representatives and has been reported favorably by the Committee on Pensions of the Senate.

The enactment of this proposed legislation is urgent and necessary. At the present time peacetime rates, which are 75 percent of the wartime rates, are payable for disability or death incurred in service even though a state of war exists unless it can be shown that the disability or death resulted from an injury received in line of duty in actual combat in a military expedition or military occupation. The bill was drafted not only in anticipation of possible war conditions and to thus provide for wartime rates in the event of war, but was also directed to disease or injury incurred in service in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict or while engaged in extra hazardous service including such service under conditions simulating war.

Section 3 of the bill was devised to cover disability or death occurring prior to the date of enactment of the act, and to limit payments of the increased rates under the act so that they can not be made for any period prior to the date of enactment of the act or receipt in the Veterans' Administration of an application for the benefits of the act, whichever is the later date.

As indicated in the report of the Veterans' Administration, disabilities and deaths were incurred prior to the present war under conditions where denial of the wartime rate was believed to result in marked injustices. It is considered that the language is sufficiently clear so as to limit payment of the wartime rates in the pre-war cases to those wherein it can reasonably be determined under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator that the disability of death was incurred in line of duty under extrahazardous conditions, including those simulating war or, as heretofore stated, where the injury or disease was received in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict.

The early approval of H. R. 6009 is respectfully urged so as to furnish the necessary legislative authority for the payment of wartime rates for disease or injury incurred in line of duty in the active military or naval service in the present war, and further to enable the Veterans' Administration to pay the wartime rates in the other cases heretofore referred to.

As heretofore indicated, the necessity for this legislation, as to the payment of wartime rates based upon present war service, is predicated upon the fact that the rates of pension for wartime service under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations, are restricted to Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, and the World War, except in those cases where the disability or death resulted from an injury received in line of duty in actual combat in a military expedition or military occupation.

It was not possible to furnish an estimate of cost of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CARLSTROM AND DORR FIELDS, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 5749) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOMER C. CHAPMAN

The bill (S. 1688) for the relief of Homer C. Chapman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Homer C. Chapman, recruit, Infantry unassigned, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States for disability incurred in the service in line of duty.

WEARING OF AVIATION BADGES BY CERTAIN FOREIGNERS

The bill (S. 2103) to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by striking out the colon at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by the words: "nor to prevent graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools or Air Corps service schools who are citizens of foreign countries from wearing the appropriate aviation badges of the Army in such manner and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe:".

24-HOUR BASIS IN NATIONAL-DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 204), submitted by Mr. TOBEY December 10, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out the preamble, so as to read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that all Government navy yards and all private shipyards and all other national-defense industries should take immediate steps to place themselves on a 24-hour per diem work basis.

The resolution was agreed to.

The amendment to strike out the preamble was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2096) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 10, to strike out "*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities at a cost not to exceed $10,000,000, and to establish the same as a naval air station" and to add a new section at the end of the bill, so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $310,000,000 for the establishment or development of naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), as amended, shall be applicable to the public-works projects authorized by this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Congress on April 1, 1942, and every 90 days thereafter, all expenditures made for the establishment or development of naval shore activities from funds appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1047) to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the numerals "28", to strike out "be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after section 7 a new section to read as follows:" and to insert "is amended by inserting before the word 'musician' the word 'street.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. Such act is further amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 1, to strike out "notwithstanding the provisions of this act"; in line 6, after the word "licensed", to insert "legitimate or vaudeville"; in line 8, after the word "production", to insert "or act"; in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "six" and insert "three"; in line 15, after the word "than", to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve"; and at the top of page 3 to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

The Board is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to protect properly the health, morals, and safety of minors coming within the purview of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928, is amended by inserting before the word "musician" the word "street."

SEC. 2. Such act is further amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

"SEC. 7a. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia, or a duly authorized agent thereof, is authorized to issue a work permit to any minor under 18 years of age, said permit authorizing and permitting the appearance of such minor on the stage of a duly licensed legitimate or vaudeville theater within the District of Columbia, in any professional traveling theatrical production, or act, or in a musical recital or concert: *Provided*, That such minor is at least 14 years of age and has completed eight grades of elementary instruction or a course of study deemed by the Board of Education equivalent thereto: *And provided further*, That such minor shall not appear on said stage in more than two performances in any 1 day, nor more than 3 hours in any 1 day, nor more than 6 days in any week, nor more than 12 hours in any week, and shall not appear on said stage after the hour of 11 p. m. Application for such permit should be made by the parent or guardian of such minor to the Board of Education of the District of Columbia or a duly authorized agent thereof, at least 14 days in advance of such appearance. The Board or its agent may issue a permit if satisfied that the parent or guardian of such minor has made adequate provision for the educational instruction of such minor and for safeguarding his health and for the proper supervision of such minor.

"The Board is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to protect properly the health, morals, and safety of minors coming within the purview of this act."

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed as amending, altering, or repealing the provisions of section 7 of the act of May 29, 1928.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will renumber the sections to accord with the amendments made by the Senate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, TUSKEGEE, ALA.

The bill (S. 1889) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the county of Macon, Ala., in a strip of land located at Veterans' Administration Facility, Tuskegee, Ala., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant an easement for highway purposes to the county of Macon, Ala., in the following-described property located at Veterans' Administration Facility, Tuskegee, Ala.:

Beginning at a point in the north property line of the United States of America and known as Veterans' Administration Facility, Tuskegee, Ala., said point being located in the east west center of section 13, township 17, range 23, twenty-one and sixty-six one-hundredths chains east of the west boundary of said section; thence east ninety-four one-hundredths chains along the north property line of the United States of America; thence south fifteen degrees sixteen minutes east seven and two-tenths chains; thence south thirteen degrees six minutes east four and four hundred and sixteen one-thousandths chains to a point in the east property line of the United States of America; thence south three and fifteen one-hundredths chains along said east property line to a corner in the property line of the United States of America; thence west two-tenths of a chain along the south property line of the United

States of America; thence north thirteen degrees six minutes west seven and four hundred and twenty-six one-thousandths chains; thence north fifteen degrees sixteen minutes west seven and forty-three one-hundredths chains to the point of beginning, containing one and twenty-three one-hundredths acres, more or less.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, TOGUS, MAINE

The bill (S. 2012) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, to the State of Maine, for road-widening purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant an easement to the State of Maine for road-widening purposes in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, located in the city of Augusta, and the town of Chelsea, county of Kennebec, described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the northeasterly property line of the United States of America at the intersection of said property line with the town line between the city of Augusta and the town of Chelsea, said point being in the center of the State highway leading from Augusta to Rockland, known as the Thomaston Road; thence easterly along said town line seventy-six feet, more or less, to a point fifty feet distant from the survey base line of said State highway, as shown on right-of-way map of State highway "P" dated June 1941; thence south thirty-three degrees thirty minutes east parallel to said survey base line five hundred and fifty feet, more or less; thence south fifty-six degrees thirty minutes west one hundred feet to a point south of and fifty feet distant from said survey base line; thence north thirty-three degrees thirty minutes west parallel to said survey base line seven hundred and thirty-four feet, more or less, crossing the above-described town line between the city of Augusta and the town of Chelsea at six hundred and sixty-three feet, more or less; thence northwesterly on a curve to the right concentric with said survey base line seven hundred and three feet, more or less, the radius of said curve being eleven thousand five hundred nine and two-tenths feet and the central angle being three degrees thirty minutes; thence north thirty degrees no minutes west parallel to said survey base line two thousand nine hundred sixty-six and sixteen one-hundredths feet; thence north sixty degrees no minutes east fifty feet to a point in the northeasterly property line of the United States of America, said point being in the center of said State highway; thence southeasterly three thousand eight hundred and twenty-two feet, more or less, along said northeasterly property line to the point of beginning, containing seven and seventy-four one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The easement herein authorized to be granted shall be limited to the period of time the aforesaid lands are required and actually used for highway purposes, and when no longer so required and used, all interests herein authorized to be conveyed in said lands shall cease and determine.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY, MURFREESBORO, TENN.

The bill (S. 2080) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant an easement to the county of Rutherford, State of Tennessee, for highway purposes, in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., described as follows:

Beginning at a nail driven in the center of the Murfreesboro and Lebanon Highway at a point where the center line of Compton Road intersects said Murfreesboro and Lebanon Highway center line, this point being the southwest corner of the Veterans' Administration property, and the northwest corner of the Herman Jackson property, and running thence with the south boundary line of the Veterans' Administration property in the center of Compton Road, south eighty-six degrees fifteen minutes east three thousand six hundred and seventy-two and one-tenth feet to a nail in the center of Compton Road near the southeast corner of the Veterans' Administration property, at the intersection of Drake Lane; thence north four degrees east twenty-five feet to a stake; thence north eighty-six degrees fifteen minutes west three thousand six hundred and seventy-two and one-tenth feet to a point in the center line of Murfreesboro and Lebanon Highway; thence with the center line of Murfreesboro and Lebanon Highway (also the west line of the Veterans' Administration property), south four degrees west twenty-five feet to the point of beginning, being a rectangular strip twenty-five feet wide and three thousand six hundred and seventy-two and one-tenth feet long along the south line of the Veterans' Administration property, containing two and one-tenth acres, more or less. Above bearings are magnetic.

The easement herein authorized to be granted shall be limited to the period of time the aforesaid lands are required and actually used for highway purposes, and when no longer so required and used all interests herein authorized to be conveyed in said lands shall cease and determine.

DISPOSITION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 4692) relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN

The bill (H. R. 4853) to amend section 4, Public, No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROCEDURE IN DETERMINING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

The bill (H. R. 4905) to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT TO TOWN OF BEDFORD, MASS.

The bill (H. R. 5305) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVIDENCE OF DEATH OF VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4787) to provide that the unexplained absence of any ex-serviceman for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to the title.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

THIRD REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 149)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am transmitting herewith to the Congress the third report of the aid which our Government has rendered under the Lend-Lease Act to the nations opposing the Axis.

We are now engaged in a total war against a group of Axis Powers led by Nazi Germany and bent on world domination. Their strategy is world-wide. Ours also must be world-wide.

Underlying the Lend-Lease Act was the conception that those who were fighting the aggression of the Axis Powers were fighting our potential enemies. The Axis Powers now have openly declared themselves to be our enemies. We must not only help others to defeat them; we must fight them with all the forces we have and can get.

The world-wide strategy of the Axis Powers must be met with equal strategy on the part of all the nations who are joined together in resisting their aggression. Accordingly we must use the weapons from the arsenal of the democracies where they can be employed most effectively. And that means we must let Britain, Russia, China, and other nations including those of this hemisphere, use the weapons from that arsenal so that they can put them to most effective use. Too much is at stake in this greatest of all wars for us to neglect peoples who are or may be attacked by our common enemies.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1941.*

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF PAST POLICY IN RELATION TO PACIFIC AREA AND EVENTS LEADING UP TO JAPANESE ATTACK (H. DOC. NO. 458)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from

the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

On December 8, 1941, I presented to the Congress a message in person asking for a declaration of war as an answer to the treacherous attack made by Japan the previous day upon the United States. For the information of the Congress and as a public record of the facts, I am transmitting this historical summary of the past policy of this country in relation to the Pacific area and of the more immediate events leading up to this Japanese onslaught upon our forces and territory. Attached hereto are the various documents and correspondence implementing this history.

I

A little over a hundred years ago, in 1833, the United States entered into its first far eastern treaty, a treaty with Siam. It was a treaty providing for peace and for dependable relationships.

Ten years later Caleb Cushing was sent to negotiate, and in 1844 there was concluded, our first treaty with China.

In 1853 Commodore Perry knocked on Japan's doors. In the next few years those doors began to open and Japan, which had kept itself aloof from the world, began to adopt what we call western civilization. During those early years the United States used every influence it could exert to protect Japan in her transition stage.

With respect to the entire Pacific area, the United States has consistently urged, as it has for all other parts of the globe, the fundamental importance to world peace of fair and equal treatment among nations. Accordingly whenever there has been a tendency on the part of any other nation to encroach upon the independence and sovereignty of countries of the Far East the United States has tried to discourage such tendency wherever possible.

There was a period when this American attitude was especially important to Japan. At all times it has been important to China and to other countries of the Far East.

At the end of the nineteenth century the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands passed from Spain to this country. The United States pledged itself to a policy toward the Philippines designed to equip them to become a free and independent nation. That pledge and that policy we have consistently carried out.

At that time there was going on in China what has been called the "scramble for concessions." There was even talk about a possible partitioning of China. It was then that the principle of the "open door" in China was laid down. In 1900 the American Government declared that its policy was to "seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China * * * protect all rights guaranteed to friendly powers by treaty and international law, and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese Empire."

Ever since that day we have consistently and unfailingly advocated the principles of the open-door policy throughout the Far East.

In the year 1908 the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan concluded an agreement by an exchange of notes. In that agreement the two Governments jointly declared that they were determined to support "by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire"; that it was "the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean"; and that "the policy of both Governments" was "directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo" in that region.

The United States has consistently practiced the principles enunciated in that agreement.

In 1921, following the close of the first World War, nine powers having interests in the western Pacific met in conference in Washington. China, Japan, and the United States were there. One great objective of this conference was the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. This was to be achieved by reduction of armament and by regulation of competition in the Pacific and Far Eastern areas. Several treaties and agreements were concluded at that conference.

One of these was the Nine Power Treaty. (See annex 1.) It contained pledges to respect the sovereignty of China and the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout China.

Another was a treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan providing for limitation of naval armament. (See annex 1.)

The course of events which have led directly to the present crisis began 10 years ago. For it was then—in 1931—that Japan undertook on a large scale its present policy of conquest in China. It began by the invasion of Manchuria, which was part of China. The Council and the Assembly of the League of Nations, at once, and during many months of continuous effort thereafter, tried to persuade Japan to stop. The United States supported that effort. For example, the Government of the United States, on January 7, 1932, specifically stated in notes sent to the Japanese and the Chinese Governments that it would not recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement brought about by violation of treaties. (See annex 2.)

This barbaric aggression of Japan in Manchuria set the example and the pattern for the course soon to be pursued by Italy and Germany in Africa and in Europe. In 1933 Hitler assumed power in Germany. It was evident that, once rearmed, Germany would embark upon a policy of conquest in Europe. Italy—then still under the domination of Mussolini—also had resolved upon a policy of conquest in Africa and in the Mediterranean.

Through the years which followed, Germany, Italy, and Japan reached an understanding to time their acts of aggression to their common advantage, and to bring about the ultimate enslavement of the rest of the world.

In 1934 the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a friendly note to the United States, stating that he firmly believed that no question existed between the two Governments that was "fundamentally incapable of amicable solution." He added that Japan had "no intention whatever to provoke and make trouble with any other power" (see annex 3). Our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, replied in kind. (See annex 4.)

But in spite of this exchange of friendly sentiments, and almost immediately thereafter, the acts and utterances of the Japanese Government began to belie these assurances—at least so far as the rights and interests of other nations in China were concerned.

Our Government thereupon expressed to Japan the view of the American people, and of the American Government, that no nation has the right thus to override the rights and legitimate interests of other sovereign states. (See annex 5.)

The structure of peace which had been founded upon the Washington Conference treaties began to be discarded by Japan. Indeed, in December of 1934, the Japanese Government gave notice of its intention to terminate the Naval Treaty of February 6, 1922, which had limited competition in naval armament. She thereafter intensified and multiplied her rearmament program.

In 1936 the Government of Japan openly associated itself with Germany by entering the anti-Comintern Pact.

This pact, as we all know, was nominally directed against the Soviet Union; but its real purpose was to form a league of fascism against the free world, particularly against Great Britain, France, and the United States.

Following this association of Germany, Italy, and Japan, the stage was now set for an unlimited campaign of conquest. In July 1937, feeling themselves ready, the armed forces of Japan opened new large-scale military operations against China. Presently, her leaders, dropping the mask of hypocrisy, publicly declared their intention to seize and maintain for Japan a dominant position in the entire region of eastern Asia, the western Pacific, and the southern Pacific.

They thus accepted the German thesis that seventy or eighty million Germans were by race, training, ability, and might, superior in every way to any other race in Europe—superior to about 400,000,000 other human beings in that area. And Japan, following suit, announced that the seventy or eighty million Japanese people were also superior to the seven or eight hundred million other inhabitants of the Orient—nearly all of whom were infinitely older and more developed in culture and civilization than themselves. Their conceit would make them masters of a region containing almost one-half

the population of the earth. It would give them complete control of vast sea lanes and trade routes of importance to the entire world.

The military operations which followed in China flagrantly disregarded American rights. Japanese armed forces killed Americans. They wounded or abused American men, women, and children. They sank American vessels—including a naval vessel, the *Panay*. They bombed American hospitals, churches, schools, and missions. They destroyed American property. They obstructed, and in some cases, drove out, American commerce.

In the meantime, they were inflicting incalculable damage upon China, and ghastly suffering upon the Chinese people. They were inflicting wholesale injuries upon other nations—flouting all the principles of peace and good will among men.

There are attached hereto (see respectively annexes, 6, 7, 8, and 9) lists of American nationals killed or wounded by Japanese forces in China since July 7, 1937; of American property in China reported to have been damaged, destroyed, or seriously endangered by Japanese air bombing or air machine-gunning; of American nationals reported to have been assaulted, arbitrarily detained or subjected to indignities; of interferences with American nationals' rights and interests. These lists are not complete. However, they are ample evidence of the flagrant Japanese disregard of American rights and civilized standards.

II

Meanwhile, brute conquest was on the rampage in Europe and the Mediterranean.

Hitler and Mussolini embarked upon a scheme of unlimited conquest. Since 1935, without provocation or excuse they have attacked, conquered, and reduced to economic and political slavery some 16 independent nations. The machinery set up for their unlimited conquest included, and still includes, not only enormous armed forces, but also huge organizations for carrying on plots, intrigue, intimidation, propaganda, and sabotage. This machine—unprecedented in size—has world-wide ramifications; and into them the Japanese plans and operations have been steadily interlocked.

As the forces of Germany, Italy, and Japan increasingly combined their efforts over these years, I was convinced that this combination would ultimately attack the United States and the Western Hemisphere, if it were successful in the other continents. The very existence of the United States as a great free people, and the free existence of the American family of nations in the New World, would be a standing challenge to the Axis. The Axis dictators would choose their own time to make it clear that the United States and the New World were included in their scheme of destruction.

This they did last year, in 1940, when Hitler and Mussolini concluded a treaty of alliance with Japan deliberately aimed at the United States.

The strategy of Japan in the Pacific area was a faithful counterpart of that used by Hitler in Europe. Through infiltration, encirclement, intimidation, and finally armed attack, control was extended over neighboring peoples. Each such acquisition was a new starting point for new aggression.

III

Pursuing this policy of conquest, Japan had first worked her way into and finally seized Manchuria. Next she had invaded China and has sought for the past 4½ years to subjugate her.

Passing through the China Sea close to the Philippine Islands, she then invaded and took possession of Indochina. Today the Japanese are extending this conquest throughout Thailand, and seeking the occupation of Malaya and Burma. The Philippines, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, come next on the Japanese timetable, and it is probable that further down the Japanese page are the the names of Australia, New Zealand, and all the other islands of the Pacific, including Hawaii and the great chain of the Aleutian Islands.

To the eastward of the Philippines, Japan violated the mandate under which she had received the custody of the Caroline, Marshall, and Mariana Islands after the World War by fortifying them, and not only closing them to all commerce but her own, but forbidding any foreigner even to visit them.

Japanese spokesmen, after their custom, cloaked these conquests with innocent-sounding names. They talked of the "new order in eastern Asia" and then of the "coprosperity sphere in greater east Asia." What they really intended was the enslavement of every nation which they could bring within their power, and the enrichment, not of all Asia, not even of the common people of Japan, but of the war lords who had seized control of the Japanese state. Here, too, they were following the Nazi pattern.

By this course of aggression Japan made it necessary for various countries, including our own, to keep in the Pacific in self-defense, large armed forces and a vast amount of material which might otherwise have been used against Hitler. That, of course, is exactly what Hitler wanted them to do. The diversion thus created by Hitler's Japanese ally forced the peace-loving nations to establish and maintain a huge front in the Pacific.

IV

Throughout this course and program of Japanese aggression, the Government of the United States consistently endeavored to persuade the Government of Japan that Japan's best interests would lie in maintaining and cultivating friendly relations with the United States and with all other countries that believe in orderly and peaceful processes. Following the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and China in 1937, this Government made known to the Japanese Government and to the Chinese Government that whenever both those governments considered it desirable we stood ready to exercise our good offices. During the following years of conflict that attitude on our part remained unchanged.

In October 1937, upon invitation by which the Belgian Government made itself the host, 19 countries which have interests in the Far East, including the United States, sent representatives to Brussels to consider the situation in the Far East in conformity with the Nine-Power Treaty and to endeavor to bring about an adjustment of the difficulties between Japan and China by peaceful means. Japan and Germany only of all the powers invited declined to attend. Japan was itself an original signatory of the treaty. China, one of the signatories, and the Soviet Union, not a signatory, attended. After the conference opened the countries in attendance made further attempts to persuade Japan to participate in the conference. Japan again declined.

On November 24, 1937, the conference adopted a declaration urging that "hostilities be suspended and resort be had to peaceful processes."

Japan scorned the conference and ignored the recommendation.

It became clear that, unless this source of affairs in the Far East was halted, the Pacific area was doomed to experience the same horrors which have devastated Europe.

Therefore, in this year of 1941, in an endeavor to end this process by peaceful means while there seemed still to be a chance, the United States entered into discussions with Japan.

For 9 months these conversations were carried on for the purpose of arriving at some understanding acceptable to both countries.

Throughout all of these conversations this Government took into account not only the legitimate interests of the United States but also those of Japan and other countries. When questions relating to the legitimate rights and interests of other countries came up, this Government kept in appropriate contact with the representatives of those countries.

In the course of these negotiations the United States steadfastly advocated certain basic principles which should govern international relations. These were:

The principle of inviolability of territorial integrity and sovereignty of all nations.

The principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries.

The principle of equality—including equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

The principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention, and pacific settlement, of controversies.

The Japanese Government, it is true, repeatedly offered qualified statements of peaceful intention. But it became clear, as each proposal was explored, that Japan did not intend to modify in any way her greedy designs upon the whole Pacific world. Although she continually maintained that she was promoting only the peace and greater prosperity of east Asia, she continued her brutal assault upon the Chinese people.

Nor did Japan show any inclination to renounce her unholy alliance with Hitlerism.

In July of this year the Japanese Government connived with Hitler to force from the Vichy government of France permission to place Japanese armed forces in southern Indochina, and began sending her troops and equipment into that area.

The conversations between this Government and the Japanese Government were thereupon suspended.

But during the following month, at the urgent and insistent request of the Japanese Government, which again made emphatic profession of peaceful intent, the conversations were resumed.

At that time the Japanese Government made the suggestion that the responsible heads of the Japanese Government and of the Government of the United States meet personally to discuss means for bringing about an adjustment of relations between the two countries. I should have been happy to travel thousands of miles to meet the Premier of Japan for that purpose. But I felt it desirable, before so doing, to obtain some assurance that there could be some agreement on basic principles. This Government tried hard—but without success—to obtain such assurance from the Japanese Government.

The various proposals of the Japanese Government and the attitude taken by this Government are set forth in a document which the Secretary of State handed to the Japanese Ambassador on October 2, 1941. (See annex 10.)

Thereafter, several formulas were offered and discussed. But the Japanese Government continued upon its course of war and conquest.

Finally, on November 20, 1941, the Japanese Government presented a new and narrow proposal (see annex 11), which called for supplying by the United States to Japan of as much oil as Japan might require, for suspension of freezing measures, and for discontinuance by the United States of aid to China. It contained, however, no provision for abandonment by Japan of her warlike operations or aims.

Such a proposal obviously offered no basis for a peaceful settlement or even for a temporary adjustment. The American Government, in order to clarify the issues, presented to the Japanese Government on November 26 a clear-cut plan for a broad but simple settlement. (See annex 12.)

The outline of the proposed plan for agreement between the United States and Japan was divided into two parts:

In section 1 there was outlined a mutual declaration of policy containing affirmations that the national policies of the two countres were directed toward peace throughout the Pacific area, that the two countries had no territorial designs or aggressive intentions in that area, and that they would give active support to certain fundamental principles of peace upon which their relations with each other and all other nations would be based. There was provision for mutual pledges to support and apply in their economic relations with each other and with other nations and peoples liberal economic principles, which were enumerated, based upon the general principle of equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

In section 2 there were outlined proposed steps to be taken by the two Governments. These steps envisaged a situation in which there would be no Japanese or other foreign armed forces in French Indochina or in China. Mutual commitments were suggested along lines as follows: (a) To endeavor to conclude a multilateral nonaggression pact among the governments principally concerned in the Pacific area; (b) to endeavor to conclude among the principally interested governments an agreement to respect the territorial integrity of Indochina and not to seek or accept preferential economic treatment therein; (c) not to support any government in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China, with capital temporarily at Chungking; (d) to relinquish extraterritorial and related rights in China and to endeavor to obtain the agreement of other governments now possessing such rights to give up those rights; (e) to negotiate a trade agreement based upon reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment; (f) to remove freezing restrictions imposed by each country on the funds of the other (g) to agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate; (b) to agree that no agreement which either had concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in a way to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement; and (i) to use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to the basic political and economic principles provided for in this suggested agreement.

In the midst of these conversations we learned that new contingents of Japanese armed forces and new masses of equipment were moving into Indochina. Toward the end of November these movements were intensified. During the first week of December new movements of Japanese forces made it clear that, under cover of the negotiations, attacks on unspecified objectives were being prepared.

I promptly asked the Japanese Government for a frank statement of the reasons for increasing its forces in Indochina. (See annex 13.) I was given an evasive and specious reply. (See annex 14.) Simultaneously, the Japanese operations went forward with increased tempo.

We did not know then, as we know now, that they had ordered and were even then carrying out their plan for a treacherous attack upon us.

I was determined, however, to exhaust every conceivable effort for peace. With this in mind, on the evening of December 6 last, I addressed a personal message to the Emperor of Japan. (See annex 15.)

To this Government's proposal of November 26 the Japanese Government made no reply until December 7. On that day the Japanese Ambassador here and the special representative whom the Japanese Government had sent to the United States to assist in peaceful negotiations delivered a lengthy document to our Secretary of State, 1 hour after the Japanese had launched a vicious attack upon American territory and American citizens in the Pacific.

That document (see annex 16) was a few minutes after its receipt aptly characterized by the Secretary of State as follows:

> I must say that in all my conversations with you [the Japanese Ambassador] during the last 9 months I have never uttered one word of untruth. This is borne out absolutely by the record. In all my 50 years of public service I have never seen a document that was more crowded with infamous falsehoods and distortions—infamous falsehoods and distortions on a scale so huge that I never imagined until today that any government on this planet was capable of uttering them.

I concur emphatically in every word of that statement.

For the record of history, it is essential in reading this part of my message always to bear in mind that the actual air and submarine attack in the Hawaiian Islands commenced on Sunday, December 7, at 1:20 p. m., Washington time—7:50 a. m., Honolulu time of same day—Monday, December 8, 3:20 a. m., Tokyo time.

To my message of December 6 (9 p. m. Washington time—December 7, 11 a. m. Tokyo time) to the Emperor of Japan, invoking his cooperation with me in further effort to preserve peace, there has finally come to me on December 10 (6:23 a. m. Washington time—December 10, 8:23 p. m. Tokyo time) a reply, conveyed in a telegraphic report by the American Ambassador at Tokyo dated December 8, 1 p. m. (December 7, 11 p. m. Washington time).

The Ambassador reported that at 7 o'clock on the morning of the 8th (December 7, 5 p. m. Washington time) the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs asked him to call at his official residence; that the Foreign Minister handed the Ambassador a memorandum dated December 8 (December 7 Washington time) the text of which had been transmitted to the Japanese Ambassador in Washington to be presented to the American Government (this was the memorandum which was delivered by the Japanese Ambassador to the Secretary of State at 2:20 p. m. on Sunday, December 7 (Monday, December 8, 4:20 a. m. Tokyo time); that the Foreign Minister had been in touch with the Emperor; and that the Emperor desired that the memorandum be regarded as the Emperor's reply to my message.

Further, the Ambassador reports, the Foreign Minister made an oral statement. Textually, the oral statement began, "His Majesty has expressed his gratefulness and appreciation for the cordial message of the President." The message further continued to the effect that, in regard to our inquiries on the subject of increase of Japanese forces in French Indochina, His Majesty had commanded his government to state its views to the American Government. The message concluded, textually, with the statement:

> Establishment of peace in the Pacific, and consequently of the world, has been the cherished desire of His Majesty for the realization of which he has hitherto made his government to continue its earnest endeavors. His Majesty trusts that the President is fully aware of this fact.

Japan's real reply, however, made by Japan's war lords and evidently formulated many days before, took the form of

the attack which had already been made without warning upon our territories at various points in the Pacific.

There is the record, for all history to read in amazement, in sorrow, in horror, and in disgust.

We are now at war. We are fighting in self-defense. We are fighting in defense of our national existence, of our right to be secure, of our right to enjoy the blessings of peace. We are fighting in defense of principles of law and order and justice, against an effort of unprecedented ferocity to overthrow those principles and to impose upon humanity a regime of ruthless domination by unrestricted and arbitrary force.

Other countries, too—a host of them—have declared war on Japan. Some of them were first attacked by Japan, as we have been. China has already been valiantly resisting Japan in an undeclared war forced upon her by Japan. After 4½ years of stubborn resistance, the Chinese now and henceforth will fight with renewed confidence and confirmed assurance of victory.

All members of the great British Commonwealth, themselves fighting heroically on many fronts against Germany and her allies, have joined with us in the Battle of the Pacific as we have joined with them in the Battle of the Atlantic.

All but three of the governments of nations overrun by German armies have declared war on Japan. The other three are severing relations.

In our own hemisphere many of our sister republics have declared war on Japan, and the others have given firm expression of their solidarity with the United States.

The following are the countries which have to date declared war against Japan:

Australia, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, The Netherlands, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Panama, El Salvador, South Africa, United Kingdom, and Poland.

These and other peace-loving countries will be fighting as are we, first, to put an end to Japan's program of aggression and, second, to make good the right of nations and of mankind to live in peace under conditions of security and justice.

The people of this country are totally united in their determination to consecrate our national strength and manpower to bring conclusively to an end the pestilence of aggression and force which has long menaced the world and which now has struck deliberately and directly at the safety of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1941.*

ANNEXES

1. Senate Document No. 124, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, which contains texts of Washington Conference treaties and resolutions.

2. Identic notes to the Japanese and the Chinese Governments, January 7, 1932.

3. Note from the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, handed to the Secretary of State by the Japanese Ambassador, February 21, 1934.

4. Reply thereto, handed to the Japanese Ambassador by the Secretary of State on March 3, 1934.

5. Statement by the American Ambassador to Japan to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, April 29, 1934.

6. List of American nationals killed or wounded by Japanese forces in China since July 7, 1937.

7. List of American property in China reported to have been damaged, destroyed, or seriously endangered by Japanese air bombing or air machine gunning since July 7, 1937.

8. List of American nationals reported to have been assaulted, arbitrarily detained, subjected to indignities, etc., since July 7, 1937, by Japanese authorities or agents.

9. List of Japanese interferences with American trade and enterprise in China.

10. Document handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on October 2, 1941.

11. Document handed to the Secretary of State, by the Japanese Ambassador on November 20, 1941.

12. Document handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on November 26, 1941.

13. Memorandum addressed by the President to the Secretary and the Under Secretary of State, copy of which, under authorization of the President, was read and handed by the Under Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on December 2, 1941.

14. Reply thereto, handed to the Secretary of State by the Japanese Ambassador on December 5, 1941.

15. Personal message from the President to the Emperor of Japan, December 6, 1941.

16. Document handed by the Japanese Ambassador to the Secretary of State, December 7, 1941.

(NOTE.—The documents and correspondence referred to accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS IN ANTHRACITE REGIONS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, recently I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 118, creating a commission to investigate conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions of the United States. The joint resolution was ordered to lie on the table. The House has passed House Joint Resolution 255 relating to the same subject. It is identical in every respect. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 255 in place of the joint resolution which I introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is Senate Joint Resolution 118 on the calendar?

Mr. GUFFEY. It is on the table. The House has passed a similar joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 255.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator wish to take up the House joint resolution?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not understand the parliamentary situation. Will the able Senator from Pennsylvania again specify what he desires in the matter?

Mr. GUFFEY. On December 10 Representative BOLAND, of Pennsylvania, introduced House Joint Resolution 255, which is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 118, which I introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 118 was introduced a few days ago, and has been lying on the table since. In the meantime the House has passed House Joint Resolution 255, dealing with the same subject. What the Senator from Pennsylvania is asking is that in lieu of his joint resolution, which is on the table, the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 255, which has just come over from the House.

Mr. DAVIS. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal-producing regions of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to speak upon the joint resolution if my colleague has given up the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the anthracite industry and the anthracite mining population of one and a half million have been suffering from loss of tonnage demand over a period of years, which has wiped out the entire curb reserve of the industry and drastically reduced the annual income of those that remain.

The importance of the anthracite industry is shown by the fact that the number of men employed at anthracite mines is greater than the number employed in all metal mines of the United States and is also greater than the total number of men employed at all mines and quarries producing nonmetallic minerals other than coal. However, as has already been pointed out, there has been a very serious decline in anthracite production and employment.

This decline in employment has caused major relief problems in the anthracite region, as shown by the following figures for W. P. A. expenditures and direct relief for the four principal anthracite-producing counties—Lackawanna, Luzerne, Northumberland, and Schuylkill Counties—as obtained from the respective offices in Harrisburg, Pa.:

	1938	1939	1940
Work Projects Administration expenditures	$44,398,863	$26,480,557	$14,018,114
General assistance (relief)	7,316,122	14,068,006	12,515,916
Total	51,714,985	40,548,563	26,534,030

The cost of the relief has been tremendous.

The major problem of employment and unused industrial facilities exists in the northeastern section of Pennsylvania. This is conclusively shown by recent surveys of industrial and employment conditions there, conducted by the Pennsylvania State Employment Service. I refer to the entire anthracite mining and important textile region found in the counties of Carbon, Columbia, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Monroe, Pike, Schuylkill, Susquehanna, Wayne, and Wyoming.

Approximately 321,000 persons are employed in this area, consisting of 78,000

in manufacturing employment and 243,000 in nonmanufacturing occupations, and indications are that severe dislocations of workers have occurred in the textile industry. Large numbers of silk workers were laid off during the period in which most silk supplies were frozen.

Luzerne County has approximately 103,000 persons employed with 19,000 engaged in manufacturing industries and 84,000 in nonmanufacturing employment. Wilkes-Barre is the important center of activity.

In Lackawanna County, 14,000 are employed in manufacturing industries and 66,000 in nonmanufacturing employment, making a total employment of approximately 80,000 persons.

Schuylkill County is the third most important county in the district industrially, with a total employment of some 61,000 persons. About 16,000 persons are engaged in manufacturing employment, and 45,000 persons are working at nonmanufacturing employment.

Additional reports from some of these companies and other manufacturers, totaling 32, have been received in the past 2 months. These 32 reporting companies indicate that they now employ 6,563 workers, of whom 2,826 are engaged in defense work.

Priorities and restrictions on parts, silk, rayon, chemicals, rubber, certain metal parts, pig iron, steel, and cloth are most important factors in these curtailments.

Already among these specific 32 companies, 3,735 persons have been laid off and a minimum of 745 more is anticipated. Six of the companies have reduced their working hours, and 3 have shut down completely. The reports indicate that 20 of the firms have been contacted by Government agencies concerning their problem, and 12 have not. Twenty-seven of the 32 companies indicate that they are in a position to convert or use their facilities for certain types of defense products.

Reemployment opportunities for already-displaced or to-be-displaced workers are extremely slim in this area. A large reservoir of labor has existed here for a number of years, and the current defense-production program has not stimulated employment in this section. In fact, defense-contract allotments for this section are extremely few. Unless some of these companies are permitted to obtain the scarce materials and parts, or are given defense contracts, or unless new plants for defense production are located in this area, an increasingly large number of migrations of workers to other sections can be expected.

Factory employment in the Scranton area stands at 85 percent of the 1923–25 average. This level is much lower than exists throughout the remainder of the State, and indicates the continued lack of increase in production, even though industry throughout the State is extremely accelerated. Factory pay rolls are only at 94 percent of the 1923–25 volume. Scranton business is currently 21 percent better than a year ago, as measured by bank debits, factory pay rolls, and independent store sales, in comparison with a State-wide increase of 29 percent.

Unemployment is still the major problem in this section, although registrations of unemployed workers in the Scranton office of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service have reduced somewhat in the past year. Current registrations indicate a total of 10,838 persons are actively looking for work, having indicated this desire within the last 60 days. Of these, 7,924 are male and 2,914 female. Measuring the demand for workers in this area against this reservoir of unemployed, most recent reports indicate that Scranton employers will not need more than 812 workers during the next 6 months in manufacturing work. This represents, therefore, only a need for 8 percent of the presently unemployed that are registered with the employment service. It must be realized, too, that the employment service does not have all of the unemployed registered, and it is estimated that the total unemployment is probably 15,000. This total of 15,000 will probably be increased in the near future, as indicated by the recent reports on the effects of priorities and restrictions on parts, silks, rayons, chemicals, rubber, certain, metals, pig iron, steel, and cloth, which are the most important factors in these curtailments. Thirty-two companies have indicated that they will probably have a total lay-off of about 4,500 workers; in addition, a number of companies have had to reduce their working hours, and three have shut down completely. Reemployment opportunities for these displaced workers are extremely slim, in view of the already large reservoir of unemployed.

Significant factors concerning this area are as follows:

First. A large reservoir of unemployed, consisting of a good proportion of young male workers, many with mechanical aptitudes or technical high-school training.

Second. An extreme evidence of interest on the part of the unemployed to obtain training in occupations vital to defense.

Third. An expanding program of vocational training involving current training in machine-tool operations, sheet-metal work, pattern making, electric welding, aircraft maintenance, electric-motor maintenance and repairs, supplemented by engineering defense-training courses conducted by Pennsylvania State College.

Fourth. Additional plant and equipment capacity on the part of local employers for use in the manufacture of defense products.

Fifth. A well-developed system of rail and motor carrier, freight, and passenger service.

Sixth. Connections by these carriers to the important centers, such as Buffalo, New York City, and Philadelphia.

Seventh. Excellent power facilities and water supply.

Eighth. More than adequate housing facilities. At present there are 1,750 dwellings available as registered with the Scranton Real Estate Board.

Ninth. A fair wage level. Wages in this area are slightly less than those existing in other eastern industrial centers such as Philadelphia, Newark, Bethlehem, Pittsburgh, and Baltimore.

Tenth. Excellent commuting facilities for workers in the entire area.

I have introduced a resolution calling for the Federal operation of a research laboratory in the anthracite region for the purpose of advancing the scientific and technological improvements in this field and for the further utilization of anthracite in industry. This resolution was adopted unanimously by the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining, and I had every reason to believe it would promptly pass the Senate as a national-defense measure. It has now remained on the Senate calendar for many months. Each time I have sought to call it up for consideration objections have been made. In the interest of the great need of this important and strategic area of northeastern Pennsylvania, and in view of the fact that Senate Resolution 357 will remain on the Senate calendar for the coming year, I optimistically entertain the hope that the commission appointed under the pending joint resolution will report back to the Congress and favorable action may ensue on this much-needed legislation, for if there ever was a section in any part of the country which needed to have a thorough study made of the employment and industrial conditions it is these counties in the northeastern part of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 118 will be indefinitely postponed.

FLORIDA'S FIRST HEROES OF THE WAR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to revise and to add briefly to some remarks I made on the floor of the Senate on the 12th of December relative to two young men from Florida who have already given their lives in the service of their country. My first reference was to a young man named Theo F. Byrd, a citizen of Tampa, Fla., who was a private in the Air Corps, at Pearl Harbor, and who lost his life upon the first onslaught of the Japanese at that place. He was a private soldier who died the glorious way a soldier would choose to die. We honor his memory, and esteem the tradition of worthiness which he has associated with the name of American arms. He is mourned by a father and mother, Mr. and Mrs. Theo F. Byrd, living in Tampa; by two sisters; and by his grandparents; and with them, the whole country honors his name in his passing.

Dispatches have brought us the news of another hero in the war, also a Florida boy, Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., of Madison, Fla., who is survived by his wife and a young son, and by his father, living at Madison, Fla.

The United Press on December 12 carried the following dispatch:

MANILA, December 12.—Army Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., became America's first hero of the second World War today.

He gave his life in diving in close over the 29,330-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* off

Luzon to send it and its crew of 1,200 to 1,500 men to the bottom. He scored.

Kelly was 26, a native of Florida. He graduated from the University of Florida and then went to West Point, from which he graduated 4 years ago.

In 1938 he finished the primary flying school of the Army and the advanced flying school bombardment course in 1939.

He was accepted as a combat pilot in September 1940, and served in Hawaii until he was assigned to the Philippines.

Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander of our Far Eastern Army, was the source of the following dispatch which appeared in the December 12 issue of the Evening Star, under a Manila date line:

General MacArthur announced with great sorrow the death of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., who so distinguished himself by scoring three direct hits on the Japanese capital battleship *Haruna*, leaving her in flames and in distress.

It has subsequently been disclosed that the battleship *Haruna* was sunk by this assault of Captain Kelly which cost him his life.

There is nothing that words could contain, Mr. President, which could adequately express the sorrow of the Nation in the passing of such glorious heroes as Private Theo. F. Byrd and Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., proved themselves on those occasions to be. I can think of no more appropriate words by which to express our sentiments of gratitude, admiration, and appreciation, as well as our sense of comfort in their passing, than to paraphrase the words of Scripture associated with the Apostle Paul, and to say that they have fought the good fight of a soldier's faith; they have gone to lay hold on to life eternal, whereunto their God and their country have called them.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] is ill today and unable to be present in the Senate. He has prepared a statement and gathered certain clippings telling eloquently the story of Captain Kelly's death. I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by my colleague and the data which he has compiled may be incorporated at this place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

On Friday last the heart of the entire Nation was lifted by the news from Manila that the battleship *Haruna* of the Japanese Fleet had been blasted to the bottom of the Pacific by the bombs of an American plane. But our Nation was saddened because the pilot of that plane paid with his life for his deed.

Mr. President, the pilot of that plane was a son of the State of which I have the honor in part to represent in the United States Senate. I feel, therefore, that it is only fitting and proper that I should officially call the attention of this distinguished body to the courage and self-sacrifice of Capt. Colin Purdie Kelly, Jr., United States Army.

The battle of the Philippines is still raging; we have been unable to obtain all of the details of Captain Kelly's courageous deed; but sufficient information has reached us to enable us to know beyond doubt that his act was among the bravest in the history of the Republic.

His commander in chief, Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, took sufficient time from the raging battle to inform the world of this young Floridian's bravery, and the War Department in Washington received the following brief communique:

"General MacArthur announced with great sorrow the death of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., who so distinguished himself by scoring three direct hits on the Japanese capital ship *Haruna* leaving her in flames and in distress."

So died a brave soldier, and another name has been added to the scroll of mortals who gave their lives that this Nation might survive.

Mr. President, so long as this Nation continues to breed sons like Colin Purdie Kelly, Jr., she will never writhe beneath the heel of a conqueror's boot. Let those who seek to trample her beware, for her anger and the anger of her sons is terrible to behold. Let Hitler and Mussolini and their back-stabbing yellow cohorts in the Pacific mark well the deed of Colin Purdie Kelly, Jr., for it is such deeds by such men that will spell out their ultimate doom.

The sympathy of this entire Nation goes to the family of this brave soldier; to his mother and father in Madison, Fla., and to his wife and infant son in New York. May God in His infinite grace ease their sorrow with the knowledge that their son and husband and father gave his all in order that these United States may remain forever free and that the chains of slavery may never bind the people of this great Nation.

Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously, the Congressional Medal of Honor to Captain Kelly. I would press for an immediate vote on the bill but it is my understanding that such action must await an official citation from General MacArthur and a recommendation from the War Department. It is my sincere hope that these will be forthcoming in the near future. Meanwhile I hope that the resolution will be referred to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, I request permission to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks certain news articles and editorials concerning the brave deed of Captain Kelly.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 13, 1941]

CAPTAIN KELLY'S WIDOW TOO PROUD TO SHOW GRIEF; "GAVE JAPS SOMETHING TO REMEMBER," SHE SAYS—HOLDS BABY SON CLOSE TO HER HEART—ONLY TALKS OF FLYER'S "MARVELOUS RECORD"

(By Grace Robinson)

NEW YORK, December 12.—The beautiful girl held her year-and-a-half-old son to her heart but she shed no tears. She was "proud," she said, of what "he" had done—"and didn't he give those Japs something to remember him by!"

There was no weeping, no moaning. For she was an officer's wife—a widow now—the widow of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., the 26-year-old West Point flyer who is credited with scoring three direct hits on the 29,330-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* and sinking it Wednesday north of Luzon in the Philippines.

HOME "FOR A VISIT"

Mrs. Kelly, who is staying with her parents in Brooklyn, came here from Hawaii last month "for a visit"—the Army has been sending wives and children of its personnel home from Philippine and Hawaiian posts since last spring. She last heard from her husband Monday—when three letters came all at once.

Today she didn't want to talk of herself or her grief. Only of "Captain Kelly" and his "marvelous" record since he joined the Air Corps and of his "glorious" death.

"He was an officer in every sense of the word," she said. "Even I, his wife, did not know what orders he had received, the places he was to go, or the secrets that he knew. He was a marvelous officer and I know that he would want to have died in action as he did. I know he is happy that it came in that fashion.

"Please—when you write—write only of what Captain Kelly has done—not of me, not of Corkey (their baby). For it is Captain Kelly who deserves all the praise—all the glory. * * *"

With glowing eyes and a steady voice, Mrs. Kelly recalled her marriage to Kelly. It was a West Point marriage—solemnized on August 1, 1937, 1½ months after his graduation from the academy.

"But his life, his love, was flying," she said. She told how, after finishing West Point, he went into the Air Corps. He was at Randolph Field, at Kelly Field, at March Field, and at Hickam Field in Hawaii, to which post his family accompanied him.

In 1940 Kelly became an executive officer of the Forty-second Bombardment Squadron in Hawaii.

"He was a pioneer—always took the initiative. He became the pride of all the men in his command, and even the officers praised and commended him repeatedly," the young widow continued. "So, when the flying fortresses, the B–17's came out, he was the first man ever to fly a B–17 in the Pacific. He was chosen to teach other men to fly them. And I think it must have been a B–17 in which he died."

Mrs. Kelly, who is a tall, stunning brunette, seemed to derive comfort from the fact that her gallant husband's sacrifice had the significance, the permanence, of a victory. When she spoke of how the "Japs would remember him," this reporter remarked that the "United States would remember him, too."

"CORKEY" PROUD, TOO

"I am happy that he has done this and has left his imprint behind," she said quietly. "I am proud of him—and 'Corkey' will be proud, too." She drew her son, Colin P. Kelly 3d, to her tenderly. Then, "Is there any word about those who were with him—the copilot, or anyone?" No word had come through as yet to the public.

Mrs. Kelly was formerly Marian Wick. Her parents are Mr. and Mrs. Theodore A. Wick. Kelly, a 6-footer weighing 175 pounds, was born on July 11, 1915, in Madison, Fla., where his parents still live. He attended Marion Institute, a prep school in Alabama.

KELLY'S FATHER SAD BUT PROUD—GLAD HE DID PART FOR HIS COUNTRY

MADISON, FLA., December 12.—The Kellys were in mourning tonight, but their sadness was tempered by pride in the heroic death of their son and heir, Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., 26-year-old Army flyer, who sank the 29,330-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna*, to become America's first hero of World War No. 2.

"I'm proud that he did his part for our country," C. T. Kelly, Sr., replied when informed that his son was killed after scoring the three direct bomb hits that sent the *Haruna* to the bottom off Luzon.

Dispatches from Manila said his diving airplane vanished in the roaring explosion that sank the *Haruna* as the pilot plunged his craft straight down at the enemy and released a stick of high explosives almost into the mouths of flaming Japanese guns.

"He always wanted to be a soldier ever since he was about 12 years old," the elder Kelly, who is in the naval-stores business, said. "He always talked about aviation. Sometimes I thought he was almost too crazy about it. But now I am proud of him."

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Reporter-Star of December 12, 1941]

FLORIDA HERO GIVES HIS LIFE TO SINK JAPANESE BATTLESHIP

MANILA, P. I.—Three dare-devil American aviators flew to fame—and one to death—today against the Japanese.

Terse statements from military and naval sources in Manila told the story of how American and Filipino aviators struck back against powerful enemy assaults. The name of 26-year-old Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., of Madison, Fla., who was killed in action, heads the roll of the heroes.

His diving airplane vanished in a roaring explosion that sank the 29,000-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* off the coast of Luzon Island as the pilot plunged his craft straight down at the enemy and released a stick of high explosives almost into the mouths of flaming Japanese guns.

Kelly was only one of the defense fliers who made American skill and daring in the air felt against the invaders.

Around the air bases they told of the blows struck by Lt. Boyd D. Wagner, of Philadelphia, who like Kelly flew an Army Air Corps plane. Wagner raced northward to the tip of Luzon Island as the Japanese sought to land reinforcements under aerial protection in the Aparri sector.

Half a dozen enemy craft tackled him and two of them went down after a fierce dog fight. Wagner then streaked on toward the enemy landing field and dropped down until his plane was merely skimming the treetops, his machine guns spattering bullets against Japanese craft on the ground. A dozen planes were wrecked when—his fuel running low—Wagner turned back toward his home base.

They were talking, too, of Lt. C. A. Keller of the United States Navy Air Force, and how he "shadowed" a Japanese battleship of the *Kongo* class northwest of Luzon despite steady and fierce enemy antiaircraft fire. Keller kept his plane within sight of the 29,000-ton enemy craft until naval bombers led by Lt. Comdr. J. V. Peterson arrived and pressed home an attack that put the vessel out of action.

But the American fliers were not the only ones who stood out in the battle against invasion forces.

Admiral Thomas C. Hart, commander of the Asiatic Fleet, told how Filipino fliers in the defense forces had shot down two Japanese planes out of 11 bagged since early this morning. Hart also said that Lt. H. Tutter, of the United States Naval Air Force, had been attacked by three Japanese fighter planes at sea. He shot down one and then made a forced landing on the water, taxiing his plane to the shore where he repaired minor damages. The next morning he returned to base.

Kelly was 26, a native of Florida. He graduated from the University of Florida, and then went to West Point, from which he graduated 4 years ago.

In 1938 he finished the Primary Flying School of the Army, and the Advanced Flying School Bombardment Course in 1939.

He was accepted as a combat pilot in September 1940 and served in Hawaii until he was assigned to the Philippines.

KELLY ALWAYS WANTED TO FLY

MADISON.—A man who had spent most of his life wanting to be a soldier-flier and who died in battle became the first hero of the Second World War today.

He was Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., 26, of Madison, a West Point graduate who successfully dive-bombed the 29,330-ton Japanese battleship *Haruna* off Luzon in the Pacific Ocean sending it and its crew to the bottom.

"He always wanted to be a soldier—ever since he was about 12 years old," C. T. Kelly, Sr., his father said when notified of his son's death. "He has always talked about aviation. Sometimes I thought he was almost too crazy about it.

"But I'm proud that he did his part for our country. He was a fine specimen of manhood and I guess fairly bright. That's how he got an appointment to West Point," the father proudly asserted.

Captain Kelly was the son of a well-to-do lumber and naval stores operator. He was the grandson of former Congressman D. H. Mays, of Monticello, and the nephew of Parkhill Mays, former member of the State Legislature from Jefferson County.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 13, 1941]

ARMY'S KELLY NO. 1 HERO OF PACIFIC WAR—GAVE LIFE TO SINK JAPANESE BATTLESHIP; NAVY HAILS KELLER

MANILA, December 12.—America's roll of honor in World War II began emerging today from the smoke and flame over the Pacific, and the name of Capt. Colin Kelly, Jr., led all the rest.

It was he who hurled a United States Army plane down into the blazing muzzles of Japanese guns and, dumping his deadly cargo of bombs at suicidal range, dealt a mortal blow to the 29,000-ton battleship *Haruna*.

NATIVE OF FLORIDA

Kelly, 26, native of Florida, 4 years out of West Point, dived to victory and to death in the tornado of gunfire raging over the *Haruna* before the big battle wagon went down off the coast of Luzon to give the Allies their first resounding success of the 6-day-old war.

The name of the Army's No. 1 hero was not alone on the honor scroll. Already those of Lt. C. A. Keller, Lt. H. T. Utter, and Lt. Boyd D. Wagner were on the list. Unlike Kelly they lived to tell their tales of exploits scarcely less sensational.

Native airmen, too, were getting in telling blows in the battle of the Philippines. Admiral Thomas C. Hart, commander of the Asiatic Fleet, said they shot down 2 Japanese planes of 11 bagged since early Friday morning.

Six Filipino pilots of the Commonwealth Defense Forces attacked two formations of 27 planes each and downed 2 without a single loss.

ARMY, NAVY SPLIT HONORS

The air forces of the Navy and Army split the honors in the first round of heroism. Kelly and Wagner were in the Army contingent; Keller and Utter in the Navy.

Kelly, nemesis of the *Haruna* and its crew of more than 1,200 Japanese, was graduated from the University of Florida and then went to West Point. In 1938 he finished the primary flying school of the Army and the next year the advanced flying school bombardment course.

Accepted as a combat pilot in September 1940, he served in Hawaii until he was assigned to the Philippines.

To a Navy pilot, Keller, went the tribute of spotting and shadowing a 29,000-ton Japanese battleship of the Kongo class, weaving and ducking through and around a drumming field of enemy fire.

NAVY BOMBERS ARRIVE

With bulldog tenacity he held on until naval bombers under Lt. Comdr. J. V. Peterson arrived and hammered home an attack that put the big ship out of action.

The six Filipino heroes, who charged into the two Japanese formations of 27 planes each over Batangas, were identified as Capt. Jesus Villamor, Lt. Godofredo Juliano, Lieutenant Aclan, Lieutenant Manlunas, Lieutenant Mondiego, and Lieutenant Basa.

Wagner, of Philadelphia, lifted his Army plane from the field when the call came, and sped north to the tip of Luzon Island, where the Japanese sought to land reinforcements under aerial protection in the Aparri region.

Half a dozen enemy craft challenged him. Two went down under his fire after a brief, bitter dog fight. Wagner headed to the enemy landing field and, dipping down to the treetops, spat machine-gun bullets into Japanese craft on the ground. No less than a dozen were wrecked when, his fuel running out, he turned back to home base.

CADET IN 1937

Entering the air force as a cadet in 1937, Wagner was commissioned a second lieutenant the same year and was promoted to first lieutenant the next.

Utter won the commendation of Admiral Hart for attacking three Japanese fighter planes at sea. He shot down one. Making a forced landing on the water, he taxied his naval plane to the shore and repaired minor damage. The next morning he flew back to his base.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 13, 1941]

PILOT KILLED SINKING "HARUNA" CALLED FIRST UNITED STATES HERO IN NEW WAR—CAPT. COLIN P. KELLY, JR., PAID POSTHUMOUS TRIBUTE BY LIEUTENANT GENERAL MACARTHUR

MANILA, December 12.—A Florida-born West Pointer, Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., 26, who helped even the score which the Japanese ran up at Pearl Harbor when he planted three bombs on the Japanese battleship *Haruna*, paid for the sinking of the ship with his life.

One sentence in a communique issued by Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander of the Far Eastern Army, paid posthumous tribute to the young Army flyer:

"General MacArthur announced with great sorrow the death of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., who so distinguished himself by scoring three direct hits on the Japanese capital battleship *Haruna*, leaving her in flames and in distress."

Just when and how Captain Kelly died was not stated, but it is possible that death came without his knowing that the *Haruna* had been mortally damaged. The War Department in Washington announced that the 29,330-ton *Haruna* was sunk Wednesday, north of Luzon.

Captain Kelly was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1937, and became a captain on September 9, 1940, after training in various flying and bombing schools.

A United States naval flyer who trailed a Japanese battleship for a long time in the face of frequent antiaircraft fire until other naval planes could fly to the scene and "seriously cripple" the huge ship also was officially cited for his work.

The story was told in the report of Admiral Thomas C. Hart, commander in chief of the Asiatic Fleet, on the attack on the *Kongo*, or a ship just like her, off northwest Luzon Island.

(This was the second Japanese battleship which the United States claims to have sunk or damaged.)

Admiral Hart's account of the attack on the *Kongo* was the first detailed action by the naval flyers to be reported from the far eastern front.

"The *Kongo* was last seen out of control and, we are sure, seriously crippled," the announcement said. (This action already had been announced in Washington.)

MACARTHUR COMMENDS ANOTHER

General MacArthur commended First Lt. Boyd D. Wagner, of the Army Air Corps, who "distinguished himself by his daring attack on a Japanese air detachment at Appari yesterday morning."

"When attacked by five pursuit planes," he said, "he shot 2 planes out of the air and machine-gunned 12 on the ground, leaving 5 burning." Wagner ended his terse report by saying, "My gas was running low, so I returned home."

Lieutenant Wagner's home is at Johnstown, Pa. He was graduated from the University of Pittsburgh. He entered the air force in 1937 as a cadet and was commissioned second lieutenant on June 16 of that year. He was promoted to first lieutenant on October 1, 1938.

Admiral Hart's announcement said Lt. C. A. Keller, piloting a big plane, sighted the *Kongo* or a ship just like her off northwest Luzon and held contact a long time despite frequent antiaircraft fire.

Other planes arrived and Lt. Comdr. J. V. Peterson and other pilots in the attack group pressed home the assault under heavy antiaircraft fire.

The announcement said they made "at least one hit and we think two. The ship was definitely out of control and we are sure she was seriously crippled.

"There was no fire when she was last seen so she may have been able to return to port."

Admiral Hart revealed that the American Navy had lost three large planes since the war started—two during the daylight raid on the Gulf of Davao about an hour after the Pearl Harbor attack.

Air force casualties thus far have been small, but there have been "plenty of attacks on our planes," he said.

Giving further details of aerial fighting, the Army spokesman said the pursuit ship (apparently that of Lieutenant Wagner) that was sent to Aparri, on the northern shore of Luzon Island, found 12 Japanese pursuit ships on the ground and two in the air.

"The American pilot shot down those in the air and machine-gunned those grounded and returned unscathed," the spokesman said.

He declared that Lt. Col. Rogers Helsman, a native of Texas, who had served in the Philippines before, has the situation in Davao Province on Mindanao Island "well in hand."

Lieutenant Colonel Helsman arrived there about 3 weeks ago. Davao, with a large Japanese population, has been considered a sensitive spot, the spokesman added.

"There were numerous rumors of a planned large uprising there," he said. Lieutenant Colonel Helsman, with the forces at his disposal, has 1,500 Japanese males interned. He reports everything quiet and under control.

BULLET HOLES IN PLANES

Admiral Hart's report said most of the damages suffered by American naval planes were minor bullet holes.

He said one plane was hit, in one of its tanks, but the craft managed to return to its base on the other tank.

The admiral said American naval planes shot down one Japanese plane.

"Lieutenant Utter attacked three Japanese fighters and shot down one with his own guns," the report said. "Two others fled. Utter landed on the sea and taxied to the coast, repaired the damage and returned to the base."

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 13, 1941]

CAPTAIN KELLY, HERO IN PHILIPPINES, WAS NATIVE OF FLORIDA

Capt. Colin Purdie Kelly, Jr., who died a hero's death in aerial fighting in the Philippines, was born in Monticello, Fla., July 11, 1915.

The loss of Captain Kelly was announced officially today.

Captain Kelly's father lives in Madison, Fla. The officer was married and had one son.

Captain Kelly entered West Point in 1933 and was graduated 4 years later as lieutenant of the Infantry. He transferred to the Air Corps, went through his primary training in 1938, and his advanced training the next year.

He was transferred to the Thirty-second Bombardment Squadron, General Headquarters Air Force, at March Field, Calif. Later he was assigned to the Forty-second Bombardment Squadron and was sent to Hickam Field March 28, this year.

His widow is Mrs. Marian Wick Kelly.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 13, 1941]

HEROES ALL

It is but partially true, as Dean Swift wrote, that "men who lived and died without a name are the chief heroes in the sacred lists of fame." Within a few minutes after the beginning of the treacherous Japanese attack on Sunday morning, America had heroic defenders in action. Many already have laid down their lives. The essential genius of their country, under Providence, is pledged to the preservation of their immortality in the way that would please them best—by the unwavering defense of the freedom for which, in Lincoln's words, "they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Surely the name of Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., lost in the Battle of Manila, is assured of enduring remembrance. A Florida-born West Point graduate, only 26 years of age, he sacrificed himself in the destruction of the Japanese dreadnaught *Haruna*, sunk north of Luzon on Wednesday. News of his achievement came back to his countrymen at home at a time when they required encouragement. The tidings were received with a gratitude which shall be justified by future events.

So, too, the example of Captain Kelly's comrades is certain to stimulate the effort of their fellows on the production front as well as in the field. First Lt. Boyd D. Wagner, who shot 2 Japanese planes out of the air and machine-gunned 12 on the ground, and Lt. Clarence A. Keller, who defied antiaircraft fire to trail the Japanese *Kongo* until other flyers arrived to put her out of control, have shown the courage which all Americans must cultivate against the challenge of their foes.

To win the ultimate triumph to which they are dedicated by their own conscicus and purposeful choice, every citizen of the United States—yes, even every little child under the Stars and Stripes—will need to be brave. During the difficult months ahead, there will be losses and sorrows hard to bear, but also there will be that stalwart quality of heroism which God gives to a free people.

CAPT. COLIN P. KELLY, JR.—MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a bill which I introduce on behalf of my colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself may be received and appropriately referred. It proposes to authorize the President to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to Captain Kelly because of his distinguished service and his death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill introduced by the Senator from Florida for himself and his colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2128) to authorize the President to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Colin Purdie Kelly, Jr., captain, Air Corps, United States Army; was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CORPORAL ANTONIO TAFOYA

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I may say that probably there is not a Member of the Senate who has not received sad news announcing that some fine young man from his State has made the supreme sacrifice during the war in which the United States has been engaged now for barely more than a week. I have in my mind a young man from my State who heroically has given his life in the service of his country.

Within the last 8 or 10 years the President and the State Department have been doing their utmost in order to bring about what we now call good will amongst the Latin-American nations and the United States. I happen to represent, in part, the one State in the Union where to a greater extent than in any other State descendants of Latin-American stock still reside. I know that the people of Latin America now feel exactly as we in the United States do regarding the occurrences of the past few days. Particularly is this true when they are cognizant of the fact that within the confines of the United States there are American citizens who bear the names of their ancestors who lived in Latin America and who have the same historical background and the same religious background as do the people of Latin America. Amongst the boys who made the supreme sacrifice at Pearl Harbor was one who did not bear an Anglo-Saxon name but a Spanish name, and who died as an American only, Corp. Antonio Tafoya, of Albuquerque, N. Mex.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter G. Riddick, of Arkansas, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, to fill a new position.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

ARTHUR D. HEALEY, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Elisha M. Brewster, retired; and

Charles Edward Wyzanski, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hugh D. McLellan, resigned.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment and promotion in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law;

Chaplain (Colonel) William Richard Arnold, Chief of Chaplains, for temporary appointment as brigadier general, Regular Army, with rank from November 21, 1941; and

Brig. Gen. Henry Joseph Reilly, Reserve, to be brigadier general, Reserve Corps of the Army, under the provisions of law, from December 23, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward C. Ernst to be medical director, United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter J. Gorman to be medical director, United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur S. Carpender to be rear admiral for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House is now considering the amendments which the Senate adopted to the appropriation bill Friday last. It is expected that within a reasonable time the bill will be brought back to the Senate for action. In view of the action which may be taken by the House, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, so that we may dispose of that bill today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., when it was called to order by the President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 547) authorizing the Secretary of War to execute an easement deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 46 to the bill, and concurred therein with amendments; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 48 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 41 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6219) to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 334. A bill for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 904. A bill for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson;

S. 1190. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville;

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Anderson; and

S. 1623. A bill to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6219) to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President I think there should be a quorum for the consideration of the measure which is about to come before the Senate. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Herring	Schwartz
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smathers
Brown	Hughes	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tobey
Chandler	Maloney	Truman
Chavez	Maybank	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	White
Ellender	Norris	Wiley
George	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, and 86; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$388,000,000: *Provided*, That expenditures from appropriations under this heading may hereafter be made until June 30, 1943, without securing the specific approval of the projects by the President"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment after the date "June 30, 1943"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$827,820,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the Secretary of War to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense article procured from funds appropriated for the Military Establishment prior to or since March 11, 1941, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of March 11, 1941 (Public, No. 11). The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under the authority of this paragraph shall not exceed $2,000,000,000, and the limitation of $1,300,000,000 fixed by section 3 (a) (2) of such Act is hereby reduced to $800,000,000 and this latter limitation shall not be applicable to the War Department after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That in the purchase of this field the Navy Department shall take into consideration expenditures by any Federal agency from Federal funds in or for developing such field prior to acquisition thereof by the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 6 of said amendment, after the word "collateral", insert "public works"; and, after the sum "$300,000,000", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to Congress on or before January 10, 1943, a statement by projects of the obligations incurred under this appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "as amended by this Act: *Provided*, That Public Law Numbered 72, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 24, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words 'five hundred and fifty thousand tons' and inserting the words 'one million three hundred and fifty thousand tons' in lieu thereof: *Provided further*, That Public Law Numbered 323, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved November 21, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words 'four hundred' and inserting 'eight hundred' in lieu thereof, and also by deleting the following: ', not to exceed $300,000,000';" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the first and second provisos in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That in a total amount of not exceeding $10,000,000 and within the purposes provided for in this paragraph, the President may authorize the expenditure of sums from this appropriation for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the expending agency as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That the President shall transmit to Congress, on or before January 10, 1944, a report of the expenditures of such sum of $100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Beginning in line 7 of said amendment, after "specified,", strike out the following: "and including 3 cents per mile for travel performed by employees on official business in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, but not within the District of Columbia, $100,000,000: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$75,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than $5,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Office of Price Administration except that in the event of the enactment hereafter into law of legislation for price control this limitation may be exceeded to the extent necessary to give effect to such legislation: *Provided further,*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 11 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000" and strike out "$24,000,000" and insert "$22,000,000"; and in the matter inserted by said amendment strike out all of lines 12 and 13; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$59,115,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,815,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 41, 46, and 48.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER (except as to amendment No. 50),
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 50),
W. P. LAMBERTSON (except as to amendment No. 50),
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the conference report?

Mr. CHANDLER. Reserving the right to object, I wish to discuss amendment No. 41 for a moment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is not before the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall discuss it when it is before the Senate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That amendment is not included in the report. The first step is to agree to the conference report.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no objection to the report if that amendment is not included. When it comes before us I wish to discuss it. It was read by the clerk.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Every opportunity will be given the Senator to discuss the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is mistaken. That amendment is not included in the report.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Kentucky thought he heard amendment No. 41 read.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was recited as one of the amendments in disagreement. It will be in order to discuss it later.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am certain I heard amendment No. 41 referred to by the clerk.

Mr. BARKLEY. That number was read, but the amendment is still in disagreement.

Mr. CHANDLER. When it comes before the Senate I wish to discuss it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee will recall that when we were considering the appropriation bill we went very thoroughly into the duties to be performed by the Board of Investigation and Research under the Transportation Act, and we inserted an amendment restoring the Budget Bureau estimate, which had not been allowed by the House, and included in the amendment a provision requiring the Board to make an investigation and report as to interterritorial rates. I should like to know what has been done in reference to that amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Under the rule, the first thing to be done at this time is to agree to the report. We have not reached the point of considering the House amendments to Senate amendments. Will not the Senator permit the conference report to be adopted? Then, I will ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House.

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment is still in disagreement, is it?

Mr. MCKELLAR. It will be in disagreement unless the Senate concurs in the House amendment to it, and I shall be glad to explain the matter fully when we reach it. I am glad the Senator has asked about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I now ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives as to its action on amendments Nos. 46, 48, and 41.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 15, 1941.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 46, to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein with amendments as follows:

In line 6 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "in addition to";

In lines 9 and 10 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "an investigation of and report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States,"; and

In lines 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That said report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States shall be submitted to Congress not later than June 30, 1942";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 48, to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In line 6 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "in" insert "or near"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 41, to the said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will take up first the matter of investigation of the rate structure, inasmuch as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] has already asked a question in respect to it. On page 26 of the bill, as agreed to by the Senate, occurred the words "including in addition to the objects specified in the appropriation." The House has stricken out the words "in addition to."

Then appeared the words, "for this purpose in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942."

The Senate inserted the following words: "an investigation of and report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States." The House has stricken out those words.

In line 17 on the same page appeared the following proviso:

Provided, That said report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States shall be submitted to Congress not later than June 30, 1942.

Those words were stricken out.

If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] will bear with me for a minute, the Senator will recall the difficulties we had with this matter before the committee. On December 9 last I received the following letter which was addressed to me as chairman of the subcommittee:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1941.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the position of the Board of Investigation and Research in response to questions by the chairman and other members of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on H. R. 6159, the Board states that, should the funds—

The House left in the measure the provision for the funds but struck out the directory language. The letter continues—

presently requested be appropriated, the Board will immediately investigate the interterritorial rate structure of the country. Our investigation will relate to the costs of the services rendered, the effect of rates upon the movement of commerce, and their influence upon the utilization of our transportation system and the national economy. The Board will begin these studies as soon as the requested $246,500 supplemental appropriation recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget is made available.

It should be understood that the additional recommended appropriation of $246,500 will not be sufficient, in view of the other duties required of the Board, for a complete investigation of this entire question within the statutory life of the Board. It is, however, the purpose of the Board to undertake such studies as soon as funds become available and to report to the Congress and the President its progress, findings, and recommendations.

This statement is filed, after consideration by the Board, with the request that it be added to supplement and clarify the record.

Respectfully,

NELSON LEE SMITH.
ROBERT E. WEBB.
C. E. CHILDE.

After I learned what the House had done I called the office of the Board on the telephone and Mr. Childe was the only one I could get. He said that undoubtedly——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. Childe is the Chairman of the Board; is he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; he is one of the members of the Board. Mr. Smith is Chairman. Mr. Childe said he knew that the Board as a board unquestionably would carry out the terms of this letter. Under those circumstances I feel that the Board will do what they have agreed to do, and the motion I should like to make is to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendment numbered 46.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask the Senator a further question. In the face of the letter he has read, even if the Senate had not taken any action, I have no doubt that the Board would have proceeded to make the investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator means if the House had not taken the action it did; does he not?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I mean the Senate had not taken action. But the Senate specifically included among the duties of the Board an investigation of interterritorial rates?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; what the Board said they would agree to do.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. That specific designation of duties assigned to the Board was stricken out in conference?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was stricken out in the House.

Mr. OVERTON. In the House. If we agreed to the amendment of the House, would the Congress then be on record as not desiring such an investigation, and as overriding the express wishes of the Board to make such an investigation, and overriding its express purpose in making such an investigation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think so. Under the circumstances, and especially since I talked to Mr. Childe over the telephone, I am quite sure the Board will make the investigation, whether we attempt to restore the words stricken out or do not do so. I believe the members of the Board are men of honor and uprightness, and that they will carry out their word to the letter. I asked Mr. Childe the direct question, and he assured me they would.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that in the committee I took the position that in view of this letter it would not be necessary specifically to include a designation of duty upon the Board to make this investigation. But I think the majority of the committee disagreed with me, and that provision was inserted in the measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not want the action of the Senate in agreeing to this amendment by the House to be interpreted by the Board as a direction to them to abandon their express purpose to make this investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. From the statement Mr. Childe made to me I am quite sure the Board will not abandon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the Senate amendment authorized and directed the Board to make this investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understand correctly, the House struck out the word "directed."

Mr. McKELLAR. The House struck out the words, "an investigation of and report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States." The president of the Board, Mr. Smith, testified that under the authority already existing in the law there was no doubt in the world in his mind or in the minds of the other members of the Board that they had the right to make the investigation, and would do so. I have read the act, and I am quite sure its language is broad enough, and I am quite sure the Board will make the investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator another question. I have no doubt that the language of the original act creating this Board, in which this provision was carried, which is the Transportation Act of 1940, is broad enough, and as a member of the committee which framed the law I think I may say that it was contemplated that the Board should make an investigation of all interterritorial rates, and other matters that should be looked into and reported upon affecting transportation. In view of the fact that the original act undoubtedly authorizes such an investigation and that the appropriation is carried according to the Budget Bureau's estimate, I cannot understand why the House insisted on striking out that language What was the motive of the House in striking it out? Did the House not want an investigation, or what was the matter with the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in that connection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senate that since the House acted this afternoon I have talked with Representative RAMSPECK, of Georgia, who has been very much interested in the question of the investigation of interterritorial rates; in fact, he is the chairman of a group in the House which has been striving for a long time to try to get something done to remove the discriminations in interterritorial rates. Representative RAMSPECK advised me that upon consultation among different Members of the House they agreed that this Board not only had the right to make the investigations but that it was in the contemplation of the original act which set up the Board that the investigations should be made, and that the language inserted by the Senate was in no way necessary, particularly in view of the fact that the members of the Board had all signed the letter addressed to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], stating that the investigation of the rates would go forward.

So under the circumstances I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Tennessee that there could be no reason or excuse for the Board not making an investigation of intraterritorial rates. On the contrary, in view of the contemplations of the original act under which the Board was created, and under the solemn promise of the Board, as conveyed in the letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Board is certainly under a solemn obligation to go forward with the investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with that interpretation. I have some knowledge of the Board; and I have a very intimate acquaintance with one member of it. I have not the slightest doubt that the Board will go forward with the investigation. But what puzzles me is why the House insisted on striking out all language carrying any reference to the investigation which we all feel will be made. I cannot understand why the House insisted on striking out the language.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer the question because I do not know the answer; but I am quite sure that the Board will do what it has stated in writing it will do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to agree to the amendments of the House to Senate amendment No. 46.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, with reference to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 48, let me explain to the Senate what it means. Under the heading "Federal Works Agency" the Senate made the following amendment:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Sites for and construction of general office buildings, Washington, D. C.: For the lease or purchase of sites and for the construction of general office buildings and other structures thereon, including heating plants, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for the construction of such facilities on Government-owned land in—

The House inserted the words "or near."

or near the District of Columbia, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, $35,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without advertising: *Provided further*, That the Board of Commissioners of the United States Soldiers' Home is hereby authorized to lease to the United States, for a period of 10 years and upon the payment of a rental to be fixed by the Secretary of War, a site or sites upon which may be erected some of the buildings herein authorized: *Provided further*, That all funds received for rental or other use of United States Soldiers' Home property, facilities, or supplies shall be immediately available, to the Board of Commissioners thereof for reexpenditure without regard to fiscal year limitations.

The Government owns some land near the District of Columbia and some land in the District of Columbia, on which the proposed buildings are to be constructed. One of the places is the Soldiers' Home. Another is at Suitland, Md., nearby; and I think there are some other places. It was thought by the Senate committee that the buildings ought to be constructed within the City of Washington, but the House has inserted the words "or near." If the Government owns land near Washington and can utilize it properly in this time of stress, some buildings might be built on it. Therefore I move, Mr. President, that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 48.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Was there a record vote in the House on this amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand there was not.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who proposed this amendment in the Senate committee, seems to be absent.

Mr. McKELLAR. He was present a little while ago. I intended to call the matter to his attention.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know what his position might be. Personally, I very much regret that the House did not have an opportunity to declare itself by way of a record vote on this very important amendment. It has been in controversy for a long time. It is another splendid example of getting around a legislative committee. I think it is bad procedure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 48.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the next amendment in disagreement is the amendment of the Senate No. 41. The House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate. The Senate amendment was as follows:

For a special executive assistant for each Senator at the rate of $4,500 per annum, fiscal year 1942, $216,000, for the period starting January 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1942, such positions are authorized for the period of the emergency only.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall detain the Senate only a few moments.

For nearly a year some of us have been trying to obtain some extra help for Senators who are overburdened with work. Last year some of us made a fight on the floor against the recommendations of a committee, and at that time we were promised that if we would go to the committee thorough and careful consideration would be given to the request.

In June of last year a point of order was sustained on precisely this same matter in the Senate. When the Senate Appropriations Committee met recently it voted overwhelmingly in favor of an amendment which would provide some extra help for each Member of the Senate, so that a Senator who needed a research assistant could have one, and a Senator who needed extra clerks could have them. I point to the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as examples of Senators who need extra help.

When that report came to the floor of the Senate with the approval of the Committee on Appropriations there ensued an active fight on the floor, and a more or less full and free discussion. By a vote of 53 to 30 the Senate adopted the amendment and instructed the conferees on the part of the Senate to represent to the conference committee that it was the view of the Senate that we needed this extra help.

When the conference committee met the House conferees objected to the amendment. How they were permitted to do so I do not know, but in taking the conference report back to the House they took this amendment back as a separate matter in disagreement. Today when the House voted on it it did not have a record vote. It voted by voice vote, and declined to give the Senate the help which it said it needed.

If I am not misinformed, this is the first time in 150 years that one House has sought to impose its will on the other in this respect. If a Senator who needs additional help had the courage to say so, he is among the 53 Senators who voted for the amendment.

The House does not know whether Senators need additional help. The House did not have a record vote on the amendment. It simply disagreed and sent it back.

I am not willing to permit the House to tell me whether I need extra help. I need a research man and have been trying to obtain one. I do not need him nearly so much as do a number of other Senators.

Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate nine Senators

have died, some of them because of overwork. Not only does the action of the House not suit me, it is painful to me, it is obnoxious to me. I do not want the membership of the House telling me that I have not sense enough to know what I need in order to perform my duties.

I intend to move that the amendment be sent back to conference. This is a $10,000,000,000 appropriation bill, but the delay will not be very serious. Already more money is appropriated than the Government has been able to spend. It will be some time before it is all spent or allocated. I want the Senate to say to the House—and if Senators have enough courage they will say it—that we know what we need. I am not willing to have the House tell me that I do not know whether I need extra help in my office.

If House Members ever say to me that they need extra help in order to perform their duties I am not going to say that they do not need it, because I do not claim to know. I do claim that Senators who are doing their work and attending committee meetings know what they need. I am a member of two very important committees, and I do not have time to remain for very long at a time at meetings of either of them. Other Senators are in the same position. They go from one committee to another, devoting only a part of their time to each committee.

They do not know what is going on, and they cannot find out. Yet we provide secretaries, and secretaries to secretaries, and assistants to the secretaries, and assistants to the assistant secretaries, and automobiles and drivers, and assistant drivers, and telephone operators and switchboards for every board, bureau, and commission.

It is time the Senate had sufficient courage and judgment to assert itself, and I am ready to assert myself. I move Mr. President, that the bill be sent back to the conference committee with instructions to insist on amendment No. 41.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to speak upon the motion, and to urge the Members of the Senate to support the motion just made by the junior Senator from Kentucky. Some 2 weeks before the death of the late Senator Adams, I met him one Sunday afternoon coming out of his office in the Senate Office Building. I had observed him working almost every Sunday and holiday, as I have been working. I seldom reach my office later than 7 o'clock in the morning; and all the members of my office staff are still working at this hour, and will be working for perhaps an hour more. I have good health and energy, and I have no objection to working 10, 12, and 14 hours a day; and the members of my office staff are willing to do so. But, Mr. President, we cannot get our work out. Matters vital to the people of California and to the Nation are not attended to.

I am surprised at the House of Representatives, because I know that at least the Representatives from California know how difficult it is for us to find time in which to attend to the matters that come to us. I realize there are some Senators who do not need additional help. Well, they do not have to take it.

When I was talking with the late Senator Adams I commented upon the fact that, like him, I came here from a legal career. I said to Senator Adams that if I had a law practice equal in volume of work to the work I do in my office here, I would have at least twice as many assistants and clerks as I now have, and I would consider myself stupid and disloyal to my clients if I did not do so.

So far as the provision now before us is concerned, it would not be sufficient, even if it became a law, entirely to relieve my difficulties, but at least it would give me one more able, energetic young man who could help in handling the immense volume of details which come into the office of a Senator.

If the prestige and the dignity of the Senate of the United States are worth anything, I think we should say to the House of Representatives that we will be the judges of what clerks and assistants we require. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt the motion made by the junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize how the Senate feels about the action which has been taken by the House in regard to an amendment which pertains alone to the Senate and its official work. I share those feelings, although I have no particular interest in the executive secretary who would be provided for me under the amendment, and do not know whether, if it were adopted, I should avail myself of the opportunity afforded. I would do so if I needed him; and if I did not, I should not.

I desire to comment briefly upon the attitude of the House toward the Senate, not only in this matter, but in another matter of the same type and character. I was a Member of the House for 14 years, and there are Members of this body who were Members of the House of Representatives for a longer period. So far as I recall, in those days the House never in any way questioned the action of the Senate with respect to its clerical assistants; and for 150 years, so far as I know, the Senate has never questioned the action of the House in providing clerical assistants for its Members. I do not believe any Member of either House knows how much clerical assistance the Members of the other body may need.

As my colleague has said, the House did not afford a roll call on the amendment; and, so far as I know, no Member of the House gave any reason why the amendment should be stricken out.

The only thing that bothers me now in connection with the motion of my colleague is the question whether the Senate is justified in holding up this $10,000,000,000 defense bill in order to obtain authorization for employment of another secretary for each Senator. I do not know how long it would take to dispose of the matter, or how long the bill would be held up.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will do so in a moment.

I doubt very much whether the foundations of the Government would collapse if the bill should go over until tomorrow, although I do not want to be in the attitude, and I will not assume the attitude, of asking that the bill be held up in order that each Senator may be authorized to employ another secretary. But it is not the first time the House has acted in this manner respecting matters pertaining purely to the Senate.

I desire to take occasion to say what I never said before about something which pertains to and affects the minority leader [Mr. MCNARY] and myself as majority leader of the Senate. In the whole history of the United States Senate the minority leader has never had an extra clerk because he was minority leader; nor has the majority leader had an extra clerk because he was majority leader. Everyone knows that the work of both the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and myself has been doubled, and probably quadrupled, because of the labor entailed by the positions we hold. There is scarcely a night when, after working all day on the floor of the Senate and in my office, I do not take home with me a bulk of work which requires me to labor until midnight in order to keep myself informed on bills and reports, and to obtain information which I feel I should have in order that I may perform as efficiently as possible the duties of my position.

Two years ago the Senate inserted in the legislative appropriation bill a provision allowing the majority leader and minority leader an extra research clerk at a rate of compensation, as I recall, of, I think, $5,000 a year. That provision was adopted here unanimously. The bill went to the House of Representatives, where the provision was kicked out the window. They would not even allow such a provision for the minority leader and majority leader, to enable them to do their work more efficiently.

In view of that attitude I should like to call attention to what the Congress of the United States does for the House of Representatives. Senators will find in the current legislative appropriation bill appropriations for clerk hire of the Members of the House of Representatives. On page 9 of the act we find special and minority employees listed, and one of the paragraphs reads as follows:

> Office of the majority floor leader—
>
> Of the House—
>
> Legislative clerk, $3,110; clerk, $2,530; two assistant clerks, at $1,800 each.
>
> Then:
>
> For official expenses of the majority leader, * * * $2,000—

For official expenses, he gets $2,000, which he is permitted to expend as he sees fit in the exercise of his functions as majority leader, and for which he is not required to make any accounting.

I do not object to that. I would never have known of it if the majority leader

of the House had not called my attention to it, and stated that he thought it was an outrage that the Senate of the United States and the Congress of the United States did not make some provision for extra assistants for the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate. That $2,000 has been paid to the majority leader of the House by a check of $166.66⅔ every month ever since 1929; and I daresay there are not 10 Members of the Senate who know that the appropriation has been carried in the legislative appropriation bill for the last 12 or 14 years. At the present session Congress has added another clerk for the majority leader and another one for the minority leader in the House; so that now the whole thing adds up as follows:

To the majority leader, $11,240 a year, in addition to the regular clerks and assistants he has under the regular appropriation. The same is done for the minority leader:

Clerk, $3,180—

In addition to his regular assistants—

legislative clerk, $3,060; assistant clerk, $2,100; janitor, $1,560; in all, $9,900.

In addition to that, the majority whip and the minority whip are permitted to appoint two assistants, although the corresponding officials in the Senate are not allowed to do so.

Two years ago, when the Senate inserted an amendment allowing the majority and minority leaders each a research clerk to help them in their work, the House of Representatives took it upon itself to throw the amendment out of the window, and declined to agree to it. I have never mentioned the matter since, and I have never made any effort to have the amendment inserted in any other bill that came to the Senate. The other day the Senate adopted, by unanimous vote, a little resolution providing for an additional assistant each to the minority leader and the majority leader, not payable out of the appropriations, not payable as a similar item is in the House, not payable as the $2,000 is paid, but payable out of the contingent fund of the Senate. In other words, in order to get a little help we had to go to the contingent fund of the Senate, instead of to the House, and ask them to cooperate in a bill to do a little piece of justice to those of us who are charged with some responsibility in guiding the proceedings of the Senate.

I do not know, except in these two instances—the one that 2 years ago affected the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and myself, and this case—that the House has ever attempted to dictate to the Senate as to how much clerk hire they need or ought to have. We certainly have never done that with respect to the House.

What I have said about this matter does not in any way imply any criticism of the House or of the majority and minority leaders for the assistance they have been given. The present condition has been in existence ever since the 71st Congress, in 1929; and this extra compensation—for that is what it really is—has been paid to the present majority leader, to his predecessor, now the Speaker of the House, who was kind enough to refer me to it and tell me about it, for I never had heard of it until he told me; to his predecessor, the former Speaker from Alabama, Mr. Bankhead; to his predecessor, Mr. Byrns, of Tennessee; to his predecessor, Mr. Snell of New York; and it goes all the way back to the days when John Q. Tilson was majority leader of the House of Representatives, as I recall.

I mention that state of affairs merely to show that it seems to me the House of Representatives is going out of its way, every time we send over there an amendment affecting the clerical assistance of Senators, to say that we do not need it, or that it is none of our business to determine for ourselves what we shall undertake to appropriate for the assistance of Members of the Senate.

Still, that leaves me with the question whether we are justified in holding up this appropriation bill in order to get this additional assistance for each Senator. It does not affect me, because the Senate has already provided an assistant for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and an assistant for me under the resolution which was sponsored by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], without my knowledge and without any solicitation on my part. I knew nothing about it. I did not consult him about it. I never asked him for it; but the Senate did adopt a resolution providing this extra assistance for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and me in the capacity which we occupy in the Senate. So I am not interested in the matter one way or the other. I do not care whether Senators get $4,500 additional clerk-hire, so far as I am personally concerned. I have every reason to believe that Senators need it. I have confidence that if any Senator does not need it, he will not use it; but I feel that it is an outrage—and I say that not in any spirit of criticism, or any desire to create friction between the two Houses, but I say it because I think it is an outrage—for the House of Representatives to undertake to dictate to the Senate what we shall have in the way of clerk hire.

That is all I want to say. Every Senator here will exercise his own judgment in the matter. But I do not feel that this bill should be delayed on account of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. My colleague has covered the matter so thoroughly that there really is not any question that I want to ask him now, except I want him to make it clear that in addition to all this help which the majority and minority leaders of the House have, which I do not question the need for, the majority leader of the House gets that $2,000, and he does not have to account for it at all to anybody.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. I want it understood, however, that I do not in any way question the propriety of the expenditure. I think they are entitled to it. I think the extra expenses incurred by the majority leader of the House will more than absorb $2,000; but, in view of the generosity of the Members of the House with themselves, it is difficult for me to understand why they are so parsimonious and so niggardly when it comes to senatorial assistance.

Mr. CHANDLER. We are asking for this assistance merely during the period of the emergency, and they tell us that we cannot even have it in the emergency.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, let me ask the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] whether he has figured out what relation in percentage terms this $260,000 bears to the nine-billion-dollar-plus total involved. It is somewhere around one forty-five thousandth part. What is it in terms of percentage, if the Senator knows?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no idea; but I will tell the Senator another way in which he can figure it out. My State has 9 Representatives. The average is 3 or 4 clerks to each district. If the average is 3 clerks, that is a total of 27. If the average is 4 clerks, the total is 36. If the average is 5 clerks, the total is 45. Each one of us in the Senate has the whole State to look after. In the case of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], whose colleague [Mr. WAGNER] has been sick, I do not know how many Representatives his State has, or how many clerks they have, but I know that he is trying with his office staff to do the work of all those people.

If we do not stick up for ourselves and assert ourselves now, I shall feel sorry for us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I find myself in a rather peculiar position in this matter. I voted against the amendment in question when it was before the Senate the other day, but the Senate overruled us by a majority of 23; so when we went to conference, and the House conferees asked us to leave out this amendment, we declined to do so. We were very strenuous about the matter, and they had to take it back to the House.

Frankly, I want to say that I endorse all the statements of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. We have never interfered with the House in regard to the number of clerks they should have, or the compensation that should be paid them; and it seems to me they ought not to have interfered with us at this time. I want to say, further, that the action of the House in striking out this Senate amendment has rather converted me to the idea that I made a mistake in not voting for the amendment when it was before the Senate.

Be that as it may, however, I think we should make a very great mistake now if we should undertake to hold up this bill, even for a day, because of an amendment of this kind. Two or three other bills will come before us to which such an amendment can be offered. Deficiency bills will be here regularly from time to time, and we can put such an amendment on one of those bills and stand on the amendment until the House

agrees to it. I do not think we ought to hold up this bill on this account.

I am appealing to Senators. Each Senator understands the situation as well as I do. We are engaged in a very great war, and I doubt the wisdom of holding up this bill at all because of an amendment of this kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am impressed by that suggestion; and, as a matter of fact, I said a while ago, in my brief remarks, that I doubted the wisdom of our holding up this bill because of this item. How soon will another appropriation bill come along to which such an amendment can be attached?

Mr. McKELLAR. Judging from what I have heard, such a bill will be here late in January; and I say to the Senate that I will cooperate in every way I can to see that the wish of the Senate in regard to its own employees shall be carried out.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment I shall be delighted to yield.

I do not feel that I need such an assistant in my office. However, each Senator may pass on that question for himself. I know that such Senators as the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], the Senators from California [Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BURTON], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. O'DANIEL], and Senators from the other large States, are entitled to more help than they have. Those are enormous States. Probably Massachusetts should be included in the list. But we all know how difficult it is to make a rule for one group of States and not for another group of States. I think whatever the Senate agrees to in regard to its own employees should not be objected to by the House. The Senate never has undertaken, so far as I can recall, in the 25 years I have been here, to interfere with the House in regard to its administrative personnel; and therefore I do not think the House ought to interfere with the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised first to yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the House is not now in session. Will not the bill have to go over until tomorrow, anyway? The House has already adjourned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; if we agree to the House amendment, that will end the consideration of the bill, and it can be signed and go to the President this evening; but what strikes me with a great deal of force is that we ought not to hold up a $10,000,000,000 bill for a day or a night because of a proposal of this kind, which we can just as well or better put on another bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question is not on that particular point. Mr. Coolidge, when President, among other wise things he said from time to time, once said that a President ought not to have to do anything that he could get somebody to do for him. In this emergency no Senator ought to be compelled to write letters about horse books and cow books if he can get somebody to write them for him. He ought to be over here, attending the meetings of committees, knowing what he is voting on, and helping in the war effort.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Tennessee that he is no more anxious than am I to provide for the defense of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. CHANDLER. We are not going to cause any trouble by delaying this bill until tomorrow. There will be no effort to get the money out of the banks tonight, because they are closed, and they will be closed until tomorrow, and this one little item can be agreed to then. If Senators miss this opportunity to say that they have been mistreated and insulted and told that they did not have enough sense to know how to run their offices, or how to ask for enough help to run them, I fear that they may permanently lose the opportunity.

I believe what the Senator from Tennessee said about consideration of the subject in the future, but I was promised that last year—not by the Senator from Tennessee—and I got scant comfort, and almost no consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that I think we ought to put a similar amendment on a bill of less importance than this, and insist upon it.

Mr. CHANDLER. We have already put it on this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. But at the very beginning of the war I believe it would be unwise to insist upon our action. I believe it would be good diplomacy and statesmanship to agree with the House at this time, and act on the subject later. Of course that is a matter for Senators to determine for themselves.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the able Senator from Tennessee if he does not think it is possible that the rather unhappy wording of this provision may have had some influence on the decision of the House. As worded in the bill, it is "for a special executive assistant for each Senator." On the theory which the majority leader has so well set forth, I do not think the House ought to determine what we shall or shall not do in the way of providing additional clerk-hire for ourselves.

Mr. McKELLAR. I entirely agree with the Senator about the matter.

Mr. PEPPER. But I was going to say, if I may, that, since the motion of the Senator from Kentucky contemplates the return of the bill to conference, if it would be within the scope of the authority of the conferees to rewrite the provision so as to provide what it actually means legally, merely additional clerk-hire for each Senator, and strike out the perhaps objectionable words "special executive assistant," I believe the amendment would have a more favorable reception.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, there are no conferees at present. Stating the matter as it appears to me, suppose we should send the bill back to the House, and the House should refuse to alter its decision, we should be in a very unhappy situation. I feel just as other Senators do about the injustice done to us. Certainly an injustice has been done to this body. There is not any doubt about that. I feel exactly as other Senators do about it, but in view of the very great importance of the appropriation bill at this time, should we not reserve the assertion of our rights until later? I think it can be done, and I should be very happy to do it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that I was unable to be present when this question was voted upon Friday, and I desire to have it recorded that if I had been present I would have voted against providing the extra clerk. I may say further that I hope for the further opportunity of voting against sending the bill back to conference on the issue of an extra clerk. I think the conference report should be approved, and should be approved tonight.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to appeal to the Senator from Kentucky, for whom I have a genuine and great affection. I would rather join him in his effort, when we have some other measure before us, when we could thresh the whole matter out with the House and have it settled for all time. I will join him in such a move to the extent of my ability, and I appeal to him to go along with us.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have made my motion merely because I want a chance to right a wrong, not because it means anything to me personally. If I thought it would hurt the country one iota, I would not insist.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very sure of that.

Mr. CHANDLER. We have been here all day waiting for this conference report. It can go back, and the Senate can tell the House that it is entitled to this small consideration. If the Senator from Ohio does not want the extra clerk, he does not have to take him, and I do not want to urge it on him.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to submit a suggestion for what it may be worth, in the hope that it may prove to be a solution.

It is demanded that we take some action to right a wrong which the House perpetrated upon us. We have already gone on record in favor of the additional clerical help provided in the amendment under discussion, and we did so by a very pronounced vote. Why could we not now adopt a resolution authorizing the appointment of these clerical assistants, drawing from the contingent fund the money with which to compensate them until the next legislative appropriation bill comes before the Senate? We can take that action, we can do it tonight, and we can prove to the House that we are able to run our own offices, and that we insist upon having that autonomous right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How much money is in the contingent fund? In order to replenish the contingent fund, we need the action of the House.

Mr. MEAD. This would not take effect until the first of the year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that, and this appropriation is not intended to replenish the contingent fund of the Senate, but if we deplete the contingent fund of the Senate, we will need the action of the House to replenish it, just as we require the consent of the House to take the original action.

Mr. HILL. I think there is a difference, however. Under the rules of the House, as I understand them, the language which we put into the bill on Friday is considered to be legislation. Therefore, since it is legislation, the House conferees have no authority, under a rule of the House, to accept the amendment. This is a new rule of the House, put into the rules, as I recall, some 5 or 6 years ago. Under the rule of the House, any Member of the House, even if the House conferees attempted to agree to the language we inserted on Friday, would have the right to make a point of order against the agreement, and insist on a separate vote by the House on the amendment.

If we follow the procedure suggested by the Senator from New York, to wit, to provide for an executive assistant for each Senator out of the contingent fund of the Senate, it is true, as the Senator from Missouri well stated, that the contingent fund would have to be replenished by an appropriation which would have to be concurred in by the House of Representatives. But an appropriation carrying money into the contingent fund of the Senate would not and could not, in my opinion, be construed as legislation on an appropriation bill, and would not come under the rule which requires a separate vote in the House; and therefore appropriations for the contingent fund of the Senate could be agreed to in conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Notwithstanding the opinion expressed by the Senator from New York, I very seriously doubt the wisdom of beginning to appropriate money for clerk hire out of the contingent fund. Of course, it would require an appropriation in the legislative appropriation bill, or in some deficiency bill, to replenish the contingent fund out of which the salaries would be paid. We have on one or two occasions provided temporary assistance in the way of a $1,500 clerk payable for a few months out of the contingent fund, but I do not think it is good legislation to begin to provide for a $4,500 executive assistant for each Senator out of the Senate contingent fund.

If Senators are entitled to it, it should be provided as a matter of law. For myself I am not willing to obtain this help for myself, nor for any other Senator, by a subterfuge—which the proposed action would be—by providing that we will pay for it out of the contingent fund, knowing that as soon as we do that, we will have to replenish the contingent fund by $246,000, if that be the amount.

My idea is—and I wish to direct myself to my colleague—that it would be most unfortunate for the country to be apprised of the fact, by tomorrow morning's newspapers, that the United States Senate held up a $10,000,000,000 defense appropriation in order to provide an extra clerk for each Senator. That is what I think about it. I do not believe the Senate wants to or that it ought to put itself in that position, and I am not going to vote to put it in that position.

The legislative appropriation bill will be before the Senate in a few weeks. It will be before the Senate in the early part of January. We can put into the legislative appropriation bill a provision which will be operative as a matter of law, and there will be no hurry about considering the measure when it gets to the House or when it gets into conference, and the Senate will have the right and the Senate conferees will have the right if the Senate sees fit to put the provision in question in that bill, to hold up an agreement on that bill until the House agrees to that provision; or we can put some other provision into the measure that will make it possible to throw the entire matter of clerical assistants into conference and see if we can work the matter out in a way that will be just to both Houses. Therefore, I do not think we should hold up this bill now on this particular account. I doubt the wisdom, in fact, I am convinced of the utter unwisdom of undertaking to accomplish the objective in a hurry, by subterfuge, by taking the money out of the contingent fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky as the majority leader, will go along with the plan he has outlined, there is no doubt in the world that the Senate can have its way about its own clerk hire. As one who voted against the proposal in the beginning, I will agree to cooperate with our leader and cooperate with all those who want to carry this matter through. I believe that is the best way to do it, and I ask the Senate to do it in that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that, of course, I will go along with that plan. I voted for the amendment now under discussion, and I will vote for it again when it comes up again, and I say that if the House needs additional clerical hire, I shall vote for what the House thinks it needs.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it has always been the practice for each House to decide what its own needs are.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So I believe that is the best solution of the matter.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I was one of those who voted for the amendment, but I thoroughly agree with the statement made by the majority leader and with the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee, who is chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate. I do not think the Senate can afford to hold up this appropriation bill, which is so vitally important to our national defense, in order to take the position that it is determined to have extra clerical help. I believe we need extra clerical help. I voted for the amendment, and will vote for it again when it comes up, but I do not propose to vote to send this bill back to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I supported this amendment on the floor, and, as one of the conferees representing the Senate, I stood out for it as stoutly as it was possible to do in the conference. However, I think it would be most unfortunate if we were to delay the enactment of this tremendous bill merely to thresh out again the question of this additional clerical hire.

I realize how deeply Senators feel about the matter. I am as much outraged by the action of the House as is any other Member of the Senate. The amendment to which the Senator from Kentucky refers, which provided for additional assistance for the majority and minority leaders, was offered by the Senator from Georgia in the Committee on Appropriations. I was shocked and outraged when the House of Representatives rejected that amendment.

Mr. President, if this sort of sniping between the two bodies is to be carried on, I think the Senate should appoint a committee to investigate the entire question of all the employees of both legislative bodies. I have not checked the matter over carefully, but in my opinion it will be found that the committees of the House of Representatives are staffed much more heavily than are the committees of the Senate, and that the House has a greater number of committees than the Senate has. If the two branches of Congress are to pass judgment on each other, let us count the mail and telegrams, visitors, and all that goes to make work in an office, and see where the additions are needed.

But, Mr. President, I think we should wait until there is another deficiency bill before us, and that this amendment, in a little different shape, providing merely for clerical assistance under the terms of the act which was passed this year,

should be placed in that bill. We should make the issue in that manner, rather than sending this bill back to conference on account of the difference of opinion between the two Houses of Congress in an almost personal matter.

So far as I am concerned, I shall vote to recede from this amendment at this time, because I think it would be a very unfortunate thing for the country today, with all the momentous issues before us, to have the Senate reject a conference report in order that we might endeavor to obtain additional clerical help. We need additional clerical help. There is no question about that. I need additional help in my office. I do not see how Senators representing States with greater populations than that of Georgia can possibly give attention to the matters coming into their offices. The work of Senators is increasing daily. People are concerned about their sons, for example, who are in Hawaii. For the past several days I have no doubt that every Senator has had to put one or two girls on almost full-time work trying to find out about the sons of constituents who are on the far-flung battle front of this country today. But I think it would be very unfortunate to fight out this issue in connection with the bill before us when every other question has been closed. I hope that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and other Senators who have led this fight will carefully consider the propriety of letting this amendment drop at this time, and bringing it up on some other bill which is not so much in the Nation's eye, and is not so inextricably interwoven with the great question of national defense.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. When this matter was before the Senate the other day and was voted upon I missed the opportunity to vote on it. That was a matter of regret to me, because I have always been in favor of the substance of this proposal. If I had been here when the vote was had I should have been among those registered in favor of the proposal. Like the Senator from Kentucky, I cherish my 14 years of service in the other body. The memories of that service are very dear to me. But like him I resent keenly the attitude of the other body toward the action of the Senate on this item. I think it is a discourtesy for which there can be no justification. But, Mr. President, it is not the only discourtesy to which the Senate has been subjected at the hands of the other body in late days. Only a short time ago we were invited over there to a joint session of the two Houses, and there were not enough seats provided for Senators. It comes within my personal knowledge that four Senators were obliged to crowd themselves into two seats. While that treatment was accorded to Senators, I venture the assertion that there were anywhere from 200 to 400 persons on the floor who were not entitled to the privilege of the floor under the rules of the House.

Mr. President, whenever an appropriate time comes for me to vote for this proposal or its substance I stand ready to do so; but I cannot justify sending this bill back to conference on this item at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was one of the Senators who supported this amendment. Like the Senator from Maine and other Senators, I feel that the action of the House was unwarranted, practically unprecedented, and that it establishes a very bad precedent. If the House may pass judgment upon the need for clerical assistants in Senators' offices, it may pass judgment upon whether the Senate shall have any clerical assistants, on the number of employees in the Secretary's office, and on all the other functions and agencies of this body.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should serve notice on the House in no uncertain terms that it does not intend to permit the House of Representatives to dictate its policy in regard to services and payment of its employees. Nevertheless, I wish to urge upon the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] that he accept the assurance of the majority leader and of the able Senator from Tennessee that this issue will be raised at the earliest opportunity, and that he not place the Senate in the position of attempting to secure acquiescence in this manner on this item in relation to this particular bill. Personally I believe that the precedent proposed is important enough to justify such action; but the country certainly would not interpret it in that way. I believe that the issue of securing adequate and efficient staffs for Members of the Senate in order that they may more efficiently discharge their responsibility had better be raised in connection with some other measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think every Member of the Senate must agree with the position taken by the majority leader. The action taken by the House of Representatives in this matter is not only a violation of the long practice of comity between the Houses, but is an intolerable affront to the Senate on the part of the House, the more so because, apparently, the House deliberately took advantage of the fact that it knew that this was an extremely important bill and that the Senate would not want to hold up the bill on one single item, important as it might be to the efficiency of the Senate. The House took advantage of that fact by not even having a record vote. It simply flouted the Senate without showing any consideration whatever for the action of the Senate.

It seems to me that it is a question on which the Senate should take action. I am not willing to take the action by subterfuge and indirection, as I believe the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to take the money out of the contingent fund of the Senate would be. I think it is a matter that must be tried out between the two Houses.

My recollection goes back to the construction of the first office building, which was erected at the instance of the House of Representatives long before the Senate had an office building. Afterward, at the instance of the Senate and without any dispute in the House as to the necessity, the Senate Office Building was constructed. Following that, when the House felt that it needed additional office space, the Senate unhesitatingly and ungrudgingly acquiesced.

I think the action of the other body is outrageous. It follows the innovation of a year or so ago, referred to by the Senator from Kentucky, in the matter of clerical help for the majority and minority leaders.

I also agree with the Senator from Kentucky that at this time we cannot afford to be placed in the eyes of the country and of the world, in the position of holding up an appropriation bill of this magnitude in a dispute as to clerical help, or any kind of help, for either branch of the Congress.

As a substitute for the suggestion of the Senator from New York to take the money out of the contingent fund, I suggest a way in which we can obtain a fair and free conference with the House instead of having the House flout us in the matter of the whole subject of clerical assistance in the two Houses. When the legislative appropriation bill comes before us we can strike out all the appropriation for clerical assistance in the House and let the whole question of clerical assistance in the two Houses go to conference. In that case we could have a fair conference without being subject to a point of order in the House.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend from Tennessee that I realize that every delay presents an opportunity for disaster. In my service in the Senate I have never delayed my Government. I have never willfully or by accident prevented it from doing all it could to get itself in a position to meet any enemy on equal terms.

I think the discussion has been helpful. I raised the question so that we might have a discussion. As I understand, my colleague the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and other members of the Appropriations Committee will very speedily report to the Senate a bill on which the whole issue can be thrashed out. We can face the issue directly if we will. I am prepared to face it directly and to give some relief to Senators who need additional help so badly. It is asked only during the period of the emergency. In order not to delay final action on the bill, although I think the prospects of delay are exaggerated, I shall withdraw my motion. In this discussion Senators have been placed on record as being opposed to any delay on this bill. That

suits me. That is exactly where I stand. I am not in favor of any delay. I am in favor of doing things as quickly as possible in the interest of the country.

With the understanding which has been stated, let me say to my friend from Tennessee that I withdraw my motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 41.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am one of the Senators who voted against the amendment when it came up yesterday or the day before. I thought it was a very bad amendment and should be rejected. I am still of the same opinion. I am still opposed to it; but when the Senate agreed to it I acquiesced with as much grace as possible.

I do not care to repeat what I said the other day, or apologize for it, either. I expect to be opposed to such a proposal whenever it comes up, in any form in which it may come up.

However, I very much regret what some Senators have said in regard to the action of the House. I regret it not because it has any effect on me one way or the other personally. I am afraid that because of some of the things which have been said here today a feeling will grow up between the two Houses which will come home to trouble them.

I believe that the action of the Senate or of the House in fixing the number or the salaries of its own clerical help ought to have great weight with the other House; and under ordinary circumstances it ought to be agreed to by the other House. Yet, Mr. President, I should not go so far as to say that we must agree to any such amendment which the House puts in for its clerical help, or that the House must agree when we take similar action. If such an attitude were correct, we should never be able to express our own judgment. Naturally we give due weight to the action of the other House, such weight as we think it should receive. I feel that any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House would not be exceeding his constitutionally sworn duty if he should oppose it. My own opinion is that in this case the House conferees and other Members of the House felt the same way about it, and considered that the Senate had gone beyond all reason in providing for a new deputy Senator. If such an assistant would help a Senator and relieve him of work, then we should provide that in the absence of the Senator the deputy Senator would have the right to perform his duties; and the Senator could sit in his office and dictate letters while the deputy Senator came to the floor of the Senate, or vice versa.

I say to the Members of the Senate that regardless how many assistant clerks we may have or how able they may be, Senators will never in the world relieve themselves of the responsibility which must and will come to them.

Senators have spoken of Members of the Senate who have killed themselves by overwork, and I have no doubt that that has happened, and that it will happen in the future; but I do not think we can remedy that situation by providing additional clerks, for Senators who have been working on Sundays will continue to work on Sundays, even if they have 100 clerks, even if they have so many clerks that they cannot get into their own offices. Such overwork always will be done by a conscientious man, who will work almost without limit.

Is it the idea, Mr. President, for us to say to the House that when we provide for the salary of a clerical assistant the Members of the House have only one thing to do: They must vote for it? The Members of the House will not stand for that, and it will not leave a very good feeling with the House. If they feel, as probably they have felt and do feel, that we have gone beyond reason, even if we do not believe so, we must concede that they have a right to entertain such a belief if they wish to do so.

I am glad the Senator has withdrawn his motion, and that the matter may at least be deferred until some future time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I voted for the amendment now under discussion. Some years ago I attempted to initiate a measure to provide for an independent economic council, under sole direction of the two Houses of the Congress, to assist Members of Congress in economic research. I consulted Senators on both sides of the Chamber, and they thought the idea was good. The final decision arrived at was that we could get whatever we needed in the way of information through research from the National Economic Council. However, that was entirely under the domination of the executive branch of the Government.

I have always felt that the research done for Members of Congress should be of an independent character, entirely under the control of Congress, and responsible to it.

So long as there is executive opposition to such a body, it seems to me that an executive assistant, who is competent as an economic research assistant, can be used by Members of Congress to relieve them of the necessity of doing so much reading at night. There is no time during the day to read and to make research; it must be done at night.

I have seen Senators work until they dropped. Senator Copeland of New York worked himself to death, as did Senator Fletcher, of Florida, and Senator Logan, of Kentucky, and recently Senator Adams, of Colorado, passed away as a result of overwork.

I think something should be done about providing more assistance to enable Members of the Senate to do independent economic research. However, I agree that such provision should be made in a legislative bill; and it seems to me that the leaders of the two sides of the Senate Chamber should make some arrangement to have some assistance provided for this kind of work. A Senator who does not care to avail himself of it and who does not care to have research done would not have to use the assistant if he did not choose to do so. I understand there are Senators who do not care to have such assistants.

I think the point is well taken that the amendment should not be insisted upon at this time, but that proper provision should be made in a legislative way and in a regular way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to a memorandum I have just received. Mr. Webb and Mr. Smith called personally to say they still stand by the Board's letter and testimony, and that the investigation will be made.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wished to put the information in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think there is any question that such an investigation will be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 41.

The motion was agreed to.

REENACTMENT OF OVERMAN AND TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACTS

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably the bill (S. 2129) to expedite the war effort, and I submit Report No. 911 thereon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Indiana whether he hopes to take up tomorrow the bill he has just reported from the Committee on the Judiciary; the one which reenacts or revives the provisions of the Overman Act in force during the last World War, and of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The committee will be in position to take it up tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope that that may be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I too hope that that may be done.

Mr. McNARY. Is the report from the committee now being filed?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is. It will be printed and will be on Senators' desks in the morning.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be placed on the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to affix his signature to bills or other measures ready for signature during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 15, 1941

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Nan Wood Honeyman, of Portland, Oreg., to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 29, with headquarters at

Portland, Oreg., to succeed Judge Fred Fisk, whose term of office will expire on April 30, 1942.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Henry Harley Arnold, United States Army.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Horace Hayes Fuller (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Harry Keneth Rutherford (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Walter Crawford (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, Jr., Infantry.

Col. Frederick Gilbreath, Cavalry.

Col. Walter Melville Robertson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Medical Corps.

Col. John Mather, Ordnance Department.

Lt. Col. William Samuel Rumbough, Signal Corps.

Col. Carl Adolph Baehr, Field Artillery.

Lt. Col. Edward Hale Brooks, Field Artillery.

Col. Charles Clarence Curtis, Coast Artillery Corps (National Guard of the United States).

Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Infantry (Reserve).

Chaplain (Col.) William Richard Arnold, chief of chaplains.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier general, Reserve

Brig. Gen. Henry Joseph Reilly, Reserve, from December 23, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Franklin A. Hart to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. William S. Fellers to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

Maj. Ralph D. Leach to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

To be majors

Capt. Frank G. Dailey to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

Capt. Frank H. Wirsig to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

To be captains

First Lt. Michael Sampas to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940.

First Lt. William G. Robb to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 27th day of November 1940.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

John H. Masters
Leonard M. Mason
Walter N. Flournoy
Kenneth A. King
Arthur B. Barrows

First Lt. Marion M. Magruder to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1941.

First Lt. Wood B. Kyle to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1941.

First Lt. Russell E. Honsowetz to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

First Lt. Russell B. Warye to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1941.

To be second lieutenants

Carl M. Johnson, a citizen of Nevada, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1941.

George D. Webster, a citizen of North Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 15, 1941:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be medical directors

Edward C. Ernst.
Peter J. Gorman.

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel

Edwin Randolph Page.

To be lieutenant colonels

James Keller De Armond.
Walter Llewellyn Wheeler.
Norme D. Frost.
Linus Dodge Frederick.

To be majors

George Lawrence Holcomb.
William Ray Clingerman, Jr.
Walter Eckman.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be rear admiral

Arthur S. Carpender.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Hal P. Johnson, Hatfield.

FLORIDA

James A. Williams, Alachua.
Alonzo W. Silas, Clewiston.
Mae B. Wells, Lawtey.
Thomas J. West, Riviera.

GEORGIA

Judson Leland Cooper, Pelham.

LOUISIANA

Paul W. Arnolie, Port Sulphur.

MINNESOTA

Leonard N. Riley, Ellsworth.
Della C. Underdahl, Frost.
Eva A. Weed, Garvin.
John C. Myers, Green Isle.
Mary A. Culhane, Rushford.
John M. Lambert, Two Harbors.
Alphonse J. Koelzer, Waterville.

MONTANA

Bertha V. Powers, Neihart.

NEW YORK

John H. Otten, Blauvelt.
William L. Bergner, Callicoon.
Gus Di Savino, Chadwicks.
Cornelius J. O'Connell, Chestertown.
Walter A. Soule, Minoa.
Bernard E. Ryan, Mohawk.

PUERTO RICO

Angel Ramirez, Adjuntas.

RHODE ISLAND

John J. O'Connor, Ashton.

WISCONSIN

Lila Robie Baker, Danbury.
Roberta B. Kessler, South Wayne.
Arthur B. Roemer, Tigerton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in Thy tabernacle we find Thy mercy seat. We thank Thee that Thou hast made sacrifice a divine and an everlasting virtue, exalting and glorifying it. We would not seek far and wide for a better place, nor for more honorable labor. We pray for that spirit that shall make us willing to toil in a common task; give us eyes to see and hearts to love truth and service at the altar of our country, a most sacred privilege. Release all our powers to believe that the foundation of God standeth sure and that no weapon forged against Him can prosper; that nation that sows to the wind shall reap to the whirlwind. Lead us beside still waters that we may be quiet and listen.

Grant that yonder immortal document may clothe the shrine at the altar of our hearts. We do homage to it and trust that it may be engraved in the very depths of the soul of our Nation. We thank Thee for the glorious company of patriots, for the apostles of freedom, and the army of martyrs for liberty and humanity; we hallow it today as we stand in awe in its presence. Oh, America, keep thy hands clean and God helping us, we shall light a candle that shall make the teachings of our Master coextensive with man throughout this sad world. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 12, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 12, 1941, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4993. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Sarasota Pass and across Longboat Pass, county of Manatee, State of Florida; and

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for control of photographing, possession of cameras, etc., in areas of the Canal Zone.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; and

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of each of the reports submitted to the House

during the current Congress by the Select Committee to Investigate National Defense Migration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 57. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on the bill H. R. 5479.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson; and

S. 1190. An act for the relief of Julia Neville.

RECEIPT OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6159

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read:

DECEMBER 15, 1941.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on December 12, the Clerk of the House received, on Saturday, December 13, from the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943," a conference report on the said bill, which was printed as House Report No. 1501 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Yours very truly,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

WAKE ISLAND

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, let us ask the blessings of Almighty God for the small force of Americans on Wake Island resisting the armed forces of the Japanese Empire. May Americans everywhere offer prayers of thanksgiving and hope, and voice the pride of a great Nation for that small group of Americans fighting valiantly against overwhelming odds, with no surrender in their hearts, but dreams of a far-off land—outnumbered and outgunned tremendously by the air force, Army, and Navy of Japan, but fighting on heroically, repelling attack after attack. This Republic may endure thousands of years, but American school children a thousand years from now will recall Wake Island and its little force of defenders and say, "They were brave men."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter that I wrote to Mr. Leon Henderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper account taken from the Washington Post of last Saturday containing the death notice of John Magee, of the Royal Canadian Air Force, and also to include a beautiful poem entitled "High Flight."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide that the air-raid warnings throughout the country will be the same.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is on the floor, if he is going to hold hearings and report out a bill which will extend the life of the national life insurance in order that the men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps may take out insurance. Only 50 percent have thus far applied for insurance. If this bill is not passed tomorrow they cannot do so because the time for doing so expires on tomorrow. Will the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means tell me if he plans to report out the bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] or my bill for that purpose? I believe the bills are very much alike.

COLIN KELLY, JR.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a brave soldier died gloriously last week, and all of America is proud of his brave, heroic deed. I speak of Colin Kelly, Jr., intrepid flyer, who hurled his plane straight at the blazing guns of a Japanese warship and sent his bombs crashing into the vitals of the huge craft. Colin Kelly is dead, but the story of his magnificent sacrifice will live as long as this Nation. As long as there are annals of free men, those annals will tell how Colin Kelly died for America, while sinking single-handed a great battleship—29,000 tons of the destructive might of the Japanese Navy.

Captain Kelly was born at Monticello, in Jefferson County, in the Third District of Florida, 26 years ago. He was reared in the neighboring town of Madison. His grandfather, the Honorable Dannitt H. Mays, now deceased, served with honor and distinction in the Congress of the United States.

With his people, and his friends back in Florida, with all the people of this Nation, I bow in sorrow at his passing, but I am humbly grateful for the undying courage and the magnificent patriotism with which he lived.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON] may be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of an infected foot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article published in the Grange National Monthly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered on the Bill of Rights today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and include therein a part of a letter on the subject of farm equipment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

REENLISTMENT OF DISHONORABLY DISCHARGED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to a situation that, in my judgment, should be rectified by appropriate legislation. Under existing law, any member of the Army or Navy who has been dishonorably discharged cannot be accepted for reenlistment. This holds true regardless of whether he was guilty of the crime of murder or of some simple indiscretion or some act of misconduct that might be no more than a misdemeanor under civil law. Many of these men have rehabilitated themselves and have become patriotic, outstanding American citizens. Many of them are highly skilled at mechanical and technical pursuits. They earnestly desire to serve their country in the great fight which lies ahead for preserving the American way of life.

A case directly in point was presented to me last Saturday. It involved a 'teenage soldier who was discharged dishonorably for misconduct that may have sprung from the mere exuberance of youth. Despite the fact that he has given ample proof of his integrity and stability of character by years of endeavor in private pursuits, and he has developed into a stalwart American, he is now balked in his laudable ambition to bear arms in defense of his country by the prohibition in question. This case can be multiplied by hundreds—possibly by thousands.

I commend this subject to the study of the Commiteee on Military Affairs, to see if we cannot in some manner make it possible for these fine Americans, who have fully atoned for their misdeeds, to be given absolution and allowed to fulfill their laudable ambitions and their aspirations to serve their country along with their fellow citizens.

It seems to me this is a subject that is of vital import at the present time. I hope that legislation to remedy the situation may be framed and reported to the House at an early date.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Governor of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, and in one extension to include an editorial from a newspaper on this war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CHICAGO MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from one of my friends, Mr. Norman Draper, who is connected with the American Meat Institute, which demonstrates how the Chicago meat industry goes to work when an emergency arises.

At 9:30 a. m. on December 10 Gen. J. E. Barzinski, commanding general of the Quartermaster Depot at Chicago, received a requisition from the Office of the Quartermaster General in Washington, D. C., for 1,000,000 pounds of frozen, boneless beef. At 5 p. m. that afternoon the meat had been purchased and packed, and was rolling on its way to the San Francisco Quartermaster Depot for export shipment to the Far East.

Three Chicago packing houses cooperated with the depot in getting out this record shipment. As a radio commentator in Chicago said, this is the kind of industrial cooperation that will help win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the expiration of other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the legislative business on tomorrow, and following any other special orders, I may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram and also a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Military Affairs may sit during sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a tribute to George D. Riley, one of the editorial writers of the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a tribute to Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter written by myself to the Honorable William Knudsen and one to the Honorable Jesse Jones, and the answers thereto, together with some telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a resolution and also a speech by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a column entitled "The Crimson Rambler," written by Walter H. Crimm, and appearing in the Salem Republican Leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief letter to the board of directors of the American Coalition and a list of the patriotic societies belonging to the Coalition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a poem, High Flight, by the late pilot-officer, John Magee, of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which I received this morning from the Croatian Catholic Union, showing their united body as being behind the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THIRD REPORT, LEASE-LEND ACT (S. DOC. NO. 149)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am transmitting herewith to the Congress the third report of the aid which our Government has rendered under the Lend-Lease Act to the nations opposing the Axis.

We are now engaged in a total war against a group of Axis Powers led by Nazi Germany and bent on world domination. Their strategy is world-wide. Ours also must be world-wide.

Underlying the Lend-Lease Act was the conception that those who were fighting the aggression of the Axis Powers were fighting our potential enemies. The Axis Powers now have openly declared themselves to be our enemies. We must not only help others to defeat them. We must fight them, with all the forces we have and can get.

The world-wide strategy of the Axis Powers must be met with equal strategy on the part of all the nations who are joined together in resisting their aggression. Accordingly we must use the weapons from the arsenal of the democracies where they can be employed most effectively. And that means we must let Britain, Russia, China, and other nations, including those of this hemisphere, use the weapons from that arsenal so that they can put them to most effective use. Too much is at stake in this greatest of all wars for us to neglect peoples who are or may be attacked by our common enemies.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1941.*

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN SINCE 1853 (H. DOC. NO. 458)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

On December 8, 1941, I presented to the Congress a message in person asking for a declaration of war as an answer to the treacherous attack made by Japan the previous day upon the United States. For the information of the Congress, and as a public record of the facts, I am transmitting this historical summary of the past policy of this country in relation to the Pacific area and of the more immediate events leading up to this Japanese onslaught upon our forces and territory. Attached hereto are the various documents and correspondence implementing this history.

I

A little over a hundred years ago, in 1833, the United States entered into its first far eastern treaty, a treaty with Siam. It was a treaty providing for peace and for dependable relationships.

Ten years later Caleb Cushing was sent to negotiate, and in 1844 there was concluded our first treaty with China.

In 1853 Commodore Perry knocked on Japan's doors. In the next few years those doors began to open; and Japan, which had kept itself aloof from the world, began to adopt what we call western civilization. During those early years the United States used every influence it could exert to protect Japan in her transition stage.

With respect to the entire Pacific area, the United States has consistently urged, as it has for all other parts of the globe, the fundamental importance to world peace of fair and equal treatment among nations. Accordingly, whenever there has been a tendency on the part of any other nation to encroach upon the independence and sovereignty of countries of the Far East the United States has tried to discourage such tendency wherever possible.

There was a period when this American attitude was especially important to Japan. At all times it has been important to China and to other countries of the Far East.

At the end of the nineteenth century the sovereignty of the Philippine Islands passed from Spain to this country. The United States pledged itself to a policy toward the Philippines designed to equip them to become a free and independent nation. That pledge and that policy we have consistently carried out.

At that time there was going on in China what has been called the "scramble for concessions." There was even talk about a possible partitioning of China. It was then that the principle of the "open door" in China was laid down. In 1900 the American Government declared that its policy was to "seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China * * * protect all rights guaranteed to friendly powers by treaty and international law and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese Empire."

Ever since that day we have consistently and unfailingly advocated the principles of the open-door policy throughout the Far East.

In the year 1908 the Government of the the United States and the Government of Japan concluded an agreement by an exchange of notes. In that agreement, the two Governments jointly declared that they were determined to support "by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire"; that it was "the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean"; and that "the policy of both Governments" was "directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo" in that region.

The United States has consistently practiced the principles enunciated in that agreement.

In 1921, following the close of the first World War, nine powers having interests in the western Pacific met in conference in Washington. China, Japan, and the United States were there. One great objective of this conference was the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. This was to be achieved by reduction of armament and by regulation of competition in the Pacific and far eastern areas. Several treaties and agreements were concluded at that conference.

One of these was the nine-power treaty. (See annex 1.) It contained pledges to respect the sovereignty of China and the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout China.

Another was a treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan providing for limitation of naval armament. (See annex 1.)

The course of events which have led directly to the present crisis began 10 years ago. For it was then—in 1931—that Japan undertook on a large scale its present policy of conquest in China, It began by the invasion of Manchuria, which was part of China. The council and the assembly of the League of Nations, at once and during many months of continuous effort thereafter, tried to persuade Japan to stop. The United States supported that effort. For example, the Government of the United States on January 7, 1932, specifically stated in notes sent to the Japanese and the Chinese Governments that it would not recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement brought about by violation of treaties. (See annex 2.)

This barbaric aggression of Japan in Manchuria set the example and the pattern for the course soon to be pursued by Italy and Germany in Africa and in

Europe. In 1933 Hitler assumed power in Germany. It was evident that, once rearmed, Germany would embark upon a policy of conquest in Europe. Italy—then still under the domination of Mussolini—also had resolved upon a policy of conquest in Africa and in the Mediterranean.

Through the years which followed Germany, Italy, and Japan reached an understanding to time their acts of aggression to their common advantage—and to bring about the ultimate enslavement of the rest of the world.

In 1934, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a friendly note to the United States, stating that he firmly believed that no question existed between the two Governments that was "fundamentally incapable of amicable solution." He added that Japan had "no intention whatever to provoke and make trouble with any other power." (See annex 3.) Our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, replied in kind. (See annex 4.)

But, in spite of this exchange of friendly sentiments and almost immediately thereafter, the acts and utterances of the Japanese Government began to belie these assurances—at least, so far as the rights and interests of other nations in China were concerned.

Our Government thereupon expressed to Japan the view of the American people, and of the American Government, that no nation has the right thus to override the rights and legitimate interests of other sovereign states. (See annex 5.)

The structure of peace which had been founded upon the Washington Conference treaties began to be discarded by Japan. Indeed, in December of 1934, the Japanese Government gave notice of its intention to terminate the Naval Treaty of February 6, 1922, which had limited competition in naval armament. She thereafter intensified and multiplied her rearmament program.

In 1936 the Government of Japan openly associated itself with Germany by entering the anti-Comintern Pact.

This pact, as we all know, was nominally directed against the Soviet Union, but its real purpose was to form a league of fascism against the free world, particularly against Great Britain, France, and the United States.

Following this association of Germany, Italy, and Japan, the stage was not set for an unlimited campaign of conquest. In July 1937, feeling themselves ready, the armed forces of Japan opened new large-scale military operations against China. Presently her leaders, dropping the mask of hypocrisy, publicly declared their intention to seize and maintain for Japan a dominant position in the entire region of eastern Asia, the western Pacific, and the southern Pacific.

They thus accepted the German thesis that seventy or eighty million Germans were, by race, training, ability, and might, superior in every way to any other race in Europe—superior to about 400,000,000 other human beings in that area; and Japan, following suit, announced that the seventy or eighty million Japanese people were also superior to the seven or eight hundred million other inhabitants of the Orient—nearly all of whom were infinitely older and more developed in culture and civilization than themselves. Their conceit would make them masters of a region containing almost one-half the population of the earth. It would give them complete control of vast sea lanes and trade routes of importance to the entire world.

The military operations which followed in China flagrantly disregarded American rights. Japanese armed forces killed Americans. They wounded or abused American men, women, and children; they sank American vessels, including a naval vessel, the *Panay;* they bombed American hospitals, churches, schools, and missions; they destroyed American property; they obstructed and, in some cases, drove out American commerce.

In the meantime, they were inflicting incalculable damage upon China, and ghastly suffering upon the Chinese people. They were inflicting wholesale injuries upon other nations—flouting all the principles of peace and good will among men.

There are attached hereto—see, respectively, annexes 6, 7, 8, and 9—lists of American nationals killed or wounded by Japanese forces in China since July 7, 1937; of American property in China reported to have been damaged, destroyed, or seriously endangered by Japanese air bombing or air machine gunning; of American nationals reported to have been assaulted, arbitrarily detained, or subjected to indignities; of interferences with American nationals, rights, and interests. These lists are not complete. However, they are ample evidence of the flagrant Japanese disregard of American rights and civilized standards.

II

Meanwhile, brute conquest was on the rampage in Europe and the Mediterranean.

Hitler and Mussolini embarked upon a scheme of unlimited conquest. Since 1935, without provocation or excuse they have attacked, conquered, and reduced to economic and political slavery some 16 independent nations. The machinery set up for their unlimited conquest included, and still includes, not only enormous armed forces but also huge organizations for carrying on plots, intrigue, intimidation, propaganda, and sabotage. This machine—unprecedented in size—has world-wide ramifications; and into them the Japanese plans and operations have been steadily interlocked.

As the forces of Germany, Italy, and Japan increasingly combined their efforts over these years, I was convinced that this combination would ultimately attack the United States and the Western Hemisphere—if it were successful in the other continents. The very existence of the United States as a great free people, and the free existence of the American family of nations in the New World, would be a standing challenge to the Axis. The Axis dictators would choose their own time to make it clear that the United States and the New World were included in their scheme of destruction.

This they did last year, in 1940, when Hitler and Mussolini concluded a treaty of alliance with Japan deliberately aimed at the United States.

The strategy of Japan in the Pacific area was a faithful counterpart of that used by Hitler in Europe. Through infiltration, encirclement, intimidation, and finally armed attack, control was extended over neighboring peoples. Each such acquisition was a new starting point for new aggression.

III

Pursuing this policy of conquest, Japan had first worked her way into and finally seized Manchuria. Next she had invaded China and has sought for the past 4½ years to subjugate her.

Passing through the China Sea close to the Philippine Islands, she then invaded and took possession of Indochina. Today the Japanese are extending this conquest throughout Thailand—and seeking the occupation of Malaya and Burma. The Philippines, Borneo, Sumatra, Java come next on the Japanese timetable; and it is probable that further down the Japanese page, are the names of Australia, New Zealand, and all the other islands of the Pacific—including Hawaii and the great chain of the Aleutian Islands.

To the eastward of the Philippines, Japan violated the mandate under which she had received the custody of the Caroline, Marshall, and Mariana Islands after the World War, by fortifying them, and not only closing them to all commerce but her own, but forbidding any foreigner even to visit them.

Japanese spokesmen, after their custom, cloaked these conquests with innocent-sounding names. They talked of the "new order in eastern Asia" and then of the "coprosperity sphere in greater east Asia." What they really intended was the enslavement of every nation which they could bring within their power, and the enrichment not of all Asia, not even of the common people of Japan but of the war lords who had seized control of the Japanese State. Here too they were following the Nazi pattern.

By this course of aggression, Japan made it necessary for various countries, including our own, to keep in the Pacific in self-defense large armed forces and a vast amount of material which might otherwise have been used against Hitler. That, of course, is exactly what Hitler wanted them to do. The diversion thus created by Hitler's Japanese ally forced the peace-loving nations to establish and maintain a huge front in the Pacific.

IV

Throughout this course and program of Japanese aggression, the Government of the United States consistently endeavored to persuade the Government of Japan that Japan's best interests would lie in maintaining and cultivating friendly relations with the United States and with all other countries that believe in orderly and peaceful processes. Following the outbreak of hostilities between Japan and China in 1937, this Government made known to the Japanese Government and to the Chinese Government that whenever both those governments considered it desirable we stood ready to exercise our good offices. During the following years of conflict that attitude on our part remain unchanged.

In October 1937, upon invitation by which the Belgian Government made itself the host, 19 countries which have interests in the Far East, including the United States, sent representatives to Brussels to consider the situation in the Far East in conformity with the Nine Power Treaty, and to endeavor to bring about an adjustment of the difficulties between Japan and China by peaceful means. Japan and Germany, only, of all the powers invited, declined to attend. Japan was itself an original signatory of the treaty. China, one of the signatories, and the Soviet Union, not a signatory, attended. After the conference opened, the countries in attendance made further attempts to persuade Japan to participate in the conference. Japan again declined.

On November 24, 1937, the conference adopted a declaration, urging that "hostilities be suspended and resort be had to peaceful processes."

Japan scorned the conference and ignored the recommendation.

It became clear that, unless this source of affairs in the Far East was halted, the Pacific area was doomed to experience the same horrors which have devastated Europe.

Therefore, in this year of 1941, in an endeavor to end this process by peaceful means while there seemed still to be a chance, the United States entered into discussions with Japan.

For 9 months these conversations were carried on, for the purpose of arriving at some understanding acceptable to both countries.

Throughout all of these conversations, this Government took into account not only the legitimate interests of the United States but also those of Japan and other countries. When questions relating to the legitimate rights and interests of other countries came up, this Government kept in appropriate contact with the representatives of those countries.

In the course of these negotiations, the United States steadfastly advocated certain basic principles which should govern international relations. These were:

The principle of involability of territorial integrity and sovereignty of all nations.

The principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries.

The principle of equality—including equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

The principle of reliance upon international cooperation and conciliation for the prevention, and pacific settlement, of controversies.

The Japanese Government, it is true, repeatedly offered qualified statements of peaceful intention. But it became clear, as each proposal was explored, that Japan did not intend to modify in any way her greedy designs upon the whole Pacific world. Although she continually maintained that she was promoting only the peace and greater prosperity of east Asia, she continued her brutal assault upon the Chinese people.

Nor did Japan show any inclination to renounce her unholy alliance with Hitlerism.

In July of this year the Japanese Government connived with Hitler, to force from the Vichy government of France, permission to place Japanese armed forces in southern Indochina; and began sending her troops and equipment into that area.

The conversations between this Government and the Japanese Government were thereupon suspended.

But during the following month, at the urgent and insistent request of the Japanese Government, which again made emphatic profession of peaceful intent, the conversations were resumed.

At that time the Japanese Government made the suggestion that the responsible heads of the Japanese Government and of the Government of the United States meet personally to discuss means for bringing about an adjustment of relations between the two countries. I should have been happy to travel thousands of miles to meet the Premier of Japan for that purpose. But I felt it desirable, before so doing, to obtain some assurance that there could be some agreement on basic principles. This Government tried hard—but without success—to obtain such assurance from the Japanese Government.

The various proposals of the Japanese Government and the attitude taken by this Government are set forth in a document which the Secretary of State handed to the Japanese Ambassador on October 2, 1941. (See annex 10.)

Thereafter, several formulas were offered and discussed. But the Japanese Government continued upon its course of war and conquest.

Finally, on November 20, 1941, the Japanese Government presented a new and narrow proposal (see annex 11) which called for supplying by the United States to Japan of as much oil as Japan might require, for suspension of freezing measures, and for discontinuance by the United States of aid to China. It contained however no provision for abandonment by Japan of her warlike operations or aims.

Such a proposal obviously offered no basis for a peaceful settlement or even for a temporary adjustment. The American Government, in order to clarify the issues, presented to the Japanese Government on November 26, a clear-cut plan for a broad but simple settlement. (See annex 12.)

The outline of the proposed plan for agreement between the United States and Japan was divided into two parts:

In section one there was outlined a mutual declaration of policy containing affirmations that the national policies of the two countries were directed toward peace throughout the Pacific area, that the two countries had no territorial designs or aggressive intentions in that area, and that they would give active support to certain fundamental principles of peace upon which their relations with each other and all other nations would be based. There was provision for mutual pledges to support and apply in their economic relations with each other and with other nations and peoples liberal economic principles, which were enumerated, based upon the general principle of equality of commercial opportunity and treatment.

In section 2 there were outlined proposed steps to be taken by the two Governments. These steps envisaged a situation in which there would be no Japanese or other foreign armed forces in French Indochina or in China. Mutual commitments were suggested along lines as follows: (a) To endeavor to conclude a multilateral nonaggression pact among the governments principally concerned in the Pacific area; (b) to endeavor to conclude among the principally interested governments an agreement to respect the territorial integrity of Indochina and not to seek or accept preferential economic treatment therein; (c) not to support any government in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking; (d) to relinquish extraterritorial and related rights in China and to endeavor to obtain the agreement of other governments now possessing such rights to give up those rights; (e) to negotiate a trade agreement based upon reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment; (f) to remove freezing restrictions imposed by each country on the funds of the other; (g) to agree upon a plan for the stabilization of the dollar-yen rate; (h) to agree that no agreement which either had concluded with any third power or powers shall be interpreted by it in a way to conflict with the fundamental purpose of this agreement; and (i) to use their influence to cause other governments to adhere to the basic political and economic principles provided for in this suggested agreement.

In the midst of these conversations we learned that new contingents of Japanese armed forces and new masses of equipment were moving into Indochina. Toward the end of November these movements were intensified. During the first week of December new movements of Japanese forces made it clear that, under cover of the negotiations, attacks on unspecified objectives were being prepared.

I promptly asked the Japanese Government for a frank statement of the reasons for increasing its forces in Indochina. (See annex 13). I was given an evasive and specious reply. (See annex 14.) Simultaneously, the Japanese operations went forward with increased tempo.

We did not know then, as we know now that they had ordered and were even then carrying out their plan for a treacherous attack upon us.

I was determined, however, to exhaust every conceivable effort for peace. With this in mind, on the evening of December 6 last, I addressed a personal message to the Emperor of Japan. (See annex 15.)

To this Government's proposal of November 26 the Japanese Government made no reply until December 7. On that day the Japanese Ambassador here and the special representative whom the Japanese Government had sent to the United States to assist in peaceful negotiations, delivered a lengthy document to our Secretary of State 1 hour after the Japanese had launched a vicious attack upon American territory and American citizens in the Pacific.

That document (see annex 16) was a few minutes after its receipt aptly characterized by the Secretary of State as follows:

I must say that in all my conversations with you [the Japanese Ambassador] during the last 9 months I have never uttered one word of untruth. This is borne out absolutely by the record. In all my 50 years of public service I have never seen a document that was more crowded with infamous falsehoods and distortions—infamous falsehoods and distortions on a scale so huge that I never imagined until today that any government on this planet was capable of uttering them.

I concur emphatically in every word of that statement.

For the record of history it is essential in reading this part of my message always to bear in mind that the actual air and submarine attack in the Hawaiian Islands commenced on Sunday, December 7, at 1:20 p. m., Washington time—7:50 a. m., Honolulu time of same day—Monday, December 8, 3:20 a. m., Tokyo time.

To my message of December 6 (9 p. m. Washington time— December 7, 11 a. m. Tokyo time) to the Emperor of Japan, invoking his cooperation with me in further effort to preserve peace, there has finally come to me on December 10 (6:23 a. m. Washington time—December 10, 8:23 p. m., Tokyo time) a reply, conveyed in a telegraphic report by the American Ambassador at Tokyo dated December 8, 1 p. m. (December 7, 11 p. m., Washington time).

The Ambassador reported that at 7 o'clock on the morning of the 8th (December 7, 5 p. m., Washington time) the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs asked him to call at his official residence; that the Foreign Minister handed the Ambassador a memorandum dated December 8 (December 7, Washington time) the text of which had been transmitted to the Japanese Ambassador in Washington to be presented to the American Government (this was the memorandum which was delivered by the Japanese Ambassador to the Secretary of State at 2:20 p. m. on Sunday, December 7 (Monday, December 8, 4:20 a. m., Tokyo time); that the Foreign Minister had been in touch with the Emperor, and that the Emperor desired that the memorandum be regarded as the Emperor's reply to my message.

Further, the Ambassador reports, the Foreign Minister made an oral statement. Textually, the oral statement began: "His Majesty has expressed his gratefulness and appreciation for the cordial message of the President." The message further continued to the effect that, in regard to our inquiries on the subject of increase of Japanese forces in French Indochina, His Majesty had commanded his Government to state its views to the American Government. The message concluded, textually, with the statement:

Establishment of peace in the Pacific and consequently of the world has been the cherished desire of His Majesty for the realization of which he has hitherto made his Government to continue its earnest endeavors. His Majesty trusts that the President is fully aware of this fact.

Japan's real reply, however, made by Japan's war lords and evidently formulated many days before, took the form of the attack which had already been made without warning upon our territories at various points in the Pacific.

There is the record for all history to read in amazement, in sorrow, in horror, and in disgust.

We are now at war. We are fighting in self-defense. We are fighting in defense of our national existence, of our right to be secure, of our right to enjoy the blessings of peace. We are fighting in defense of principles of law and order and justice, against an effort of unprecedented ferocity to overthrow those principles and to impose upon humanity a regime of ruthless domination by unrestricted and arbitrary force.

Other countries, too—a host of them—have declared war on Japan. Some of them were first attacked by Japan, as we have been. China has already been valiantly resisting Japan in an undeclared war forced upon her by Japan. After 4½ years of stubborn resistance, the Chinese now and henceforth will fight with renewed confidence and confirmed assurance of victory.

All members of the Great British Commonwealth, themselves fighting heroically on many fronts against Germany and her allies, have joined with us in the battle of the Pacific as we have joined with them in the battle of the Atlantic.

All but three of the governments of nations overrun by German armies have declared war on Japan. The other three are severing relations.

In our own hemisphere many of our sister republics have declared war on Japan and the others have given firm expression of their solidarity with the United States.

The following are the countries which have to date declared war against Japan:

Australia, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, New Zealand, Panama, El Salvador, South Africa, United Kingdom, Poland.

These and other peace-loving countries will be fighting as are we, first, to put an end to Japan's program of aggression and, second, to make good the right of nations and of mankind to live in peace under conditions of security and justice.

The people of this country are totally united in their determination to consecrate our national strength and manpower to bring conclusively to an end the pestilence of aggression and force which has long menaced the world and which now has struck deliberately and directly at the safety of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1941.*

ANNEXES

1. Senate Document No. 124, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, which contains texts of Washington Conference treaties and resolutions.

2. Identic notes to the Japanese and the Chinese Governments, January 7, 1932.

3. Note from the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, handed to the Secretary of State by the Japanese Ambassador, February 21, 1934.

4. Reply thereto, handed to the Japanese Ambassador by the Secretary of State on March 3, 1934.

5. Statement by the American Ambassador to Japan to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, April 29, 1934.

6. List of American nationals killed or wounded by Japanese forces in China since July 7, 1937.

7. List of American property in China reported to have been damaged, destroyed, or seriously endangered by Japanese air bombing or air machine gunning since July 7, 1937.

8. List of American nationals reported to have been assaulted, arbitrarily detained, subjected to indignities, etc., since July 7, 1937, by Japanese authorities or agents.

9. List of Japanese interferences with American trade and enterprise in China.

10. Document handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on October 2, 1941.

11. Document handed to the Secretary of State, by the Japanese Ambassador on November 20, 1941.

12. Document handed by the Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on November 26, 1941.

13. Memorandum addressed by the President to the Secretary and the Under Secretary of State, copy of which, under authorization of the President, was read and handed by the Under Secretary of State to the Japanese Ambassador on December 2, 1941.

14. Reply thereto, handed to the Secretary of State by the Japanese Ambassador on December 5, 1941.

15. Personal message from the President to the Emperor of Japan, December 6, 1941.

16. Document handed by the Japanese Ambassador to the Secretary of State, December 7, 1941.

EASEMENT DEED TO THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 547) authorizing the Secretary of War to execute an easement deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this merely amends the title of the bill. It is satisfactory to the members of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the action just taken by the House in concurring with a Senate amendment which slightly alters the title to the bill H. R.

547 ends a legislative process that has taken many months. For that portion of my district in California which this bill is designed to benefit, and for myself, I desire to express gratitude to the Committee on Flood Control and its very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and the hard-working members of that committee. I want also to express appreciation to the Chief of Engineers and his assistants for the courteous and kindly consideration of this matter; a small one here perhaps, but an important matter to those people in Los Angeles County and particularly those who live in Van Nuys, Encino, San Fernando, and Sunland, and all of the other adjoining communities who will enjoy the parks and playgrounds, the land for which this bill H. R. 547 permits them to lease.

One hundred thousand people and their children will use these park lands for healthful recreation. Local citizen groups will contribute of their time and funds to help improve the parks. Here we have two great flood-control projects that will serve a dual purpose, flood control when the waters descend upon us, and recreation the rest of the time. Other lands behind the Sepulveda and Hansen Dams are even now being leased and used for agriculture and income is thereby provided to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Van Nuys and San Fernando and all of their neighbors are grateful to their Government and hope now that the necessary signatures will be speedily attached to H. R. 547 in order that it may become public law and permit these long anticipated improvements to become realities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including a statement over the forum of the air last night made by myself, as well as the statements of the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], and two others.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is consent day, and the Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1544) to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. It is my understanding that a rule has been granted on this bill, to be taken up probably tomorrow.

Mr. FISH. Yes; it is to be taken up under a rule in the proper way.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I understand it is to come up tomorrow.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ROADS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4937) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This is the first authorization bill on the calendar for normal expenditures, and by reference to the report it will be seen that the recommendation came from the Department on May 28. We are now at war, and it is my opinion authorizations for the normal expenses of the Government should cease, and cease now. Let us conserve our resources for the defense of our country. Gentlemen may talk all they want and say the bill does not make an appropriation, but is simply an authorization; but if we permit an authorization, invariably the appropriation follows. There are other bills of this nature on this calendar and also on other calendars, but I think the time has now come when we should delay making additional authorizations, other than for national defense. It is a fact that in the Federal road law there is a provision which enables money to be diverted for Indian reservations. This is one of the broadest authorizations I ever read, because it is unlimited in amount and places the discretion in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. In my opinion, it is much too broad and unnecessary now. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections have been made, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

PUYALLUP TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4578) to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. I wonder if the author of the bill is here with the amendments that have been agreed upon. Apparently he is not here. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOMESTEAD PROJECTS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 105, transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, effective July 1, 1942, the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands by virtue of the provisions of the Second Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1931 (46 Stat. 1552, 1570), by virtue of the provisions of the act of April 22, 1932, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes" (47 Stat. 91, 129), by virtue of the provisions of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat. 195, 200), and by virtue of all other provisions of law relating to such projects are hereby transferred from the jurisdiction and control of the government of the Virgin Islands, Department of the Interior, to the jurisdiction and control of the Department of Agriculture. The Virgin Islands Homestead Authority is hereby abolished and its functions transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 2. All real and personal property owned or held by the United States in the Virgin Islands and employed exclusively in the prosecution of homestead projects, and all equipment, assets, and records, pertaining to homestead projects in the Virgin Islands, including the equipment, assets, and records of the Virgin Islands Homestead Authority, are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. All valid contracts, sales, transfers, leases, and other transactions heretofore entered into or effected by the government of the Virgin Islands, the Virgin Islands Homestead Authority, the Department of the Interior, or any officer or agency of any of the foregoing, in connection with homestead projects in the Virgin Islands are hereby continued in full force and effect: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, or his designee, may compromise claims and obligations arising under, and adjust and modify the terms of such contracts, as circumstances may require.

SEC. 4. The Department of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use for the administration, development, management, and liquidation of the homestead projects in the Virgin Islands transferred to its jurisdiction and control all funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, allocated, or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture for rural rehabilitation projects and functions of like character to those transferred hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "effective July 1, 1942."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 19 (a) OF THE PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5825, to amend section 19 (a) of the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934, as amended by the act of August 7, 1939, and to amend the act approved June 19, 1934, so as to authorize certain sugar excise tax funds and other funds to be used for military and naval defense purposes in the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be rereferred to the Committee on Insular

Affairs, and I would like to state to the House the reason therefor, if it is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized under reservation of objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5825 is an act reported favorably by the Committee on Insular Affairs, authorizing the Philippine government to expend certain sugar excise taxes and the gold devaluation profits that is to the credit of the Philippine Islands on the books of the Treasury of the United States, this money to be expended through the War and Navy Departments in building up a defense for the Philippine Islands.

Since the action of the committee on this bill the President has asked Congress for a direct appropriation for these purposes. As I understand it, the Appropriations Committee is working on it and this direct appropriation will likely be made.

Since then, in answer to a wire from the Commissioner, President Quezon of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, has wired the President of the United States as follows:

DECEMBER 14, 1941.

Commissioner ELIZALDE,
Washington, D. C.:

In reply to your telegram of December 12, I have today sent following telegram to the President of the United States: "I am in dire need of funds for public relief and the protection of our civilian population. I beg you to secure the passage of a law placing at the disposal of the Government of the Commonwealth the proceeds from excise tax on sugar already collected and if possible the gold devaluation fund to be spent for the above-mentioned purposes in agreement with the commanding general of the United States forces in the Far East. My people are already shedding their blood side by side with the American soldiers and the civilian population are cooperating unto death in doing their part. My volunteer guards are serving day and night without compensation and I should like to give them at least free food. The national assembly has appropriated all available funds of the Commonwealth government and authorized me to spend them for war purposes. It will have a tremendous heartening effect on my people if the United States Congress would in turn appropriate the money which after all has already been decided under existing legislation previously approved by the Congress to belong to the government of the Commonwealth."

QUEZON.

So that is my reason for asking that this bill be re-referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, so that it may take proper action thereon.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I understand that this request of the President of the Philippines is a most worthy and humane request, and I certainly hope the gentleman will try to have his committee bring in that recommendation of the President of the Philippines at once.

Mr. McGEHEE. We shall act upon it at once, if possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that the bill be re-committed to the Committee on Insular Affairs?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF THE ASSINIBOINE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1035, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill and the two following bills were thoroughly discussed in the House 2 weeks ago. It was explained then that the language of the bills deprived the United States of properly protecting itself in the Court of Claims. The gentleman who reported this bill stated the bills would be called up on Calendar Wednesday. There is a very large amount of money involved, and such bills should not be considered by unanimous consent. As the committee has the next call, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill has a minority report. The next bill calls for a possible authorization and appropriation of $50,000,000. The bill following that has a minority report. As a matter of policy, I would like to reiterate that we feel it our duty to object to any bill on this calendar where a minority report has been filed, or which provides an authorization of very much over $1,000,000. For that reason I object.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are heard, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS OF MONTANA

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 42, to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes" (44 Stat. L. 807).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. KEAN objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

ARAPAHOE AND CHEYENNE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1065, authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. KEAN objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2, to provide a discretionary penalty of punishment by death on conviction of willful sabotage against the national defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Nebraska, the author of the bill, accept an amendment confining the death penalty to sabotage in time of war only? If this is done, I will gladly support the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that he is not accurate in referring to me as the author of the bill. I am, however, the member of the Judiciary Committee who reported the bill to the House on behalf of that committee.

So far as I am concerned, I am agreeable to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey. And may I make an observation in connection with the objection to this bill made by the gentleman the last time the Consent Calendar was called. At that time it was contended that the provision of the bill allowing the imposition of the death penalty to be discretionary with the jury was too severe. Since that time in the State of Iowa, the State adjacent to my own State of Nebraska, an explosion occurred last week in a defense plant in which 10 workmen lost their lives. I do not charge or suggest that the explosion resulted from an act of sabotage. I sincerely trust that it did not. It is a type of thing, however, which could have resulted from such an act.

This bill is one to protect workmen, to protect labor against the result of sabotage, against death from acts of sabotage. To me it is clear that to allow a jury under such circumstances to impose the death penalty is not too broad a grant of power. At the present time saboteurs might destroy by explosion a plant in which defense work is being done, and kill workmen, and under the existing law which this bill would amend they would be subject only to fine and imprisonment.

Mr. KEAN. Under the laws of the State of Nebraska would not that be murder?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We are speaking now of Federal law, not State law. This is distinguished from State law.

Mr. KEAN. I think the gentleman will find that it would constitute murder under the laws of his State.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. There is no doubt about murder being covered by State law, but this bill is designed to cover a Federal offense.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It takes three objections to prevent consideration. Is there further objection?

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises

or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the maximum penalties provided in sections 2, 3, 5, and 6, in the case of a conviction of an offense under this act committed after the date this section takes effect, the person convicted shall be punished by death if the verdict of the jury shall so recommend."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "shall", insert "if such offense resulted in death or serious injury to any other person or placed any other person in grave danger of death or serious injury."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr KEAN: Page 1, line 8, insert before the word "Notwithstanding" "When the United States is at war."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to provide for a discretionary penalty of punishment by death on conviction of willful sabotage against the national defense whenever such act causes or threatens death or serious injury to others."

COTTON-MARKETING QUOTAS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2035, to amend sections 345 and 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-marketing quotas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what the situation is in respect to this bill? Last week when the bill was called one of the Members asked that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture. That was objected to. Is it expected that the bill will later be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the bill contemplates a referendum on a certain agricultural commodity to wit, cotton, so that when the farmers vote they may by referendum fix a quota for 3 years instead of 1 year. Just a few days ago the farmers voted by referendum on a quota for 1 year, so there is really no need for the legislation at the present time. It may be that the chairman has it in mind to rerefer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the bill's going over. The incident to which the gentleman from Minnesota referred was a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of the bill. That request was objected to by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. That terminated the matter. There was no effort to rerefer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Georgia know any reason why the bill should not be stricken from the calendar?

Mr. PACE. The referendum was held day before yesterday, fixing the quota for 1 year. I do not think any special purpose would be served to consider the bill at this time, but I would rather not take the responsibility of saying that it could be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO PARAGRAPH 1798 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1632, permitting free entry of articles imported by returning residents from certain countries on the basis of the frequency of use of the exemption rather than the length of visit abroad, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the Speaker is to recognize a member of the Ways and Means Committee to suspend the rules on this bill following the call of the calendar. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. THOMAS F. FORD, SHORT, and BENNETT objected.

AMENDMENT TO THE GREAT PLAINS ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4648, to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418) entitled "An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States," as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule. It contains the original act and amendments to the act, but it does not print the proposed amendments to the act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order is premature, inasmuch as the bill is not now before the House for consideration. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill reads, "An act authorizing construction of water conservation and utilization projects in the Great Plains and arid and semiarid areas of the United States." I want to go along with the gentleman from Missouri in what he said just a few moments ago. All we have to do is start authorizing and from there on the bills will start to come in.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. This bill is not an authorization, neither is it an appropriation. It provides some clarifying language for existing law and carries a limitation. It prescribes a method for expending money already appropriated and authorized. It does not increase any authorization.

Mr. SCHULTE. Will the gentleman answer this question then: Does that mean this will not cost the Government any more money; that is, no more funds are to be expended?

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is right.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentleman will assure the House of that? If he does, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that is absolutely correct. It does not provide for an authorization.

Mr. SCHULTE. I know that.

Mr. COCHRAN. The act does provide for an authorization that you seek to amend.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, but I do not seek to amend by increasing the authorization.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to serve notice on the gentleman that the next time this bill is called up if the report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule I am going to insist on my point of order.

Mr. CURTIS. The report does conform to the Ramseyer rule. There was an early report filed that did not. It was called to my attention and a new report filed.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman just handed me a report and I say the report he hands me does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that the request of the gentleman from Indiana is based upon the assumption that the proposed bill would create some authorization. The gentleman from Nebraska is correct in stating that this bill does not create a new authorization. There is an authorization in existing statutes. This bill seeks to place a limitation of $500,000, as I understand it, upon an authorization that already exists; so rather than causing the Government to expend more money this definitely seeks to place a limitation upon a certain category for which authorization is presently existent.

Mr. COCHRAN. This bill, however, broadens the original act to give the Secretary of the Interior power to take in

other projects not now provided in the original act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. I think the gentleman is not correct because he will find that under existing law projects may be constructed which have flood-control features; but this amendment, as I understand it, specifically provides those flood-control features may not be in excess of $500,000.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO ORGANIC ACT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5925, to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 20 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1807), is hereby amended by striking out the word "shall" in said sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "may," so that said sentence, as amended, will read as follows:

"He may attend or may depute another person to represent him at the meetings of the legislative authorities herein established, and may give expression to his views on any matter before such bodies."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPIES OF NATURALIZATION PAPERS OF PARENT TO BE ISSUED TO HIS OR HER CHILDREN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4489, to permit the courts of the United States and State courts to issue copies of naturalization certificates to all persons over 21 years of age who can show they are entitled to citizenship in the United States of America by the naturalization of their parent or husband.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I feel that the bill has a world of merit to it—I would like to have the gentleman from Illinois explain the bill. I believe he can do away with any objections that may be raised against this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 4489 is one which simply permits the courts of the United States that have issued naturalization papers to aliens to issue copies of the same from their records under certain provisions and safeguards, and with heavy penalties, to the children of those aliens in order that they may show they have derived their citizenship from their parents' papers. That in substance is the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what kind of penalties are provided?

Mr. MASON. There is a penalty of $5,000 and 5 years in jail for anyone, either on the part of the court or the applicant or any witnesses, who knowingly certifies anything that is false.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I presume the gentleman means that these certificates will issue under the regular processes of the court, through the clerk?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in reading over the second section of this bill, with regard to the penalty, I see that the issuance of one of these certificates under certain conditions is made a felony. There seems to be an ambiguity as to who is subject to this penalty, which, as was explained by the gentleman from Illinois, is a rather severe one. I am not certain but that an innocent person might be made subject to the penalty. I have talked this matter over with the gentleman from Illinois and he has agreed that by the deletion of a couple of commas the intent of the committee will be made more clear.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The committee felt that that penalty would be proper in this case.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not dispute the penalty at all.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then they would have to apply in the regular way to the courts.

Mr. COLE of New York. Let me refer the gentleman to the provisions of this section, which might very well be interpreted to read, "Any person who is a party to the issuance of one of these certificates is subject to the penalty."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is very simple.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am sure it is not the intent of the gentleman to subject an innocent person who may be a party to the issuance of such a certificate to a $5,000 fine and imprisonment for 5 years.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the bill, the Attorney General will make rules and regulations.

Mr. MASON. The correction that has been suggested is simply striking out the commas so that no one who is innocent would be punished, but anyone knowingly being a party to the fraudulent issuance of a certificate will be punished. This is simply an attempt to correct the grammatical construction.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The committee would have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any individual over 21 years of age, who is a resident of any State in the United States of America or the District of Columbia, who claims to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or husband, may, upon the payment of a fee of $2, make application to the court, either State or Federal, where the original certificate of naturalization was issued, accompanied by two photographs of the applicant, for a copy of the naturalization certificate of his or her parent or husband, as the case may be. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the said court that the applicant is a citizen; that the said applicant is a child of the said parent so formerly naturalized and was under 21 years of age at the time said parent secured such naturalization certificate and at the time resided in the United States of America, or that the applicant is the true and lawful wife of a person who has been formerly naturalized, then such person shall be issued a true and lawful copy of the naturalization certificate issued to his or her parent or husband, which shall be accepted by all courts, election boards, and departments of government as prima facie evidence of the citizenship of the person to whom such copy of naturalization certificate is issued.

SEC. 2. Any person who knowingly issues, or is a party to the issuance under section 1 of this act, any copy of such naturalization certificate as aforesaid, or falsely secures, makes affidavit, or certifies that an applicant for such copy of naturalization is a citizen, when the truth is otherwise, or any applicant knowingly, or having reason to believe that he is not a citizen, or not entitled to such a copy of naturalization certificate of his or her parent or husband, shall be guilty of a felony, and on conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on page 2, lines 18 and 19, the commas be deleted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM PAYMENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5739, amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2077, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the Senate bill the same as the House bill, or is it broader than the House bill?

Mr. PACE. It is word for word the same, with one typographical correction.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is about the first time your committees have been together at any time this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso under the head "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 144, 77th Cong., approved July 1, 1941), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1940 and 1941 carried out farming operations as landlords, tenants, or sharecroppers on cropland owned

by the United States Government and who complied with the terms and conditions of the 1940 and 1941 agricultural conservation programs, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers, and wherever in either of such years the acquisition of title to, or lease of, any farm for use in the national-defense program caused the producers to lose their interest in the crops planted thereon, or the proceeds thereof, prior to the time of harvest, the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers on such farm in such year shall be entitled to apply for and receive the payments which they would have received under the agricultural conservation program for such year if they had been permitted to retain their interest in such crops, or the proceeds thereof, to the extent that it does not clearly appear that in connection with such acquisition full compensation was made for the failure to receive such payments."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5739) was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 6233.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a rule on the bill to which the gentleman from Texas has just referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5638, to amend the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF JUNE 10, 1922

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4779, to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of June 10, 1922, so as to equalize the rates of pay of commissioned officers of corresponding grade and length of service.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the author of the bill I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the calendar, in view of the fact that, since the introduction of the bill, war has been declared and the bill now would be useless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 80, providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this celebration would not occur until 1945, and I think we would be in a little hurry in passing a joint resolution of this character now, and, therefore, I object.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN MINNESOTA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4465, to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands owned by the State of Minnesota which are contiguous to or situated within the exterior boundaries of any national park or other Federal reservation under his jurisdiction, in exchange for any lands of equal value owned by the United States in the State of Minnesota, under the jurisdiction of either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and which are desired by such State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands owned by the State of Minnesota which are contiguous to or situated within the exterior boundaries of any national forest, land-use project under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or other Federal reservation under his jurisdiction, in exchange for any lands of equal value owned by the United States in the State of Minnesota, under the jurisdiction of either the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, and which are desired by such State.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized to make conveyances, on behalf of the United States, to the State of Minnesota of any lands under their respective jurisdictions to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of any land by the State of Minnesota, under the provisions of this act, may be made subject to such reservations and conditions as such State shall prescribe, but such reservations and conditions shall be duly considered in determining the value of the lands for the purposes of making any exchange of lands under this act. Any exchange of lands under the provisions of this act shall be made only after a determination that such exchange will be in the public interest. Such determination may be made by the Secretary of the Interior if the lands to be conveyed by the United States are under his jurisdiction and the lands to be acquired by the United States are to be under his jurisdiction after their acquisition. Such determination may be made by the Secretary of Agriculture if the lands to be conveyed by the United States are under his jurisdiction and the lands to be acquired by the United States are to be under his jurisdiction after their acquisition. In all other cases, such determination shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, jointly.

SEC. 5. Lands acquired by the United States pursuant to any such exchange shall become a part of the national park, national forest, land utilization project, or other Federal reservation to which they may be contiguous or within the exterior boundaries of which they may be located.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out, in lines 8 to 10, inclusive, the following wording: "under the jurisdiction of either the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, and which are desired by such State" and insert in lieu thereof the following new wording: "which are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and where authority to convey title to such lands on behalf of the United States otherwise is vested by statute in the said Secretary of Agriculture; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands owned by the State of Minnesota which are contiguous to or situated within the exterior boundaries of any national forest, land-use project under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or other Federal reservation under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, in exchange for any surveyed, unappropriated, and unreserved public lands of equal value owned by the United States, where authority to convey title to such lands on behalf of the United States otherwise is vested by statute in the Secretary of the Interior; the lands within the national forests so accepted by said Secretary of the Interior thereafter to be subject to the provisions of the act of February 1, 1905 (33 Stat. 628), in respect to the surveying, prospecting, locating, appropriating, entering, relinquishing, reconveying, certifying, or patenting of lands reserved from public domain."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert the following new wording: "*Provided*, That all conveyances of public domain in national forests shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided for by the act of February 1, 1905 (33 Stat. 628)."

Page 2, line 19, after the word "prescribe" and the comma, insert the following new wording: "and the conveyance of any land by the United States, under the provisions of this act, may be made subject to such reservations and conditions as the United States shall prescribe."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "jurisdiction", insert the following new wording: "and are to be conveyed by him."

Page 3, line 14, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert the following new wording: "and shall be subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6208) entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 25, strike out all after "designate." over to and including "the" where it appears the first time in line 1, page 4, and insert "The."

Page 4, line 1, after "Commissioners", insert "of the District of Columbia."

Page 4, line 1, after "authorized", insert "and empowered."

Page 4, line 3, strike out all after "and" down to and including "necessary" in line 8.

Page 4, line 16, after "designate.", insert "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

Page 4, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 9. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered, without regard to the provisions of any other law, and for defense purposes, to borrow money from the Treasury of the United States, to expend the same, to obligate the District of Columbia for the payment of equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, and to employ personnel as the Commissioners in their discretion may deem necessary, not exceeding $1,000,000, and the said Commissioners are further authorized and empowered to use such regular employees of the Government of the District of Columbia as they deem necessary.

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to loan to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia such sum or sums as are authorized by this section."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 6109

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 6109.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman withhold that request for the moment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

FREE ENTRY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED BY RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 1632) permitting free entry of articles imported by returning residents from certain countries on the basis of the frequency of use of the exemption rather than the length of visit abroad, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. V, title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1798), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1798. Wearing apparel, articles of personal adornment, toilet articles, and similar personal effects of persons arriving in the United States; but this exemption shall include only such articles as were actually owned by them and in their possession abroad at the time of or prior to their departure from a foreign country, and as are necessary and appropriate for the wear and use of such persons and are intended for such wear and use, and shall not be held to apply to merchandise or articles intended for other persons or for sale: *Provided*, That all jewelry and similar articles of personal adornment having a value of $300 or more, brought in by a nonresident of the United States, shall, if sold within 3 years after the date of the arrival of such person in the United States, be liable to duty at the rate or rates in force at the time of such sale, to be paid by such person: *Provided further*, That in case of residents of the United States returning from abroad all wearing apparel, personal and household effects, and in the case of individuals returning from abroad, all professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment, taken by them out of the United States to foreign countries shall be admitted free of duty, without regard to their value, upon their identity being established under appropriate rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That up to but not exceeding $100 in value of articles (including distilled spirits, wines, and malt liquors aggregating not more than 1 wine-gallon and including not more than 100 cigars) acquired abroad by such residents of the United States as an incident of the foreign journey for personal or household use or as souvenirs or curios, but not bought on commission or intended for sale, shall be free of duty: *Provided further*, That in the case of articles acquired in any country other than a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port, the exemption authorized by the preceding proviso shall apply only to articles so acquired by a returning resident who has remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for a period of not less than 48 hours: *Provided further*, That the exemption authorized by the second preceding proviso shall apply only to articles declared in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury by a returning resident who has not taken advantage of the said exemption within the 30-day period (or such other period as may be prescribed in accordance with the next following proviso) immediately preceding his return to the United States: *Provided further*, That in the case of residents of the United States arriving from a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port, the Secretary may by special regulation or instruction, the application of which may be restricted to one or more individual ports of entry, provide that the exemption authorized by the third preceding proviso shall be applied only to articles declared in accordance with said regulations by a returning resident who has not taken advantage of the said exemption in the same customs district within such period (not less than 30 days nor more than 6 months) immediately preceding his return to the United States as the Secretary may deem necessary to specify in the public interest or to facilitate enforcement at the specified port or ports of the requirement that the exemption shall apply only to articles acquired as an incident of the foreign journey: *And provided further*, That all articles exempted by this paragraph from the payment of duty shall also be exempt from the payment of any internal-revenue taxes."

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I may say, first of all, for the information of the House that the amendment proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means is entirely a clerical amendment. As introduced, the bill spoke of the Tariff Act of 1920, when it should have referred to the Tariff Act of 1930. This is the entire purpose of the amendment. So we will get rid of that first of all.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain somewhat briefly the purpose of this bill which has been reported unanimously from the Ways and Means Committee. In the 1930 act, as amended, the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Senate and the President approved a provision which provided that while continuing the importation of $100 of goods free of duty from foreign countries that cross the Canadian border, a returning resident must have remained there 48 hours, but in connection with the Mexican border, they gave the Treasury Department the privilege of making any rules they wanted to. This bill does not affect the Canadian border in any way, shape, or manner, but the Treasury Department, as to the Mexican border, decided in its wisdom or lack of wisdom, whichever you may think, to put into effect a provision that transient tourists must stay over there 24 hours at least in only one customs district, that of San Diego, which includes Calexico and Tia Juana. There are no places fit for habitation for people—the gentleman from Oklahoma, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], or my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. COX]—where they would want to stay 24 hours, or where you could with any safety to health. For that reason the Committee on Ways and Means by unanimous report has seen fit to bring this bill to you for your consideration, so that the Treasury will be bound by certain regulations. This does not permit the unlimited importation of any article. The limit is still $100, and the Treasury is given authority to make the limit once in 6 months, instead of once in 30 days. There will be no loss of money to the Treasury. We have considered this very carefully, and I have been instructed to make every effort by parliamentary means to have the bill passed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Is this bill for the benefit of the holiday crowd that go across the border to some of the resorts on the other side of the line?

Mr. BUCK. It certainly is not. The only opposition to this bill that I know comes from the Hollywood crowd, a small group of merchants, who think that all of the trinkets should be bought in Los Angeles, instead of permitting the development of tourist trade in the other parts of southern California.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Are not the people back of this bill the A. A. A. and other interested people who want to encourage tourists to go to this God-forsaken place to which the gentleman has referred for the purpose of trade. Where you may buy overcoats and other commodities much cheaper than you can buy them in the United States?

Mr. BUCK. Oh, I would hardly say that.

Mr. MICHENER. Would the gentleman not say that that is so?

Mr. BUCK. I would not say that at all. After all, if I go across the border at El Paso, Tex., of whatever they have over there I am entitled to bring $100 worth of goods. What difference does it make if I am compelled to stay 24 hours at Tia Juana?

Mr. MICHENER. It makes this difference. If you put a large department store or any kind of a store just across the border and there is nothing there but the store—no entertainment—and you build a highway down through the State leading to the store, the people would go down there, make the trip and visit the store and buy enough material at Mexican prices and thus save enough to pay for the trip.

Mr. BUCK. I hope the gentleman will not use up all of my time, but I say to him in the first place the highway is already there, as far as that is concerned. In the second place, I call his attention to something that I think I stated to the Committee on Rules. This is not a local question. The chambers of commerce of El Paso, Laredo, Del Rio, McAllen, Brownsville, and San Antonio, Tex., and Nogales and Douglas in Arizona, and the South Texas Chamber of Commerce approve of this, and I have in my hand, which I shall ask permission to place in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, a petition of 1,782 individual retailers in California. I have telegrams and letters from the disabled American Veterans of the World War, the Society of Forty and Eight, the Automobile Club of Southern California, the Motor Truck Association of Southern California, the Apartment House Association of Los Angeles County, the California State Restaurant Association, the Southern California Restaurant Association, the San Diego Restaurant Association, the National Restaurant Association, and the San Diego and California State Hotel Association. Of course, it must be admitted that a considerable portion of the agitation for the repeal or the change in the bill that the Ways and Means Committee inadvertently reported 2 or 3 years ago, comes from those who realize that a lot of their tourist trade has gone. On the other hand, the opposition is only from the selfish interests of certain store owners in Los Angeles who want to keep the trade there, instead of having it distributed throughout the rest of southern California entirely.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Is it not true that 17 of the California Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats, endorsed this bill?

Mr. BUCK. There is no question about that, and I will file that in connection with my remarks as well. I thank the gentleman for calling it to my attention.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. COX. The subject which the gentleman is discussing ought to be of interest to people other than those who live in California and Texas. I think the most beautiful automobile drive in the world is from Laredo to Mexico City. I made the trip myself. Others have made the trip. Naturally, they have an interest in acquiring small articles as they come and go. The bill which the gentleman is advocating accommodates the desire and the needs of people who go down into Mexico. Naturally, they want to bring back something to evidence the places of interest they have been.

Mr. BUCK. May I say that at the present time the law is of benefit only to bootleggers who do not care whether they go over in trailers or how long they stay. They stay 24 hours when you and I and the rest of us cannot stay there in any comfort or ease.

Mr. COX. We all want to protect the workers of this country, but I cannot see any valid objection to the gentleman's proposal. I hope the House will accept it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about extending that up north, so that when people go down to the Soo and want to go across, they can go over without staying 48 hours? We have to stay 48 hours and we do not want to stay that long. We want to come back home and sleep at home.

Mr. BUCK. I suggest that the gentleman bring that up before the Ways and Means Committee, because that was not discussed or considered. You can go over there and you must stay, at the present time, 48 hours across the Canadian line. Objection has been heard before our committee to the Canadian side of the matter, but not to the Mexican side, because except for this one district, which is only the southern part of California, it is absolutely free, and you can go in any time you want.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. Does this bill in any way change the situation with reference to cities along the Canadian border?

Mr. BUCK. No. It does not refer to cities along the Canadian border; it refers to cities where they have free zones. There is none on the Canadian border.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] just raised the question whether any change was contemplated in such legislation. Many department stores have registered complaints against this bill, believing it might establish a precedent for legislation which would come up in the near future, and would take in cities along the Canadian border. If the gentleman will permit me to do so, I would like to read two of the complaints I received within the past day or two.

RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
Buffalo, N. Y., December 12, 1941.

Hon. ALFRED F. BEITER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: H. R. 1632, reported favorably by Ways and Means Committee, is now on the Consent Calendar. There was an objection by Congressman THOMAS FORD on December 1 which pushed it ahead to the 15th.

This resolution would kill the Doughton law provision which prohibits returning residents from bringing back merchandise tax-free (up to $100) unless absent from the country more than a given number of hours—a rule that is of vital importance to border cities.

With present upset conditions there certainly should be no relaxing of customs or immigration control.

Will you join Congressman FORD in objecting so as to stop any consideration of the bill at this time?

Your effort to defeat this resolution will be appreciated by our association.

Yours very truly,
R. T. FISKE, *Secretary.*

THE WM. HENGERER CO.,
Buffalo, December 11, 1941.

Congressman ALFRED F. BEITER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You will recall that the merchants of Buffalo were very much interested in securing passage of the Doughton bill 2 or 3 years ago, providing that a tourist is entitled to a $100 exemption on his return to the United States only if he has been out of this country for 48 hours.

I am now informed that the interests which originally opposed the border regulation so vigorously in the first instance are now back of H. R. 1632. This eliminates the necessity of being out of this country any stipulated number of hours as far as reentry from Mexico with purchases is concerned.

Congressman TOM FORD objected to this bill December 1, which pushed it over for another 2 weeks. The bill is scheduled to make its next appearance December 15, and we Buffalo merchants would greatly appreciate your entering an objection to the bill at that time so that it will return to its regular calendar position. Although this law does not change the situation as refers to the cities bordering on Canada, we are logically concerned that the precedent of the passage of this bill would open the situation as far as we are concerned in the near future.

I hope that you can find it possible to be present on the floor of the House Monday, December 15, and object to H. R. 1632 when it comes up. I am requesting this same cooperation from your colleagues from this area.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD M. HECHT, *President.*

Mr. BUCK. I can assure the gentleman we have no contemplation of taking up any legislation of this type with reference to the Canadian border.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Does not this bill play directly into the hands of the professional smuggler? He goes across the border and stays 24 hours and accomplishes his purpose, and thus discriminates against other people.

Mr. BUCK. You mean if this bill is not enacted it plays into the hands of the professional smuggler?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Of course it does. I thought I had stated that already.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. As a matter of fact, the bill, if anything, will greatly benefit and make the stay in California a little more pleasant for the legitimate tourist.

Mr. BUCK. Certainly. There is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] said that 17 members of the delegation signed a petition not for this bill, but asking the Secretary of the Treasury not to impose the 24-hour rule. Well, 5 or 6 of them, when they found out what the real purpose of that petition was, told me personally that they would not have signed it had they known, but the petition has gone through and therefore their names were on it and they could do nothing about it.

At the time that was done the Treasury Department was contemplating putting on the existing 24-hour rule in that particular customs district because it is a free zone, and any opposition from San Antonio, El Paso, or any place else is irrelevant and immaterial, because it has nothing to do with this situation at all.

Now, they say it is for the benefit of our tourist trade. Last year was one of the biggest tourist years the State of California ever had and this 24-hour rule was on all that time. So the tourist angle is out.

The trucking associations, apartment-house associations, hotel associations, and restaurant associations have all come in and said they were opposed to the 24-hour rule, but they are not affected financially, and this is the reason why they are not: 150 merchants in the cities of Los Angeles, San Diego, Beverly Hills, and Pasadena, who, when they buy perfume, English sporting goods, and all types of luxury goods, pay a duty to the Treasury of the United States. My God, gentlemen, this is no time to allow a lot of loopholes that will permit the importation into this country of millions of dollars' worth of luxury goods which would yield a handsome revenue. These people can afford to pay the full price for these goods if they want them.

Another thing that is wrong with the bill is that the Treasury Department was not consulted as to what the effect of its operation would have on the Department. I have this information from Mr. Gaston, who is in charge of the division handling this problem. The Department also states that the present situation is working satisfactorily. Furthermore, it insists that the bill will increase border traffic, adding additional burdens to the Customs Service.

In a critical situation such as we find ourselves in now, this change would be not only undesirable but I am assured it would be embarrassing.

Finally, the bill is drawn in the interest of one single merchant doing business in Tia Juana.

It is unfair to hundreds of other merchants, nay, thousands of other merchants, who deal in the type of luxury merchandise that comes into this free port. These merchants pay duty on their goods and are forced to sell their goods in competition with this one single merchant who comes here and asks the Congress of the United States to grant him permission to do business to his advantage as against all the other merchants of the State.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do I understand the gentleman from California to say that the Treasury Department has not approved this bill?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It has not approved it and does not approve it and it was not consulted.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I notice this language in the bill: "That all jewelry and similar articles of personal adornment having a value of $300 or more brought in by nonresidents of the United States shall if sold within 3 years after the arrival of said person in the United States be liable to duty at the rate or rates in force at the time of such sale."

Is there any provision in the bill for the registration of these imported articles? I fail to find it.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I have not found it myself.

Mr. SPENCE. If there is no provision for registration how can they ascertain when a violation occurs? Of what value is this provision I have read?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. It is a loophole in the tariff law; that is all it is.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. Again referring to the matter which we discussed a few moments ago, opponents point out that the same interests who originally opposed the border regulation so vigorously in the first instance now are backing this bill. This eliminates the necessity of being out of this country any given number of hours as far as reentry from Mexico is concerned. Does the gentleman have any information on that?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. That is the sole purpose of this bill. Here is a telegram from James Oviatt, who has one of the biggest stores in the State.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Here also is a telegram from the Marston Co. of San Diego, one of the principal merchants there. Here is one from James Oviatt, of Los Angeles, who has a number of stores and is one of the principal merchants. I have also a telegram from the president and managing director of the California Retailers' Association opposing this bill. This association represents all the merchants in town.

What the House is being asked to do at this time is to grant to one merchant an exemption and permit him to have people go over the border and bring back hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of luxury goods which this bill will enable him to sell duty free in competition with other merchants who bring them in through the regular channels and pay duty. This bill would let this one outfit rob the Treasury of the country at a time when every dollar is needed to fight a war and would work against the interest of the merchants who bring similar goods in in the regular way, and who, by paying duty, contribute to the fighting of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves 1½ minutes.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield to anyone in favor of the bill.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK] yield me some time?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1½ minutes.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is backed by the tourists' group of California, which is one of our biggest industries.

Mr. Speaker, replying to my colleague's statement regarding the California delegation, I may say that the California delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike, discussed this matter at great length. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD] was the only member of the delegation who was opposed to this bill. We proceeded to Secretary Morgenthau's office. He at first did not want to see us, but finally did. The Democratic members of the delegation asked him why he made this ruling. He said he had made a promise to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD]; whereupon the Democratic members asked him if the other 19 members of the State did not amount to anything. Mr. Morgenthau had no reply to that.

Now, this bill works directly into the hands of the professional smuggler.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman means that failure to pass the bill would work into the hands of the professional smuggler.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes. I thank the gentleman from California. Failure to pass this bill works into the hands of the professional smuggler under present conditions. Professional smugglers will go across the border, stay at questionable places—and when I say questionable they are questionable—for 24 hours and accomplish the thing they want to accomplish, stay just long enough to entitle them to bring back $100 worth of goods. There is no place to stay over there.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I have another minute?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. May I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD] if he will let me have another minute?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to my colleague. He is making a very good argument against the bill.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have 1,782 retailers who are asking that this bill be passed. The statement that my colleague makes that the California retailers object does not check with that statement. How about these 1,782 retailers? How about the Auto-

mobile Club of Southern California that is directly interested in this? How about the Apartment House Association, the Hotel Association, the Restaurant Association, the Truck Association, and many others?

As a matter of fact, the amount of business done here is very small. It would be in the form of souvenirs, and so forth; and if they did not buy this stuff across the border, no doubt it would not be bought at all; therefore it does not greatly affect any of the retailers either in Los Angeles County or San Diego County, because most of the goods would be of the type of Mexican shawls, Mexican souvenirs, and so forth, which you could not get on the other side of the border.

I ask every Member to back up the other 17 Members of the California delegation and vote for the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, let us clear this matter up about the 17 Members from California. I have talked with two of them in the last 20 minutes. They tell me they did sign this petition some time ago, but did not know what was in it. That is, they did not appreciate its implications. I do not know anything about this California fight, but I do sense that the sandwich sellers and the retailers along the highway, as well as the people who profit from traffic are for this measure. Most of the permanent stores, the department stores, the dry goods, and clothing stores are against this because overcoats and other commodities are bought at this department store just across the border in Mexico. No one will deny that much of this material can be bought for less in Mexico than it costs the wholesaler in the United States. There is a department store across the border. A cement road has been built to the department store. There are a lot of retail establishments, restaurants, and so forth, along the highway. Now it is sought to change the law so that a man can drive from Los Angeles to this department store over in Mexico and buy goods cheaper than the wholesale merchant can buy them in Los Angeles. I prefer to have these overcoats manufactured in our own country, sold from our own retail stores where American standards of wages are paid. The American taxpayer should not be discriminated against.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. No; I only have 2 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is attacking the integrity of a Member of the House when he states that he signed that petition without knowing what was in it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan is a very meticulous gentleman, as we all appreciate. He always knows what he is doing when he does it. Some Members are not so exact. They sometimes investigate and find out later that they made a mistake. I have known Members to sign petitions which were placed on the Clerk's desk, asking that certain legislation be brought up. They signed in good faith, but they found they had made a mistake. They then corrected that mistake. In fact, I made that mistake once myself, and I do not want to make it again.

I hope all of the Members from California will take the floor here and tell us how they feel toward this bill. If these Members have misinformed me I would like to know it. If all the California Members here, as the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] says, are enthusiastic and all het up in favor of this bill, I would like to have them take the floor and tell us about it. On the other hand, if this is a bill the purpose of which is to make it easy to buy goods outside the United States to the detriment of the Treasury of the United States and legitimate retailers in the United States, I think we ought to know that too. This is a free-trade bill. I still believe in protecting our own industry against ruinous foreign competition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill and to include two letters I received in opposition to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, by an act of this Congress long passed, a person who leaves the United States and returns is entitled to bring in duty-free $100 worth of merchandise. If a tourist visiting in California crossed the border into Mexico, he would have to stay 24 hours, under Treasury regulations now in effect, before he can avail himself of this exemption privilege.

This bill will modify the regulation, which is now in effect, so as to provide that "frequency of visit," rather than the length of the stay abroad, would determine the right of the returning citizen to claim the exemption. If this bill is agreed to, the tourist would not have to stay abroad any particular length of time in order to obtain the exemption. But, under the terms of the new statute, he would be allowed to avail himself of the privilege only once during a period which must not be less than 30 days or more than 6 months, the precise period to be fixed by Treasury regulation.

You will see, upon reflection, how that benefits the legitimate tourists. Anyone who is over there for the purpose of seeing Mexico and buying a souvenir trinket, or something else that may strike his fancy, can do it without any particular inconvenience and come back within an hour or so; but if a person is in the inelegant business of smuggling under the cloak of respectability which the present Treasury regulation affords, he is going to find it deucedly inconvenient to separate his expeditions, 30, 60, or 90 days. All he has to do to comply with the 24-hour provision is to hire a cot or two and run his men back and forth over the border, each man, each day, claiming the exemption. It is a scandal as matters stand now.

If you would help the legitimate retailer and the tourist, too, vote for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the point that the gentleman from California just referred to that a man can go over there and stay 24 hours, then come back with a hundred dollars' worth of goods prompts me to make this reply: He has to make an oath of affirmation that those goods are not for the purpose of sale. If he gets caught selling them, he is going to be in trouble.

Another point the proponents make is the fact that this is in the interest of tourist trade, and they stress that. As I said before, California has had one of the biggest years it ever had last year and this rule was in effect. The Treasury does not want it. They do not want to have their regulations disturbed. They do not want to lose the revenue that will result from this bill going into effect.

I ask the House to defeat it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the regulation adopted by the Treasury Department in effect attempts to provide for a local embargo by regulation of customs. In effect a special embargo tariff is in force just for the benefit of one localized section. There is no reason that I can see which justifies one special procedure in one place along the southern border different from the other sections. The customs work carried on at El Paso might be compared to this. An entirely different rule applies there. Under generally similar conditions the San Diego customs district is singled out for a special rule.

This Congress could never justify a special regulation applying to only one point of contact with our neighbor on the south. I believe this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the author of this bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, you have just listened to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD]. May I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from California said the Treasury was not consulted about this bill and had no opinion on it.

I hold in my hand a report that was made to the Committee on Ways and Means, and I read from that report:

> Reference is made to the request of your committee, dated April 2, 1940, for an expression of this Department's views with respect to H. R. 9143, a bill "Permitting free entry of articles imported by returning residents from certain countries on the basis of the frequency of use of the exemption rather than the length of visit abroad and for other purposes."
>
> H. R. 1632, if enacted, would eliminate that portion of the fourth proviso to paragraph

1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 36 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C. Supp. V, title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1798), which reads as follows:

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BUCK. May I suggest in the interest of saving time, because the gentleman has other points to consider, and I understand the gentleman is reading from the Treasury report, that he read the concluding sentences, and let it be understood by the Members of the House that the Treasury has no objection to the enactment of this bill and that no revenue loss will be incurred by its passage.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In compliance with the gentleman's request, I shall read the following closing paragraphs of the letter:

This bill, if enacted, would permit a returning resident of the United States to apply the $100 exemption to articles acquired by him in a contiguous country that maintains a free zone or free port, regardless of the length of time spent by the returning resident in that country, but would permit the Department to deny the exemption to such a resident if he had taken advantage of the exemption in the same customs district within the period (to be fixed at the discretion of the Secretary) of not less than 30 days nor more than 6 months.

The enactment of H. R. 9143 appears to be a matter that lies within the sound discretion of the Congress, and the Department perceives no administrative difficulties which would affect the proper administration of the bill, if enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

The letter is signed by Mr. Herbert E. Gaston, Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BUCK. If the gentleman will yield further, may I make it clear to the Members of the House that this bill has a unanimous report from the committee. I see the ranking Republican member of the committee here, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], and I ask him to confirm the fact that this is a unanimous report.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. This bill has been before the Committee on Ways and Means for some time, earnestly advocated by one of our colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK], and the author of the bill. After due hearing and deliberations, and after having received a report from the Treasury Department, the Committee on Ways and Means made a unanimous report on the bill, as was stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I say I am glad this bill is here, for one reason, at least, that it has caused the distinguished gentleman on the other side to hit the sawdust trail and become a rank protectionist instead of a free trader.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I have been denied the heavenly wish to visit southern California, which I have always understood to be a land of salubrious climate, sunshine, and oranges. My colleague the gentleman from Michigan has referred to the fact that you go across the border to buy overcoats. It seems to me an unjust stigma has been placed upon that part of the State, and I hope the gentleman from California will correct it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that perhaps he is letting the icy blasts of Michigan confuse him in his thinking about California.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The House is waiting to pass a very important naval bill. The Committee on Naval Affairs has a meeting scheduled at 2 o'clock to report out another very important naval bill. Does not the gentleman believe it to be a little out of place at a time like this to take up the time of the House with a bill of this character?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; I think one portion of the United States is entitled to as much attention as another.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. This being a unanimous report of the Committee on Ways and Means, I do not believe the Members of the House need be greatly concerned by the opposition to it, as evidenced here today. I ask that they all vote in favor of the bill. I would forget that the one Member actively opposing this bill may have a personal feeling against one man who he says is in favor of it, and vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In conclusion, may I say that this is not one man's bill; it is a bill that has been requested by a large majority of the people in southern California. It merely affects those people from California and other States who go across the border and in returning exercise their prerogatives under the law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS F. FORD) there were—ayes 66, noes 18.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUAL NATIONALITY OF CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6109) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, to provide for the clarification of the dual nationality of certain persons, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. KRAMER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection until an explanation of the bill can be made?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes, I withhold the objection, but I reserved the right to object because there is an amendment I want adopted if this bill passes. However, I will hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. KRAMER. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas if he will explain this bill to the House?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an amendment to the Nationality Act of 1940, is recommended and supported by the War Department and by the Department of Justice, and by other departments of our Government.

The bill provides that those American citizens who have dual citizenship and who are inducted or are now in the armed forces or who are employed by the Government will be required to take an oath that provides a renunciation of allegiance to the foreign government where they have dual citizenship. That is to say, if they have citizenship in the United States and also claim to be citizens of Germany, or if Germany claims them as citizens, then the provisions of this bill will apply. The same thing obtains as to Japan, Italy, or any other foreign country. They take this oath, and by it they declare that they do not owe any allegiance whatever to any foreign government. It applies only to those who have dual citizenship.

The bill further provides that any and all American citizens who have dual citizenship, besides those in our armed forces and in Government service, may take an oath of renunciation to the government of the country which may claim them as citizens. The oath is similar to the one required of naturalized citizens.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me explain to the gentleman from Kansas what my amendment means, and I think he will agree with me. On page 1, line 8, after the words "United States", in order to make this thing entirely clear, insert the words "who was born in the United States or in one of the territorial or insular possessions thereof." Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that this is the situation: This legislation is directed at the Japanese who claim dual citizenship.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not entirely. It applies to all who have dual citizenship, if the gentleman please.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me show the gentleman how that comes about. Whenever a child is born of Japanese parents, they immediately register that child's name with the Japanese consul and that name is then sent to Tokyo. He is then registered as a Japanese subject. He has all the privileges of Japanese citizenship. He can go to Japan, own land, join the Army, or enjoy all the benefits of a Japanese citizen. If this is not done, he cannot become a Japanese citizen or is not a Japanese citizen and does not enjoy those benefits. Now, there are thousands—25,000 in California, I am told, and untold thousands in Hawaii—who claim this dual citizenship. When I was in Hawaii in 1937, the Japanese Empire was drafting into the Japanese armed forces young men in Hawaii who claimed dual citizenship and who had voted in our elections the year before. Now they are the only people who have dual citizenship. The people who were born in foreign countries cannot claim dual citizenship, because when they come here and take an oath of allegiance, they renounce their citizenship in, and their allegiance to, the country from which they come. What I want to do is to confine this to people who were born in the United States and who are claiming this dual citizenship, and for that reason I have offered this amendment, and I do not see how anybody can object to it.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me go a little further, if the gentleman please.

I would like to recall, if I may, to the gentleman from Mississippi that this bill does apply to the group that he has mentioned. It also applies to thousands of others. They include individuals who were born abroad of American parents, and would be included under this measure. Let me give an illustration. We have, for example, American citizens who have gone abroad and have had children born over there, but being born of American citizens abroad. They return with these children when they are infants. Such individuals are American citizens, but having been born abroad they have dual citizenship. That is, they also have citizenship in the foreign country where they were born. This is just one situation.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me suggest further that there are a number of countries that have various and different laws, rules, and regulations with reference to the question of claims on individuals who are of parentage belonging to that particular country. For example, we have individuals who come from a foreign country, who are over here and become citizens by naturalization, and while they are still naturalized citizens, they go abroad and have children over there who come back here as infants. Such children are American citizens because they are children of American citizens, but the foreign countries also claim them, and they are therefore classified as having dual citizenship. Some countries even claim citizens who are born in this country or our possessions. The problem is an extremely complicated one, and there can be no harm in requiring each and every individual serving in governmental capacity, who may have such dual citizenship, to take this oath and make the whole thing clean-cut. It applies under the terms of the bill only to those individuals who belong to or will join the armed forces or who are employed or may be employed in the Government service. Except that any others in the same class may renounce citizenship to such foreign government if they choose to do so.

This bill comes here because the War Department believes it is extremely important, and the Department of Justice also thinks that it is necessary. The measure involves quite a number of individuals, and it ought to be passed without the gentleman's amendment. I have all the respect in the world for the gentleman from Mississippi. The gentleman and I agree on the restriction of immigration. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that I will go just as far as he on the matter of restricting immigration. I am quite sure the legislation will not do the thing it should do, or what the gentleman from Mississippi would like to have done, if his amendment is adopted. Let me say too, that I have profound respect for the good intentions of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman that I have added words that cure the very objection he raises. Let me read the gentleman the amendment as I have it here.

I think it takes in some people who have no right to claim citizenship in the United States. In this amendment I have added these words at the last: "or of American parents." That will reach the people the gentleman from Kansas is talking about, and it will make the amendment read as follows: After the words "United States", insert "who was born in the United States or in one of the Territorial or insular possessions thereof, or of American parents." That will reach the gentleman's objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I wish I could agree with the gentleman. His amendment limits the legislation to a certain group and leaves out a large number that should be included. As I said a moment ago, the problem is extremely complicated. There are some countries which even claim persons as being their citizens if their grandparents had been citizens of such country. Different countries have different means of making claim on persons who are citizens of the United States. We want to clip that off, so that Germany, Italy, Japan, or any other country may not claim them if they are really citizens of the United States, and will renounce allegiance to such foreign countries. I just believe that the gentleman's amendment will not be helpful to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman from California——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California cannot speak for what the House will do if the amendment is offered. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 501) be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting therein a new section, between sections 503 and 504, as follows:

"SEC. 503½. (a) For the purposes of this section the term 'dual national' means a national of the United States who under the laws of any foreign state is a citizen or subject of such foreign state or owes allegiance or fidelity to such foreign state or to any prince, potentate, or sovereign thereof.

"(b) A dual national may, upon reaching the age of 18 years, or at any time thereafter, renounce and abjure his foreign nationality, allegiance, and fidelity by taking the formal oath of allegiance to the United States, in the form prescribed by subsection (b) of section 335.

"(c) No person shall hereafter be admitted upon his voluntary application to the service of the United States, either civil or military, until he shall have taken, or unless he shall submit proof satisfactory to the civil or military authorities, as the case may be, that he has theretofore taken the formal oath of allegiance to the United States and renunciation of foreign nationality, allegiance, and fidelity, in the form prescribed by subsection (b) of section 335.

"(d) Every person who has heretofore been or shall hereafter be registered for the military service of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 301), as amended, or has heretofore been or shall hereafter be ordered into the active military service of the United States under the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858; U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 401), or under the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress), shall upon induction or entrance into such service take the formal oath of allegiance to the United States and renunciation of foreign nationality, allegiance, and fidelity, in the form prescribed by subsection (b) of section 335, unless such person shall submit proof satisfactory to the military authorities that he has theretofore taken such oath: *Provided, however*, That refusal or failure to take such oath shall not preclude the induction or entrance into such service of such person.

"(e) Every person who at the time of the approval of this act is in the service of the United States, either civil or military, shall within 120 days after the approval of this act take the formal oath of allegiance to the United States and renunciation of foreign nationality, allegiance, and fidelity, in the form prescribed by subsection (b) of section 335, unless such person shall submit proof satisfactory to the civil or military authorities, as the case may be, that he has theretofore taken such oath: *Provided*, That such period may be extended in cases of emergency under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That refusal or willful and knowing failure to take such oath shall be cause for summary discharge with prejudice from such service, subject to the discretion of the head of the department, agency, independent establishment, or other instrumentality of the United States in which such person is serving.

"(f) The oath contemplated by the provisions of this section shall be in addition to the oath or oaths required by other provisions of law upon entrance into the service of the United States, either civil or military.

"(g) Authority to administer the oath contemplated by the provisions of this section is hereby conferred upon naturalization courts and persons now or hereafter authorized by law to administer the oath or oaths required

by other provisions of law upon entrance into the service of the United States, either civil or military.

"(h) Upon the taking by a dual national of the oath contemplated by the provisions of this section, a certificate reciting that such national has taken the formal oath of allegiance to the United States and renounced and abjured his foreign nationality, allegiance, and fidelity shall upon request be issued to such national in such form as may be prescribed by the Attorney General. Copies of such certificates shall be transmitted to the Secretary of State.

"(i) The Attorney General is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk, and I rise in support of that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Page 1, line 8, after the words "United States", insert "who was born in the United States or in one of the Territorial or insular possessions thereof, or of American parents."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will cover everybody who has any right to claim citizenship in the United States.

As I explained to the House a moment ago, people who are born in foreign countries, unless their parents are American citizens, have no claim to American citizenship. This bill is directed at the Japanese on the Pacific coast and in Hawaii. As I said a while ago, that situation came about by virtue of the fact that those Japanese, who came here in the beginning, cannot become citizens under our law. When their children are born, those children are immediately registered with the Japanese consul, and their names are then sent into Tokyo, and they become Japanese citizens, and yet many of them claim American citizenship and when they grow up they can vote in our elections and enjoy all other rights of American citizenship. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of deporting every Jap who claims, or has claimed, Japanese citizenship, or sympathizes with Japan in this war.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] says there are a few people temporarily in foreign countries, whose children are born there, who claim dual citizenship. I have never been able to find one.

I am not in favor of throwing the doors of immigration open, or even sliding them ajar in this way. I went through this fight in 1924, when the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations were battling here to save America for Americans, and I do not want this bill to be passed leaving a loophole for people who are not entitled to American citizenship to come here and claim the right of citizenship just because they happen to be on the Federal pay roll.

We do not know what is likely to happen. These are perilous times, and I for one am not willing to begin to break down our immigration laws. Many of these people on the Government pay roll ought never to have been there. Those jobs should have been given to Americans in the beginning. There is a certain element that conducts regular civil-service schools, training applicants, not for efficiency, but for passing civil-service examinations. The rolls have been literally packed with these "eligibles," many of whom are not even citizens of the United States. It has become a racket. It ought to be investigated; these civil-service schools ought to be broken up, everyone connected with them should be prosecuted and their beneficiaries should be driven from the Federal pay roll. Certainly we should not put the stamp of our approval upon such individuals by the passage of this measure in its present form.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman's amendment surely cannot hurt anything, and it merely indicates that the gentleman is very much interested in this matter, as are the proponents of the bill. We cannot lose anything by supporting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And may I say to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING] that I discussed this proposition with him and the amendment is satisfactory to him.

Mr. KING. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I believe the language of the bill does cover all of the group the gentleman has in mind, but I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that the amendment will not do any harm.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. What I want to do is to hold the bill down within proper limits. I was a member of a committee, along with the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING], in 1937, when we investigated this very thing, this dual citizenship among the Japanese in Hawaii. I am thoroughly familiar with it. I know what it means. I am for making those people absolutely renounce all their allegiance to a foreign power or get out of the country. I would apply the same rule to everyone else who claims citizenship here. And I am not willing to support a bill that I think goes far beyond that and permits people to come in here who are not entitled to American citizenship and claim protection under it, because they have managed to get on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Just why should any American of foreign birth claim dual citizenship?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They do not. The ones that claim dual citizenship are the Japs who are born in this country or in Hawaii.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. It is not a question of why they should, but the fact remains that they are not necessarily claiming this dual nationality, but it is the government of other countries which is claiming it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Well, you cannot keep other countries from claiming anything. I am not sure you can keep the Japanese Empire from claiming these Japs, and if they are caught over there they will draft them into the army and use them against us. This bill will not prevent that. But if my amendment is not adopted it will bring more evils than it will cure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] with reference to the question of restricting citizenship in this country. This measure does not in any way extend the rights of American citizenship. If it did, I would not support it.

It is not only a matter for the American citizen to determine. It also involves the claim that a foreigner is also a citizen or national of that country. I am informed that Germany, for instance, now is making the claim that individuals born of German parentage in the United States are also citizens of that country. A number of other foreign countries claim the same thing. Now, it is just hoped that this will help clarify that situation and let this individual of a country where he is claimed to have dual citizenship—not be himself, but where the country claims he has dual citizenship—give him the right to take an oath and say, "I do not claim any citizenship in such country, and do not owe allegiance to its government." It gives him the right to do that very thing. It is practically the same oath that is given to an individual when he becomes a naturalized citizen.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississpipi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The addition which I made to my amendment takes care of that situation. Besides, you cannot keep a foreign country from claiming anything.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate that you cannot make them do things, but you can give the individual who does have citizenship in this country a chance to clarify that and say, "I am a citizen of the United States only, and I am not a citizen of Germany or any other foreign country, and I do not owe its government any allegiance whatsoever."

He can say "I am a citizen of the United States and the United States only", and he can say "I take an oath that I am a citizen of the United States and I owe allegiance to no other country in the world, even though some other country may claim that I owe allegiance to that foreign country." That is all there is to it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not true that this bill has nothing to do with trying to create citizenship?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly. It has nothing whatever to do with the creation of citizenship at all. It does not make an individual a citizen in any respect whatever.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The War Department and the Department of Justice themselves felt it would be for the protection and defense of this country to

compel certain people now in the service to make a direct renunciation against certain Axis countries, in which their fathers or forefathers were born, which countries claimed them as citizens. Is that not the substance of the bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the substance of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman that probably the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is not necessary, but at the same time it does not hurt anything.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes, it does. That is the difficulty of it. I have tried to explain why.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. His amendment applies to two classes of people only.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It applies to two classes of people only.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is, children born in the United States or children of American parentage? Nobody can have dual citizenship except he is in those two classes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes. That is the difficulty. Our country, of course, does not recognize or claim other groups, but other countries have different laws, rules, and regulations, that are so much more far reaching. That is the difficulty with the proposition.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. A man born in a foreign country comes here and takes the oath of allegiance. He renounces his allegiance to the foreign country from which he came.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But I am saying to the gentleman there are a number of individuals who are born in the Territories of the United States, yet foreign countries claim them as being citizens of their country.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. My amendment covers that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; it does not, necessarily. There are even cases where they go as far as born in the United States, to claim citizenship of persons whose grandparent or grandparents were born abroad. Some countries go even further than that.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Member from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Is it not a fact that certain countries hold that their nationals, when they come to this country and become naturalized, do not forefeit citizenship in their own country?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. THOM. And therefore when they go home they oftentimes seize them for army service in their own countries?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There are some cases where individuals have become naturalized in the United States and then go back and they are claimed for citizenship there, and their children with them, even though they are of the age of majority.

Mr. THOM. But this bill does not change that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This bill does not change that. But it does give his children born here a chance definitely to renounce, so far as we are concerned, any allegiance to that power.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] calls my attention to the fact that this adds a new section and numbers it 503½.

Does the gentleman know of any precedent for inserting a section between two sections of a bill and giving the new section a fractional number?

Mr. REES of Kansas. At the moment, no. I would say to the gentleman that I did not write the bill. In any event it is a technical matter and can very easily be corrected by amendment at the proper time. It is not a matter, I am sure the gentleman will agree, that would invalidate the legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. It would not, but it would establish a precedent. Suppose that next week or next year the gentleman wanted to add a second section, one following this. This one has been given some number plus one-half. What fraction would the next one take?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In the brief time at my disposal I cannot answer the gentleman's question except to say that the bill can easily be amended in that respect to conform with the section of the law sought to be amended.

Mr. KRAMER. The half number was assigned in order to avoid having to change all succeeding sections of the act. It was more convenient.

Mr. MICHENER. I appreciate the fact that it is more convenient, but it is a bad precedent to establish. Here we have a section numbered one-half. I suppose next we shall have one numbered three-fourths or six-eighths, or some other fraction. It is wrong draftsmanship.

Mr. KRAMER. But without it we should have to change all the suceeding section numbers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the fact that the section carries a fractional number makes any serious difference. In any event it can be corrected by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be passed without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. The amendment, in my judgment, should be rejected, and the bill passed as reported. The legislation comes to the House at the instance of the War Department. It has the approval of the Department of Justice. I am sure all agencies who are guarding our national defense want this legislation. I trust it may have your support.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was very carefully considered by a subcommittee of five of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a subcommittee of which I was a member. The committee sat morning after morning. We met with Army and Navy authorities and with officials of the Department of Justice. Every person who knows much about the processes that were followed in drafting this legislation knows that the bill has received careful consideration.

The authorities of the War Department feel that this bill is very much needed at this time. It is a bill that the authorities of the Navy Department approve and want. The authorities in the Department of Justice feel it thoroughly workable and warranted. I hope the membership will not be misled, and that the membership will not conclude it is unsound legislation, because it has been most carefully studied and considered.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am not attacking the rest of the bill provided this amendment is adopted. I know this amendment is necessary if the country is to be properly protected.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to call attention to the fact that this bill was brought up by unanimous consent with the understanding there was no objection to it; otherwise its consideration would have given place to other matters. The House must dispose of a conference report on the $10,000,000,000 supplemental defense appropriation bill this afternoon.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am going to very brief.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] speaks about deporting these American-born Japanese. These people are American-born, they cannot be deported—American-born Japanese, American-born Italians, American-born Mexicans, or American-born offspring of any nationals—whether we like it or whether we do not. This is their country and this country recognizes that situation of dual nationality. This bill requires them to make an election, and especially where they join the armed forces of the United States they must take this oath of allegiance to the United States; and I see no reason at this particular time why they should not.

I believe, as does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], that the amendment will help nullify the effects of this bill and weaken the bill rather than strengthen it. I believe every one of these people should make a clear, clean, and concise acknowledgment as to just where they stand.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be defeated and that the bill be passed as reported.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I wish to make this observation to clear up a point that perhaps has not been brought before the House. There are really two

sections to this bill; one of them gives to these dual nationals the opportunity to abjure and renounce any dual nationality, and the other applies to every citizen. There is no discrimination. We were very careful in the subcommittee in writing this bill that there should be no discrimination as between the nationals of any country. The wording therefore means: Every person in the civil and military services shall be amenable to this bill and take the same oath regardless of their parentage, regardless of their antecedents and their background. It applies to every man and woman in the Government services.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That was my understanding. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This amendment I have offered covers every single human being that could legitimately claim dual citizenship under any circumstance.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. It is not the individual who claims the dual citizenship. It is beyond and above him, his Government claiming that. We want the individual to clarify his statement.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. You cannot prevent a foreign government from making claims. If we could, we would stop the war and run the American flag up all over the world.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I agree with the gentleman, but we can say to the individual, "You will have to tell us where you stand." That is what we can do about it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. You are covering in large numbers of people who were not born in the United States and who are not entitled to citizenship merely because they happen to be on the Federal pay roll. They have no right to such favors. Those places should be given to Americans. They have been making a racket of the civil service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "nays" apparently had it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This measure is not going through in this form if I can help it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-three Members are present; not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 51, nays 298, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—51

Boren	Collins	Culkin
Bryson	Colmer	Cunningham
Butler	Cooley	Domengeaux
Clevenger	Cox	Dondero
Ford, Miss.	Lanham	Rankin, Miss.
Fulmer	McGehee	Richards
Gibson	Manasco	Rivers
Gilchrist	Michener	Smith, Va.
Gore	Mills, Ark.	Starnes, Ala.
Granger	Moser	Tarver
Grant, Ala.	Murray	Vincent, Ky.
Gregory	Nichols	Vorys, Ohio
Hare	Oliver	West
Hobbs	Pace	Whitten
Jenkins, Ohio	Pearson	Whittington
Johnson, Luther A.	Peterson, Fla.	Worley
Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Ga.	
	Pierce	

NAYS—298

Allen, Ill.	Flaherty	McCormack
Allen, La.	Flannagan	McGregor
Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	McIntyre
Anderson, Calif.	Folger	McKeough
Anderson, N. Mex.	Forand	McLaughlin
Andresen, August H.	Ford, Leland M.	McLean
Angell	Ford, Thomas F.	McMillan
Arnold	Gale	Maas
Barnes	Gamble	Maciora
Barry	Gavagan	Magnuson
Bates, Mass.	Gearhart	Mahon
Baumhart	Gehrmann	Martin, Mass.
Beam	Gerlach	Mason
Beckworth	Gillette	Merritt
Beiter	Gillie	Meyer, Md.
Bell	Gossett	Mills, La.
Bender	Graham	Mitchell
Bennett	Grant, Ind.	Monroney
Bloom	Green	Mott
Boehne	Guyer	Mundt
Boggs	Gwynne	Nelson
Boland	Haines	Norrell
Bonner	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Mich.
Boykin	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	O'Connor
Bradley, Pa.	Hancock	O'Hara
Brown, Ga.	Harrington	O'Leary
Brown, Ohio	Harris, Ark.	O'Neal
Buckley, N. Y.	Hart	O'Toole
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Paddock
Burdick	Healey	Patman
Byrne	Hébert	Patrick
Camp	Heffernan	Patton
Canfield	Heidinger	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Cannon, Fla.	Hess	Pheiffer, William T.
Cannon, Mo.	Hill, Colo.	Pittenger
Capozzoli	Hill, Wash.	Plauché
Carlson	Hinshaw	Ploeser
Carter	Hoffman	Plumley
Cartwright	Holmes	Poage
Case, S. Dak.	Hook	Powers
Casey, Mass.	Houston	Priest
Celler	Howell	Rabaut
Chenoweth	Hull	Ramsay
Chiperfield	Hunter	Ramspeck
Clason	Imhoff	Randolph
Claypool	Isac	Rankin, Mont.
Cochran	Jackson	Reece, Tenn.
Coffee, Nebr.	Jarman	Reed, Ill.
Coffee, Wash.	Jarrett	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, Md.	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Rizley
Cooper	Johns	Robertson, N. Dak.
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson, Va.
Courtney	Johnson, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller
Creal	Jones	Rodgers, Pa.
Crosser	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Crowther	Kean	Rolph
Cullen	Kee	Romjue
Curtis	Keefe	Russell
D'Alesandro	Kefauver	Sacks
Davis, Ohio	Kelley, Pa.	Sanders
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, Ill.	Sasscer
Day	Kennedy, Martin J.	Satterfield
Delaney	Kennedy, Michael J.	Sauthoff
Dewey	Keogh	Scanlon
Dickstein	Kerr	Schuetz
Dies	Kilburn	Schulte
Dingell	Kinzer	Scrugham
Dirksen	Kirwan	Secrest
Disney	Klein	Shanley
Ditter	Kocialkowski	Shannon
Downs	Kopplemann	Sheppard
Drewry	Kramer	Sheridan
Duncan	Kunkel	Short
Dworshak	Lambertson	Sikes
Eaton	Landis	Smith, Maine
Eberharter	Lea	Smith, Pa.
Edmiston	Leavy	Smith, Wash.
Elliott, Calif.	LeCompte	Smith, W. Va.
Ellis	Lesinski	Smith, Wis.
Engel	Lewis	Snyder
Englebright	Ludlow	Somers, N. Y.
Fenton	Lynch	South
Fish	McArdle	Spence
Fitzpatrick	McGlinchey	Springer
Stearns, N. H.	Tibbott	Wickersham
Stefan	Tinkham	Wigglesworth
Stevenson	Traynor	Williams
Stratton	Treadway	Wilson
Sullivan	Vinson, Ga.	Winter
Sumner, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolcott
Sutphin	Vreeland	Wolfenden, Pa.
Taber	Walter	Wolverton, N. J.
Talle	Ward	Woodruff, Mich.
Tenerowicz	Weaver	Wright
Terry	Weiss	Young
Thom	Wheat	Youngdahl
Thomas, Tex.	Whelchel	

NOT VOTING—81

Andrews	Flannery	Osmers
Arends	Gathings	Rich
Baldwin	Gifford	Robinson, Utah
Barden	Harness	Rogers, Okla.
Bates, Ky.	Harris, Va.	Sabath
Bishop	Harter	Schaefer, Ill.
Blackney	Hendricks	Scott
Bland	Holbrook	Shafer, Mich.
Bolton	Hope	Simpson
Brooks	Jacobsen	Smith, Ohio
Buck	Jenks, N. H.	Sparkman
Buckler, Minn.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Steagall
Burch	Johnson, W. Va.	Sumners, Tex.
Burgin	Kilday	Sweeney
Byron	Kleberg	Thill
Chapman	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Clark	Larrabee	Thomason
Cluett	McGranery	Tolan
Costello	Maciejewski	Van Zandt
Crawford	Mansfield	Wadsworth
Doughton	Marcantonio	Wasielewski
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Welch
Durham	May	Wene
Eliot, Mass.	Murdock	White
Elston	Myers, Pa.	Woodrum, Va.
Faddis	Norton	Zimmerman
Fellows	O'Day	
Fitzgerald		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Burch with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. May with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Holbrook with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Flannery with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Wene with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Chapman.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Zimmerman with Mrs. Byron.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. White.

Messrs. HULL, GEHRMANN, and KELLEY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE, 1942 AND 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri what this bill is about?

The SPEAKER. This is an appropriation bill for $10,000,000,000.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 53.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, and 86; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$388,000,000: *Provided*, That expenditures from appropriations under this heading may hereafter be made until June 30, 1943, without securing the specific approval of the projects by the President"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment after the date "June 30, 1943"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$827,820,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the Secretary of War to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense article procured from funds appropriated for the Military Establishment prior to or since March 11, 1941, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of March 11, 1941 (Public, No. 11). The value of defense articles disposed of in any way under the authority of this paragraph shall not exceed $2,000,000,000, and the limitation of $1,300,000,000 fixed by section 3 (a) (2) of such Act is hereby reduced to $800,000,000 and this latter limitation shall not be applicable to the War Department after the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That in the purchase of this field the Navy Department shall take into consideration expenditures by any Federal agency from Federal funds in or for developing such field prior to acquisition thereof by the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 6 of said amendment, after the word "collateral", insert "public works"; and, after the sum "$300,000,000", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to Congress on or before January 10, 1943, a statement by projects of the obligations incurred under this appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "as amended by this Act: *Provided*, That Public Law Numbered 72, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 24, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words 'five hundred and fifty thousand tons' and inserting the words 'one million three hundred and fifty thousand tons' in lieu thereof: *Provided further*, That Public Law Numbered 323, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved November 21, 1941, is hereby amended by deleting the words 'four hundred' and inserting 'eight hundred' in lieu thereof, and also by deleting the following: ', not to exceed $300,000,000' "; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the first and second provisos in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That in a total amount of not exceeding $10,000,000 and within the purposes provided for in this paragraph, the President may authorize the expenditure of sums from this appropriation for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the expending agency as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That the President shall transmit to Congress, on or before January 10, 1944, a report of the expenditures of such sum of $100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Beginning in line 7 of said amendment, after "specified,", strike out the following: "and including 3 cents per mile for travel performed by employees on official business in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official stations, but not within the District of Columbia, $100,000,000: *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$75,000,000: *Provided*, That not more than $5,000,000 of the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Office of Price Administration except that in the event of the enactment hereafter into law of legislation for price control this limitation may be exceeded to the extent necessary to give effect to such legislation: *Provided further,*"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 11 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000" and strike out $24,000,000" and insert "$22,000,000"; and in the matter inserted by said amendment strike out all of lines 12 and 13; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$59,115,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,815,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 41, 46, and 48.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER (except as to amendment No. 50),
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 50),
W. P. LAMBERTSON (except as to amendment No. 50),
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1 to 14, inclusive, relating to Title I—War Department: The House bill carried appropriations totaling $1,556,496,246 under "Defense Aid—Title III," and, in addition, provided that defense articles to the value of $500,000,000, procured under appropriations made available to the War Department since March 11, 1941, might also be furnished to other governments. The Senate proposed that the amounts granted by the House under "Defense Aid" be appropriated to the War Department, and that no money limitation be imposed upon the disposition of defense articles procured from War Department appropriations made since March 11, 1941. The conference agreement provides that the appropriations totaling $1,556,496,246 under "Title III—Defense Aid" be transferred to the appropriate War Department appropriations and carried thereunder. It also gives authority for the Secretary of War, when authorized by the President, to furnish in accordance with the act of March 11, 1941, to governments, whose defense is vital to the defense of the United States, defense articles procured from War Department appropriations made either prior to or since March 11, 1941, and places a limitation of $2,000,000,000 in value on articles to be so furnished. The agreement also reduces the $1,300,000,000 limitation in the act of March 11, 1941, upon the value of defense articles that may be furnished from funds appropriated prior to March 11, 1941, to $800,000,000, and provides that the new limitation shall not be applicable to the War Department. The effect of this change is to leave a limitation of $800,000,000 upon value of defense articles to be furnished from funds appropriated prior to March 11, 1941, by all agencies other than the War Department, and to place a limitation of $2,000,000,000 in value upon articles furnished from appropriations to the War Department both prior to and since March 11, 1941. This change will greatly simplify procedure and accounting of the War Department and make more flexible the handling by that Department of requirements for defense articles both for our own forces and lend-lease purposes.

The effect of the action agreed upon with respect to other amendments embraced by Title I—War Department, follows: Waives the requirement for Presidential approval of projects financed out of the appropriation "Expediting Production," as proposed by the Senate, but not beyond June 30, 1943; appropriates $125,000,000 for contingent fund, Chief of Staff, as proposed by the Senate, but dispenses with the Senate requirement for periodic report of expenditures; lifts the limitation upon the number of selective trainees who may be paid from the appropriation "Pay of the Army," as proposed by the Senate; provides for the payment of a money allowance to enlisted men traveling under orders at the rate of 3 cents per mile, in lieu of transportation or transportation and subsistence, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional $62,797,085 for "Army transportation," as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $827,820,000 for "Military posts," instead of $434,320,000, as proposed by the House, and $927,820,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional $485,600 for "Signal Service of the Army," as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $129,222,000 for "Engineer Service, Army," as proposed by the Senate, instead of $19,122,000, as proposed by the House; perfects the text of the appropriation for the Army of the Philippines, as proposed by the Senate, and provides for expenses incident to prisoners of war, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 15 to 35, inclusive, relating to Title II—Navy Department: Appropriates $50,000,000 for the Naval Emergency Fund, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $10,000,000, as proposed by the House, and broadens the scope of the appropriation, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $335,415,000 for public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks, as proposed by the Senate, amended with respect to the amount for temporary and emergency construction so as to limit "collateral items" to public-works projects, and to require a report of expenditures under such amount; provides for contractual authority in the amount of $640,000,000 under "Aviation, Navy," including $50,000,000 for additional plant facilities, as proposed by the Senate, instead of contractual authority of $140,000,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $18,665,727 for various Coast Guard purposes, as proposed by the Senate; provides for the construction or acquisition and conversion of 800 small vessels as mine craft and patrol craft, as proposed by the Senate, instead of 400 of such types of vessels, as proposed by the House, and provides for the construction or acquisition and conversion of 800,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels, as proposed by the Senate; and makes current naval appropriations available for the pay and other expenses of not to exceed 50,000 men inducted into the naval service and not to exceed 10,000 men inducted into the Marine Corps under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 36: Strikes out Title III—Defense Aid, as proposed by the Senate, previously referred to herein under Title I—War Department.

Nos. 37 to 40, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates $10,000 for payment to the widow of a deceased Senator, and provides for the employment of an assistant in the Senate Library, from January 1 to June 30, 1942, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42: Appropriates $25,000 for a depository for protection of valued congressional documents, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 43: Appropriates $100,000,000 as an emergency fund for the President, as proposed by the Senate, amended with respect to expenditures of a confidential character so as to provide for appropriate certification by the expending agency.

No. 44: Appropriates $300,000,000 under "Defense housing", as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000, as proposed by the House, for the provision of temporary shelter occasioned by war demands, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 45: Appropriates an additional amount of $75,000,000 for the Office for Emergency Management, instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; amends the text by eliminating provision for a personal money allowance for use of privately owned automobiles and by limiting to $5,000,000 the amount that may be made available to the Office of Price Administration, pending enactment of price control legislation. In making the reduction of $25,000,000, the conference committee has no desire to hamper any essential activities of the Office for Emergency Management. The amount allowed ($75,000,000) should be adequate for the immediate future. As the fiscal year progresses, and the specific needs become more definitely defined, such additional sums as may be justified can be provided.

No. 47: Appropriates $135,000 for national-defense activities, Federal Power Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 49: Authorizes the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to enter into contracts in connection with the construction of the airplane engine research laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, upon a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, subject to certain prescribed restrictions, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 50: Appropriates $22,000,000 under the "Tennessee Valley Authority" for additional power-production facilities, instead of $24,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, the reduction of $2,000,000 applying to the steam plant at or near Sheffield, Ala. There has been eliminated the mandatory provision, proposed by the Senate, that the work be undertaken and prosecuted with all possible expedition.

Nos. 51 to 59, inclusive, relating to the District of Columbia: Appropriates $22,570 for salaries and expenses for the Office of Administrator of Rent Control, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of $7,700, proposed by the Senate for salaries and expenses, Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board; appropriates $1,911,000 for street improvements, to be charged to the special fund derived from gasoline taxes and motor-vehicle fees, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates an additional $130,000 for the construction of a covered reservoir adjacent to the filtered-water reservoir of the McMillan Filter Plant, and increases the limit of cost of such project from $490,000 to $620,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 60: Appropriates $1,000,000 under the "Department of Agriculture" for orchard rehabilitation loans, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 61 to 66, both inclusive, relating to the office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics: Appropriates an additional amount of $223,702 for technical development, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional $7,792,290 for the establishment of air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $59,115,300 for the development of landing areas, instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $127,115,300 as proposed by the Senate, and fixes the amount of the appropriation to be applied to administrative expenses at $2,815,450, instead of $2,375,000 as proposed by the House, and $3,815,450 as proposed by the Senate; makes the proposed appropriation for the development of landing areas and unobligated balances of prior appropriations for such purpose available until June 30, 1943, as proposed by the Senate, and increases from 503 to 504 the total number of public airports and other public landing areas in the program as proposed by the Senate.

No. 67: Appropriates $515,300 for observations, warnings, and general weather service, Weather Bureau, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $190,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 68 to 73, both inclusive, relating to the Department of the Interior: Appropriates $100,000 for suppressing contagious diseases of livestock on Indian reservations, instead of $150,000 as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $150,000 for advances to Colorado River Dam fund, Boulder Canyon project, Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,500,000 under "General fund, construction", Bureau of Reclamation, for the Boise project, Idaho (Anderson Ranch), as proposed by the Senate; raises from $140,000 to $160,000 the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from the appropriation for gaging streams under the Geological Survey, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $578,000 under the Bureau of Mines for manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $77,400 under the Bureau of Mines for investigations and research on processes for production of potassium carbonate and sodium carbonate from trona

and wyomingite rock, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 74 and 75, relating to the Department of Justice: Appropriates an additional $180,000, for salaries, special national-defense unit, and an additional $1,100,000 for salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 77 (Department of State): Makes the appropriation proposed by the House for special and technical investigations, International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, available until June 30, 1943, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 78 (Treasury Department): Appropriates $5,835,446 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Internal Revenue, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,335,446, as proposed by the House, the increase of $1,500,000 being for the collection of the "use" tax on automobiles, by sale of stamps through the Post Office Department.

Nos. 79 and 80, relating to flood-control, general, Corps of Engineers, War Department: Appropriates $25,750,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $17,800,000, as proposed by the House, and authorizes the Corps of Engineers under available appropriations for civil functions objects, for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, to enter into contracts in such manner as the Secretary of War may determine to be in the public interest without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or section 3 of the River and Harbor Act of August 11, 1888, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 81 to 86, both inclusive: Makes technical changes.

DISAGREEMENTS

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

No. 41: Providing for a special executive assistant for each Senator.

No. 46: Appropriating an additional amount of $246,500 for expenses of the Board of Investigation and Research for transportation.

No 48: Appropriating $25,000,000 for general office buildings in the District of Columbia.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
JED JOHNSON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER (except as to amendment No. 50),
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 50),
W. P. LAMBERTSON (except as to amendment No. 50),
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the conference report summarized in the statement just read reports complete agreement on all differences between the two Houses, with the exception of three Senate amendments, on which we ask separate votes. After disposition of the conference report consideration will be had on the amendment providing for additional staff for the Members of the Senate; on the amendment providing additional funds for the Bureau of Investigation and Research for Transportation; and on the amendment providing for the erection of office accommodations for Federal agencies.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. McLEAN. This bill, as it went to the Senate, provided additional appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority of $25,000,000. As it comes back from the Senate there is added $22,000,000. This makes additional appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority of $47,000,000.

Last January there was appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority $69,800,000. The War Department allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority $6,500,000. I understand now that the committee on behalf of the House has agreed to this increase of $22,000,000. If the conference report is adopted, this will stand as the act of the House. Therefore, the House has no opportunity to express itself separately as to this additional appropriation which is to be made to the Tennessee Valley Authority unless we vote down the conference report.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Senate bill provided $24,000,000 for that purpose and the House agreed to $22,000,000, subject to the jurisdiction of the T. V. A.

Mr. McLEAN. My point is that the House has no opportunity to vote on that item unless it votes against the conference report, and it seems to me the T. V. A. is being treated very generously and I should like to be assured that all of this fund is justified by and will be used for national defense.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When the House votes on a conference report it votes on all items in disagreement between the two Houses, for which separate consideration is not provided. An agreement having been reached by the managers on the part of the two Houses, all items in disagreement are voted on simultaneously. Otherwise the conference would be of no effect. A conference report is voted on as a whole and cannot be amended. Is that what the gentleman wishes to know?

Mr. McLEAN. My information is that what the Tennessee Valley Authority desires is a new dam known as the Douglas Dam, which will destroy a tremendous canning industry in the State of Tennessee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no reference to, and no provision for, any such dam as the gentleman indicates in either the House bill or the Senate bill.

Mr. McLEAN. This is put in to prevent the construction of the Douglas Dam. This is a controversy between the Tennessee Valley Authority and others who think the Douglas Dam project unwise and unnecessary.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The subject to which the gentleman refers is not germane to the bill before us.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. I believe the gentleman, as chairman of my committee, will recall that the question came up in the Appropriations Subcommittee as to the advisability of increasing the contingent amount allowed the Corps of Engineers for construction work from 5 to 15 percent on approximately $400,000,000 of construction carried in the House bill. Was that amount increased by the Senate?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. While the Senate added additional funds to these items, there is nothing in the bill as far as the bill is concerned which makes any change in the contingent fund.

Mr. ENGEL. There is $390,000,000 in the bill added by the Senate which the Corps of Engineers can use for Air Corps construction. They can use as much of that for contingent funds as they want to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is nothing in the hearings or in the bill which would justify them in changing the amount that they presently have the right to use, for which they have additional funds.

Mr. ENGEL. But they can use that money? They have that fund to use if they see fit?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They could not do it unless Congress changed the law.

Mr. ENGEL. On page 9727 of Friday's RECORD is a statement regarding the Floyd Bennett Field. This bill provides approximately $10,000,000 for the purchase of that field. In the statement on page 9982, Commander Ballentine of the Navy states that we have already spent $2,200,000 of rivers and harbors money on the field and $4,856,000 of W. P. A. money; a little over $7,000,000 of Federal money has been spent on Floyd Bennett Field. Is the $10,000,000 we are to pay them in addition to that $7,000,000? I have not had a chance to examine the matter at all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We make provision here for $10,000,000 for the purchase of the field. We also appropriate something in excess of $8,000,000 additional for facilities, but we specifically state that the expenditures to which the gentleman refers that has been previously spent be taken into consideration.

Mr. ENGEL. If the gentleman will yield further, the statement further shows that the city of New York has invested approximately $3,564,000 in that field.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. And in making provision for the purchase of the field, that amount was taken into consideration.

Mr. ENGEL. Then we are paying them $10,000,000 when they have invested approximately $3,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We provide in excess of $18,000,000—$10,000,000 for purchase and $8,000,000 for improvements in addition to what has already been spent.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me that quite a bit of explanation is necessary with reference to amendment No. 44 on page 22, which provides for a deficiency appropriation of $300,000,000 with reference to defense housing. I understand this is quite separate and apart from the $300,000,000 that was authorized in the

bill that the House passed on last Thursday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. It is in addition to that appropriation and is in no way related to it.

Mr. LANHAM. And this is for temporary, movable housing made necessary by reason of three shifts of workers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right. We are providing in many of these plants for a third additional shift. The housing now available is barely sufficient for two shifts. It is necessary to have additional housing for half as many more workers as we are now employing in these plants and this provides temporary housing to tide over the emergency. It is also necessary to provide for additional Army and Navy personnel and housing for any other purposes which might become necessary on short notice. This fund is intended to take care of these urgent needs as they develop.

Mr. LANHAM. Much of it, as I understand, will also be used by the War and Navy Departments for their personnel in the operation of their various agencies.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. As a matter of fact, it is not always possible to foresee just what will be needed, but we are making provision for every possible contingency.

Mr. LANHAM. There is no intention by this appropriation to divert any of these funds to subsidized, low-income housing?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; we are carefully avoiding that field. This fund is for the emergency and unpredictable. For example, if through some sudden catastrophe housing should be destroyed unexpectedly and it should become necessary to replace it on short notice, this fund will be available for that purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. And for temporary housing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Temporary housing only.

Mr. LANHAM. And it will be administered in the way that similar appropriations have been administered heretofore.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the jurisdiction of the President of the United States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman explain briefly why the managers on the part of the House eliminated the provision for the employment of an assistant to the Senators in their offices?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That will come up presently in the form of an amendment which will be submitted to the House for a separate vote.

Mr. Speaker, this bill completes fiscal provision, so far as provision can be made at this time, for the current defense program. It provides adequate funds or contract authorization for the utilization of all existing facilities of production or facilities the construction of which can be undertaken under the circumstances. With the passage of this bill money has been provided for the utilization of every plant, every factory, every foundry which can produce, or which can be modified to produce, ordnance, planes, ships, or tanks, or other essential munitions. There is no single facility which could be utilized for the production of war material for which we have not made ample provision of funds in this bill.

In view of the events of the past week, it is some relief to look back over the proceedings of the Committee on Appropriations for the session of Congress now closing. There have been few instances, if any, in which 40 Members of the House have devoted their time and energy so arduously and so continuously, and under such pressure, as that under which the 40 members of the Committee on Appropriations have labored since the beginning of the session last January. We have been assailed by doubts within and criticism without. The unprecedented requisitions, the staggering amounts involved, the wide field of operations in which the money was to be spent, and the celerity with which decisions had to be made, at times raised questions of the most serious import. Never before has any government provided for activities on such gigantic scale. All past appropriations are dwarfed into insignificance. The total appropriations for the World War in 1917 and 1918 aggregated approximately $34,000,000,000, whereas the committee has reported already to the Congress appropriations and contract authorizations totaling in the neighborhood of $70,000,000,000. But today with our backs against the wall, fighting to hold off the invader, facing foes on both oceans, all doubts are resolved. There is not a Member of the committee or the Congress who would cancel the appropriation for a single gun.

And it is a matter of gratification in reviewing the record of the past year to realize that we have appropriated for every facility for which provisions could be made. There are no regrets of omission or neglect or inadequacy. We have reported appropriations for every dollar that could be used for the defense of the Nation. If either Army or Navy lacks equipment or is deficient in any respect, it is not due to lack of funds which could be provided by Congress in the time afforded.

And in this résumé especial acknowledgment must be made of the invaluable and indefatigable service of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the entire minority membership of the committee. The long and difficult program could not have been completed without their earnest cooperation and support. They have contributed indispensably to the promptness, efficiency, and economy with which the work of the committee has been dispatched.

We report as a united committee and I trust we will have the united support of the House and a unanimous vote on the bill.

There is no middle ground here. Every resource of the Nation, everything we value, every achievement of the past 150 years is at stake. If we lose we face a bondage more terrible than any since Pharaoh placed his foot upon the neck of Israel. It is a war of defense. America asks no selfish advantage, no national aggrandizement at the expense of any other people. We seek neither spoils nor indemnities, neither trade priorities nor commercial concessions, neither lands or territories nor glory of empire. We provide only for the defense and protection of American culture, of our form of government and of our way of life. But in defense of these there is no sacrifice we will not make, no price we will not pay, no expenditure of blood or treasure we will not approve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me before he begins?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. EATON. I understood from the chairman of the committee that this bill provides strictly for the utilization of all the productive capacity and forces of the Nation. I ask the gentleman now having the floor if this provides for the utilization of the scores of thousands of little industries over the country, in this defense program, that otherwise might go out of business in the immediate future.

Mr. TABER. Of course, it cannot provide for every small industry at this time. It is hoped, however, and the committee urged representatives of the departments as they came before us, to give their best consideration to the letting of contracts to small businessmen. We all realize that this is a very important thing, and that it is necessary if people in many communities are to continue to be employed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes in with a conference report covering everything except amendment No. 46, relating to the executive assistants for the Senators at $4,500 each; amendment No. 48, relating to the transportation investigating committee; and amendment No. 49, relating to the construction within the District of Columbia of a temporary character.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HOLMES. As I understand this is in addition to the legislation that we passed the other day, the Lanham Act?

Mr. TABER. The provision included in the conference report is of a somewhat different character, for instance, the $300,000,000 item is for the construction of buildings and temporary quarters for the officers and enlisted men and is not of the same type of construction required under the Lanham Act.

Mr. HOLMES. I understand that this appropriation does not provide for defense housing or anything in that category.

Mr. TABER. It does not, and I do not think that any of it comes under the United States Housing Authority.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The $300,000,000, as I understand it, is for trailers and so-called movable dormitory units.

Mr. HOLMES. And as I understand the provisions of this bill, the Government will contribute so much in lieu of taxes, the same as in the original emergency.

Mr. TABER. Of course, these quarters for Army and Navy, and for personnel would come under that.

Mr. HOLMES. I appreciate that, but general construction, to take care of employees.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Are none of the existing housing agencies to be used for the expenditure of this $300,000,000 item? We have several of them.

Mr. TABER. That, I think, will come under the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy, that $300,000,000 that I speak of.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman took up the matter of using existing facilities and buildings, with the idea of helping communities that have those buildings.

Mr. TABER. We did, and we have urged the War and Navy Departments in every case, where possible, to use existing facilities to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very grateful.

Mr. LANHAM. And is it not also true that they must use whatever they can of such construction, before using Federal funds for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am wondering if the gentleman will tell the House who has jurisdiction and authority over the expenditure of the $300,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That comes under the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman put the facts as they are in the RECORD regarding this purchase of Floyd Bennett Field; the amount of W. P. A. money spent, the amount that New York has in it and the amount that New York is going to get?

Mr. TABER. I do not know how much New York is going to get. I cannot give the figures. We tried to have the amendment drawn in such a way that every dollar of Federal funds that has been expended on the Floyd Bennett Field to this date should be deducted from the purchase price of $10,000,000. That was the intention of the conferees and we tried to have it fixed that way. That is, we said those things should be taken into consideration in fixing the price.

Mr. ENGEL. But the War Department is not compelled to deduct any definite amount?

Mr. TABER. It is the Navy. No, they are not compelled to pay any definite amount. It is a matter of negotiation.

Mr. ENGEL. In other words, they can deduct $1,000,000 or $100,000 or the entire $4,500,000?

Mr. TABER. I suppose they could, but I do not believe they will, with that language in the bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Does the gentleman have in mind the purposes for which appropriations are made as contained in items 79 and 80, civil appropriations, two power projects and two flood-control projects?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I have that in mind. The flood-control projects that started out relate to items of $17,000,000—five or six different things that we reported, and about $8,000,000 which the Senate added. There were two items without Budget estimate on the Cumberland River. There were two items in Oklahoma without Budget estimate.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. As soon as the gentleman from Vermont has finished.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Did you answer my question?

Mr. TABER. There are two items on the Cumberland River without Budget estimate and two in Oklahoma without Budget estimate. There was the Bluestone project in West Virginia with a Budget estimate.

Mr. PLUMLEY. But approved by the Army engineers as such?

Mr. TABER. As to whether or not Cumberland and Oklahoma were approved by the Army engineers I would not want to say.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speakers, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Both of the items to which the gentleman has referred have been authorized by law and are approved by the Army engineers, but there were no Budget estimates.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Further, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], concerning small industries, is there anything in this bill which would call for a compelling force in the event that certain small industrialists were able to do the work but found they could not get contracts?

Mr. TABER. No, there is nothing compelling, but I do not believe that where small business is able to do a job there is going to be any holding back on the part of the Army and the Navy. I think they and the Office of Production Management are thoroughly aroused to the necessity of taking care of that situation, as far as they can.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I am sure the gentleman is correct, but I have still some complaints coming to me.

Mr. TABER. I suppose if there were not any complaints there would not be anything for a Congressman to do.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The bill of the House appropriated approximately $8,000,000,000. As it comes back in the form of a conference report it is more than $10,000,000,000. In other words, there has been an addition of more than $2,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I believe I understood the gentleman to say that a number of these dams which were provided for in the bill in another body did not carry Budget estimates to support them. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is true with reference to the Holston Dam on the Tennessee Valley Authority, $20,000,000, and these four items to which I referred, about which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] spoke a moment ago.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. If I am incorrect in this statement, please correct me. I am informed by reading the RECORD that the Holston projects will ultimately cost forty-eight and one-half million; those on the Cumberland, $43,700,000; and the one in Oklahoma approximately $20,000,000. In other words, approximately $103,000,000 to complete these projects which were authorized previously?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct. I want to say this frankly. I took a position opposed to the Douglas Dam on the Tennessee Valley Authority, because from the hearings presented to us on the subject and from such information as I could gather myself, I could not find a justification for the dam. I was opposed to the Holston Dam, the two dams, which will cost $48,000,000, to which the gentleman from Alabama referred, because I could not see any justification for them from the standpoint of need, and I do not see any now. They are not going to produce much power before the spring of 1944, and I do not believe they will be of any great value in the defense program. From a defense standpoint there is absolutely no justification for them.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McLEAN. Under those circumstances, does not the gentleman think it would be advisable if we could have a separate vote on these T. V. A. proposals, so that the merits could be discussed and determined?

Mr. TABER. I think, perhaps, it would be wise, but the Senate receded from the part of the language relating to the Tennessee Valley, which made it subject to a point of order, and it was therefore impossible to segregate the T. V. A. items from the rest of the conference report.

In other words, the construction of the dams is authorized when the funds are made available; and it is absolutely impossible for anyone to procure a separate vote on anything of that nature unless legislation is involved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. As the bill left the House it carried an item of around $50,000,000 for 104 airport development projects scattered throughout the

United States. As I understand, the Senate increased the amount to $127,000,000. As the bill comes back to us does it carry any change in this particular program?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, it left us with $50,000,000 and comes back with $59,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. So it does not change the 104 projects?

Mr. TABER. One project was added in the Senate.

Mr. STEFAN. Making the total 105 projects?

Mr. TABER. I know every Member of the House will feel that this airport work is very important.

Mr. STEFAN. But there was no change in the general program of airport development?

Mr. TABER. No; except I hope that outfit will exercise better judgment in this construction than it has in some.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Some time ago I believe I understood the gentleman to say he could see no justification for the Holston dams nor the dams on the Cumberland River because they would not produce power until 1944, but I did not understand whether that also was the objection of the gentleman to the Douglas Dam.

Mr. TABER. I did not say that I objected to the Douglas Dam because of that reason. The evidence that was presented to us and that has been presented in letters checked up with the figures they gave us does not in my opinion justify it as a defense proposition.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure all of us believe in the maintenance of cordial relations with the Senate. Does the gentleman not fear that striking out the executive assistants to the Senators might have a tendency to injure those relations and bring some retaliation?

Mr. TABER. I do not know that it is going to bring any retaliation. I would not want to run away from it on that ground; but that is not involved in the conference report, because it will come up as a separate amendment to be voted on separately.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from New York desire additional time?

Mr. TABER. I would like 1 additional minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TABER. I should like just to say that I appreciate the very nice things the gentleman from Missouri said about me. I want to say that the members of the Appropriations Committee have uniformly, all through the time since this terrible world condition confronted us, given up their entire time to hearings and work in connection with that committee. I know most of us have done so to our own detriment and to the detriment of the work we generally take care of for our districts; but this is a time not when Members of Congress must be reaching out for something but when they must all give of themselves to the very limit to help the country to work out from the situation it is in; and I propose just so long as I am here to do my very best to help the country work out of the situation. I know the other members of the committee feel the same way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report to its adoption or rejection.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 18, after line 10, insert "For a special executive assistant for each Senator at the rate of $4,500 per annum, fiscal year 1942, $216,000, for the period starting January 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1942, such positions are authorized for the period of the emergency only."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the managers on the part of the House, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 41.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46: Page 25, after line 20, insert:

"BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION

"Board of Investigation and Research: For an additional amount for all necessary expenses of the Board of Investigation and Research, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until September 18, 1942, including in addition to the objects specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, an investigation of and report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States, and including expenses incident to attendance at meetings or conventions of societies or associations concerned with the problem of the Board; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $500 for periodicals and newspapers, rents in the District of Columbia; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board, $246,500: *Provided*, That said report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States shall be submitted to Congress not later than June 30, 1942."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 46, and agree to the same with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement from Senate amendment No. 46 and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Strike out of the matter inserted by such amendment the following:

In line 6, the words "in addition to."

In lines 9 and 10, the following: "an investigation of and report on the interterritorial rate structure of the United States."

In line 21, the colon.

In lines 22, 23, and 24, all of the proviso.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it proposed to strike out the legislative language that would make this subject to a point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The amendment provides for the elimination of the mandatory provisions and appropriates the $246,500 recommended by the Budget Bureau, leaving it within the discretion of the Commission to proceed as it is otherwise authorized to function under the statute.

Mr. TABER. Does the language referred to come from the House bill, or the House bill with the Senate amendments? It does not correspond to the copy I have.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The amendment at the desk eliminates the lines inserted by the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. The words that I thought were covered by that begin in line 1 of page 26, including "in addition to the objects specified" running down through the words "United States" in line 5.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The designation of lines in the amendment refer to the lines of the Senate amendment and not to the lines of the bill. If the gentleman will consult the page, the amendment eliminates the last three words in the first line and all except the first number in line 4, the first clause in line 5, and further language in lines 17 and 18.

Mr. TABER. I see what it is.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Designation is to lines in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. In the bill we have in front of us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking the distinguished chairman to yield to me at this time is to make it plain that as one of the conferees on this bill I deeply regret that the Senate language here has been stricken. This matter was brought up, argued, and debated fully by the conferees. Upon a motion made by me, the House conferees agreed to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. Just why this language to which we agreed is being eliminated I confess I do not know. Just who must be appeased I have not been advised. I am advised, however, that the language of the Senate specifically directing a freight-rate study is really surplussage and unnecessary; that the Board now has that authority, and what it really needs is the money to operate on, which this amendment provides. I also desire to make it plain and have the RECORD show that no one in this Congress, officials or others, will have any reason or excuse to interpret this amendment as even a suggestion on the

part of this committee and the Congress that a thorough study and investigation of discrimination in freight rates is not wanted or expected. That is one of the important duties of this Board under the law and such a study and investigation by the Board is one of the prime reasons for making this appropriation available.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction of this legislation.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. The principal objection I see to the amendment proposed by the Senate is that it authorizes a duplicate investigation.

The Transportation Act of 1940, section 5 (b), provided for an investigation of interterritorial freight rates by the I. C. C., for the purpose of determining whether such rates are unreasonable, or unlawful in and of themselves, or in their relation to each other, and directed the Commission to make such orders as might be appropriate for the removal of such unlawfulness.

In section 302 (a) of the act, under another title and for an entirely different purpose, a Board of Investigation and Research was authorized to be appointed. It was its duty to investigate and report to Congress, as to first, the relative economy and fitness of the carriers subject to the act, with the view of determining the service for which each type of carrier is fitted or unfitted; second, the extent to which each type of such carriers is subsidized at public expense; and third, the extent to which such carriers are taxed.

Subsection (b) of that section authorized the Board, "in its discretion", to investigate other matters relating to the carriers, "which it may deem important to investigate for the improvement of transportation conditions."

The Senate amendment proposes an investigation by that Board which is an exact duplicate of the investigation already authorized and in process of being carried out by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission has power and is directed by proper orders to put its findings into effect. The Board would have no such power. Its investigation would be relatively futile. It could not remedy the situation, it could only recommend.

I am advised that over 400 appearances have already been made before the I. C. C. in this investigation. The experts of the Commission have submitted their reports and now it is up to those who favor or oppose the proposed changes to present their case.

The Senate amendment proposes that this special board shall report by the 1st of next July. May I say that it is absolutely impossible for any board of three men, particularly if they are not experts on freight questions, to investigate and make a competent report within that time. Freight rates involve the most complicated phases of transportation regulation and no board newly appointed with a newly assembled and more or less inexperienced personnel, can possibly do the job that is assigned by the Senate committee.

Besides that, of course, it would be poor procedure and would put the Congress in an indefensible position before the country to authorize two bodies at the same time and with duplicated expense to carry on separate investigations.

I believe that the investigation authorized by the I. C. C. is important and should be carried out. It deals with a very important question, the transportation system of the United States, but I can see nothing whatever to be gained by authorizing duplicate investigations. That would only confuse and mess up the situation and delay any real remedy that should be applied.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. When the Transportation Act was passed last year it provided for the appointment of a board of investigation and research. My recollection as a member of the committee is that the rate-making power was very deliberately left out of the act because of the fact that rate-making is a highly intricate, technical problem, and one which the Interstate Commerce Commission has so efficiently and capably handled. As I understand the gentleman, the provision the Senate has placed in this appropriation bill is clearly legislation and for a purpose which the committee of the House deliberately left out of the basic law. Is that right?

Mr. LEA. The gentleman is correct in that the amendment involves legislation on an appropriation bill. As I construe the act creating the board, subdivision (b) of section 302 of the Transportation Act, the discretionary section, is broad enough that the board could, if it found it important enough, investigate the freight-rate structure. The Senate amendment would compel them to do that whether they wanted to or not, and whether or not they thought it important or necessary.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. The point I want to bring home to the House is this: At the time the committee, over which the distinguished gentleman from California presides, placed in the bill the provision setting up this board, is it not a fact that the committee very definitely intended, and I think the House in passing the measure did too, that this board should not deal with the rate structures of our transportation system?

Mr. LEA. Yes; that was clearly the intention. We specifically gave that authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission. We certainly did not intend two investigations by different bodies at the same time and of the same subject.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like the RECORD to show that whatever interpretation Members may put upon this act, the conferees certainly had no intention of limiting or restricting whatever powers this board may have had ordinarily by deleting this language.

Mr. LEA. I appreciate that suggestion. Our committee believes this investigation should be made and that it should be thorough, competent, and fair, but we think nothing is gained by duplicating the work.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman from California knows I have been very much interested in this subject for several years. As a matter of fact, I appeared before his committee. I do not want the impression to be left here, however, that this Board is not to consider the freight-rate structure in making this recommendation. As I understood the gentleman's last statement in response to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] he said that the language was broad enough for it to consider the subject of freight rates; is that correct?

Mr. LEA. Yes; in subdivision (b). I might say also that the gentleman from Georgia was largely instrumental in securing the investigation by the I. C. C. The language of the act is that approved by the gentleman and other proponents of the section.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think it ought to duplicate what the Commission is doing, I agree with the gentleman on that, but it ought not to be barred from considering the freight-rate structure in their over-all consideration of the transportation system of this country.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. I do not think there is any disagreement on that.

Mr. PEARSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PEARSON. Is it not a fact that when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce considered the creation of this Board in connection with the Transportation Act of 1940, it was specifically contemplated that this Board was to investigate the question of interterritorial rates and make recommendations to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that the discrimination which had sprung up in the application of the interterritorial rates might be corrected?

Mr. LEA. That duty was specifically given to the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is the investigation that is being carried on by the I. C. C.

Mr. PEARSON. But was not this Board created for the purpose of carrying on the investigation and making recommendations?

Mr. LEA. This Board was created primarily for the three purposes named in section 302 and it was specifically directed to make that investigation. Then a discretion was given the Board, where it was deemed by it to be important, to investigate matters for the improvement of transportation conditions. We have subdivision (b), which reads:

The Board is further authorized, in its discretion, to investigate or consider any other matter relating to rail carriers, motor carriers, and water carriers, which it may deem

important to investigate for the improvement of transportation conditions and to effectuate the national transportation policy declared in the Interstate Commerce Act as amended.

Mr. PEARSON. Does not that language embrace, and as a matter of fact carry with it, the implication that this Board is authorized by the express provisions of the Transportation Act to investigate those matters which have to do with the transportation policy of the country and which are necessarily based upon the rate structure as it is enforced in the various sections of the country?

Mr. LEA. The language is broad enough to include the rate structure. I am clear in my conviction that it was not contemplated at that time that this Board would carry on this interterritorial freight-rate investigation.

Mr. PEARSON. May I say to the gentleman that I would be the last one to insist upon a duplicate expenditure involving the same subject, but I certainly did not understand when our committee created this agency that it was not to have any authority with reference to investigating the rate structure of the country.

Mr. LEA. As I take it, this language in (b) is broad enough to cover such an investigation, but there was then no intention of which I am aware that this Board would conduct the interterritorial investigation. We specifically placed that duty on the I. C. C.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It was the intention of both the conferees and the Congress that the investigation they made of rates should be in comparison with the different forms of transportation. That is what we set up that Board for. Railway management, railway labor, the truckers, and all, wanted some unified system of transportation in this country. That was what was considered in the committee.

Mr. LEA. That is what was contemplated.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not true that any power this Board may exercise, whether or not it deals with interterritorial rates, is a power the Interstate Commerce Commission now has?

Mr. LEA. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SOUTH. In other words, it is claimed here that this will be a duplication because the I. C. C. now has the power. Is it not true that the I. C. C. likewise has the power to deal with any and all other problems relating to transportation with which this special Board that was set up last year sometime will deal?

Mr. LEA. They do have that general power, but, of course, here we gave them a specific direction as to what they should do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. Have we not enough duplication of boards and bureaus already? It seems to me the better plan would be to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission specifically to investigate these questions, if they do not have the power now.

Mr. LEA. The I. C. C. is already specifically instructed to do this in section 5 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940.

Mr. LEWIS. Why should we not refuse to concur in this Senate amendment, instead of merely striking out a part of it?

Mr. LEA. The main purpose in creating the Board was to set up an independent investigation of the three specific subjects involved. There was no intention on the part of the committee, I am sure, to authorize a duplicate investigation.

Mr. LEWIS. We have overlapping investigations and committees, and I believe we had better begin to save money by cutting them down.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ELLIS. Is the gentleman satisfied, however, that the Interstate Commerce Commission has dealt as it should have dealt with the interterritorial rates?

Mr. LEA. The Commission is slow, to a great extent necessarily so, in getting to its report. But it is the best qualified body we have to do the job. Therefore it was specifically assigned to it. I think there is a great defect in the rate structure. There is a great opportunity for improvement in the rate structure.

Mr. ELLIS. Then it would not hurt anything to have a duplicate expenditure.

Mr. LEA. Yes; in my judgment, it would. It would probably mess the thing up and bring no useful result. It is likely that it would still further delay constructive action.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. It is not the thought of the gentleman that any of the duties that are conferred upon the Board of Investigation are curtailed by the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has the right to make these investigations of freight rates?

Mr. LEA. No; not as a matter of law. I believe a duplicate job is undesirable and unnecessary. It would divert the Board from the job it is given to do and unnecessarily duplicate the work of the I. C. C.

Mr. TERRY. I may say to the gentleman that when the transportation bill was passed in the House it was the thought of many of the Members of the Congress that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was created in 1887, had not completed the investigation of the freight-rate structure of the country, and there was no indication that it ever would do it. This provision for the investigation and research board was put in the bill so we could have some final decision on that point and secure a thorough investigation of the whole transportation problem.

Mr. LEA. I know much fault was found with the Commission, particularly with delays in making decisions. So we placed section 5 (b) in the act to direct them to investigate and remedy the situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a defense bill of tremendous importance to the country. I do not want to chide anybody, but it does look to me as if maybe we are having a little politics, as usual. For years we have been hearing of alleged regional freight-rate discriminations. Some of the discussions have had many political implications.

Let us get a picture of this controversy and a picture of what is going on. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I was on the subcommittee that drafted the so-called omnibus transportation bill in the last Congress. At the time we had that bill under consideration in the committee, some Members of Congress and others came before our committee and complained of the alleged freight-rate discriminations between certain sections of the country, and they at that time wanted written into the law certain inflexible provisions of rate making. Well, they started with a lot of charges in the hearing, but the further the case went the weaker it became, until, finally, they said, "Oh, no; the I. C. C. is the rate-making body of this Government; Congress cannot make rates; Congress has no right to impose its dictates in that regard upon the I. C. C." And then what happened? It was written into the Omnibus Transportation Act, subsection (b) of section 5, at the request of these people who are here today asking that this Board duplicate the effort of the I. C. C. They asked our committee to delegate to the I. C. C. the matter of making an investigation regarding these alleged discriminations. This was done at their request, and they said that was all they wanted.

Now, in that same bill we set up this Board of Investigation. What was the Board of Investigation charged with doing? It has, specifically, three things to do: First, to determine the relative economy and fitness of different carriers; second, to determine the extent to which different systems of carrying have been subsidized.

This was put in there because some people say you ought to charge tolls on the waterways because the Government spent so much money to build them.

The third was to inquire into the matter of the comparative taxes paid by different transportation systems.

Then there is this subsection (b) that the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], refers to as a kind of catch-all. But I do not want this Board of Investigation, charged

specifically with doing these three things above referred to, to conclude from this debate and the action I hope will be taken here today, that they shall invade the province of the I. C. C., the rate-making body of the Government, and undertake to make an investigation of these alleged discriminations. This would involve duplication of effort. It was never suggested to our committee that the Board make such investigation.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I refuse to yield, as I have but a few minutes and I want to continue with my statement.

In other words, if those who alleged at the time the measure was before the House and the substantive act was being drafted that these freight-rate discriminations exist, and they wanted this Board to make the investigation, why did they not say so? If, on the other hand, it appears from the action that was taken that the I. C. C. and not the Board was to do that job and if, as the chairman of our committee has said, the I. C. C. is doing the job, then why in heaven's name should this Board also be put on that job?

I have read the hearings of the Senate subcommittee—I should say the hearings of the subcommittee of another body, because we do not want to mention them by name or mention the persons over there by name, but I will tell you what it got down to over there. Certain Members of the other body said, and I can show it in the hearings, that if we do not have this authority granted to this Board of Investigation, to go into this matter of freight-rate differentials, we are not going to support the item for the appropriation. In other words, their position is that if the Appropriations Committee will not initially support the effort to override the will of the Congress when it passed the original act and undertake to require the Board to do something that it never was expected to do, they are not going to be for this appropriation.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I want to continue with my statement and if I have any additional time, I shall be glad to yield.

I do not know that we even ought to talk about the merits of this alleged freight-rate discrimination. The language as attempted to be written in the conference report refers to interterritorial rate structure. I take it that that would refer to a rate from one territory into another territory. That has been one of the fundamental differences, and possibly we might as well know what some of the facts are. It has been alleged by certain people in southern territory that they cannot get their products up into the north at a cheap enough rate. Now, as against that, it is my information that the rate from north to south and south to north on identical commodities in identical quantities and between identical points is exactly the same. That does not sound like discrimination to me.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I have only 10 minutes. I will yield if any time remains after my statement is completed.

Then it is suggested that on occasion rates for a given number of miles in southern territory are greater than for an equal number of miles in official territory. Of course, that refers to intraterritorial rates.

Well, in the first place, all of these things have been presented to the I. C. C. time and again. Further, everyone who knows anything about rates understands that such matters as density of traffic, the condition of the terrain, and a lot of other factors involved in the cost of furnishing transportation are different in different sections of the country. They necessarily mean different rates in different sections. And the financial condition of the railroads in some sections would not indicate that their rates are too high.

So the whole issue is here. The I. C. C. is the rate-making body of our Government, and I do not think it is up to the Congress of the United States to take away from the I. C. C. its right to make those rates. We cannot make all of the rates. They are highly intricate and difficult matters which the Congress itself could not undertake to determine. Rather must we set up an agency and charge them with the duty of making rates, charge them with the duty of seeing that they are fair and reasonable, and then stand by that agency in what it seeks to do.

The I. C. C. is not only making an investigation as directed by the Congress, but there has been before the Commission what is known as the Southern Governors case, in which certain rates were challenged, and the relief of the I. C. C. was asked. My information is that the I. C. C. has granted much of the relief that was asked, to the discomfiture of many people who are doing business in my part of the country.

In conclusion, I think this Board has only the authority granted to it by the legislation enacted, known as the omnibus transportation bill. They have a duty to determine, first of all, the three things specified in the act. They must recognize, as the Chairman of that Board recognized when he testified before the Senate subcommittee, that it is not their job primarily to investigate the matter of alleged discriminations. Rather is that a matter charged to the responsibility of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in view of the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has entered upon the doing of that job, to my mind it would be the height of folly for us here today, either by specific language in the conference report or by the proceedings of the day, to lead this Board to conclude that we want them to divert from the proper functions they are to perform, and go into this field that is now being occupied and gone into by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the rate-making body of the Government. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think that the State Legislature of the State of Indiana should invade this field by making annual appropriations to fight the South and the West?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman wants to go into that matter of Indiana against Arkansas at this time, I might state that the State of Arkansas, along with other States, appropriated a lot of money to get this Southern Governors' case presented to the I. C. C., and they did that long before Indiana or any other State in our section made any appropriation, and the gentleman knows that is the truth.

Mr. ELLIS. Sure it is, but Indiana invaded the field.

Mr. HALLECK. Indiana appropriated money after Arkansas and other Southern States had appropriated money, seeking to present their case to the I. C. C. Indiana and the other States, in self-defense appropriated money to present their case before the I. C. C., exactly where the case should be presented, and the gentleman knows it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this presents a rather peculiar situation, because I think all of the gentlemen who have spoken with so much heat are speaking for the same thing, and I have rarely seen anything like that happen in the House before. I believe a clear statement as to what is in this bill and how it happens to be here and what the present situation is should dissipate any disagreements. The Board to which they refer, by the legislative act, has certain duties to perform, and that is not being changed by this bill. The Senate amendment in no way changes their fundamental authority. The Board came in before the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an increase in funds. The original amount asked for was cut by the Budget. The House committee and the House voted that amount of money. The bill went to the Senate. The Senate amended the wording, using language which attempted to emphasize the desire of the Senate that the Board investigate territorial rates. The motion of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, is to recede and concur with amendments. In effect, all those amendments do is to revert to the House provisions as they came to the Senate. So the result is that if the motion of the gentleman from Missouri is agreed to, then you will be voting just what you voted in the House bill—namely, to give them the money to carry on the work that they were organized to do by the legislative act, whatever that may be. You do not change it or alter its authority, but you merely give them what they ask for and what the House allowed, without the special emphasis put into the section as to interregional rates. There is no reason for anyone to be excited about it.

The Senate attempted to emphasize something. The House knocks it out by these amendments. The authority remains the same, and I trust the House will not be misled by the long arguments.

Incidentally, I come from the South where such rates are questioned universally. I hope this House will not be misled in any way to try to do something else to this amendment, but vote just as the chairman has made his motion, namely, to recede and concur with an amendment. That passes it back just in the condition it was when the House passed it before. This board has all the authority it had under the law. You will find in the testimony before the Senate committee that that is so stated.

So let us not be disturbed. All of us seem to be for the same thing. Let us accept the motion of the chairman of the committee to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. If that is done the Board may proceed with its duties as outlined by the House, and it provides sufficient funds for them to carry on their work. Is that true?

Mr. O'NEAL. The Board may proceed under all the authority it had by law which this House passed, which from the testimony in the Senate hearings is that they have authority to investigate rates.

Mr. GREEN. And they do have sufficient funds?

Mr. O'NEAL. They do have sufficient funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] a moment. I think the gentleman's statement was very good and very clear, but I think he was mistaken on one thing. The House language, as I understand it, did not carry anything with reference to this particular investigation, but it was all inserted in the Senate in the language of a Budget estimate that was presented, with the exception that they undertook to tie in this special investigation of interterritorial rates.

For my own part, the duty of this Board of Investigation and Research, under section 302 of the Interstate Commerce Act of 1940, was specifically prescribed. It is not right, as I see it, for us to go beyond the statute. It is not right, in making provision for carrying out that statute, to go beyond it. That Board is given authority to go into all rates whatever—the whole rate structure of the country, the whole structure of transportation costs, and all that sort of thing. If they would get anywhere I would see no objection to it. I hope that they will confine themselves to what they were authorized to do and not try to go into something that is outside of their province and which the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing. The Interstate Commerce Commission has reviewed many rates and corrected many conditions. Among others I might mention, they have reduced the rate on oranges coming up into the North, very markedly. They had a right to do that, because the volume of traffic at that time was such as to justify it, and still is.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Do I understand the position of the gentleman from New York, in support of the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, is not to disturb the amount of appropriation made by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is right, but simply to cut out the language which would have made it subject to a point of order otherwise.

Mr. CURTIS. And so far as the duties of this Board of Investigation and Research are concerned, you neither add nor subtract from the basic language which created the Board?

Mr. TABER. That is it. Of course, it will work according to whatever that Board finds. The trouble with their finding anything is that it takes years and years and a tremendous structure to find anything. The Interstate Commerce Commission can much quicker take up and correct individual cases of rates than this Board can delve into the thing and find out. I believe the people of this country will find that their proper and best appeal is the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Do I understand the gentleman from New York to say that originally, as this bill came to the House, it carried no appropriation for this specific purpose?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. HARE. Then it went to the Senate and $246,000 was placed on as an amendment, with additional language to which the House now does not wish to subscribe, but does wish to subscribe to the appropriation of $246,000?

Mr. TABER. That is just it.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. I am somewhat confused and some of our colleagues say this is a duplication of work.

Mr. TABER. If the language that was carried in the Senate is carried, the Interstate Commerce Commission by the Transportation Act of 1940 was directed to make the kind of investigation that the Senate tried to add onto this Board, and that would be a duplicate investigation, which some of us would not feel was necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 48, on page 30, after line 8, insert:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

"Sites for and construction of general office buildings, Washington, D. C.: For the lease or purchase of sites and for the construction of general office buildings and other structures thereon, including heating plants, approaches, the installation or extension of sewers, water mains, and other utilities as may be necessary, and for the construction of such facilities on Government-owned land in the District of Columbia, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, $25,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts for construction may be entered into without advertising: *Provided further*, That the Board of Commissioners of the United States Soldiers' Home is hereby authorized to lease to the United States, for a period of 10 years and upon the payment of a rental to be fixed by the Secretary of War, a site or sites upon which may be erected some of the buildings herein authorized: *Provided further*, That all funds received for rental or other use of United States Soldiers' Home property, facilities, or supplies shall be immediately available to the Board of Commissioners thereof for reexpenditure without regard to fiscal-year limitations."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 48:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 48 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 8 of the matter proposed to be inserted by such amendment, after the word "in" insert the words "or near."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the difference between the House and the Senate is expressed in two words, "or near." Under the provision carried in the Senate amendment $25,000,000 is provided for the erection of office facilities in the District of Columbia, and the location of the buildings is restricted to Government-owned land within the District. It seemed to the managers on the part of the House that a wider latitude should be permitted, so they proposed the incorporation of the amendment permitting construction on Government-owned land within "or near" the District of Columbia. Under this liberalization buildings may be constructed in nearby Maryland or Virginia if found advisable.

We have had some experience with buildings constructed under the requirement that they be erected within the District of Columbia, and where due to failure to secure suitable sites within the District considerable delay ensued. These buildings are needed immediately. There must be no occasion for unnecessary delay, so we provide by this amendment that in the event appropriate sites on Government-owned land are not immediately available within the District locations may be selected just over the line.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, as I get the argument of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, this House position, which the gentleman enforces by his words at this time, is made

necessary by the very defense effort the country finds itself in. Is it not further a fact that it is necessary now to care for the increased personnel that have been brought to Washington, that buildings be provided immediately, not later; and that the time necessary for attempting to find sites within the District of Columbia is precious time, and certainly the District of Columbia now in connection with defense activities is a metropolitan area other than just the confines of the District itself?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. We have emergency agencies here for which no quarters are available. There is no place for them to go. They must be housed, and they must be housed immediately. To insure the earliest possible construction of adequate quarters, the House asks this amendment.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri if the collateral public works item, line 20, page 12, is intended to cover items of every description essential to public works? For instance, would it cover hospital equipment, training school equipment, and so forth?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. While the paragraph probably does not specifically mention equipment, it carries the language "collateral public works items;" and under that phraseology equipment and essential appurtenances necessary to make these facilities usable and habitable is implied and authorizes expenditures from this fund for such purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the chairman think that the insertion of this amendment would be regarded as advisory upon the Authority to place these facilities outside the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; this merely allows more latitude. The expectation is that if suitable land now owned by the Government can be found within the District it will be used. This merely provides for a contingency in which we might not be able to find suitable land within the District and in this event amendment would become operative.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very much interested in this proposal because it happens that I have introduced a resolution, which is before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which proposes that a committee consisting of the chairman of the Capital Parks and Planning Commission, the chairman or president of the Board of Commissioners of the District, and the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, to consider the problems of building within the District of Columbia and consider the available lands within the boundaries of the District for the purposes of orderly procedure. In connection with it I have already received reports from the Auditor of the District of Columbia and from other public officials which indicate there are many hundreds of acres within the District of Columbia now tied up by some institution which could be used for such improvements as this. The Soldiers' Home grounds are mentioned in the language of the Senate amendment. There some 400 acres are available. There are other institutions within the District where many acres are tied up in farms or just associated with public buildings where the capital investment in public improvements at the present time is infinitesimal in proportion to the number of acres tied up.

If this amendment were adopted, if there were any suggestion at all that the authorities could regard it as advising them to go outside the District of Columbia, I would be opposed to it.

One problem I have in mind is the fact that we now find that those employees who will be located in the new War Department Building in Virginia may face an additional income tax. It seems to me we should exhaust the building possibilities within the District of Columbia for those improvements which must be located in the seat of government.

I have no objection to the amendment if it is not understood to be advisory. It is all right if it is merely permissive, but if it is advisory I should want to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Both the House version and the Senate version, of course, specify that the facility shall be located upon Government-owned land. Outside of that there need be no conflict with the gentleman's proposition.

No such inference is to be drawn as the gentleman indicates. The amendment gives wider latitude, but does not preclude locations within the District of Columbia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is permissive but not advisory?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is permissive, not mandatory.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true, further, that in those cases where we can go to Government-owned land beyond the District to that extent we diminish the congestion in these buildings, thereby make for their efficiency and also for their security?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That will unquestionably be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6219) to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, because I know what the bill is, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the measure to the House?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat an emergency measure. It has been very carefully considered this afternoon by the Ways and Means Committee, which has favorably reported the bill unanimously. The bill provides for extending the time of those in the Army and military service, giving an additional 120 days in which to apply for insurance. The time expires tomorrow night, and it is necessary that we grant this additional time immediately. Some in the armed forces have not taken advantage of the act so far, but since war has been declared they might want to take advantage of it. In justice to those who have been in the service for some time this will give them an additional 120 days in which to apply for insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the limitation in section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 upon the time within which applications for national service life insurance may be made, personnel on active duty prior to the enactment of this act, in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall be granted insurance under such section without further medical examination if application therefor is filed within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, STORAGE, USE, AND POSSESSION IN TIME OF WAR OF EXPLOSIVES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3019, to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes.

TO EXPEDITE THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 389, Rept. No. 1506),

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6233), to expedite the prosecution of the war effort. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that the time previously accorded me for today be carried over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS ST. CROIX RIVER AT OR NEAR HUDSON, WIS.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 4314, authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, be, and are hereby, authorized to negotiate and enter into agreements or contracts for the purpose of acquiring by purchase, gift, or condemnation, bridges now existing on or crossing the St. Croix River, which is also designated as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis., with the proviso that such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated by such State or States free of tolls, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Hudson, Wis., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, this motion is made to suspend the rules and pass a bill that was objected to when called on the Consent Calendar. The bill authorizes the construction of a bridge across the Saint Croix River. This is on the military network of roads between Chicago and St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minn. The bridge is partly owned by the city of Hudson, which acquired its title in 1917. The original investment of the city was $156,160. Since that time it has collected $1,821,000 in tolls and has made a net profit out of the bridge of over $1,474,000 on an original investment of $156,000. It is said the city is making a 44-percent profit on its investment at the present time. The purpose of this bill is to give the public a more and adequate bridge, toll-free.

The main span of the present bridge is only 136 feet long. On each side there is an approach, making the total length of the bridge and approaches 900 feet. There is a 7-percent grade on the approaches to the old bridge that has been there so long. The State highway departments have found it entirely inadequate to meet the traffic needs, and the highway departments of the two States affected want this bill passed. They desire in making up their budgets to construct a new bridge which would be toll-free, and to provide for it in the estimates which will be formulated in January. It is important to take this action. The case in favor of the bridge is clear. I hope it will be authorized.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The project proposed in this bill is very important to both States and to people residing on both sides of the St. Croix River. I hope this bill will pass unanimously at this time, so that we may proceed out there to get the bridge constructed for the benefit of the people and for the benefit of the national-defense program.

Mr. LEA. I am sure the statement of the gentleman is justified.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. The gentleman is apprised of the fact that unless this authorization passes this year the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin will not be able to set up the proper budgets for the construction of this bridge, to appropriate any money until a year from now, and that the gentleman also knows this bridge is very much needed for defense purposes. This highway ordinarily carries a large volume of important traffic. It is imperative that the bill pass now.

Mr. LEA. I understand that is true.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a patriotic address made at a patriotic rally at Pittsburgh last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order, I have been granted permission to address the House for 10 minutes today. Owing to the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that this special order may be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), indefinitely having been called to active duty in the Navy.

To Mr. MAGNUSON, indefinitely, beginning December 20 1941.

To Mr. RANDOLPH, for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. JACOBSEN (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE) indefinitely, on account of serious illness.

To Mr. TINKHAM, for 2 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. TABER, for the balance of the session, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include a statement of my own addressed to Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and in the other to include a statement by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] I ask unanimous consent that he may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H. R. 6215.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, owing to the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that this special order may be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr MUNDT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Surely.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify the request I just made on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6215). It is not a conference report. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time simply to remind the House and advise the country that starting today over in the Senate a special committee headed by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, is holding hearings on the problems of the small business man in connection with the defense program of America. You will recall, also, that last week the House authorized the appointment of a House committee to investigate the same problem and make recommendations for the better utilization of the small business units of this country with reference to its defense program. The Chair has appointed the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] as chairman of that committee, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has been appointed as the ranking Republican representative on that committee. I want to advise small business men throughout the country that if they have any suggestions to offer at this time as to how small factories, small producers, and mills or shops employing 20 men or less, can best utilize their productivity for the defense program of this country, that either Senator MURRAY or Congressman PATMAN or Congressman HALLECK are now ready to receive their suggestions.

It seems to me that now that this country is at war, the importance of utilizing every last lathe, every last tool, every last machine shop and every productive unit of the country is tremendously magnified, and I hope that we can take a leaf out of the experience book of England which has found that by spreading defense contracts over the country and dividing them into small units they have greatly aided the business of stepping up production in essential defense supplies.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. I think all the colleagues of the gentleman from South Dakota appreciate the interest he takes in all legislative matters, and I have just been wondering if for several reasons this is not the most important matter we could take up for consideration. There is not any group in the country today that is more needed for the two reasons, first, for the help they can give to their country and, second, for the help they can give their own employees.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is precisely correct, and it has even a more vital and far-reaching significance than that, because as we start assuming the tremendous tax burden which we all know we must assume, it is important that we retain the tax structure and what is involved in that structure from the standpoint of these small business men. I think the statistics will show that there are fewer tax dodgers among the small business men of America than there are among the giant corporations that employ tax-evasion experts to tell them how they can pay the smallest possible amount of tax.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman's great interest in the small business concern and the fine work he has done along that line, and it seems to me that the red, white, and blue train that O. P. M. sponsored has done a fine piece of work, so far as I can learn, in helping some of the small business concerns.

Mr. MUNDT. And their clinics in the different cities have been very helpful, and I congratulate O. P. M. on the progress that has been made; in fact, I had luncheon not long ago in the office of Mr. William Batt, who is O. P. M. director of raw materials, and I found I had done him a bit of injustice in speaking about him on the floor of the House a few weeks ago, because I did not appreciate until I visited him his interest not only in the small business of America but his interest in maintaining the entire American economic and political structure.

Yes; I feel that O. P. M. is preparing to do its part, and now I am glad Congress is going to do its part through these committees, not to criticize anybody but to gather up the constructive suggestions and present a program to the President or to O. P. M. as to the way in which the small business men can make the greatest possible contribution which, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, will not only enhance the production of this country in the important field of defense materials, but will also protect and preserve the small business men themselves in the small towns and small communities.

WORKERS IN SMALL BUSINESSES ARE READY

Mr. Speaker, unless steps are taken to include our smaller communities and our small business men in the defense production program, America will be weakened on the home front in numerous ways. Not only do we lose the vast aggregate productive power of these small units, not only do we fail to keep functioning many thousands of small business men whose tax payments we shall badly need but the injury to a vitalized America goes even beyond that. We also dislocate the population figures of this country by pouring still more people into cities already overcrowded and underhoused while draining from smaller communities which are in many instances overhoused at the present time the very cream of their working population. Unless we include these small producers in the defense program, the injury to America, Mr. Speaker, goes even beyond all this. It means that laborers and trained artisans in our smaller communities will be idle while the Nation is crying for skilled manpower.

WORKERS IN SMALL BUSINESSES ARE LOYAL

America has no more loyal men and women and no harder-working citizens than the laboring people of our cities of 50,000 and under, the vast majority of whom work in units of 20 people or less. Here there are no problems of labor unrest, no alien labor organizers, no strikes, and no walk-outs. Here all labor, whether organized or unorganized, puts America first and, man for man, the production of these workers cannot be equaled anywhere else in all the world. The schools, the churches, the local governments in these areas depend upon small business men and their employees and associates to support these essential segments in the backbone of the American way of life. If these small producers are closed down, local public institutions will lack the tax income to function properly and local business and professional enterprises—theaters, doctors, dentists, stores, barber shops, garages, lawyer, preachers, school teachers—all will suffer seriously. I am sure we are all interested in preventing ghost towns of unemployment and depression from springing up in the midst of the most vigorous industrial effort in this Nation's history. By tackling this problem now, by approaching it constructively and energetically, by sticking with it until it is solved, we can serve America

well by distributing portions of defense contracts in such a way that we cannot only preserve the smaller communities and businesses of this Republic but at the same time greatly magnify the aggregate defense production of this country.

In the field of conservation, in which I have long worked, we used to have a statement in regard to the preservation of trees, which, as I recall it, went as follows:

If the Nation will save the trees, the trees will save the Nation.

I believe we might paraphrase that from the standpoint of the small business man and say, "If America will save the small business men, the small business men will save America." They will save her by increasing the production of defense material and by giving her that sound economic background and tax base which is essential as we meet the dangers which confront the future of this country, while we prosecute this war to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. To make an observation in respect to two things called to my attention in connection with the small business man in national defense. I take the same position that the gentleman from South Dakota takes. These suggestions must be of a constructive type in order to help both the defense program and the small business man. The Tolan committee has gone into this matter quite a little, and we have held hearings in the interior of the country. We found that a small concern would make application to receive the bidders' lists for various articles to be manufactured. The request for a bid would arrive in their hands perhaps 3 days before that bid was due back here in Washington, or some place on the east coast. That is the shortest time. Sometimes it would be 5 or 6 days, but usually from 3 to 8 days, after they received the requests for bids, the bid would have to be submitted, and it was impossible for them to get the blueprints, to determine where they could get the material, and the other information on which to assemble the bids on small articles that small business concerns can make and can make well. That is one change that could be made that would help materially.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. One of the beneficial features of these hearings is that they provide a forum and a clearing house where a discussion can be held and proposals entertained of just how the Government and the small business man can work together more successfully. Obviously the small business man is not in a position to hire a professional contact man to represent him here in Washington, and so some system must be found by which the Government may work directly with the small business man.

I have been notified by the chairman of the Senate committee, Senator MURRAY, and by the chairman of House committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], that they are glad to have people come to Washington if they have constructive suggestions as to just how to remedy the situation. Yesterday's copy of the Washington Times-Herald contained an article which I shall ask to include as a part of my remarks and which reported that Mr. Walter Finke, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, will bring to Washington various suggestions to present to these committees here. If it is not convenient for the small business man to come to Washington, I am sure Mr. Finke would be glad to receive by mail all useful suggestions for coordinating the production efforts of America's small business men. Mr. Finke can be addressed as follows: Mr. Walter W. Finke, 5229 South Morgan Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

If the small business man is not able to come here, if he will contact Mr. Finke, the president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, he will gather up the information, and see that a summary of all helpful recommendations and suggestions is presented here. I am hopeful that within the next 60 to 90 days something tangible, something workable, and something concrete will develop, which will bring the small business man back into the economic family of America during these serious times and which will give America the full benefit of the productive capacity of these small units as we fight on to victory in this war in which increased production means so much in a decreased cost in lives. I ask unanimous consent to include the Times-Herald article with my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

SMALL BUSINESS HEARINGS SET—SENATE TO BEGIN INQUIRY TOMORROW

The first congressional inquiry devoted solely to the plight of America's "disappearing backbone," the small business man, will open here tomorrow when a Senate committee, headed by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat), of Montana, begins a week of hearings.

The extent to which the war effort can be speeded up if the full facilities of small business are utilized will be the chief concern of the committee, it was announced.

Small business men from all sections of the country, headed by Walter Finke, president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, will bring their experience and problems to Washington. Government experts from the Office of Production Management, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor will also be represented. New England businessmen will appear before the committee on Tuesday; Wednesday will be the Middle West's day; representatives from the Pacific coast will present their problems on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for 30 minutes.

THE HAWAIIAN TRAGEDY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I had requested 30 minutes today, but I shall take only a very few moments.

In view of the official statement made by Secretary of the Navy Knox, I shall forego at this time making any lengthy statement with regard to the Hawaiian debacle which is now revealed as the Hawaiian tragedy.

I am satisfied that the Navy will sift this thoroughly without fear or favor and will go to the bottom of this matter. Those responsible for the losses under the circumstances must be removed. They cannot be trusted under fire. They are not trustworthy. I hope the Secretary of War will follow suit and make a similar personal inquiry and such statement as his findings will justify.

I have accomplished my purpose. My deductions of dereliction and slumber are confirmed. Secretary Knox frankly stated that our forces were not on the alert against a surprise attack and this brought forth a Presidential demand for an investigation. There must be no whitewash if there is evidence of guilt. We have entrusted the fate of countless thousands of our brave young men and the security and the welfare of the Nation in the hands of the Army and Navy. We hold the leaders responsible. This is war, not a comic opera; serious business, not a social event.

DONATION BY BAKERS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, typical of the sentiments of the people from whose loins I sprang, I wish to read a telegram I have just received from the owner and operator of a large bakery in Spartanburg, S. C., employing some 200 persons. This telegram is dated today and addressed to me, and reads as follows:

Becker's bakery here will hold continental day Tuesday this week. Each man will give his entire day's salary, which will be matched by us, to be sent to the President of the United States for national defense. Why not all the bakers in the United States and its possessions do the same thing?

T. W. WOODWORTH.

This telegram is like many telegrams, letters, and other communications I have received from my people during the past week.

[Here the gavel fell.]

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill for hospital construction, a chart showing the number of available beds in the vet-

erans' hospitals, rates of compensation for the veterans, and certain bills that have already passed the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a hospital-construction bill is not necessary because General Hines already has authorization to construct hospitals as beds are needed, and all that is needed is an appropriation. I am sure the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], will hold hearings to consider the necessary number of beds the committee thinks are necessary. He is very much interested, as you all know, in the care of the disabled veterans. We must do everything possible to insure adequate care and compensation for the veterans of this great World War.

The matter referred to follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide sufficient hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities to care for the rapidly increasing load of disabled war veterans and to enable the Veterans' Administration facilities, rather than in contract temporary facilities and other institutions, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, through the Federal Board of Hospitalization, and subject to the approval of the President, is hereby authorized to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization and medical treatment under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by purchase, replacement, remodeling or extension of existing plants, and by construction on sites now owned by the Government or on sites to be acquired by purchase, condemnation, gift, or otherwise of such hospitals and out-patient dispensary facilities to include the necessary buildings and auxiliary structures, mechanical equipment, approach work, roads, and trackage facilities leading thereto, sidewalks abutting hospital reservations, vehicles, livestock, furniture, equipment, and accessories; and also to provide accommodations for officers, nurses, and attending and other personnel; and also to provide proper and suitable recreational centers; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to accept gifts or donations for any of the purposes named herein. Such hospitals and dispensary plants to be constructed shall be of fireproof construction, and existing plants purchased shall be remodeled to be fireproof, and the location and nature thereof shall be in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs through the Federal Board of Hospitalization, subject to the approval of the President.

SEC. 2. The construction of new hospitals or dispensaries, or the replacement, extension, alteration, remodeling, or repair of all hospitals or dispensaries heretofore or hereafter constructed shall be done in such manner as the President may determine, and he is authorized to require the architectural, engineering, constructing, or other forces of any of the departments of the Government to do or assist in such work, and to employ individuals and agencies not now connected with the Government, if in his opinion desirable, at such compensation as he may consider reasonable.

SEC. 3. For carrying into effect the preceding sections relating to hospitals and out-patient dispensary facilities there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Table of rates for service-connected disability and death (peacetime and wartime) (to reveal effects of H. R. 6009, 77th Cong.)

SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY

	Peacetime rates (Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. II, as amended)	Wartime rates (H. R. 6009—Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. I, as amended)
(a) 10-percent disability	$7.50	$10
(b) 20-percent disability	15.00	20
(c) 30-percent disability	22.50	30
(d) 40-percent disability	30.00	40
(e) 50-percent disability	37.50	50
(f) 60-percent disability	45.00	60
(g) 70-percent disability	52.50	70
(h) 80-percent disability	60.00	80
(i) 90-percent disability	67.50	90
(j) Total disability	75.00	100
(k) Pension (a) to (j) increased for anatomical loss or loss of use of only 1 foot, or 1 hand, or 1 eye by	18.75	35
(l) Specified rate for anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or so helpless as to need regular aid and attendance	112.50	150
(m) Specified rate for anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands and 1 foot, or both feet and 1 hand, or if blind in both eyes, having only light perception	131.25	175
(n) Specified rate for blindness in both eyes, having only light perception, and suffered anatomical loss or loss of use of 1 hand or 1 foot	150.00	200
(o) Specified rate for anatomical loss or loss of use as provided in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, and/or blindness in both eyes having only light perception, which conditions entitled him to 2 or more of the rates provided in those subparagraphs, no specified condition being considered twice in determination	187.50	250

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH

	Peacetime rates (Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. II, as amended)	Wartime rates (H. R. 6009)	
		Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. I, as amended	Public, No. 198, 76th Cong., sec. 5, as amended
Widow under 50:			
No child	$22	$30	$38
1 child	[1] 29–33	[1] 40–45	[1] 48–53
2 children	[1] 35–42	[1] 48–58	[1] 56–66
Widow 50 to 65:			
No child	26	35	45
1 child	[1] 33–37	[1] 45–50	[1] 55–60
2 children	[1] 39–46	[1] 53–63	[1] 63–73
Widow over 65:			
No child	30	40	45
1 child	[1] 37–41	[1] 50–55	[1] 55–60
2 children	[1] 43–50	[1] 58–68	[1] 63–73
Each additional child	[1] 6–9	[1] 8–13	[1] 8–13
No widow:			
1 child	15	20	20
2 children	[2] 24	[2] 33	[2] 33
3 children	[2] 34	[2] 46	[2] 46
Each additional child	[2] 6	[2] 8	[2] 8

[1] Dependent upon age of child. Higher rate payable if child over 10.
[2] Equally divided.

Table of rates for service-connected disability and death (peacetime and wartime) (to reveal effects of H. R. 6009, 77th Cong.)—Continued

SERVICE-CONNECTED DEATH—continued

	Peacetime rates (Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. II, as amended)	Wartime rates (H. R. 6009)	
		Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. I, as amended	Public, No. 198, 76th Cong., sec. 5, as amended
Dependent mother or father	$15	$20	$45
(Or both)	[3] 11	[3] 15	[3] 25
Limitations on total amount payable	[4]	[5]	[6]

[3] Each.
[4] Total amount shall not exceed $56. Otherwise subject to apportionment.
[5] Total amount shall not exceed $75. Otherwise subject to apportionment.
[6] As to widow and children total payment shall not exceed $83 (subject to apportionment). Authorized amount shall be paid in event monthly payment of compensation under Veterans Regulation 1, series, pt. I, and of yearly renewable term or automatic insurance or national service life insurance does not aggregate or exceed amount of compensation above authorized.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Heading: Number of hospital beds in Veterans' Administration facilities, 61,819 capacity.

Other Government hospitals utilized, 2,633 beds.

State and civil hospitals utilized, 1,035 beds.

Domiciliary facilities, 18,725 capacity.

Unoccupied beds, Veterans' Administration facilities:

Hospital beds	4,353
Domiciliary beds	2,992

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in my statement under the heading of "Veterans' benefits" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 11, 1941, page 9700, I promised to give a statement to the House regarding certain pending legislation for wartime pension for disabilities incurred in line of duty.

H. R. 6009, "a bill to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes," was passed by the House of Representatives December 11, 1941. This bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, December 11, 1941, report No. 889, and it is expected it will receive early attention by the Senate. I have learned that it has just passed the Senate. That bill will insure the payment of wartime rates for disabilities and deaths resulting from injury or disease received in line of duty during the present war. Under the present law, the wartime rates under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the Veterans Regulations, for service-connected disabilities and deaths are available only based upon service in the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, and World War I,

except that wartime rates are made available under existing law for disability and death resulting from an injury received in line of duty in actual combat in a military expedition or military occupation. The bill, when approved, will automatically remove this limitation as to the present war and the wartime disability and death rates will be payable. The bill is also retroactive insofar as eligibility is concerned to cover disability or death resulting from injury or disease received in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict or while the person was engaged in extra hazardous service including such service under conditions simulating war. The payments authorized by the act will be prospective from the date of enactment of the bill or date of receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the benefits thereof.

The increased rates which will be payable on a wartime basis generally under the bill, H. R. 6009, for the present war and in those cases heretofore referred to and the peacetime rates payable under existing law are set forth in simple arrangement in the table which I desire to insert at this point.

It will be noted that H. R. 6009 contains specific provisions that in any case wherein the requirements of the act are met, even though the disability or death is due to injury or disease incurred prior to the date of enactment of the act, the wartime rates will be paid although the award at the higher rates will not be effective prior to the date of enactment of the law.

It should be noted that this legislation is not restricted to selectees or National Guard men or volunteers, but covers also those persons in the Regular Establishment and with the retroactive provision in the bill as to eligibility, will cover in addition to all these groups in the active service and those who may come into the active service, the Regulars, volunteers, National Guard men, and selectees, and any others in the active military or naval service who suffered injury or disease or where death resulted from injury or disease incurred at any time during the past years in the active military or naval service in line of duty under the circumstances described in the bill.

Another bill, H. R. 1030. An act to provide increases of pension payable to dependents of veterans of the Regular Establishment, and for other purposes, passed the House of Representatives, has been reported favorably by the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, and is now on the Senate calendar. This bill would increase the rates of pension to widows, children, and dependent parents based upon peacetime service-connected death to establish better uniformity with the rates provided for peacetime veterans for service-connected disabilities which have already been increased to 75 percent of the wartime rates. This bill is mentioned particularly because of the fact that an amendment to the bill reported by the Committee on Pensions of the Senate would provide that the awards of death pension under part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, shall be effective as of the day following the date of death of the veterans if claim is filed within 1 year following the date of death. This provision will establish uniformity with the rule applicable to Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, and World War cases.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMERICA ANSWERS THE CHALLENGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, millions of American citizens today are observing and celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights that has often been referred to as the Magna Carta of our liberties. Those priceless fundamental guaranties of our rights and liberties are held near and dear to the hearts of our citizens everywhere. Now as never before we realize and appreciate the sacredness of those fundamental and inalienable rights as set forth in that all-important document as handed down to us by our forefathers.

Today a startled but determined Nation must rededicate itself to the fundamental principles set forth in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States. We must pledge ourselves and our lives if need be to defend our liberties against international pirates and outlaws that are now threatening the Nation's existence. The precious and sacred principles, ideals, and guaranties of freedom and liberty must and will be preserved and transmitted to our children unfettered and unimpaired. We must pass the torch of freedom and democracy to those who follow us that they may enjoy the same rights, privileges, and blessings without favor or discrimination.

It is entirely fitting that this Congress should today consider and pass another huge defense bill on the anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. It is a practical way for this Congress to assure our citizens that, regardless of the cost, financial or otherwise, the American way of life must and will be preserved.

Important and epoch-making events have occurred within the past few days—events that seriously threaten the fundamental rights of American citizens everywhere. On December 8, 1 week ago today, with only 1 opposing vote, this Congress declared that war existed between the Japanese Empire and the Government and the people of the United States. Then, 3 days later, Congress, without an opposing vote, declared war on both Germany and Italy.

It seems almost inconceivable that war in all of its fury should have been thrust upon our land. Ours are peace-loving, God-fearing people. We did not want war. We hoped and fervently prayed that an honorable way would be found whereby the black clouds of war might be lifted, but Congress had no other choice. It was either fight or surrender, and America does not know how to surrender.

The sudden, brutal, and unprovoked attack upon the Hawaiian Islands that early December Sunday morning will go down in history as the most treacherous assault ever made by one nation upon another. It bore all the earmarks of being made in Germany. Yet the heartless attacks of Hitler's hordes on Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Lowland Countries, pale into insignificance when compared to the dastardly attack of the cunning Japs under a flag of truce.

It is now definitely certain that while the traitorous, tricky Japanese were stalling for time, sending so-called peace envoys to Washington and giving out statements to the effect that they were hopeful of settling differences between America and Japan in a peaceful manner, those deceitful pirates of the Pacific were at the same time actually establishing a secret base or bases from which they operated and struck down many American citizens while they slept, including helpless women and children.

It would be utter folly to minimize the seriousness of this war. That this is the most critical situation America has ever faced must be admitted by all. For our beloved America to be suddenly forced into a war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, with those three international outlaws running rampant in both the Atlantic and Pacific, seeking to drag our citizens down to a watery grave, cannot be lightly considered. Our Nation's very existence is now in jeopardy. America faces a tremendous task. It now seems certain to be a long, tough war that will challenge every American to do his or her utmost.

As the slogan of the Spanish-American War was "Remember the Maine," the slogan of Americans as we go forth to battle in defense of American liberties against the treacherous and hypocritical Japanese will be "Remember Pearl Harbor." There is no doubt in the mind of any American that our enemies will pay and pay dearly for their treachery and duplicity and their wanton, ruthless, and cowardly attack upon our citizens.

The Pearl Harbor incident, however, as well as the sinking of the two modern British battleships, the *Repulse* and the *Prince of Wales*, has been a costly but valuable lesson. We know now what some of us have suspected for years—that despite the repeated assurances of our naval experts that battleships are indestructible by air bombers, the events of the last few days must radically change our entire defense program. No battleship, irrespective of its size or cost, can stand the gaff against the modern air bombers, especially those equipped with torpedoes. It means a closer cooperation between our air force and our other armed forces. It means that mastery of the air, especially in the war of the Pacific, since Japan staged her sea blitzkrieg, is equally, if not more, important than the mastery of the land and sea. It means that the small, fast pocket battleship that can be constructed within a few months, and the small but powerful destroyer must supplement, to a large extent, the big, clumsy "floating palaces" that have been constructed largely for bluff and

show. It means that we must build more and still more fighting planes and powerful bombers of all types. Several years ago, when a battleship was sunk by bombers in the Spanish War, some of us who do not pretend to be naval or military experts, began demanding more and better fighting planes and bombers rather than concentrating our naval efforts on the construction of giant battleships. Some 5 years ago the RECORD will show I stated:

Day by day it becomes increasingly evident that we can no longer depend on the huge, expensive, and clumsy battleships to guarantee American freedom of the seas or defense of American citizens against huge modern bombers.

In January 1938 I said on this floor:

If it is our purpose to properly and adequately prepare ourselves for national defense, than I submit in all fairness that America needs coast defense, additional air bases, more and better bombers, faster and better cruisers, more destroyers, and submarines rather than the big, expensive, slow battleships that are seldom used in any warfare and certainly not urgent to defend our own borders.

In March of the same year I said, as also shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It does not take an admiral, a general, or a naval expert to know that America needs more and better coast defense, more and better bombers, fast cruisers, airplane carriers, and submarines. The weakness in this bill, as I see it, is too many capital battleships that will take 5 years to build, and too little consideration given to our neglected air force that we must strengthen in case of future hostilities, which God forbid may never come to blight our land.

For those statements I was criticized and actually ridiculed by some of the self-admitted naval experts in and out of Congress.

It is generally conceded that the outcome of the present war against the unholy three will in a very large measure depend on which country can make the greatest number of fast and durable fighting airplanes and bombers. During my several years on the Appropriations Committee of the House, I have insisted that adequate funds be allowed for the construction of fighting planes and bombers for both the Army and Navy. I have advocated, urged and demanded that the United States of America build an air force superior to any nation in the world. I am pleased to say that the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations has given both the Army and the Navy every dollar they have requested for planes during the past 3 years. It has also allowed enormous sums for production facilities for bombers.

Since 1939 appropriations have been made for the construction of 37,000 planes of various types for the Army and 14,000 planes for the Navy. It now seems obvious, because of the turn of events in the Pacific, that the number of Navy planes must be materially increased at once. The $8,000,000,000 bill passed by the House a few days ago made funds available for 16,000 planes. The United States Senate, as you know, increased the bill to $10,572,000,000. Five hundred million dollars of the increase is to be expended for the construction of planes, the major portion of which I am hopeful will be used to build two- and four-motored bombers and torpedo-carrying planes. So our committee is now and for many months has been cooperating to the fullest in the vast plane-building program.

Now that legislation has been introduced in both the House and the Senate to authorize the increase of the United States Navy 30 percent, which legislation I shall wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support, serious consideration should be given by the committee and the Congress to the end that a radical change be inaugurated in the policy of the Navy building program to make certain that the spending of a major portion of the funds appropriated for the Navy will not be expended for the construction of capital battleships. The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee is reported as saying that these funds will be sufficient to build nine 45,000-ton battleships. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I shall never agree to spend funds for the increase of the Navy in such a manner. Even with the stepped-up program of construction, it would take from 3½ to 4 years to complete a battleship of that magnitude and the cost would be over $100,000,000 each. The battle of the Pacific will be won or lost before such ships could possibly be constructed, and the battle must not and will not be lost.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to criticize our American Navy merely because it apparently was caught off guard at Pearl Harbor. We have a really great Navy, and I am confident it will give an excellent account of itself. In fact, it is now doing so. We must leave no stone unturned to back up our Navy that stands now as a mighty bulwark of protection of our liberties and all that Americans hold dear. Those naval officers, however, and other self-admitted naval and military experts who during the past months have talked so vociferously about "cleaning up on Japan some morning before breakfast," have rendered a distinct disservice to the Nation.

I also desire to take this occasion to say that those Members of Congress who consistently and persistently opposed a two-ocean navy, also the fortification of Hawaii, Guam, the Philippine Islands, and other American possessions, on the flimsy excuse that we could not afford to offend Japan, or upon the repeated assurance by them that there was not the remotest possibility of America ever being dragged into war on the Pacific, must also now realize that their advice and council, if followed, would have meant total disaster, humiliation, and defeat for the United States.

To those who have been so critical, in season and out, of the President of the United States, as well as Members of Congress who have been insisting on a modern, up-to-date Navy, an efficient, well-trained Army, and the most powerful air force in the world, let me remind them that as far back as 1933, when our Navy was a poor fourth and we had less than 100,000 officers and men in our Army, and practically no air force, the President of the United States called upon Congress to materially strengthen our long-neglected naval forces as well as all component parts of the Army, and to build up our then weak defense in the air. At that time the cry went up from the isolationists, the appeasers, and other Roosevelt critics of "Why such an enormous outlay of funds for national defense?", "Whom are you going to fight?", and "What nation would dare attack or declare war on the United States?" Except for the farsightedness of the President of the United States and his insistent demand for strengthening our armed forces, we would now be in a helpless position.

More than 3 years ago the President asked Congress for funds to immediately fortify Guam, pointing out that this little American outpost, now reported to be in the hands of Japan, would be helpless in case of attack, but his appeal was ignored. We were told that fortifying American air and naval bases in the Pacific would offend Japan.

For the same reason we continued to ship her American products. It is a pitiful but sad fact that the bombs, bullets, shot, and shells that were fired by the Japs at Pearl Harbor that fateful Sunday morning, December 7, were actually made in the United States or from American-made materials. Undoubtedly many of the planes that participated in that dastardly attack also were constructed largely of American materials. Certainly the steel that went into Japanese planes and ships came from our mines, mills, and factories. Perhaps the gasoline in those death-dealing bombers came from the oil fields of California, Texas, or Oklahoma.

More than 3 years ago, along with a few other Members of Congress, I protested to Congress and the country against the shipment of American raw materials to Japan, and the RECORD shows that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have repeatedly queried Army officers, as well as officials of the State Department, as to the reason for sending American-made goods, including our raw materials, to that treacherous, hypocritical country that, with one hand extended greetings of friendship and good will, and with the other held the dagger with which American citizens were stabbed in the back.

As unfortunate and cowardly as was the sudden Japanese attack, it had the effect of sobering and uniting our people, including our lawmakers and other officials in Washington. It has stopped a lot of loose talk, charges, and countercharges on the part of the so-called appeasers in both Houses of Congress. From henceforth during this present grave emergency petty differences and cheap politics must take a long-delayed but much-needed rest.

Further strikes in defense industries must not be tolerated. This House has spoken in no uncertain terms on legislation to curb defense strikes. It is hoped that the body at the other end of the Capitol will also act at an early date so that the public may know that strikes in these great industries so essential to the Nation's defense are actually at an end.

One who strikes now in a defense industry is striking against his Government and is giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

There is another element, Mr. Speaker, that is beginning to show its ugly head. I speak of the war profiteer. No person, firm, or corporation has a moral right to profiteer off of the misfortunes of war. We saw it in its many phases during World War No. 1. We saw sugar kings buy up sugar at 3 cents a pound and retail it to our people at 30 cents. We saw the coal barons double the price of coal almost overnight. We witnessed the sad spectacle of the raincoat makers charging the Government 500-percent profit on a raincoat that would not pretend to hold water, and now we see lobbyists swarming the Capitol for the purpose of getting defense contracts, on which they are pulling down huge fees and commissions.

The public is fed up on this kind of sabotaging of our national defense program. These heartless profiteers and racketeers are as detestable as are the saboteurs, alien enemies, and other subversive forces that we hold in such dire contempt.

In voting for the $10,500,000,000 bill which passed this House unanimously today, we have a right to expect that the Government get a dollar's worth of materials and service for every dollar of the taxpayer's money expended.

In these dark and trying hours, when American liberties are in peril, let us not forget that God reigns and His purpose lives. Let us have the faith and assurance that God will guide and help us in these epoch-making days. Let us turn to Him, trust and beseech Him to give us courage and spiritual strength, which is so essential if we are to forge a genuine all-out American defense that we cannot buy with all these vast appropriations made by Congress. Only with the help of an infinite and all-wise God will we be able to defend and preserve our liberties for ourselves and our posterity. Except with divine assistance will America be enabled to rehabilitate mankind. When peace comes let us hope and pray for a lasting peace based upon the sacred and priceless principles of liberty and freedom as guaranteed to all Americans by that sacred and important document, the Bill of Rights.

With American ingenuity, brains, valor, determination, and the help of Almighty God, we shall achieve a righteous and lasting victory.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson;

S. 1190. An act for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville;

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson; and

S. 1623. An act to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 16, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, December 17, 1941, to consider private bills.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the committee in executive session on Wednesday, December 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., Room 304, House Office Building, to consider bills which have been referred to this committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1165. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved October 16, 1941, to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States (Public, No. 274, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1166. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the construction of water-conservation and utilization projects under the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, approved May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1167. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5822. A bill to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6223. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3019. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385) (Rept. No. 1505). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. NELSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 389. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6233 to expedite the prosecution of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6233. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6215. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6233. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6234. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10-percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

My Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6235 (by request). A bill to issue and sell special postage stamps, the proceeds to be used for the building and construction of additional defense units for the United States Navy; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6236. A bill to provide for uniform air-raid warning signals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 6237. A bill to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6238. A bill to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 6239 (by departmental request). A bill providing for the disposal of lands within the Palm Springs or Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 6240. A bill authorizing the appointment of an officer of the Veterinary Corps as

assistant to the Surgeon General of the Army with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6241. A bill to authorize an appropriation to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons entitled to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Joint Resolution No. 3, Laws of 1941, relative to the construction of the Delaware River tunnel as a military necessity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6242. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Colin P. Kelly, Jr.,; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esperanza Garma Labez; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gabriela Redondo Ayson; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 6245. A bill for the relief of F. E. Stolte; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2164. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Mrs. Charles W. Vath and others, of Sandy Lake and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2165. Also, petition of Leroy J. Stoddert and others, asking support of House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2166. By Mr. KEOGH: Resolution of the New York State Department of Health, Albany, N. Y., at the request of the Public Health Council of the State of New York, condeming official reliance upon regulation of houses of prostitution in the vicinity of certain of the military establishments of the United States and advocating suppression of prostitution as an aid to preventing the spread of venereal diseases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2167. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of the Industrial Union Council, Congress of Industrial Organization, Detroit, Mich., urging consideration of Philip Murray's industry council plan; to the Committee on Labor.

2168. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Federal Labor Union, Local No. 22657, Rock Island, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2169. Also, petition of the Worthy Adelphia Lodge, No. 1, of Mayaguez, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to cooperation with our social plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2170. Also, petition of the American Labor Party, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid all defense agencies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2171. Also, petition of Local 26, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antilabor legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

2172. Also, petition of the American Association of Port Authorities, New Orleans, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 4896, relative to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2173. Also, petition of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers, Local 128, Nashville, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2174. Also, petition of the General Welfare Association, Youth Center, No. 560, Syracuse, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1941

The Very Reverend Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, by whom we are sustained in every time of utmost need, we beseech Thee to consider the travail of our souls as we behold the sufferings of our generation, who are as yet uncomforted in the midst of doubt and desolation. Heed not our fears, most merciful God, forgive our failures, have pity on our waywardness, guide Thou our lives, and waken our eyes to reality, for we would see Thee face to face.

If we have scorned to heed Thy call take not our refusal for an answer, but have pity on our misguided minds. And now we lift to Thee our broken cries, Thou who didst gather into human form the habiliments of God, and do Thou once more lead us up the narrow way to Golgotha, that we may see and understand Thy sacrifice by which all pain shall be assuaged and the sorrows of all hearts comforted.

We ask it in Thy name and for Thy sake, O Blessed Christ, Thou who alone canst lead us by Thy love into the fuller light and to more glorious life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 15, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 15, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Sioux Skyways, Inc.;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells; and

S. 1870. An act for the relief of John Paul Murray.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2077) amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural-conservation-program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2. An act to provide for a discretionary penalty of punishment by death on conviction of willful sabotage against the national defense, whenever such act causes or threatens death or serious injury to others;

H. R. 1632. An act permitting free entry of articles imported by returning residents from certain countries on the basis of the frequency of use of the exemption rather than the length of visit abroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4314. An act authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.;

H. R. 4465. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota;

H. R. 4489. An act to permit the courts of the United States and State courts to issue copies of naturalization certificates to all persons over 21 years of age who can show they are entitled to citizenship in the United States of America by the naturalization of their parent or husband that was issued out of the court;

H. R. 5925. An act to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; and

H. R. 6109. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, to provide for the clarification of the dual nationality of certain persons, and for other purposes.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to report a bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not understand the request. Will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight tonight to report a bill. The particular bill I have in mind is the bill extending the age limit for the selective service. The committee is now in session, and very likely will complete its labor before 2 oclock, but we were not sure how long the Senate would remain

in session this afternoon. That is the reason for the request.

Mr. McNARY. Let us wait until nearer the end of the session today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Lucas	Tobey
Chavez	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Alva B. Adams, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 15, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I write to confirm that I fully approve and endorse the bill for the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. MAY in the House on Friday last.

I approve the proposed congressional declaration of policy, the provision for the registration of all our manpower between 18 and 64, inclusive, and the extension of liability for military service so as to include all the age groups from 19 to 44, inclusive.

I consider the registration provision an essential instrument for the orderly planning of our national effort.

As to the extension of liability for service, I approve it as a means of providing a sufficiently large pool of men available for service in our land and naval forces (including the air forces) adequate to meet all contingencies now foreseeable.

These two features of the bill supplement each other. I consider them of equal and prime importance.

The reasons for the bill are more fully set forth in the letter sent by the Secretary of War on Saturday last to Representative MAY and Senator REYNOLDS. I endorse without qualification the Secretary's statement in that letter.

I am sending an identical letter to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders of the House.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

AMENDMENT TO CHARTER OF DEFENSE PLANT CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, stating that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to law, has filed with him two certified copies of an amendment to the charter of Defense Plant Corporation (with accompanying papers), which was ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, or presented by Senators, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of the Bill of Rights Association, of Noroton, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to require the registration of labor unions and the regulation of their accounts, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILEY:

Resolutions of the Kiwanis Club, of Mauston; the Franklin Town Taxpayers' League; the Greenfield Tax Economy League; and the Citizens Economy Council of Sheboygan County, all in the State of Wisconsin, favoring the curtailment of nondefense expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Wisconsin Holstein-Friesian Association, favoring a careful study of proposed ice cream standards; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Wisconsin Holstein-Friesian Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to prevent the use of butter taste, odor, and color in the manufacture of butter substitutes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Wisconsin Holstein-Friesian Association, stating that no price ceilings should be placed upon agricultural products unless comparable ceilings are placed on the prices of materials and the rates of labor involved in the production of defense materials as well as goods and equipment used by farmers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Wisconsin Holstein-Friesian Association, favoring full support for the food-for-defense program and pledging loyal cooperation of the association to support the Nation and further the just course of America in this time of grave emergency and peril; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Wisconsin Holstein-Friesian Association, favoring the allocation of materials by the Office of Production Management so as to prevent a shortage of farm machinery and equipment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Milwaukee County (Wis.) Industrial Union Council, favoring granting to labor the opportunity to present its viewpoint at public hearings on any proposed legislation affecting communications workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

STATEMENT OF TOWNSEND RECOVERY PLAN CLUB, NO. 1, HATTIESBURG, MISS.—TENDER OF SERVICES IN WAR SITUATION

Mr. BILBO presented a statement signed by members of the Townsend Recovery Plan Club, No. 1, of Hattiesburg, Miss., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of the Townsend Recovery Plan Club, No. 1, of Hattiesburg, Miss., do hereby endorse the action of the President and Congress of the United States in their declaration of war against Japan after their treacherous and murderous attack on the citizens and property of our Government of the United States, at a time when we were at peace with the Government of Japan, and at a time, when the proper officials of the two nations were negotiating, or trying to negotiate, a peace term in the Pacific. And we endorse the declaration of war against Germany and Italy. And we do hereby tender our services to Congress and the President to be used the way they think we can best serve.

Sincerely,

W. J. Stokes, president; Mrs. D. T. Duckworth, secretary; J. T. Jasthan; C. F. Cubley; W. T. Thomas; S. R. Cubley; Tom Collier; D. M. Jarman; I. M. Arnold; A. A. Vandusler; J. B. Cunningham; I. H. Hollingsworth; Mrs. C. F. Cubley; J. M. Hall; Frank H. Harpes; Mrs. Ida McArdle; A. De Cranik; L. J. Lee; C. E. Noller; Charles H. Schmuck.

THE WAR SITUATION—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF CENTRAL FALLS, R. I.

Mr. GREEN presented a letter enclosing copy of a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Central Falls, R. I., which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF CENTRAL FALLS, R. I.,
December 11, 1941.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: At the request of the city council of the city of Central Falls, I am enclosing a certified copy of the resolution entitled "Resolution Approving and

Commending the Action of the President and Congress of these United States in Their Present Attitude."

Very truly yours,
RONALDO E. LEMAY, *City Clerk.*

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Central Falls, as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of Central Falls, R. I., in meeting assembled, aware of the gravity of the present Pacific situation, cognizant of the dastardly action of the far eastern foe, do hereby in a true American manner, as Americans, all heartily endorse the attitude and action of the President of these United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his most splendid presentation of all facts to the Congress of this great Nation; a nobler or superior presentation could not be desired; his masterful action truly inspires confidence in all Americans and in all the world that so capable a helmsman guides our ship of state.

SEC. 2. This city council goes on record further endorsing the speedy action of the great United States Senate and the House of Representatives in enacting into law a request of our great Commander in Chief by declaring a state of war to exist between the perpetrator of so nefarious action in the Far East, and making one and all feel that no indecent act or action of any power, regardless of its apparent potency will pass unheeded.

SEC. 3. This city council, for itself and the citizens of this great little city of Central Falls, offers whatever it can have at its disposal to whatever authority may require the same.

SEC. 4. This resolution shall take effect upon its passage, and the city clerk is hereby authorized and empowered to transmit a copy hereof forthwith to each of our representatives in the Congress of these United States separately and also a copy to the President of these United States.

RESOLUTION OF SUNFLOWER COUNCIL, NO. 31, UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA, SALINA, KANS., ON WAR SITUATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter embodying a resolution adopted by Sunflower Council, No. 31, of the United Commercial Travelers of America, of Salina, Kans., forcefully expressing patriotic sentiments and a spirit of unity in our present emergency which I believe to represent the feeling of the State of Kansas and the country as a whole.

There being no objection, the letter embodying the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNFLOWER COUNCIL, NO. 31,
ORDER OF UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
Salina, Kans., December 8, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Buiding,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a public patriotic meeting held in Salina, Kans., on November 29, sponsored by Sunflower Council, No. 31, of the United Commercial Travelers of America, the following resolution was presented and received unanimous acceptance by all present:

"Realizing that our country is faced by the greatest danger to its safety since the birth of the Republic, we call upon all true Americans to unite and face the task of defeating the greatest onslaught against human liberty the world has ever known. To this end there must be no backing down to Japan, no separate peace; nothing less than the total defeat of Hitlerism will satisfy red-blooded Kansans. If this means a shooting war, let it come; but at whatever cost, the national policy, insofar as it is committed to this end, must be supported by all loyal Americans, regardless of political affiliations. National unity is the heart of national defense, and we call upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to cease their opposition to the Government's program of defense and work to that end."

The passing of this resolution was preceded by an address by Col. Fred W. O'Donnell, of Junction City, Kans.

The audience of 100 people represented a cross section of the political divisions of our city, consequently we believe the passing of this resolution is irrefutable evidence of the unity in thought of Salina's citizenry.

We ask that you bear out the very evident wish of our people by working toward the end indicated in the resolution.

Respectfully yours,
SUNFLOWER COUNCIL, No. 31,
UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,
D. E. HOWE, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S 2060. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 913).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2125. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 914).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2131. A bill for the relief of the Charlip Painting & Decorating Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2132. A bill authorizing the construction of a new lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Mich., in the interest of national defense;

S. 2133. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and to operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940; and

S. 2134. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St. Marys River, from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada," approved December 16, 1940; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2135. A bill for the relief of Lt. M. V. Daven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2136. A bill to grant automatic national-service life-insurance benefits to dependents of recently deceased members of the armed services of the United States and to extend the time limit for filing applications for said insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2137. A bill to amend the act approved October 16, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States" (Public Law 274, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LETTER FROM RALPH BUDD, TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONER, ON ST. MARYS RIVER AND SOO CANAL AND LOCKS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask that a statement from Mr. Ralph Budd, Transportation Commissioner of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, be printed in the RECORD at this point. It has reference to the necessity for the immediate consideration of the bill which I have just introduced, being the bill (S. 2132) authorizing the construction of a new lock at St. Marys Falls Canal, Mich., in the interest of national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1941.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: You are fully familiar with the importance of the St. Marys River and the Soo Canal and locks in the movement of vital traffic such as iron ore, coal, and grain. The situation with respect to the Weitzel lock is as follows:

All vessels trading to and from Lake Superior must pass the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. The total traffic during the season of 1940 amounted to about 90,000,000 net tons. Eastbound traffic was in excess of 77,000,000 tons, of which seventy-five and one-half million tons passed the locks on the American side. Sixty-six million tons was iron ore down-bound to lower lake furnaces. Traffic in 1941 has been much heavier than in 1940 or any previous year.

The locks now in place at St. Marys Falls Canal are the Weitzel lock, built in 1881; the Poe lock, opened in 1896; the Davis lock, completed in 1914; and the Fourth lock, opened in 1919.

The Weitzel lock, 60 years old, has a depth of only about 11½ feet and is no longer serviceable, having been out of commission since 1918. The Poe lock, with draft of 17 feet, is capable of passing all vessels without cargo and vessels of shallow draft. While the depth is thus limited, it is now and will continue to be, of great service in relieving the deeper locks of much of the upbound traffic.

The Davis and Fourth locks have a depth of about 23 feet and must accommodate all down-bound and loaded up-bound vesels. The next step in the construction of bulk cargo vessels undoubtedly will be to build for greater draft.

In connection with the dispatch of freight down-bound through the St. Marys River last season, particularly iron ore, the capacity of the locks at St. Marys Falls Canal was taxed to the fullest extent consistent with reasonable delays to commerce.

This calls attention to the need of additional facilities, which can be supplied only by the replacement of the Weitzel lock, no longer useful, with a new structure of ample dimensions to pass any ship now in service on the Lakes and any likely to be built that may be capable of loading to a draft greater than the present locks can accommodate.

Also the volume of traffic now experienced and that to be expected emphasizes the fact that if one of the present locks should be damaged, serious delays to commerce would result until repairs could be made.

The draft of bill here enclosed is identical with the one submitted to you by President A. T. Wood, of the Lake Carriers Association, with his letter of December 12, in which he suggests the introduction of a similar or identical bill in the House of Representatives.

The bill covering a new lock has been passed by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, but the project is being delayed because it is included in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This is such an important matter that I am presuming to suggest that if consistent you introduce a short bill somewhat along the lines of the enclosed text. If such a bill is passed, the item of a new lock would, of course, be eliminated from the omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

Yours sincerely,

RALPH BUDD,
Transportation Commissioner.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2. An act to provide for a discretionary penalty of punishment by death on conviction of willful sabotage against the national defense whenever such act causes or threatens death or serious injury to others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1632. An act permitting free entry of articles imported by returning residents from certain countries on the basis of the frequency of use of the exemption rather than the length of visit abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4314. An act authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 4465. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 4489. An act to permit the courts of the United States and State courts, to issue copies of naturalization certificates to all persons over 21 years of age, who can show they are entitled to citizenship in the United States of America by the naturalization of their parent or husband, that was issued out of the court; and

H. R. 6109. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940, to provide for the clarification of the dual nationality of certain persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

DECLARATIONS OF WAR AGAINST JAPAN, GERMANY, AND ITALY (S. DOC. NO. 148)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday I obtained consent of the Senate to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and as a Senate document the address by the President of the United States before the joint session, and certain other matters in regard to the declarations of war. In the heading of the document appear the words "also the proceedings in the Senate of the United States relative thereto." I ask that the document include also certain proceedings in the House of Representatives pertaining to these matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be made.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF BILL OF RIGHTS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by the President of the United States on December 15, 1941, in connection with the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF WASHINGTON, MORRIS, AND SOLOMAN MONUMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS on the occasion of the unveiling and dedication of the George Washington, Robert Morris, and Haym Soloman Monument, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROOKS ON ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF BILL OF RIGHTS

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on December 15, 1941, on the occasion of the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BILL OF RIGHTS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered on December 15, 1941, by Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, and the introductory remarks of Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, at the dedication ceremonies of the Thomas Jefferson Room in the Library of Congress Annex, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RT. REV. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D. D., TO THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Right Reverend William Lawrence, D. D., to the one hundred and fifty-fifth annual convention of the Diocese of Massachusetts, on April 10, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

LT. GEORGE S. WELCH, UNITED STATES ARMY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Wilmington, Del., Star of December 14, 1941, and an article from the Washington, D. C., Evening Star of December 15, 1941, relative to Lt. George S. Welch, U. S. A., of Wilmington, Del., which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY JEREMIAH S. BLACK ON CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jeremiah S. Black on constitutional morality, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 2049, to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936. On the same day the House passed an identical bill, House bill 5925. Of course, in order that legislation may become effective, it is necessary that one House act on the bill of the other. Since the House bill has been messaged to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title.

The bill (H. R. 5925) to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate bill 2049 was passed yesterday be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOMESTEAD PROJECTS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture, which was, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "effective July 1, 1942."

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE HOUSING—REFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, yesterday I gave notice that upon the convening of the Senate today, as soon as I should be able to obtain the floor, I should ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor, to which has been referred House bill 6128, be discharged from its further consideration and that the bill in question be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I now make that unanimous-consent request.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion, if it is now in order, that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MCNARY and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MCNARY. I am a little confused regarding the procedure. I did not hear the first request of the Senator from

Connecticut. Did he ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6128, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McNARY. Was objection made to the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection was made by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. McNARY. Now the Senator from Connecticut is moving to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from further consideration of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending motion.

Mr. McNARY. The question now is to discharge the committee, and no action has been taken on that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor and refer the bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senate briefly the purpose of my motion.

The bill in question, which has passed the House of Representatives, proposes to amend the so-called Lanham Act. So far as the Senate is concerned, the measure which became the Lanham Act was considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Included in House bill 6128 is an appropriation of $150,000,000, which provides additional funds for so-called community services. Heretofore community services legislation has been embraced in a special bill, and that also was considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Some time in the past, I presume because of a strange practice in the Senate, certain bills dealing with housing have been referred to various committees of the Senate, but in this particular instance, because all proposed legislation dealing with the so-called Lanham Act and all proposed legislation dealing with the other purposes of the proposed amendment of the Lanham Act has been handled by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I had not for a moment supposed that anything would happen to the House bill other than that it would be referred to this appropriate and proper committee.

I may say at this time appropriately, Mr. President, that not only as a result of this experience but as a result of several other confusing experiences happening in the Senate I have asked the Committee on Rules, through its chairman, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to give study and thought to the wisdom of providing a Senate rule dealing with the reference of bills.

I have no desire to quarrel with the members of the Committee on Education and Labor. I certainly do not wish to engage in a controversy with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is chairman of the subcommittee which would deal with the proposed legislation were the bill to go to the Committee on Education and Labor.

I asked for this change of reference as a matter of duty. Like other Senators, I have all the work to which I can reasonably attend, and, afflicted with the usual frailties of human nature, I am not reaching out too far for additional work. But I know that the proposed legislation properly belongs to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and, as chairman of that committee, I feel duty bound to give the committee the opportunity to assume its responsibility.

I am certain that all Senators are anxious that this bill and all other bills be properly referred. I have no personal interest in the matter. I am certain that Senators will vote in keeping with a proper procedure, and, in order that the matter may be definitely decided, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, before the roll is called I should like to make a remark or two about the bill.

All the Senator from Connecticut has said is, of course, true, but I think the Senator from Connecticut should go a little bit back of his explanation, because the very bill which became the Lanham Act, and was handled by his committee, when introduced was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and a subcommittee was actually constituted to consider the bill. It was after that reference that a motion was made to discharge our committee and send the bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Of course, we did not resist that motion.

The Senate passed a hospital bill which was sponsored, considered, and reported to the Senate by our committee, but did not become law. The Lanham bill has expanded itself into a measure embracing hospital facilities and the building of hospitals. It is larger than a housing bill; it goes into the maintenance of health provisions. Health measures have always been considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. We reported a health bill last year.

One provision of the Lanham bill was, in substance, taken from an education bill which provided $150,000,000 for school districts distressed as the result of the defense program and housing. In addition to that, the pending amendment of the Lanham Act has in it labor features and a labor amendment.

I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator from Connecticut that there should be a rule governing these matters. If the Committee on Education and Labor, which has handled measures affecting health, which has handled measures affecting labor, and which has handled educational measures, having to do with the building of schools and things of that kind, is to have taken away from it jurisdiction over such proposals, the Senate, of course, will not be working to its own advantage, because the historical background essential to the consideration of such bills will simply not be present.

There is another consideration to which I wish to refer. I do not say this—I cannot say it—as a reflection upon another committee of the Senate. There is no doubt in the mind of anyone that, as a result of the differences between the Chief Administrator, who has now gone to another place, the Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, and the Administrator of the Defense Housing plan, that the administrative officers are attempting to guide bills to the committees which will consider merely the things which they want considered and which they think will avoid consideration of other matters.

If the proposed amendment to the Lanham Act should remain as narrow as it was originally, there might be argument for its consideration by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but, with its expansion into the field of labor, into the field of health, and into the field of schools, it seems to me there is only one logical place for it to go, and that the President of the Senate, in assigning it, made the proper ruling. I am sure that when the Committee on Rules goes into the matter it, too, will rule with the President of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I happen to be a member of both the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Education and Labor, and I think I am a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor which would consider the bill now under discussion. I believe, however, that it should go to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

This is primarily a bill for public housing. The first bill having to do with defense housing that was considered, as I remember, was considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds when the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was chairman in the year 1940. Since then the Lanham Act was passed, which provided money for housing. Then we had the Lanham Act, which provided money for community facilities. We have had hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, testimony from the brick interests, the lumber producers, and others concerned with the question of how expensive a house provided for defense housing shall be, and other questions which are related.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has already held those hearings; it has considered three Lanham bills up to this point, and now we have a fourth bill, which is merely an extension of the old act, and while I may be mistaken, I think it relates only to housing I am not sure whether it relates to community facilities or not.

Mr. MALONEY. There is in the bill a provision for $150,000,000 for community facilities.

Mr. TAFT. Which is a part of the community-facilities Lanham bill which the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds also considered.

Of course, there is complete confusion in respect to the question of housing. No one committee has ever had to deal with the whole question of housing. The Committee on Education and Labor dealt with the United States Housing Authority bill and has dealt with all amendments thereto. The Banking and Currency Committee dealt with the Federal Housing Administration bill and has

dealt with all amendments thereto. The Banking and Currency Committee dealt with the Federal home-loan bank bills and has dealt with all amendments relating thereto. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has dealt with legislation respecting the Farm Security Administration, which has built houses and is now building houses for defense purposes. The Military Affairs Committee has considered appropriations for defense housing, and the first appropriations for defense housing went to the Army. The Naval Affairs Committee has considered authority for the construction of houses by the Navy. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has considered the construction of defense housing. There is a complete confusion on the question of housing, and I do not believe it can be said that any committee has jurisdiction of the question of housing. I simply feel that since the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has considered these particular bills, and since the proposal now before us is no more than an amendment to bills which that committee has previously considered, and upon which it has already held hearings, the Senate ought not to send an amendment to such a bill to another committee which has not considered this particular phase of the housing problem.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the same confusion exist with respect to the building of houses for defense purposes that exists with respect to the administration of defense housing?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Mr. Palmer testified before the Banking and Currency Committee, as I recall—perhaps it was before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—that there were now 15 different agencies of the Federal Government building houses. Last year I offered a proposal to create a special committee of the Senate to try to coordinate the housing business under one particular head, so that there would be some coordination in the housing plan of the Federal Government. The President did something along that line when he appointed Mr. Palmer to be Federal Housing Coordinator; but, unfortunately, because of certain feelings, the appointment of Mr. Palmer seems merely to have created one more housing agency without coordinating the work of the existing housing agencies.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that I think this bill ought to go to the committee of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is chairman, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The special committee of which I am chairman has held extensive hearings on the question of the handling of the housing projects, and the handling of those projects has been found to be to the detriment of the Government by reason of the fact that there is so much bickering and discord in the 10 or 15 agencies which deal with defense housing. A full investigation of the whole situation should be had. I believe the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ought to go into the matter in detail.

My committee is ready to make a report on the housing situation as we have found it. I think that report will be very helpful in arriving at the right conclusion with respect to this matter.

Mr. President, I think the motion of the Senator from Connecticut should prevail.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in concluding, I merely wish to say that the only legislation of this nature which the Committee on Education and Labor has considered—and I sat in the hearings for some length of time—is that creating the United States Housing Administration, which deals with slum-clearance projects. The United States Housing Administration cannot go out and build any building. It has not had any experience in building houses. So, while I feel that the United States Housing Administration ought to be consulted, and the local authorities ought to be used, as they are being used today under the Lanham Act set-up, I do not see that the Committee on Education and Labor has had any experience in the particular phase of defense housing which is covered by the Lanham Act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to add only that in the body at the other end of the Capitol it is a recognized rule that any amendment to an act shall go to the committee which considered the original bill. I agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] that the legislative history back of the proposed legislation should be carefully considered in connection with the broad problem of reference, but certainly a committee which has considered an original bill would seem to be the committee best qualified to consider amendments to it. So I feel that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should be the committee to consider this matter, and I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor a question. I am not concerned particularly about the controversy with respect to the jurisdiction of committees. I sometimes wish we had definite rules in the Senate, as they have in the House, with respect to the jurisdiction of committees; but we do not seem to have them. Under a ruling of a former Vice President that any Senator could write on a bill he introduced the committee to which he wanted it referred, I could introduce a tariff bill or any other bill, and have it sent to the Committee on the Library if I saw fit to do so. I do not believe that is a wise rule.

Yesterday, in commenting on the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] that this bill be taken from the Committee on Education and Labor and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, indicated he had no objection to that course being taken. While the Senator was commenting a while ago my attention was diverted, as it frequently is, and I did not hear all his remarks. Is the Senator's attitude now the same as it was yesterday, or is it different?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator's attitude would be different when it comes to voting on the question.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Connecticut has said is true. His committee considered the bill which became the Lanham Act. But that bill as introduced was sent to the Committee on Education and Labor. Then the request was made to discharge that committee from further consideration of the bill, and to refer it to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, the original measure?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; the original act which it is now proposed to amend. By the proposed amendment the act will be extended in such a way as to take in labor provisions, hospital provisions, and general health facilities. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has said there are, perhaps, 15 different housing agencies under the Government, but how is the Senate ever going to end in anything but confusion unless in some way or other we confine the housing activities to one committee so that there may be some historical background in regard to these various activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, the Federal Housing legislation was sponsored and brought in by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But the Federal Housing Administration does not build houses in the ordinary sense.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to say again for the comfort of the Senator from Utah that I have asked the Committee on Rules to make a study of this matter in order that an attempt may be made to provide a rule which will end this confusion. Now, I should also like to ask the Senator, if he is willing that I should, if he will tell me where in this bill there is a specific reference to labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the last section.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; in the last section.

Mr. ELLENDER. The section reads as follows:

SEC. 10. Section 309 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Preference in such employment shall be given to qualified local residents."

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate. Personally, I am not interested in this controversy except to see that the bill shall be referred to the proper committee. In view of the fact that up to this moment the Senate Com-

mittee on Education and Labor has handled all the housing bills dealing with the U. S. H. A., I believe that this bill should be sent to that committee. A casual reading of the so-called Lanham bill will indicate that the amended sections seek to place therein many of the provisions that have been incorporated by the Congress in the United States Housing Act. For example, on page 2, there is a limitation as to the cost of each housing unit. On page 5, there is the provision that the Public Buildings Administrator shall use the facilities of local housing authorities in the building of defense housing. The United States Housing Authority Act provided a method for the creation and establishment of local housing authorities. I believe that the United States Housing Authority has done a good job in this field. It now has a competent force which is able to build defense housing without delay and minus a lot of confusion. The Committee on Education and Labor has handled all that legislation. As the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] pointed out, it has handled legislation with reference to schools and hospitals—all of which subjects are now being incorporated in the so-called Lanham bill which forms the basis of this discussion.

While I am on my feet, I wish to refer to the fact that Senate bill 3230, to provide for the general welfare through the construction of needed hospitals, and for other purposes, was considered by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and passed by the Senate. In the Lanham bill an effort is made, as I have just indicated, to bring into the picture practically every subject that has been covered by the Committee on Education and Labor in considering these proposals. As I pointed out awhile ago in answer to an inquiry, the Lanham bill now seeks to go into the labor field by providing that preference in employment shall be given to qualified local residents.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to make the observation that I think the Senator is stretching the point quite far when he refers to a provision giving preference in employment to local residents as an important labor matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator himself asked awhile ago whether the bill contained any labor provision. I think it does. I think it deals with labor to a large extent.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator knows very well that that provision is purely incidental to the purposes of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps so, but it presents a labor problem that should be passed upon, and that properly belongs to the Senate Education and Labor Committee.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will decide once and for all time the committee to which all such bills should be referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] that the Committee on Education and Labor be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6128, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

Due to a death in his family, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], is unable to be present.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] has been called to one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised, however, that if present and voting, he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is detained on business of the Senate.

The vote was recapitulated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In view of a certain amount of confusion, the Chair will ask that the vote be again recapitulated.

The vote was again recapitulated.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

Ball	Danaher	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gerry	Russell
Brewster	Gillette	Smith
Brooks	Green	Taft
Brown	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Hayden	Tobey
Burton	Herring	Truman
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Tunnell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Chandler	Kilgore	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	White
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Willis
Connally	Nye	

NAYS—38

Aiken	George	Lodge
Bilbo	Guffey	Lucas
Bunker	Hill	McCarran
Capper	Holman	McKellar
Caraway	Hughes	McNary
Chavez	La Follette	Mead
Davis	Langer	Murdock
Ellender	Lee	Murray
Norris	Smathers	Van Nuys
Overton	Spencer	Wallgren
Pepper	Stewart	Walsh
Rosier	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Schwartz	Thomas, Utah	

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Downey	Reed
Austin	Doxey	Reynolds
Bailey	Glass	Shipstead
Barbour	Hatch	Tydings
Barkley	Maybank	Wagner
Bone	O'Daniel	
Bridges	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. MALONEY's motion was rejected.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MALONEY. Under the circumstances, is the President of the Senate permitted to dissolve a tie vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate is permitted to dissolve a tie vote if he so desires.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Having made the original ruling, the President of the Senate is not likely to dissolve a tie vote; is he? [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move a reconsideration of the vote just taken, and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I did not understand the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate rejected the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LEE. Then a vote "nay" would be a vote against reconsideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; a vote of "nay" would be a vote against reconsideration. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MALONEY. During the call of the roll, Mr. President, I am just advised that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] voted "yea" on the first roll call, but through an error his name was not recorded by the clerk. I assume, of course, that that would decide the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate is voting on a motion to reconsider the vote, it seems to me that we should now proceed in the regular order. Probably the result will be the same, anyway.

Mr. McNARY. Regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the Senate should proceed in the regular order.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I hope I am not out of order in speaking at this time. I did not quite understand the suggestion or the motion of the majority leader that we proceed in the regular order. I assume that when a mistake is discovered, the orderly procedure is to correct the mistake. I should like to be clear on that point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reason for the Chair making the ruling he did was that he took unusual pains to make sure that the vote was correctly recorded, and so the vote was recapitulated not only once but twice, in view of the then-existing state of confusion. So it would seem to the Chair that full opportunity was given every Senator in the Chamber to discover exactly how he was recorded.

Mr. MALONEY. It seems to me that is not quite the responsibility of a Senator who has voted. It so happens that the Senator to whom I refer was called from the Chamber, and when the vote was recapitulated he was not present to notice the error; but upon returning to the Chamber he discovered it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is impossible for the Chair to keep track of the goings and comings of every Senator during and following a roll call.

Mr. MALONEY. That is quite true, and, if I may be so presumptuous, I should like to state that I am not offering any criticism of the Chair. I am pointing out that a Senator has discovered that his vote was not recorded on the roll call. There is precedent for just such a situation as this, and I should think the proper procedure would be for the Senate to correct the error.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not make a motion. I made a mere suggestion, rather in the nature of a point of order, that as the Senate is voting on a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Connecticut was rejected in the first place, it is proper to proceed in the regular order, and probably the result will be the same, anyway.

Mr. MALONEY. I am seeking enlightenment and the correction of the RECORD; and, of course, I am not seeking to criticize in any way.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, it is out of order to interrupt a roll call after one Senator has answered to his name; and that is the rule. However, I made the suggestion which I have stated.

After the conclusion of the roll call,

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

Due to a death in his family, the Senatory from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is unable to be present.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] has been called to one of the Government Departments on matters pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised, however, that if present and voting, he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is detained on the business of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—40

Ball	Gillette	Russell
Bankhead	Green	Shipstead
Brewster	Gurney	Smith
Brooks	Hayden	Taft
Brown	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Holman	Tobey
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	White
Connally	Nye	Willis
Danaher	Radcliffe	
Gerry	Reed	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bilbo	Kilgore	Rosier
Bunker	La Follette	Schwartz
Capper	Lee	Smathers
Caraway	Lodge	Spencer
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Davis	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McNary	Thomas, Utah
George	Mead	Van Nuys
Guffey	Murdock	Wallgren
Hatch	Murray	Walsh
Hill	Norris	Wiley
Hughes	Overton	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Bridges	O'Daniel
Austin	Bulow	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Downey	Reynolds
Barbour	Doxey	Tydings
Barkley	Glass	Wagner
Bone	Langer	

So the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. The vote just taken was on the motion to reconsider. The question now recurs on the original motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the original motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous votes, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

During the call of the roll:

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I inquire how I am recorded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is not recorded.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I vote "yea."

After the roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I distinctly voted twice that time, and then went out for a moment and apparently the first vote was not recorded.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I ask what the vote is upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is on the question of discharging the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of the so-called Lanham bill and referring the bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. DOWNEY. I must refrain from voting; I do not understand the situation.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

Due to a death in his family, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is unable to be present.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY] has been called to one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised, however, that if present and voting, he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—39

Ball	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gillette	Reed
Brewster	Green	Russell
Brooks	Gurney	Smith
Brown	Hayden	Taft
Burton	Herring	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Holman	Tobey
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wheeler
Connally	Maybank	White
Danaher	Nye	Willis

NAYS—39

Aiken	Kilgore	Pepper
Bilbo	La Follette	Rosier
Bunker	Lee	Schwartz
Capper	Lodge	Shipstead
Caraway	Lucas	Smathers
Chavez	McCarran	Spencer
Davis	McKellar	Stewart
Ellender	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
George	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Guffey	Murdock	Van Nuys
Hatch	Murray	Wallgren
Hill	Norris	Walsh
Hughes	Overton	Wiley

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Bridges	O'Daniel
Austin	Bulow	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Downey	Reynolds
Barbour	Doxey	Tydings
Barkley	Glass	Wagner
Bone	Langer	

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is detained on business of the Senate.

So, Mr. MALONEY's motion was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote just taken, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. A second motion to reconsider is not in order.

CONTROL OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to move today to take up for consideration by the Senate my bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense. This bill would have been taken up by the Senate some days ago but for the untimely death of our late distinguished colleague, Senator Adams, of Colorado, and the attendance upon his funeral of many Senators.

Since that time the President has called a conference of industry and labor with a view to having these interests agree upon a national-defense program which shall prevent strikes and stoppages of production of national-defense articles in all industries during the pending war.

My reason for not moving today to proceed with the consideration of this bill is that the administration, the leadership in the Senate, and the entire membership of the Committee on Education and Labor, before which are pending all other bills relating to strikes and stoppages of work in industry, have desired that my bill not be now acted upon. They desire that the matter be held in abeyance until after the meeting of the national conference of representatives of industry and labor. In the face of the suggestions made by the Committee on Education and Labor, the leadership of the Senate, and the administration, it would be entirely futile for me to urge or move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of my bill at this particular moment.

However, I desire to make it clear that I am in no wise slackening my interest or my desire that Senate bill 2054 be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

I am unwilling that during the pending foreign wars we shall take any hazards or risks, through strikes or any other cause, of impairment of the continued production of national-defense articles.

My bill is a rational, simple, and effective measure to insure the continuous production of national-defense articles by the Government taking over any strike-bound plant and operating it. It provides for freezing labor relationships as they existed prior to the strike, and for the adjustment of wage scales by a Government board whose duty it will be, upon a petition of a majority of the employees within a plant, to investigate the fairness or justice of wages.

The bill is essentially a national-defense bill. It is not antiemployer. It is not antiemployee. It is for the United States of America, and its safety and protection.

The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which held extensive hearings through a subcommittee. During these hearings the bill was approved by Judge Robert P. Patterson, Undersecretary of War, for the War Department. It was approved by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, for the Navy Department. It was approved by Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, for that Commission. These are the three Government agencies primarily concerned with the production of war supplies. All three agencies approved the measure without amendment, and urged its passage. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, consisting of two Republicans and three Democrats — Senators HATCH, DOXEY, AUSTIN, BURTON, and CONNALLY— unanimously approved the bill. The full Judiciary Committee reported it favorably to the Senate by a vote of 12 to 2.

The bill stands as the only measure with such backing and such support. It is a simple, liberal measure, looking primarily to the interests of the Government of the United States, and not those of any selfish or sordid group. It ought to pass. It ought to become the law. It will stop strikes. It will be fair to labor. It is fair to industry. Best of all, it is fair and just to the country we love.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1047) to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate to employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5800) authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385).

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6223) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 6223) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

REENACTMENT OF OVERMAN AND TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 948, Senate bill 2129, to expedite the prosecution of the war effort. This is a bill from the Committee on the Judiciary which in substance provides a reenactment of certain provisions of the so-called Overman Act of 1917, and the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917. I shall not make a statement about it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2129) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Lucas	Tobey
Chavez	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO WHEAT-MARKETING QUOTAS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
ELMER THOMAS,
E. D. SMITH,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

REENACTMENT OF OVERMAN AND TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACTS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2129) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am unwilling to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of a measure of this

magnitude with only 10 or 12 Members on the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	Overton
Bailey	Green	Pepper
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Rosier
Brewster	Herring	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Schwartz
Brooks	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Lucas	Tobey
Chavez	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. Senate bill 2129 is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I had assumed that the able Senator in charge of the bill would make a very thorough, frank, and open statement concerning the provisions of the bill, and particularly with reference to any amplification of what is known as the old Overman Act, passed in 1917, and whether the measure now under consideration exceeds the Overman Act in authority. I am sure the able Senator from Indiana can inform us in an enlightened way on this measure and its objectives.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I am very happy to comply with the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, and to give a brief history of the bill. The bill was prepared in the Department of Justice; and at the request of the Department, I introduced it, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Yesterday the Attorney General, together with members of his staff, appeared before the full Committee on the Judiciary. There was a good attendance of the committee, and from 10:30 to 12:30 the bill was analyzed with care and study. Certain suggestions were made by members of the committee, and accepted by the Attorney General, more as to the matter of phraseology than as to the material terms of the bill. Late last evening the whole committee voted unanimously to approve the bill.

In a nutshell, the bill grants to the President of the United States the same war powers that were exercised by President Wilson during the last World War—and exercised by him with a great degree of success.

Title I of the bill reenacts the measure mentioned by the Senator from Oregon, commonly known as the Overman Act, which was approved May 20, 1918.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator from Indiana leaves his statement that the bill is a general reenactment of the war powers given President Wilson, will the Senator indicate whether the bill in any respect goes beyond the war powers yielded to President Wilson?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It does so not in reference to the Overman Act, under title I; but when it comes to the Trading With the Enemy Act, in the provisions for seizure and freezing of alien property, it goes further, and not only freezes it, but seizes the property; possession of it vests in the United States, and the property is to be liquidated and disposed of under the rules and regulations of the Department. To that extent it exceeds the powers granted President Wilson.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should certainly have no complaint against that particular expansion of power. Is that the only additional expansion of power?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Title II is a new paragraph. It was not in the Trading With the Enemy Act, or in the old Overman Act. Title II is new. Indeed, it goes beyond the powers granted to President Wilson. It is very short, and I will read the substance of it:

TITLE II—CONTRACTS

SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting.

Title II, section 201 of the instant bill, is entirely new. The objective of title II is twofold—not only to speed up production and to obtain all sorts of materials efficiently and speedily, but also to be of assistance to the small business man. Under the present system it is almost impossible for a man of limited means to enter into some of these contracts if he has to engage in competitive bidding, if he has to put up a performance bond, and if he does not get progress payments as the material is produced. For instance, a man may have a small industrial plant capable of manufacturing some articles necessary for defense but he does not have the means or the working capital to undertake the work. The expense of a performance bond prohibits him from purchasing such a bond. Under the terms of title II the President himself may or he may direct any agency to relieve such a small business man from executing or buying a performance bond, and progress payments may be made as the work develops. I think under an existing statute 30 percent is as much as can be advanced until the work is completed and delivered. Under the terms of this amendment the President could pay to the subcontractor or the small business man the entire price for the work if, in his wisdom, he thought it was safe and secure to do that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, am I correct in stating that that provision would also permit the President to remove all limitations on profits and any other provisions that now limit the Army and Navy in making contracts?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It was not the understanding of the Attorney General nor of any member of the committee that such results would accrue under title II.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why not, because it says:

Without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts.

So I should think this provision would supersede any law relating to contracts and that it would permit a 10-percent profit or a 15-percent profit. Of course, there are many other limitations now provided, but that one occurs to me as one which would apparently be changed by this proposed law.

Mr. VAN NUYS. If the Senator will cite the law, I will be glad to know of it. No statute was cited to us that would accomplish what the Senator says.

Mr. TAFT. We enacted a law last year, as I recall, limiting profits on naval construction to 6 or 7 percent. As I understand this bill, all limits are removed; the President may disregard that law and modify any contract that is already made and make new contracts without regard to the provisions of existing law.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I do not think that is so. That law has been repealed, as I recall. I will ask the Senator from Kentucky if that is not correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. It was amended to raise the limit on profits; but the general law is still in effect. This provision is not intended to affect that law; it pertains to the making of contracts, the performance of them, and the amendment or modification of contracts. Under the present law there is a very definite limitation on the power of the Government to modify or limit contracts as they are being performed or as the exigencies may require; but this provision has no effect on any limitation Congress has heretofore placed on profits of any concern manufacturing material, munitions, or supplies for the Government. It refers to the making and the performance of the contract; it is more of a physical nature than a financial nature, and, of course, it does not authorize the making of cost-plus contracts with which we have had so much trouble heretofore.

Mr. VAN NUYS. In a memorandum prepared by the Department of Justice there are set forth four objectives which it is sought to reach by this provision. The first is to enter into contracts without competitive bidding in the few cases where competitive bidding is still required; second, to enter into contracts

without performance bonds; third, to amend contracts; fourth, to make progress payments on contracts. Those are the four objectives intended to be reached by this new paragraph.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that the language is so clear that there can be, in my opinion, not the slightest doubt that this does change the contract laws as well as merely the procedure of making contracts. It will be considered, I say, to relieve, as an example, the limitation on profits. I do not know that I object to lifting such a limitation, but I think we ought to be clear about what the effect will be. Evidently the committee itself was in doubt because the proviso at the end of title II reads:

That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost-system of contracting.

That is the only limitation left as I see it, and evidently it was thought that if that proviso were not put in, even cost-plus contracts would be permitted. But when it comes to the question of limitation on the amount of profit it seems to me clear that this provision takes all limit off and the President can do as he pleases after this bill shall have been passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield to me in that connection I think it ought to be observed that the question of the limitation of profit is a matter of law and is not a matter of contract between the Government and some individual. It is a matter of law passed by the Congress. This simply provides really for the physical making of contracts and the terms of contracts; it does not include a limitation of profits, but no contract could be entered into that would change the law with respect to the limitation on profits. It is not intended that that should be done, and the last proviso, as I understand it, simply sets forth very clearly that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the cost-plus system, with which we have had so much difficulty in the past.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. With the Senator's permission, I should like to recur to the question propounded to the Senator from Ohio. It was my understanding, as I sat in the committee and listened to the explanation, that whatever powers are contemplated under title II are necessary. We start with that. It is my understanding that the bill would enlarge vastly the powers of the President in the particulars mentioned. I favor title II, just as I favor the bill, because our whole effort was designed, within the meaning of the language appearing in lines 14 and 15, to provide for the modification of contracts whenever the President deems such action will facilitate the prosecution of the war. But, Mr. President, I think neither the Senator from Indiana nor the Senator from Kentucky need seek to divert attention from the results otherwise to be anticipated through the operations under this title, just as they are implicit in the question propounded by the Senator from Ohio. They do save a certain protection to the Government, and they appear in two places in this particular section.

Let me invite attention to lines 7 and 8, where it is provided that "the President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort" to accomplish the results here in mind, "in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government."

In other words, the first thing he must do as Chief Executive is to provide regulations which will be in the interest of the Government and which will apply generally to any modification or extension of the contract authorization or powers derived from the act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I will yield in a moment.

Let me add a second corollary—that we also have the limitation upon profits which derives from the tax laws as well as any that would be implicit or expressed in the regulations prescribed by the President.

One concluding thought, Mr. President. In my understanding of the application of title II, the proviso was put in for the express purpose of making certain that nothing herein should authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting, for the very reason that the Senator from Ohio has correctly stated; but it does operate as a blanket proviso and a protection for the interests of the Government, having in mind the other two protections I have already outlined.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a moment?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, then, the Senator from Connecticut differs with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Kentucky in feeling that the regulations which the President may issue under this law may supersede any laws of Congress, including those imposing limitations of profit on the contracts which have already been made.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Ohio a question.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Suppose we put after the proviso on line 17 the following words:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to affect any limitation upon profits.

Would that cover the matter?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that would meet to some extent the question I raised. I only used that, however, as an example to show that this is a broad and far-reaching power, I think broader than we realize. There may be other provisions which should be changed. I have had an opportunity to examine this measure only this morning. I think probably it would be wise to continue the limitations on profits. There may be other things that it might be wise to do also. I do not know. If the committee feels that such a limitation is desirable—and I rather think it is—I think it is not the only thing we should consider.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what was the language suggested by the Senator from Indiana at the end of the proviso?

Mr. VAN NUYS. "*Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to affect any limitation upon profits."

Mr. BARKLEY. "Under existing law?"

Mr. VAN NUYS. "Under existing law."

Mr. BARKLEY. I should not have any objection to that language. I do not think the bill has that effect; but, if it is necessary or desirable to say so, there is no objection to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask for an interpretation of the meaning of the words in line 10, page 2, "or modifications of contracts?" Does that language mean that the President might change the price in a contract in any way he saw fit, for anybody, at any time or place, of course assuming that it would be in what he believed to be the national interest? Would this language grant him the right to make any contract, at any price he pleased, with anybody?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It would enable him to modify a contract by consent. Under the present law, a contract cannot be modified even with the consent of both parties.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then this language does permit possible modification of a contract?

Mr. VAN NUYS. By consent of both parties; yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That wipes out, then, all statutory protection in respect to competitive bids, and all price-control in respect to contracts, except as prescribed by the President? Is that correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. There are now very few statutes requiring competitive bids; and it was announced by the Department, as I have read, that one of the objectives of this new section is to permit the Government to enter into contracts without competitive bidding. In committee we went into detail into the question of competitive bidding, and it was agreed by all that it costs the Government more than it otherwise would cost to enter into contracts through competitive bids, and would very materially delay production; so, for the purpose of expediting production and reducing the cost, this provision would suspend competitive bidding during the operation of this law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose we pass a general price-control bill next week, or the week after next, for the purpose, let us say for the sake of the argument, of putting a ceiling upon certain prices: Would this language permit the President to lift defense production from under the price-control ceiling?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, I may say that, while we do not yet know what

sort of price legislation will be enacted, the committee hopes and expects to have a bill on the subject ready for consideration immediately after the Christmas holidays. That legislation, in all probability, will provide a general price ceiling. I very seriously doubt if it will affect, except in a general way, the terms of any contract which has been made between the Government and any producer, we will say, of shells or airplanes. I very much doubt whether any price administrator under any law could fix a ceiling for the price of airplanes or shells or other products which the Government has to have in the way of munitions. So I very much doubt if there would be any conflict at all between the general price ceiling and contracts entered into between the Government and private industry for the production of necessary materials.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am trying to find out the extent of the new authority. Let us say that we do create price control, and let us say that under the operation of the machinery the price of copper is fixed at 15 cents a pound: May the President buy copper for 20 cents a pound under this language, even if the price-control bill has fixed a price of 15 cents?

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the object of this section is to give the departments or the President, whoever exercises the authority, more flexibility not only in making contracts but in the necessary modification of them if it becomes necessary to modify them in the interest of the Government or in the interest of national defense. It might be that in some cases the Government would buy raw copper. I am not sure that it would. It is more apt to buy the finished product made of copper, of which copper is a component part. It is the finished product under the contract with regard to which the Government is entering into the relationship, and not the price of the raw copper, or even the price of the raw steel that enters into an airplane, or into a tank, or into any necessary munition of war for which contracts are made.

As a rule, the Government does not enter into contracts in regard to these matters in detail as to the component parts that go into the finished products. It is the finished product for which the Government has contracted; and, in my judgment, the price relationship as fixed by any price bill or any price administrator would be maintained. It might be possible that the price of the finished product, whether an airplane or a tank or an automobile or a motor or a truck or a shell or anything else, would be governed to some extent by the cost of the things that went into the manufacture of the product, which might be fixed by the Price Administrator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All I was trying to find out was what validity there was for the original statement made by the Senator from Kentucky that this was a rather limited sort of delegation of power which was more or less procedural in its character. I am trying to find out whether, as a matter of cold reality, this provision does not delegate to the President—perhaps we shall have to do it, but let us know what we are doing—complete, final contractual power over the entire operation.

Mr. BARKELY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me I should say that the provision does delegate complete authority over the contractual relation as to the thing contracted for. It does not delegate complete executive authority over the prices of things a contractor may have to buy or obtain in order to produce the article which is the subject of the contract entered into between him and the Government. We have to keep in mind the difference between what the Government is buying and contracting for as one thing, a completed entity for the defense program, and the prices of the various articles which go into it. For instance, the Government might enter into a contract with a contractor or a construction company for the construction of a cantonment, or housing, or any other thing that is built out of lumber or steel. The subject, of course, would be the contract for the finished product. That does not mean, as I understand, that the President could go down the line in every detail in all the raw materials and commodities that go into the manufacture or construction of such things, and control the prices of them, as against any price control exercised under the price-control legislation which later will be considered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see how the Senator from Kentucky can make that statement in view of the language in line 10, page 4, which gives the President unlimited authority for the modification of contracts. Certainly the word "modification" without limit covers everything, does it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is possible to conjure up all sorts of situations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not trying to conjure up anything. I am merely trying to find out what power we are delegating.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I should enter into a contract with the Senator from Michigan for building tanks at so much per tank, and it should later turn out that there ought to be some modification of the contract under which he was to deliver to me tanks and I was to pay for them, it would not follow that modification of the contract as to the price, or the time of delivery, or the type of tank that might be delivered, would go all the way down to the mine which produced the ore from which the steel was made, or that any other of the component parts entering into the manufacture of a tank would be under the control of the President. It is the contract for the manufacture and delivery of the tanks, if that happened to be the subject of the contract, which he has a right to modify.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The only thing I am thinking of is that the power is not to be exercised by the President; he will function through subordinates, and through those to whom the authority is sublet; and I think that for the protection of the President as well as for the protection of the integrity of the general operations, we cannot be too careful in safeguarding the processes by which these multiple billions of dollars are to be expended. There is suggestion enough already of scandalous waste, to say the least, if not more. I am merely making my inquiry, because I should hesitate to see the President assume a responsibility so great that even not only the justification but the honesty of the contracts themselves might be carried to his doorstep. Perhaps it is necessary; at any rate, I want to be sure what is going on, and that is the reason for my question.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that by the language in lines 7, 8, and 9 it is provided that the Federal agencies may function in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interest of the Government. That is the reason for inserting that language, so that there may be uniformity and unity among the different departments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think there is any protection at all in that language, because if we delegate authority to an officer and then rely upon the regulations which the officer himself promulgates, it is just one and the same thing, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The President promulgates the regulations, not the agency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that, but if his delegated authority is to be violated, of course, his regulations will be violated, too. I do not think that is any protection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, returning to the subject under discussion before the inquiry of the able Senator from Michigan, I understand the Senator from Indiana to say that the Attorney General stated to the committee that he thought competitive bidding should no longer be used in the making of contracts, but that we should operate now in a monopolistic field. If that is the attitude of the committee, and that is the language of the bill, I do not think we should be too tender of the President's right to fix profits. But I did not know we had reached the point where competitive bidding was out the window, and hereafter contracts could be made at any time, under any terms, without any thought of the public interest. Is that the attitude of the committee?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I would not say that the Attorney General favored doing away with all competitive bidding; but, as the able Senator from Oregon well knows, there are many statutes on the books now doing away with competitive bidding in different departments. The remark of the Attorney General was that there are only a few mandatory competitive-bidding statutes left.

Mr. McNARY. I wholly disagree with the able Senator. In some emergency statutes we have stated that in the discretion of the Administrator contracts might be made without submitting requests for competitive bids. Generally, the practice has been—and it is a good and wholesome practice—that competitive bids are requested and required, though, in a few instances, to meet an emergency situation, we have conferred the power to which the Senator refers.

But competitive bids are usually employed, and wisely employed, in nearly all Government contracts, as is the case between individual citizens. If they are to be wholly thrown out; if even the discretion is to be removed, and we are to say that all future contracts shall be made without competitive bidding, I merely state that we should not modify the power of the President or some agency to control profits. That is the point I make.

Mr. VAN NUYS. This does not throw them entirely out.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that to be the statement the Senator made.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The provision in question leaves it to the discretion of the President, of course, as to the modification so far as competitive bids or noncompetitive bids are concerned. It is all discretionary with the President.

Mr. McNARY. That is a different thing. The Senator stated a while ago that it was agreed yesterday, after the matter was discussed with the Attorney General, that competitive bids were out, and that hereafter contracts would be let without regard to competition.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the Senator to say "mandatory" competitive bids; not that the discretion was out, but that mandatory competitive bids were.

Mr. McNARY. That is a very different thing. The point I am making is that if we are to rely upon bids which are asked for by the President, or anyone who functions under him, without competition, the President should have wide authority in determining profits. For that reason I should object to the language which the Senator has proposed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator means the proposed amendment?

Mr. McNARY. The amendment covering profits, which the Senator read a few moments ago.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana suggested that he might be willing to accept an amendment relating to profits, and I desire to suggest the following as an amendment to see if it might be satisfactory to him, to add at the end of section 201 these words:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any change in existing laws relating to the percentage of profits or to the method of determining the fixed fee of a contractor in contracts made or hereafter made by any department or agency of the Government.

I may say that I have conferred with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is familiar with the situation so far as naval contracts are concerned, and these words have also been to some extent suggested by him.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I understand that the general language which has been under discussion seeks, first and foremost, to remove the general law limitations compelling all contracts to be made under bids; and I concede the wisdom of that. Is that correct?

Mr. VAN NUYS. In substance, that is correct.

Mr. WALSH. It is now proposed by the Senator from Ohio and other Senators that this general language shall not repeal existing laws placing limitations on profits, as provided in some of the naval bills and some of the Army bills covering the purchase of munitions, airplanes, and naval vessels. If it is desirable that such a limitation be placed in the pending bill, in my opinion the language which the Senator from Ohio has presented would seem to cover the matter.

Mr. President, I may say, to illustrate, that there is a law which fixes a limit of 6 percent on profits in the building of naval bases. Contracts limiting profits to 4 or 5 percent in the building of naval bases have been made by the bureau in the Navy Department which has to do with the handling of such contracts. This provision is suggested in the event that the Congress decides upon a policy of retaining those limitations. It does not relate at all to the general power of the President to do away with all requirements for bidding.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, is he now referring to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts?

Wr. WALSH. Yes; cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. They are already in operation, and, so far as the building of naval air bases and other naval bases are concerned, have operated very successfully, and the contracts have been let for less than the limitation on profits fixed by law. Then there are other limitations on profits fixed for the building of naval vessels and for the building of airplanes. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I understand, desires that the same general language be used in this bill, but that an effort be made to retain the limitations on profits which are already in existing law, and if that is desirable—I am not commenting upon the policy—the language which he suggested would probably cover that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I am about to leave to go to the Naval Affairs Committee. Is there anything the Senator wants to ask me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted to ask the Senator from Ohio a question, with respect to his suggested language, and I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to listen:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any change in existing laws relating to the percentage of profits or to the method of determining the fixed fee of a contractor in contracts made or hereafter made by any department or agency of the Government.

It seems to me the latter part of the Senator's suggested amendment is not consistent with the preceding proviso which reads:

Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting.

I would have no objection to the first part of the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system is not forbidden, but nothing is said about cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. In fact, there are many contracts of that kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. The proviso now in the bill simply provides—

That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting.

That language does not prohibit that system of contracting, but it simply says the bill shall not be construed to authorize it.

If language can be agreed upon simply providing that nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contract in violation of existing law as to limitation of profits, I do not see any objection.

Mr. TAFT. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. WALSH. That would be better than the extreme prohibition contained in the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I would therefore suggest, Mr. President, that at the end of line 17, on page 4, this language be added:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contracts in violation of existing law relating to limitation of profits.

I think that provision would cover what we are seeking to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky offer that as an amendment at this point?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am offering that as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I have not offered any amendment. I merely asked if my proposal would be satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I offer that language as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, on page 4, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am compelled to leave the Chamber in a few moments. I want to revert to section 2, in title I, if the Senator from Indiana is willing to do so in the discussion of the bill.

In title I, section 2, we find this language:

That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions * * * and to transfer any duties or powers—

And so forth. I call to the Senator's attention that Congress, in April of 1939, passed a reorganization bill, which, as I recall, provided that it was necessary for Congress to initiate action, otherwise the plan submitted by the President would become effective. As I recall, two plans were submitted by the President to Congress. Therefore two consolidations of various bureaus were made. Does the proposed legislation in any way impinge upon that statute enacted in 1939?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The proposed legislation is an exact copy of the Overman Act, which was passed in 1918. Whether by implication or not there would be a repeal of the statute to which the Senator referred, I cannot say.

Mr. McNARY. I have not read the Overman Act for some time. At the time of its passage there was no statute in existence permitting the President to reorganize the different bureaus in the Government's field of operations. But

we passed the law to which I refer, as I recall, in 1939. At that time Congress retained the power either to confirm or reject the President's proposal. If the rejection were not made within about 3 months, the proposal became a fixed statute. Two of those plans were carried out.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Am I mistaken, I will ask the Senator from Oregon, in assuming that the Reorganization Act has expired? Is that not true?

Mr. BARKLEY. The power of the President to reorganize has expired. He has done all the reorganizing he can under that act.

Mr. McNARY. But the previous reorganization is carried over.

Mr. BARKLEY. His power now has expired. He cannot do anything further in the reorganization of the various departments until and unless the Congress revives and extends the authority previously given him. But the time limit on that authority has expired.

Mr. McNARY. The two plans submitted by him are now in operation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; those two plans are now in operation; and they are just as valid as if the Congress itself had initiated them and had passed legislation putting them into effect, and just as valid as if the bureaus now reallocated to various departments had been put in those departments originally. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McNARY. This proposal, then, will stand apart and will take the place of the Reorganization Act which was passed in 1939 or any subsequent reorganization ordered by the President?

Mr. BARKLEY. This provision, I think, would have the same effect that the original Overman Act had in 1917; that the President could exercise the power even in the case of bureaus and departments already reorganized by him if he should find it necessary in the interest of efficient government. In other words, all the reorganizations and the allocations made under the Reorganization Act are in effect. They are final, unless Congress should take further action. The President cannot even reshift the departments under the Reorganization Act. This proposal does the same thing with respect to all bureaus and departments that the Overman Act did with respect to them originally in 1917, and I assume that the President could, if he deemed it necessary, make some change in the reorganization he has already made under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. McNARY. That is quite true. But the power the Congress retained unto itself in 1939 will be superseded by this language, which does not give Congress the right to reject or confirm anything the President may do?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. It is an absolute power, without any right remaining in the Congress to pass upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is an exact reenactment, in the same language, of the provisions of the Overman Act of 1917, which authorized the President to do the same thing. I assume that the Senator would realize the futility or the unwisdom, if I may use that word, if the President, in this emergency, found it necessary to shift some bureau in order to bring about greater efficiency under the Government, of holding it in the air until Congress could take action.

Mr. McNARY. I am not criticising the merits of the proposal. I have no objection to it. I wanted to have an explanation made of the language in the bill, and its application.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is correct in his statement. I think it is fair to say that the President, under this provision, would have the same authority that he had under the Overman Act, and he would have the same authority to take action with respect to bureaus that he has already shifted under the Reorganization Act.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask one further question, with respect to section 401 on page 9. In one instance the authority proposed to be conferred by the bill appears to be limited to the present emergency, or any emergency declared by the President, which would extend it over the period of the war. The saving clause, as I construe it, is that this authority may be repealed or modified by a concurrent resolution which, of course, contemplates action by the House and Senate without reference to the President for his signature. The authority continues during the war, or during any emergency that may be declared by the President.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The original draft, which the committee modified, was that:

> Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as may be proclaimed by the peace treaty.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] who is a member of the committee, called attention to the fact that the last peace treaty was a year or two after the actual termination of the war. So we struck out that language and inserted "until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

Mr. McNARY. The language to which I refer is found on page 4, under the heading "Title III—Trading with the enemy." The language is:

> During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe—

And so forth. I am wondering if that can be construed in the light of the provision which I read on page 9, by which the act could be modified or repealed by concurrent action of the House and Senate. Does that language apply to every provision of the bill?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It applies to titles I and II. Title I has its own limitation on page 2, line 16:

> *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war.

Mr. McNARY. I rather think that the language to which I refer relates to titles I and II, which may be repealed by concurrent action. I probably would not have asked the question if I had had time to read the bill, but it has been on my desk only a short time today.

Mr. VAN NUYS. The language to which the Senator refers relates to titles I and II.

Mr. McNARY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to return to title II for a moment. This is the language covering new executive authority which was not in the authority granted to President Wilson during the World War. I wish to preface what I am about to say by that statement because some Senators are now present who were not present when we were discussing title II before.

When we take the incidental language out of title II, and get down to the naked authority involved, this is what we find:

> The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government * * * to enter into contracts * * * and to make advance, progress and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war.

I wish to make the point again that that is a complete, blanket authority to the President of the United States to authorize any department to do anything it pleases in respect to war contracts.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And at any price.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And at any price.

I make the point again, without any reflection on anybody, that that is a perfectly natural field in which national scandal can occur more easily than in any other during a time when we are expending billions upon billions of dollars, and when such tremendous contractual values are at stake.

I wish to ask the able Senator from Indiana whether the very minimum of precaution which ought to be exercised by us if we must delegate this enormous power should not be a further proviso in title II reading approximately as follows:

> *Provided further*, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record.

Surely the Senator does not want the power covering this enormous expenditure of money exercised behind the door.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I think such a provision is already in the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is a provision under title I that all the things involved up to that point shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935.

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That does not cover title II.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It covers title I.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the Senator object to a final proviso providing that all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean that he wants to empower anyone who may have curiosity enough to do so to go to any department and demand to see the contracts entered into by that department?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that every contract should be available to public inspection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can conceive that some harm might come from the unlimited ability of anyone to go to a department and say, "I want to see a certain contract." I am open to conviction on the question, but at first blush it seems to me that such a provision might bring about injury or unnecessary harm.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator sees the general point I am trying to reach, does he not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sure he agrees with it. It seems to me we should put in some general language at this point. I should have no objection to having it revised later if it should need revision.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the representative of the Department of Justice says that under the provisions of the Federal Register Act of 1935, that must be done anyway; but the contracts in toto are not published. They are considered military secrets and are not published in the Federal Register; but the terms and conditions are published.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, what does that comment mean in respect to the suggestion that there might be some definite publicity proviso at this point? Does the Senator mean that he is objecting to it?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Department is not objecting to it, but thinks it is unnecessary, because it is already provided in the Federal Register Act itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then there could be no objection to having it.

Mr. VAN NUYS. There is none on the part of the Department.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might depend on the conditions. I think it might be unwise to empower anybody to look at the terms of a contract which might be a military contract. It might be important not to give it out to the public. There are many things which must be considered as confidential.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think any language ought to be inserted which would make it possible, for example, for a competitor who did not receive a contract to go to the Department and say, "I want to see the contract."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I disagree with the Senator. I think that is the precise point at which there ought to be fully available information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Competitors who are seeking a contract undoubtedly know in all cases what the contract is, what its terms are, to whom it is awarded, and the conditions. What I am talking about is the ability, under the language suggested by the Senator, of Tom, Dick, or Harry, or any irresponsible person—even an alien, or anyone who is not thoroughly in sympathy with our program—to examine any contract. Some harm might come from such a situation. Any person might say, "This contract is public property. I want to see it. I am entitled to see it." I know that the Senator does not want to bring about such a result. If the Federal Register Act contains the provisions which have been referred to, it seems to me that we ought not to go beyond that act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Federal Register Act now provide?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It provides for the publication of all Executive orders.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Precisely. But I want to know what happens under the Executive orders. That is not published in the Federal Register.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Indeed it is. Every Executive order is published in the Federal Register. Such publication is required by the act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator misunderstands me. I want to know what happens as a result of the Executive order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that we are all sympathetic with what the able Senator has in mind. On the contrary, I am sure that we are all sympathetic with the position in which the President finds himself when he must act expeditiously and when plans and specifications must be drawn up quickly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. PEPPER. I was wondering whether the principle of publicity and reporting, which the Senator has fundamentally in mind, could not be preserved by requiring something like what the Congress requires of the President in the administration of the Lend-Lease Act. He has very wide discretion, but he reports periodically to the Congress the substance of what he has done. I am wondering if such a requirement would not afford adequate safeguard so far as public scrutiny is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It might be; and anything of that general character would satisfy my objective. My whole point is that this is a brand-new power. Nothing of the sort was even contemplated during the first World War. This is a power, as I see it, over the expenditure of $66,000,000,000 already authorized, and probably it is a power over the ultimate expenditure of $166,000,000,000.

Mr. President, if the contractual expending power to that extent is to be delegated first to the Executive and then by him to any one he pleases, I submit that is the most fruitful field in which waste and scandal and everything of that offensive character can occur, and it is not even fair to the President to leave that power wide open, as it is under this language.

Since there must be elasticity, and we cannot curb that, the only possible cure is the establishment of a public record at some point to which anyone can go in order to determine what has happened. Perhaps my language is inept. I have drawn it only on the spur of the moment, and if any other Senator can suggest better language, I shall be glad to have him do so, for certainly I have no pride of authorship.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I desire to compliment the Senator from Michigan for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, in view of what has happened recently, and in view of what happened in the last war. We know that the buzzards come here to loot the Treasury in connection with contracts. They come here under the respectable designation, according to the terms used by the newspapers, of "brokers of influence," and they make the contractors pay them huge fees for their influence to get next to someone high in authority; and they come here only because of their political affiliation. It is bad enough as it is, in view of what little has been exposed. We know how, after the World War was over, the Treasury was looted by the hyenas who came here; and this provision of the bill would, in 10 times greater degree, open the door to the looting of the Treasury at the expense of defense and at the expense of the taxpayers.

Something must be done to prevent these wolves from coming and looting the Treasury in the name of defense simply because they have political influence, simply because they have acquaintance with men in high political positions of power. With their hands in this immense volume of funds, the chances are overwhelming that we shall have the greatest scandal in the history of the United States. The contracts which have already been let are bad enough.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me it is elementary precision and precaution to require that a public record be kept.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan read again his suggested language?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is this:

Provided further, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Michigan certainly would not object to adding the words "under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President of the United States," would he?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I should be very glad to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. Such language would provide the opportunity to protect the public interest if the contracts involved any secrets from the publication of which the enemy might secure advantage, or if the ordinary broker might be able to examine the contracts and then demand something from the contractors.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am quite willing to add the language suggested by the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I beg to state to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I can see no reasonable objection to such a safeguarding provision, "under

such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to restate my part of the suggested language and then have the Senator from Georgia restate the language he suggested, so that while we are about it we can complete our discussion of the provision.

In title II, section 201, on page 4, I propose that after line 17 the following language be added:

Provided further, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record.

Will the Senator from Georgia state the phrase he suggests adding to that language?

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest that there be added the following words:

Under such regulations as the President may prescribe.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan whether the use of the language "all acts" would make it mandatory that all acts, every act, consummated under this section shall be published, and that the President will have power to make regulations only as to how they shall be published? I am not certain that the language suggested gives him the discretion to determine whether the terms of contracts, for instance, should be made public, although under regulations which he may prescribe. I doubt the wisdom of making public the terms of contracts, so that anyone who may have a selfish motive may look at them and take some advantage from them, or profit by them. I do not like the word "all," the all-inclusive language suggested. Perhaps we can arrive at what we have in mind without making it mandatory that all contracts be made a matter of public record, subject only to the regulation of the President as to how they shall be made public.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not believe that is the intent of the Senator from Georgia, and it was not mine.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, Mr. President; that is not the meaning of the language, certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The language I suggested—

Under such regulations as the President may prescribe—

would carry with it the authority to avoid divulging anything the publication of which might be incompatible with the public interest.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That was my understanding.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what we are all seeking.

Mr. PEPPER. Did not the Senator use the word "acts", and was not the Senator thinking about contracts?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think a contract is an act; it is an act of agreement between two parties.

Mr. GEORGE. The section relates to contracts, performance thereof, and amendments and changes therein. That is the whole subject matter of the section.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would be very well to provide that anything done under the authority of the section should be made a matter of public record, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, when the publication of such an act will not be incompatible with the public interest. I think such a provision would cover the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. That language was not in the original suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. No; it was not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to it with the language I have suggested added, which would leave with the President the power to determine whether any given contract or modification or amendment of a contract should be made public.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct; because a contract might be made, let us say, for a given number of machine guns, or antiaircraft guns, and it might not be compatible with the public interest for it to be divulged to the public, or left in a place from which it could be made known to the public.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, it seems to me that the language should provide that the President should have complete control over the conditions under which such matters might be made public; and, subject to such regulations as he might make, the information might be given out. It should be made a matter of public record so that any proper public official might have access to it, but not so that anyone with ulterior motives or for purposes of frivolous curiosity could walk in from the public street and have access to the records for selfish purposes. It seems to me that if the matter is made of public record, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, we shall have accomplished the purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, certainly it was difficult enough for those of us who were present at the committee meeting to follow all the ramifications of the proposals before the committee yesterday. I can easily understand that there is confusion in the minds of Senators who were not there, and who did not hear the Attorney General's explanation. There was reason, however, for writing this language, in the form in which it appears, into title II. In the first place the Attorney General advised us that the War Department, the Navy Department, and other procurement divisions had encountered very serious difficulty because of the requirements for advertising with reference to contracts; they had run into very great difficulty concerning the provisions with reference to bonds on contracts; and, above all, there was no provision under existing law by which they could make advance payments to contractors who might need financing, or progress payments to those who might have partially completed their contracts. Therefore, in this particular, we sought to try to extend upon a very much wider basis contracting and letting to some 90 percent of the business houses and corporations of the country which today have no contracts but which might, with encouragement, be enabled to engage in a general productivity which now they cannot do. Having all those considerations in mind, Mr. President, it was important that existing provisions be suspended.

On the other hand, we encountered the question, just as it is confronting Senators now, how far making public the competitive bases for contracts would operate against the interests of the Government. I remember one Senator who was present told about a certain competitor who called at his office and complained about 15 contractors having submitted bids. I will not say that the bids were identical or nearly so; but, of course, the particular individual who complained to his Senator got short shrift when the Senator said to him, "The only reason you are complaining to me is that you did not get the contract, and the other man did."

That is the sort of thing that illustrates that if we make public all the terms not only will the Government not necessarily get an advantage, but, quite to the contrary, such action may prevent the President, through his duly appointed agencies, of course, placing a contract at even better terms than he possibly could if the whole group of contractors who are the only ones furnishing certain goods agreed substantially on a floor or minimum price. So the President of the United States would have greater bargaining power in that particular if he were not bound by any minimum or floor under prices, especially where expedition in procurement is of the essence. What I have stated is, generally, the background of the reasons for title II being written as it is.

It seemed to me that many Senators felt in the committee yesterday that there should be created some joint congressional advisory committee which would not only have some supervision over the writing of specifications, at least, to the point of considering whether the specifications or contracts permitted free and open competitive bidding, but would also retain some supervision over the execution of contracts and keep Congress informed, just as the Truman committee at the present time is investigating the performance or execution of outstanding contracts. So it was suggested, at least, and discussed, that we might have a continuing committee which would retain a permanent interest in behalf of the public, to the end that all contracts would be under regard. Such a joint council or committee of the Congress would certainly be able to report to us such information as would not be incompatible with the public interest.

When the committee was considering this bill yesterday there was no language put into the measure, to see to it that the Congress or the public, through the Congress, should be protected in that particular; but it certainly was felt that some tangible steps along that line should be taken, and, if it were not necessary to include such a provision in this measure, at least, one would be brought forward.

I think that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Indiana, can, if he chooses, elaborate this point beyond what I have said to the Senator from Nebraska and others; but I know that what I have said is substantially an accurate report of the background, the reasons for writing title II as it is written.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the comments and suggestions of the able Senator from Connecticut regarding a joint congressional committee by way of liaison which the Executive, in connection with this particular matter, falls fully within the suggestion which I submitted on the floor of the Senate earlier in the week regarding a liaison committee representing the House and the Senate by way of close cooperation with the Chief Executive. I am so keenly wedded to that idea that, of course, I find myself in complete sympathy with what the Senator from Connecticut has said. I may add that I have written the President of the United States and furnished a complete outline of a proposed joint congressional committee on war cooperation so as to determine whether there may be a meeting of minds between the White House and the Hill upon the creation of some such link between these two functions, not for the purpose of attempting to interfere with the Executive prerogative and the conduct of the war, for I freely concede that this war cannot be conducted in a town meeting, but purely for the purpose of seeing whether we cannot better satisfy the constitutional responsibility which Congress cannot avoid and at the same time perhaps simplify the Executive's opportunity to take Congress into the Executive confidence to an extent which is impossible if 531 men have to be taken into his council. So I am heartily in favor of the suggestion submitted by the able Senator from Connecticut, carried to a point far beyond that which he has indicated; but that does not relieve us of the necessity, it seems to me, upon our responsibility in connection with the extension of this new authority in title II—an authority greater than existed in the World War—of providing now minimum precautions, and certainly it is a minimum precaution to require a reasonable minimum of publicity in connection with a power which can control the expenditure of a hundred billion dollars.

Seeking to meet the viewpoint of the able Senators who have made suggestions in this connection since I proposed my original language, I now propose this final form which I believe has the approval of the Senator from Kentucky, and which, I believe, does not meet with the disapproval of the able Senator from Indiana, the chairman of the committee: At the end of title II, line 17, page 4, I offer the following amendment:

Provided further, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record under regulations prescribed by the President and when deemed by him not to be incompatible with the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana for one bit of further information?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I correct that the only censorship provision is in section 303 on page 8, and that such censorship as is there provided applies only to the transmission of communications between the United States and any foreign country, and that there is nothing in the bill which involves censorship of any form of internal communications or publications in the United States?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The Senator from Michigan is entirely correct. That subject was threshed out in detail with the Attorney General, all members of the committee participating. There is in the bill not a word which would authorize the President to exercise censorship over newspapers or messages within the United States. The provision deals wholly with outgoing messages from America to foreign countries.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Or incoming messages from foreign countries.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is very difficult to censor such messages. For instance, a newspaper might have a short-wave receiver.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; but it carries the power to do so?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes; it carries the power.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

One final question, and I am done.

Has the Senator now stated to the Senate all the powers in this proposed legislation which exceed the powers granted to President Wilson under the Overman Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I think so. I have not yet taken up title III. That is the amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act. As I remember, it is an exact copy of the former statute, except that in some instances it goes a little further. For instance, in the case of the Alien Property Custodian's Office, or such agency as may take the place of the former Alien Property Custodian's Office, the Attorney General informed us that there are at least $7,000,000,000 of funds that have to be seized or frozen under present conditions. This measure gives authority to that agency, whether it be the Alien Property Custodian or otherwise, not only to freeze these assets, but to seize them and dispose of them and liquidate them—something that has been contested in the powers of the Alien Property Custodian heretofore. So I will say to the Senator from Michigan that the bill is broader along that line. Outside of that, I know of no further extension of power than President Wilson had.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. There was always a good deal of scandal and danger of scandal in connection with the office of the Alien Property Custodian, particularly because when a man came in and claimed property back there perhaps was nobody on the other side. I wonder if any such danger is guarded against in this particular measure, or whether that is something to be dealt with after the war is over.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I think that is largely a matter of administration rather than of legislation. I may be mistaken about that, but I think so.

Mr. TAFT. If the time ever comes when there is an alien property custodian with power to give property back to anybody or pay him for it, it seems to me some better provision should be made than was made after the World War.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I think that is largely an administrative matter, and that the power here is ample to put in operation such administrative processes as will accomplish those results.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following proviso:

Provided further, That no redistribution of functions shall provide for the transfer, consolidation, or abolition of the whole or any part of the General Accounting Office or of all or any part of its functions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like now to discuss with the Senator from Indiana the question of title I. While it is true that title I is a reenactment of the Overman Act, the conditions which exist today are very different from those which existed 25 years ago. Merely because the President had that power during the World War, I do not believe it necessarily follows that exactly the same power should be granted during this war. After all, we have discussed the question of reorganization now for a good many years, and we have passed various bills in which we have placed restrictions. Under the terms of this bill, for instance, the President might, as I see the matter, practically abolish the Civil Service Commission, or transfer its functions to some other body which would not perform them. He might decide that the Federal Reserve System, which was preserved under the Reorganization Act, would be more efficiently operated under the Treasury Department. He might make all sorts of transfers. There is no limit to what he might do except one clause, which says:

Provided further, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war.

That hardly seems to me a limitation at all, because every department of the Government of the United States will be primarily concerned with the conduct of the present war. For instance, on the question of the revision of the rates of railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission may delay so long, or somebody may think they delay so long, as to

imperil the proper operation of the railroads, and their functions may be transferred to some other body, say the Federal Trade Commission.

So far as I can see, nearly everything can be done under this bill in the way of reorganizing the Departments of the Government. I suppose the administration of the Veterans' Administration may be put under the Social Security Board. I do not tremendously object to giving such power; I never have; but in this one respect it seems to me we should make a great mistake if we authorized the President to transfer to any one the powers and duties of the General Accounting Office. I think it is distinct from any of the other Departments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will observe on page 2, line 5, that these powers are conferred and this reshifting, or whatever happens, is to be done, with respect to executive agencies. Does the Senator regard the General Accounting Office as an executive agency? It was set up as an agency of Congress. I very much doubt whether it would be included in the language of the bill as it is now written.

Mr. TAFT. Then I see no objection to the amendment. I believe it would be included.

Mr. BARKLEY. I see no objection to the amendment. It is already the law, but it is just one of those things that seem to me unnecessary.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read section 2:

> That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

Mr. BARKLEY. That still refers to executive and administrative agencies or departments, which it seems to me are different from the General Accounting Office, which was set up as an agency of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator. I think the General Accounting Office is different from anything else. While possibly as a matter of law President Wilson had power to transfer the Comptroller General, the Comptroller General—who had largely the same functions as the General Accounting Office—was not transferred, and all through the World War he exercised a restraint on the expenditure of appropriations. I remember it, because I was in a Department, and we were always arguing with him, and he very properly held us within the subject of appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Comptroller General, as he existed at that time, was purely an executive officer in an executive office or function. He had not been created, as was later done with the General Accounting Office, as an agency of Congress to keep a foot upon the brake of public expenditures.

Mr. TAFT. I think we may regret giving all this power; but if the Senator would be willing to accept the amendment I have suggested I certainly should have no further objection.

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Indiana is agreeable, I personally have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is one point which I should like to have the chairman of the committee make clear. When we talk about governmental corporations, as we do in several places in Title I, we are talking about corporations owned by the Government as well as those created under R. F. C. powers, are we not?

Mr. VAN NUYS. R. F. C., T. V. A., and similar corporations.

Mr. DANAHER. It is not the Senator's understanding that, for example, under section 2 the President could coordinate, let us say, T. V. A. and put it under the Department of the Interior, for instance?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I am inclined to think so.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator so understands? I did not. That is why I wanted to make it clear.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I am inclined to think that if we include governmental agencies or corporations in that part of the bill, the President would have the same power in regard to them that he would have in regard to the ordinary bureaus and commissions.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to ask the Senator one other question, then, which is equally technical and very trite. At the top of page 4, line 1, appears the word "heretofore." I assume that refers to such powers as shall be in force at the effective date of the act. That is what it means, is it not?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is a direction quotation from the former Overman Act. What is the question?

Mr. DANAHER. The word "heretofore" refers to such powers and functions and duties as shall be in force at the effective date of the proposed act?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. It does not harken back to some date in the distant past, for example, and then come up to date with any broadening of authority as hereafter by law may be provided? We are talking about the effective date of the proposed act, and if it becomes a law on December 21 of this year, that is the date to which the word "heretofore" refers?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the bill be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2129) was passed.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—LEAVE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have just sent to the Committee on Military Affairs to ascertain the status of the bill upon which they are supposed to have been voting. It was sought earlier in the day to secure consent of the Senate that the committee might make a report up to midnight tonight. I should still like to have such consent. It is the desire of the committee to make its report today. If there shall be any valid reason tomorrow why the bill should not be taken up until the next day, I am sure the committee will listen to reason about it, but I should like to have the consent of the Senate that the committee may make its report today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like the practice of reporting a bill, and having Senators see the bill and the report of the hearings for the first time as it is placed on their desks, and not be able to give them any study. But I shall not enter an objection at this time. I merely think that it should not become a regular practice of the Senate, and that before the bill is actually debated in the Senate we should be given opportunity to examine it, as we have not had in the case of the bill before us today. I shall not object to the filing of the report in this case. However, I hope that tomorrow we may be able to postpone the consideration of the bill until the next day, until we can see why the general of the Army feels that this step is necessary. I notice that the House committee thinks it is not necessary to go quite so far as is suggested, and there are a good many considerations which might require some study of the evidence and opinions. I hope the bill will not be taken up tomorrow; but I shall not object to the report being filed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is desirable to have the report filed so that it will be available to Senators, even if we do not take the bill up tomorrow and it goes over until Thursday, because if the report is not made until tomorrow, the same complaint might legitimately be lodged the next day. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized to make its report upon the so-called extension of the draft act during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter G. Riddick to be judge of the eighth circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur D. Healey to be judge for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Edward Wyzanski, Jr., to be judge for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be forthwith notified.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that as to all nominations confirmed today the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified of all confirmations of today.

DISTRICT MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it will be necessary to return to legislative session to consider a couple of bills affecting the District of Columbia. Therefore, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of Calendar No. 944, House bill 5558, which has to do with the increase in the motor-vehicle-fuel tax in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 7, after the word "increased", to strike "2 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it may be well for me to make a brief statement in regard to the bill and the amendment just stated, which is the vital amendment in the bill.

The bill contemplates an increase in the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia by 1 cent above what it is now for the period from January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951. When the bill was introduced in the House the tax was in the same amount, increasing the gasoline tax by 1 cent, that is, from a 2-cent tax in the District of Columbia to a 3-cent tax, and it was so approved by the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives. The tax was increased on the floor of the House, however, by 2 cents, to make the total tax in the District of Columbia 4 cents a gallon, in addition to the Federal tax of 1½ cents a gallon.

The Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate now recommends that we follow the original recommendation of the District Committee of the House; that is to say, that there be an increase of 1 cent a gallon over a 9½-year period. That is based upon the needs of the District of Columbia, and is to take care of its major operations in the improvement of its highways.

To state the situation in the briefest possible manner, I may say that the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia has been 2 cents a gallon, in addition to the Federal tax, since the year 1924, and at the present time the average gasoline tax in the United States, on a weighted average basis, is 4 cents a gallon. There is only one State in the Union which has a 2-cents-a-gallon tax.

On that basis, ever since 1924 the District of Columbia has had a small income from its gasoline tax. The effect has been that the District, in spite of its increase in population, has failed to make the major engineering improvements in its highways which are necessary to carry the traffic of the community.

The recommendation of the United States Public Roads Administration and the Highway Director of the District, approved by the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission and the Commissioners, is that a program of about $35,000,000 in engineering improvements is essential to overcome the delinquency of the District in its own highway improvements during the past 7 years. It has been estimated that this $35,000,000 program could be carried out over a period of 23 years without increasing the gasoline tax, but by that time, of course, the needs would be tremendously greater. With the 2-cent increase in the gasoline tax, the program could be completed in 8 years. Under normal conditions that would be the logical step to take, because it is now already about 5 years overdue. In this period, however, when capital improvements in municipalities should be postponed if they can be postponed, when taxes for local purposes should be kept low, if they can be kept low, it is my judgment and that of the committee that the gasoline tax should be increased 1 cent, and not 2 cents, and that the period of the program should be extended over a 10-year span.

The Federal Government will enter into this program to the extent of a part of the funds because of the developments across the Potomac River, which have brought about the necessity for moving a number of these improvements several years ahead of their normal place on the program.

When the War Department and the Navy Department buildings are opened on the other side of the Potomac River serious bottlenecks will be created in the access roads to those Departments. Bottlenecks will result, among other places, at the District of Columbia entrances to each of the three bridges. It is proposed to open those buildings before the end of 1942. If that is done it is absolutely essential that the access roads be opened and improved so as to handle the traffic, if possible, before the end of 1942. Therefore, the Federal Government is contemplating recognizing these roads as access roads, and bearing a portion of the expense of cutting through those bottlenecks. That entire program can, however, be carried out on the basis of a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, spread over a 10-year period, with participation by the Federal Government to the extent agreed upon by the United States Public Roads Administration as its share.

Therefore it is recommended at this time that the bill as it came from the other House be amended so as to make the increase in the tax 1 cent a gallon instead of 2 cents a gallon. The other amendments are incidental to that matter. I believe the action suggested will enable the District of Columbia in the shortest possible time to make the necessary major engineering improvements and also join with the Federal Government in relieving the congestion which will be cause by the opening of the Federal buildings across the Potomac River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 9, to strike out "1949" and insert "1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 9, after "1951.", to insert: "When, pursuant to section 14 of such act, gasoline or other motor-vehicle fuel is sold by an agency of the United States within the District of Columbia, for use in privately owned vehicles, such agency of the United States shall, by agreement with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, arrange for the collection of the full

amount of the tax per gallon herein authorized to be imposed and as increased by this section for the period January 1, 1942, to and including June 30, 1951, and shall account to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia for the proceeds of such tax collections."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be vacated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. Evidently it is going to be difficult to get Senators back to the Senate Chamber. The Finance Committee is in session, and so are the Military Affairs Committee, the Truman committee, and other committees. I wonder if we could not have an agreement by which we can have a vote on this bill at a certain hour tomorrow, say 12:30 or 1 o'clock? It is the unfinished business, so it would go over, anyway.

Mr. BURTON. That is entirely satisfactory to me. The only importance of early action on the bill is that the tax is to go into effect on the 1st day of January 1942, and the amendment has yet to be acted upon by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL]?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the request is to vacate the order for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator from Texas willing to agree that we vote, say, at 12:30 tomorrow?

Mr. McNARY. I think that is too early.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that not later than 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on the pending bill, which is the unfinished business, and all amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask also unanimous consent that the rule requiring the calling of the roll for a quorum be waived in connection with fixing the time for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have no desire to obstruct the wheels of progress. The arrangement suggested is perfectly satisfactory to me. I realize that the pending bill is of great importance to every Senator; and it is my desire that a quorum be present at the time action is taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a legitimate suggestion.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6233) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2077. An act amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program;

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 17, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 16, 1941:

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

John H. Flynn, of Pelham Manor, N. Y., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be majors

First Lt. Richard Phillip Klocko, Air Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States).

First Lt. Harold Bell Wright, Air Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States).

(NOTE.—The dates of rank are omitted as the death or other unforeseen change in status of a senior officer might require a change in the dates of rank and necessitate the renomination of these officers.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be second lieutenants with rank from date of appointment

Ralph Bassett Martin, Corps of Engineers.
Warren James Clark, Infantry.

To be first lieutenant with rank from date of appointment

Capt. Robert Goodwin Rate, Medical Corps Reserve, Medical Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be colonel with rank from December 9, 1941

Lt. Col. Benjamin Almond Brackenbury, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 4, 1942

Maj. Richard Kemp LeBrou, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Charles Wesley Sullivan, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. William Jacob Kunzmann, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Handy Vernon Brown, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Neal Dow Franklin, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Harold Ogier Godwin, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Henry Joachim Boettcher, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Lonnie Otis Field, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Melvin B. Asp, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Maurice Stewart Kerr, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

×Maj. Robert Burdette Woolverton, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Orley DeForest Bowman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. George Clement McDonald, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Thomas Judson Weed, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Peter Emanuel Skanse, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. James Austin Gilruth, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Henry Clyde Clark, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Arthur George Liggett, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Jacob Herman Osterman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from January 8, 1942

Maj. Westside Torkel Larson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from January 23, 1942

Maj. Andrew Daniel Hopping, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from January 25, 1942

Maj. Edward Herendeen, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Richard Irving Crone, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from January 1, 1942.

DENTAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Leland Grant Meder, Dental Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from January 9, 1942, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. Samuel Rush Haven, Dental Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from January 14, 1942.

CHAPLAINS

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Willard Graham Davis, United States Army (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from January 15, 1942.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Earl Dwight Compton, United States Army (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from January 23, 1942, subject to examination required by law.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

First Lt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., Infantry (captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 16, 1941:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Walter G. Riddick to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Arthur D. Healey to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

Charles Edward Wyzanski, Jr., to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Henry Harley Arnold

To be major generals

Horace Hayes Fuller
Harry Keneth Rutherford

To be brigadier generals

Robert Walter Crawford
Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, Jr.
Frederick Gilbreath
Walter Melville Robertson
Roy Cleveland Heflebower
John Mather
William Samuel Rumbough
Carl Adolph Baehr
Edward Hale Brooks
Charles Clarence Curtis
Theodore Roosevelt
William Richard Arnold, Chief of Chaplains.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

To be brigadier general, Reserve

Henry Joseph Reilly

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Walter W. Volkmer, Marsing.
Lillian H. Witherspoon, New Meadows.

INDIANA

Ralph W. Wright, North Manchester.
Herbert Craig, Rising Sun.

IOWA

Kenneth F. Baldridge, Bloomfield.
Charles M. Robertson, Hubbard.
Clyde B. Richardson, Keosauqua.
Jeannette L. Eggert, Miles.

KANSAS

Blanche Jacobs, Gorham.
Orren P. Young, Westphalia.

LOUISIANA

Surry Dupree Hunter, Coushatta.
Wesley K. Ferguson, Leesville.

MARYLAND

Agnes C. Rafferty, Cockeysville.
James H. Dunty, Fullerton.

NEBRASKA

Fred Hlavac, Brainard.
Nels L. Nelson, Lynch.
Donald W. Flory, St. Edward.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles B. Weeks, Chocorua.

NORTH CAROLINA

Galusha Pulliam, Andrews.
Matt A. Elmore, Dover.
Rudolph A. Guyton, Glen Raven.
Mary Jane Bell, Pomona.
Nelson R. Hunsucker, Winterville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carrie May Mitchum, Bonneau.
Manning S. Bennett, Folly Beach.

VIRGINIA

William A. Coates, Arlington.
Gouverneur W. Marchant, Woodberry Forest.

WASHINGTON

Inez G. Spencer, Creston.
Chester R. Knight, Orchards.
Harry A. Mykrantz, Twisp.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in the light and bounty of Thy daily goodness, may we ever give thanks. Over our hardships and harrowing burdens we trust that our prayer shall begin with thanksgiving and end with praise. Thou who dwellest in the boundlessness of Thine estate, come and magnify Thyself in the hearts of men. Thou knowest that the trail is hard, but we thank Thee that there is One going before us in every temptation, in every thorny path, and in the approach of every urgent duty.

O God, today, ours is the way of the troubled heart; sighing and sadness are throbbing through our country's breast. Bless our land with a poise of soul that will meet the challenge in such a world; not with hatred and bitterness but with the spirit of him who said: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." Allow not unspeakable treachery to sway us, but rather lead us to a rededication at the altar of our democracy in memory of our embattled sons of freedom, that they shall not have died in vain.

In this hushed silence, O Lord, we pray for those who have been plunged so inhumanly into the depths of sorrow. Grant that they may repose their hearts and hopes in Thee. Let Thy staff comfort them as they pass through the enshadowed valley of lonely watching and waiting. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 4853. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 4906. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 298. An act to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board;

S. 1486. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Murray, Jr., a patent to certain land;

S. 1688. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Bessie Walden;

S. 1889. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the county of Macon, Alabama, in a strip of land located at Veterans' Administration Facility, Tuskegee, Ala.;

S. 2012. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Togus, Maine, to the State of Maine, for road-widening purposes;

S. 2076. An act granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes;

S. 2080. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes;

S. 2096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; and

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 139. An act to permit appeals by the United States to the circuit courts of appeals in certain cases;

H. R. 528. An act to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone;

H. R. 1047. An act to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 4365. An act to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4787. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any ex-service man for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; and

H. R. 5800. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6159) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 46 and 48 to the foregoing bill; and

That the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 41 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385)."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the Honorable Archibald MacLeish on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES A. HAMILL

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep and lively sense of sorrow that I announce to the House the death of Hon. James A. Hamill, which took place yesterday in his 64th year at his home in Jersey City.

Mr. Hamill was continuously a Member of this honorable body from the beginning of the Sixtieth until the end of the Sixty-sixth Congress. During that time he represented territory which has since been included within the congressional district I now have the honor to represent. Prior to his assuming membership in this House Mr. Hamill had achieved more than ordinary fame as a member of the New Jersey Legislature where he had been minority leader for 2 years, and as a distinguished orator and an able practitioner of the law. The ability he showed in those several fields was soon made manifest here.

Mr. Hamill enjoyed the respect of all his colleagues and the affection of a great many. In due time he was elevated to membership on the important Committee on Ways and Means. At the end of his seventh term of service he retired voluntarily from membership in the Congress to devote himself to the practice of his profession for which by talent and temperament he was eminently fitted; but he was not destined long to remain out of public life, for he was recalled to service by his native city and eventually became the corporation counsel of that city, which post he had held for about a decade at the time of his lamentable death. I could wish that the business of the House would permit me to speak of him this morning in a befitting manner, but the exigencies of the hour, I know, forbid it. He was my good, my loyal, and my long-time friend. He was a learned scholar, a noted wit, a wise legislator, a capable lawyer, and a brilliant orator. He was the ready counselor to unnumbered hosts of men and women throughout his long career. His modesty was fit companion to his gentleness. He was kindness incarnate, a considerate husband, a loving father, a constant friend. Semper fidelis! Yes; always faithful! Faithful to his God and faithful to his country. He leaves behind to those who loved him, and these are legion, proud recollections of a useful and honorable career. Peace to his soul. Love and honor to his memory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the proceedings of the House on yesterday on the bill H. R. 6109.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORP. WILLIAM H. OFFUTT AND GERALD OWEN SMITH

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I received the sad information of the first two casualties of boys from the congressional district I have the honor to represent, when it was announced that Corp. William H. Offutt, of the Seventeenth Air Squadron, of Hickam Field, Hawaii, and Gerald Owen Smith, of the U. S. S. *Tennessee*, were killed in action.

Very little is yet known regarding the very sudden, ruthless, and unwarranted attack which was made by Japan upon us. That it was a very vicious and a wholly unwarranted attack is apparent to all. Those boys—and all those who fell—gave the last full measure of devotion and effort to the cause of liberty and freedom. They are heroes today. They died for the preservation of our ideals as a free people. May their souls rest in peace.

I wish to express to the saddened families of Corporal Offutt and Seaman Smith the gratitude of the Nation for their valor and their patriotism. They died in their country's defense. Their fortitude stands as an inspiration to all Americans today.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS GOOD TARGET FOR ENEMY AIRCRAFT

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our beautiful Capitol and other beautiful white marble buildings in Washington are a marvelous sight at night to an airman. They would be an enviable target for an enemy bomber pilot.

Mr. Speaker, even though we black-out the city, a flare dropped from an enemy bomber would reflect on these beautiful targets and make them wide open to attack. I suggest that we spray these Government buildings for the duration of the war with a dark, gray, dull, Navy war paint. In such a comparatively simple and relatively inexpensive manner we could dull these glistening bright surfaces and materially reduce their effectiveness as targets for any enemy bomber pilot.

HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on the day following our declaration of war with Japan, Mr. Herbert Hoover, our ex-President, made the following statement:

American soil has been treacherously attacked by Japan. Our decision is clear. It is forced upon us. We must fight with everything we have. I have opposed the foreign policies of our Government. I have believed alternative policies would have been better. But whether our differences of view may be as to the causes which led to this situation, those are matters to be threshed out by history.

Today there is just one job before the American people. We must defeat this invasion by Japan and we must fight it in any place that will defeat it. Upon this job we must have and will have unity in America. We must have and will have support for the President of the United States in this war to defend America. We will have victory.

Mr. Speaker, in our desire to achieve unity and efficiency in our defense program, the country could do no better than to use the services of this great American. Mr. Hoover served with honor and distinction during the last war and proved himself to be an able administrator. What confidence he would inspire in the United States if he were in charge of the Office of Price Control, for instance, instead of having this position

filled by a man whose views and ability are seriously questioned. I urge the administration to give this subject the most careful consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a release by Paul J. Raver of the Bonneville Power Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from Local No. 5, Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union of Baton Rouge, La.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Winston-Salem Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Labor News, New Haven, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address I made last evening on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made last night on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I received unanimous consent previously to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address of Joseph B. Eastman and Daniel Willard. I am informed by the Public Printer that this is slightly in excess of the space allowed. I ask unanimous consent that this extension may be printed, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD setting forth ideas made known in a pamphlet put out by the Boost Detroit Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered before the Army engineers investigating the construction of the Blakely Mountain Dam and Reservoir on the Ouachita River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Kenneth N. Parkinson, of the local bar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PUBLIC WORKS AND EQUIPMENT IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5800) authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 12, strike out all after "amortization:" down to and including "Treasury:" in line 16, and insert: "*Provided*, That such interest shall be at such rate as would, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be the lowest interest rate available to the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act were said District authorized by law to issue and sell obligations to the public, at the par value thereof, in a sum equal to the repayable amounts of such advances, maturing serially over a period of 10 years in approximately equal annual installments, including both principal and interest, and secured by a first pledge of and lien upon all the general-fund revenues of said District."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reply to the inquiry of the minority leader, may I say that the Senate amendment simply clarifies the language relating to the rate of interest which the District of Columbia will pay in connection with the securing of funds under the so-called Lanham Act as it relates to defense public works for the District of Columbia. This was done at the request of the Treasury Department. It is merely a simplification of the language and in no wise changes the object and purpose of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1047) to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "1928," down to and including "follows:" in line 7, and insert "is amended by inserting before the word 'musician' the word 'street.'"

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 2. Such act is further amended by inserting after section 7 the following new section."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, the" and insert "The."

Page 2, line 3, after "licensed", insert "legitimate or vaudeville."

Page 2, line 4, after "production", insert ", or act,".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "six", where it appears the first time and insert "three."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve."

Page 2, line 22, strike out "minor.'" and insert "minor."

Page 2, after line 22, insert:

"'The Board is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to protect properly the health, morals, and safety of minors coming within the purview f this act.'"

Page 3, line 1, strike out "2" and insert "3."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments modify the provisions of the bill as it passed the House relating to employment of minors in theaters in the District of Columbia. The Senate simply tightened the bill, as it were, restricting the hours of appearance to three a day instead of six, as contained in the House bill, and to 12 hours a week instead of 24, as provided in the House measure. There is also an amendment to include traveling vaudeville acts as well as theatrical productions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, STORAGE, USE, AND POSSESSION IN TIME OF WAR OF EXPLOSIVES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives,

providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 11.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; and agree to the same.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
H. H. SCHWARTZ,
H. M. KILGORE,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3019) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use and possession of the same, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: "(1) Page 2, line 15, strike out all after 'explosion', down to and including 'shotguns', in line 17, and insert: 'The term "explosive" or "explosives" shall not include cartridges for small arms or shotguns, or such fireworks or signalling devices as are designated by the Director, nor shall such terms include ships' signal or emergency equipment.'" It was felt that fireworks and signal devices designated by the Director and ships' signal equipment should be exempted.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment strikes out the words: "No person shall import or export explosives or ingredients unless such person is licensed under this act".

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: These amendments also refer to exporters and importers licenses and are stricken out.

Amendment No. 6: This amendment is merely to change the number of subsection caused by the striking out of the previous subsection. The provisions with reference to exporters and importers were stricken out because this is covered by another provision of law.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment is clarifying verbiage and is as follows: "(3) Page 3, line 19, strike out all after 'transit', down to and including 'Commission' in lines 21 and 22, and insert: 'upon vessels, railroad cars, or conveyances in conformity with the statutory provisions or rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or regulations of the Secretary of Commerce'." The Interstate Commerce Commission Regulations did not reach certain vessels and it was felt desirable to exempt certain vessels covered by regulations of the Secretary of Commerce.

Amendment No. 7: Inserts on page 6 after line 2 the following verbiage: "(7) Page 6, after line 2, insert: 'Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as requiring a license under this act for the exportation or importation of explosives or ingredients, license for which is required under the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress approved January 31, 1922 (42 Stat. 361), the joint resolution of Congress approved November 4, 1939 (54 Stat. 4), or the act of Congress approved July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 712), or any proclamation or regulation issued pursuant thereto: *Provided, however,* That in all such cases the exporter or importer shall duly notify the Director of the character and quantity of the explosives or ingredients so exported or imported, and any other information the Director or any of his agents may from time to time require. No license under this act shall be required for the exportation of explosives or ingredients of explosives which constitute defense articles within the meaning of section 2 of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11, Seventy-seventh Congress), and which, under authority of section 3 (a) (2) of that act, have been sold, transferred, exchanged, leased, loaned, or otherwise disposed of to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States." This amendment speaks for itself and it was to prevent certain overlapping of authority.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment strikes out the words "use, import or export" in lines 15 and 16 on page 8 and inserts the words: "or use".

Amendment No. 9: This amendment provides for the adding of the words "or ingredients", after the word "explosives", on page 9, line 15.

Amendment No. 10: This amendment inserts the words "or ingredients", after the word "explosives", in line 19 on page 9.

These amendments were adopted upon recommendation of the Bureau of Mines and are to avoid confusion.

Amendment No. 11: On this amendment the Senate receded and the House verbiage will remain in the bill.

J. HARDIN PETERSON,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, certain amendments were made in the Senate which are outlined in the statement on the part of the managers. The portion with reference to exports and imports that was included in the House bill was stricken out because there is another section of law which covers that. The Export-Import Bank now does that licensing.

There is a provision which broadens the exemption covering cargoes of ships under the Department of Commerce. There are certain ships which are not under the I. C. C. and are under the Department of Commerce.

There are a few more or less clarifying amendments suggested by the Bureau of Mines. The matter was considered in conference, and we thought that the Senate amendments, some of which were brought about by conditions which arose since the passage of the House bill, should be concurred in. The conference report was unanimous. We conferred with the Bureau of Mines, and with the departments affected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The departments affected are agreeable to these changes?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; the departments are agreeable to the changes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6223) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I believe the House should have the benefit of the gentleman's knowledge as to what program is contemplated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the reservation of objection of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I shall endeavor to explain to the House what this bill seeks to do.

This bill originally authorized the construction of 900,000 tons of additional fighting ships for the Navy. At a hearing on yesterday the Navy Department recommended that the amount be reduced to 150,000 tons, for the reason that the naval construction facilities throughout the country will not right now permit a laying-down program of 900,000 tons. This bill authorizes the laying down in the calendar year 1942 of 150,000 tons in addition to the building program that is now being carried on. Therefore, the Committee on Naval Affairs, at the request of the Navy Department, reduced the authorized tonnage to 150,000 tons instead of 900,000 tons.

The House will bear in mind that for the first time we are not designating in the bill the different categories of the ships. We are leaving this flexible with the Navy Department. This bill, however, has no bearing whatsoever on Pearl Harbor. The bill has been in process of being developed and sent to the House for some months. The Navy Department felt it was highly desirable that the Department be permitted to construct whatever type of ship they may deem necessary up to the 150,000 tons.

I may state that I am not disclosing any secrets when I say that none of this tonnage will be used up in battleships due to the reason—and this is the only reason—we are now constructing some 15 battleships. This tonnage will be made up of airplane carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, and it is expected on the part of the Navy to have at least one-half of it finished in the calendar year 1943.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. My attention has been called to the fact that there are a good many shipyards in New England, capable of constructing ships, that are not being utilized in the program. Can the gentleman explain why we do not avail ourselves of every possible opportunity to increase our shipping construction?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think under this measure every shipyard in the United States that is capable of contributing in the construction of naval ships will be utilized. This will permit ships being laid down in navy yards that are not engaged now in building particular types of naval ships. In other words, this will be an expansion of the whole shipbuilding industry of the country without any additional ways being laid down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have in mind particularly two shipyards that have not had a chance to get any contracts in the past. Why are we not using these shipyards when they are equipped and ready to turn out ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I could not answer that, but I certainly hope that every shipyard and every facility in America will be put to work on a 24-hour basis to build ships, because we have got to have them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If it is our purpose to win the war, we have got to use them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, and I am at a loss to understand why the Navy Department has hesitated to use every shipbuilding facility in America.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman appreciate the fact that the Navy Department is taking into consideration the possibility of repairing ships and that certain yards are being given attention in connection with repair work which is due now on the west coast and which we hope will not be due on the east coast?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has raised that point. The reason certain navy yards are not up to their full capacity in ship construction is the fact that there must always be vacant ways to take care of repairs. We have followed that policy very wisely in the Pacific. For instance, suppose every such facility today was crowded with a ship being built, where would we repair some of the ships that have been injured? So you have to be cautious and you have to be careful that you do not eliminate the opportunity to repair when you lay down a building program; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has raised the very question which was discussed yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Georgia will permit, my reference has not been at all to Government yards. My reference is to private shipyards that will not be considered in connection with any repairing work, but they are yards which have the facilities for turning out ships and yet they have not been utilized.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can only say to the distinguished minority leader that I hope he will acquaint the Navy Department with the facts and point out to the Navy Department that they are overlooking certain yards that have facilities to build ships, because we all want to put every one of them in America to work.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that that has been done.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I shall be very glad to cooperate with him.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I raise the question of whether or not the shipbuilding facilities located on the Great Lakes have been taken into consideration in connection with this program?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman that for the first time in the history of the country we are building submarines on the Great Lakes? We are building everything on the Great Lakes that can possibly be built, and in the bill that was passed yesterday we increased the shipbuilding that should go, to a large extent, to the Great Lakes, and the 400 additional ships, instead of remaining at 400 ships, have been increased to 800 ships, as provided in the appropriation bill passed yesterday. The Great Lakes facilities can take care of that type of ship construction. In addition to that, we are building, as I have just said, for the first time, submarines on the Great Lakes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I notice in the gentleman's statement he says that this construction of 150,000 tons is going to be left largely to the Navy Department as to what shall be built.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is that the general custom or policy of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; in the past Congress has designated so many tons for each type; so many tons for battleships, so many tons for cruisers, so many tons for destroyers, and so many tons for submarines. But in the emergency, we think the Navy should have flexibility, and it may develop, as the war progresses, that they will change their mind from what their program is today.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is that more or less the unanimous opinion of your distinguished committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill was unanimously reported out, and it is the only sane and sensible way to build ships during wartime.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am very much interested in the question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], with relation to the Great Lakes facilities for shipbuilding purposes. The gentleman from Georgia indicated in response to the question, that all of the facilities that might be available in his judgment in the Great Lakes area, would be utilized ultimately by the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope so.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Then I ask the gentleman whether or not he is sufficiently interested in the possibilities of the Great Lakes facilities to press the Navy to make a survey and determine just what facilities may be used.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say to the gentleman that we did that some months ago, and we put in the RECORD the fact that a certain percentage of the original 400 ships, of a different type from these that I am talking about here, would be built on the Great Lakes. We have been hammering and driving that the work be distributed all over America, bearing in mind the repairing situation, that must be taken into consideration in every great navy yard or great industrial shipbuilding yard, and I am at a loss to understand, and I have been vexed with the Navy Department because they have not used every facility all over the country in expediting the shipbuilding program. In the gentleman's own district they have hesitated to take over a shipbuilding plant there. We sent a committee from the Naval Affairs Committee to make an investigation. They reported back to the Navy Department the facilities available there, but the Navy Department up to this good hour has not seen fit to utilize it, due to the reason that they are apprehensive that it might interfere with the shipbuilding program going on in the neighborhood which is working on a 24-hour shift building submarines.

Mr. McKEOUGH. I am very glad to have the gentleman tell me that but in passing may I make this observation? I am not quite sure that the reason advanced is the real reason. The great corporation that controls the shipbuilding facilities of Chicago likewise controls them at Cleveland and they are utilizing the Cleveland picture and I have no quarrel with them about that but for some mysterious reason they fail to take advantage of the facilities at South Chicago. I hope the Navy will be pressed by the chairman of the committee to utilize those facilities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We will try to determine the reason for their not doing so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman referred again to the ideal shipbuilding yards in my district, one of the best along the North Atlantic coast, and in response to the answer to the minority leader I can say that for the last 11 months, since I arrived back in Washington, I have taken up with the Navy Department, the Office of Production Management, the administration, and all, calling to their atten-

tion the fine facilities that are lying idle in this district. I cannot understand for the life of me why the Navy passes it up. I do know the reason, because they claim it is interfering with the building of submarines; but we have told them, and produced in the RECORD here a few weeks ago, where there is a supply of labor available for the building of ships in that yard, and I think it is a crying shame that six ways that are available, 500 feet long, with 40 feet of water, on Long Island Sound, that is ice-free the year around, are not utilized for the building of ships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman knows that he has had the cooperation of the chairman and the entire Naval Affairs Committee trying to convince the Navy Department to use the yard the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what we can do otherwise.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Neither do I, because all we can do is to legislate, and we cannot force these things down their throats unless they adopt them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It seems to me that the Navy Department should be glad to use this and other yards.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is an investigation committee, authorized by the House, carrying on a naval investigation now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I noticed a statement in the press by a very prominent gentleman at the other end of the Capitol, who is at least supposed to speak with some authority on naval matters, that the proposed increase in the Navy of 30 percent will provide as much as nine capital battleships of 45,000 tons each. What I would like to know is if, in the face of the recent events in the Pacific, your committee favors the Navy's well-known theory of spending a large portion of funds made available for our naval building program in the construction of a lot of heavy, clumsy ships which I have in the past referred to as floating palaces that are built for bluff and show, rather than turning our attention to the construction of more and better bombers, torpedo carriers, and small, fast, pocket battleships, destroyers, and more airplane carriers that must be depended upon to get this job done?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the Member from Oklahoma that there is nothing in this bill, as I have already stated, relating to battleships, but when the house is on fire a wise man does not determine where he is going to get the water, whether it is out of a bucket or a well or a hydrant. What he wants is water to put out the fire. You are not going to get me at this time engaged in a discussion between air and battleships. Suffice it to say we have to have everything in order to win the war. I think the gentleman's remarks are somewhat inaccurate when he characterizes battleships and the use of them in the manner he does. So let us win the war with what we have got, and this war will teach us as to the particular kind of weapon that has superiority over every other weapon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman that a few years ago, I believe in the year 1935 or 1936, when, as I am sure the distinguished chairman will recall, during the internal war in Spain, a well-known Spanish battleship sunk. At that time I took the floor here, not as a naval expert, but as a very careful and interested observer, called attention to the sinking, and remarked that it did not take an admiral or a naval or military expert to know that with the development of the dive bomber we could no longer depend upon the great battleships as being indestructible. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I will say to the gentleman that I frankly am unwilling to leave the kind and type of naval construction program entirely in the hands of the admirals who, I am afraid, have not yet learned a sad lesson in the light of the Pearl Harbor incident.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The more the gentleman talks, the more he shows that he is in error in his conclusions with reference to military strategy. You must have a composite unit of various forces. You must have battleships, cruisers, submarines, airplanes, and all, to make a forcible attacking unit. You cannot argue against battleships any more than you can argue today that we should abandon the infantry because the aircraft can knock them out.

I do not yield further now for that kind of a discussion.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In addition to the shipbuilding facilities at Cleveland, at the harbor of Ashtabula, Ohio, we have very magnificent shipbuilding facilities. Of course, this is an extremely important bill which the gentleman is sponsoring. It is a most meritorious bill that will no doubt pass this House this afternoon by unanimous vote. However, I trust the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee will impress upon officials of the Navy Department that on the Great Lakes, during this war emergency, extraordinary efforts, by the use of powerful ice breakers, will be made to keep all the Great Lakes clear for lake-going traffic throughout 12 months of the year, and we feel that shipyards, such as those at Ashtabula, Cleveland, Toledo, and Lorain, Ohio, and Erie, Pa., and Chicago, Ill., should be used for the construction of submarines, small cruisers, and torpedo boats, and we hope that the distinguished gentleman will do what he can to help in that direction. The shipyards are available, and thousands of skilled workers in the Middle West desire this sort of employment and to help build warships for their country.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I trust the Navy Department will, in its wisdom, build these ships wherever they can be built.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has done such a marvelous piece of work providing authorizations for the Navy, and I bespeak his good interest, as I have heretofore, in having the Navy utilize the superior existing plants, such as some in my own city of Lowell, in order that we may have immediate production.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authorized composition of the United States Navy in under-age vessels, as established by the acts of May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 401), June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 394), and June 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 779), is hereby further increased by 900,000 tons of combatant ships.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is hereby authorized to provide the total under-age composition authorized in section 1 of this act, including replacements authorized by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), by undertaking the construction of combatant ships of such types and tonnages as he determines to be necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "June" and insert the word "July."

Line 7, strike out "900,000" and insert "150,000."

Line 10, after the word "replacements", insert "thereof as."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS IN THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2096), to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a statement about this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to keep the record straight and to legislate in an orderly manner.

Yesterday the House passed a $10,000,000,000 appropriation bill. In that bill were several items which were subject to points of order. One was $310,000,000 for the Navy Department. The purpose of this bill is to enact into law as authorization that for which we appropriated the money yesterday. In that way the House and the Senate have authorized it, even though the Congress appropriated the money yesterday.

Several amendments to the Senate bill make it conform to the appropriation of $310,000,000. The $310,000,000 was for

what is known as shore construction—for the building of naval activities throughout the United States. We felt that we should cut the red tape, and when the bill was in the Senate let the Senate incorporate in the appropriation bill an appropriation of $310,000,000, even though there had been no authorization for it.

That is all this bill is for.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $310,000,000 for the establishment or development of naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities at a cost not to exceed $10,000,000, and to establish the same as a naval air station.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), as amended, shall be applicable to the public-works projects authorized by this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer two committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Page 1, line 10, change period to a colon and add the following provisos:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities at a cost not to exceed $18,750,000, and to establish the same as a naval air station; *Provided further*, That in the purchase of Floyd Bennett Field the Navy Department shall take into consideration expenditures by any Federal agency from Federal funds in or for developing such field prior to acquisition thereof by the United States."

Page 2, strike out section 3 and substitute the following new section:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress on or before January 10, 1943, a statement by projects of the obligations incurred pursuant to the authorization provided in this act."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, these amendments are in accordance with the conference report and make the two bills now the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

Mr. FULMER, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for printing, under the rule.

EXPEDITING THE WAR EFFORTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 389.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6233) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to enter into any discussion of the rule which merely provides for 2 hours of general debate on the resolution to be considered, nor is it my intention to discuss the resolution proper, which is intended to help bring to a successful termination the war in which we are now engaged. That I shall leave to the able members of the Judiciary Committee. In the brief time I take I prefer to touch upon some commonplace things.

I daresay that to many of us these are not only disturbing days but restless nights. I know how I find myself, and I assume many of my colleagues experience the same difficulties. In periods of wakefulness we consider what has been happening during the last few days and wonder what the near tomorrows are to bring to us. The world looking toward America during the last week or two must realize that the day of miracles is not past. Where only a short time ago we were a divided people ready to find fault with the other fellow, critical of much that was being done, we are now united; and this resolution we are to consider today gives expression to this widespread feeling. Only in America—nowhere else in all the world—could changes come so completely and so readily as they have during the last few days. The firing that accompanied the sneaking Japanese attack was heard in America. That firing opened on Bible week in our country. While we lost ships and men, we gained much in solidarity and in the fact that we are no longer satisfied with ostrich-like optimism and with Pollyanna preachments.

The ways of Providence, Mr. Speaker, are past understanding. As individuals and as a nation God sometimes leads us down into the depths so that, looking up through the shadows, we may see the stars. What we have learned, learned to our great loss in the last few days, will eventually be to our advantage. Speaking of recent happenings, I am reminded of a meeting that took place yesterday in Washington, a meeting in the White House, a meeting such as could have been held in no other nation in the world, when two men, candidates only a few months ago for the highest office in the gift of the people, met as friends, met to plan a program and discuss matters of mutual interest and of interest to each and every one of us. I am grateful that such meetings are possible in America at this time. Yes; and I am glad, too, that this resolution which we are soon to consider, gives evidence that all political bitterness has been laid aside. I am thankful for the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative JOE MARTIN, chairman of the Republican National Committee; thankful for Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. These men at this time, not seeking party advantage, are ready to join in the great and common interest which is to make possible victory for our people and ultimate peace for all the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am thinking, too, of the meeting held on Sunday at the National Cathedral here in Washington, where the body of Woodrow Wilson rests. Somehow I feel, down deep in my heart, that if the plans of this other World War President had been more fully followed, followed until the vision that was his had been vitalized and made a verity, the present world situation might long have been delayed, if not actually averted. But that is of the past. We face the future. At the cathedral meeting on Sunday, participated in by those representing various churches, we were made to realize that the time is here when we, as a people, must take off the blind bridles of politics, class, and creed and join hands in the common cause. This we did twenty-odd years ago. This we will do more fully today and in the days that are to come.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a force greater than the force that rends the granite cliffs of mountains; it is a force greater than that which holds the water to the shores of the sea. That force is not fear. That force, Mr. Speaker, is faith and you and I today as Members of Congress have faith in our cause, we have faith in our Army and our Navy, we have faith in the President of the United States, faith in the Common Father of us all. I have always believed that God in His goodness has always raised up great leaders when we needed them. He gave to us Washington, He gave to us Lincoln, and today He gives to us Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, we are a united people. Maybe we have not agreed with all that the President sought to do, maybe we have not at all times been in sympathy with the New Deal, maybe you and I

would like to have changed some of those in appointive places, but today all of our differences are forgotten in this bill giving to the President great powers, a bill which I understand was unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee, just as this rule comes by unanimous report from the Rules Committee. We all join hands in the hope that because of the leadership we have and the support we shall give, the war in which we are engaged, and which was not of our making, may be prosecuted to an early and victorious end, with a just and permanent peace to follow.

Mr FISH Mr Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON] is absolutely right. Not only the Congress but the American people today are united behind the war. We are united in the job of winning the war, the biggest single job that ever confronted the American people. We are engaged in the greatest war in the history of the world and there is no sacrifice too great in the prosecution of that war in order to win final victory.

This bill merely gives the President the same powers that were given to Woodrow Wilson in the last war, powers that are necessary in time of war and which we would not consider giving to any President in peacetime; powers that are necessary to win the war, but powers that should be returned to the Congress when the war has been won.

Title I of the bill virtually restates the Overman Act of the last war, and gives the President the power to coordinate the different agencies of the Government, transfer one to the other, for the sake of efficiency and in order to expedite the placing of America on a war footing. I think we are all agreed that this must be done in time of war, that power must be concentrated in the hands of the President and our Commander in Chief for the duration of the war.

Title II gives the administration and the President and those acting for him the power to waive asking for bids on Government work in order to save time and also, as is stated, to help the small contractor who is not in position to bid in competition with the larger ones and has not the necessary means of doing so.

Title III deals with the Trading With the Enemy Act, the old Trading with the Enemy Act, with certain additional powers giving the President control over communications with foreign nations, also giving the President the power to use property of the enemy that we may confiscate. In the last war the President could confiscate every property but we were not able to use it to our own advantage. This bill gives him that additional power.

Mr. Speaker, we may have had differences in the past in reference to our foreign policy as between Democrats and Republicans. It crossed all party lines. But those differences passed away the day Congress declared war against Japan. Interventionists and noninterventionists are now one. We only have one aim and one single purpose, that is to win the war, and we propose to present a united front back of the President, back of the Commander in Chief, and back of the administration. The Congress should give, and properly so, in this bill the fullest latitude and the necessary power to the President for the duration of the war to put this country immediately on a war footing in order to win the war at the earliest possible moment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 6233, which is the successor of the bill H. R. 6206. H. R. 6206 is an administration bill which was introduced on December 11. H. R. 6233 is the Judiciary Committee rewrite of the original bill.

The original bill was what we commonly call a "shotgun" measure. No one can tell by reading that bill what it means, what it covers, what powers are given, and to whom. It attempts to revive legislation once enacted by the Congress but which has expired by limitation of time or which has been expressly repealed. The Committee on the Judiciary felt it necessary to rewrite the bill so that anyone reading it might have some idea as to what was intended by the bill.

Personally, I do not know enough about the rewrite to discuss it with any feeling of finality. It is technical. One who attempts to discuss it without careful analysis is simply following the path of reckless abandon in legislation.

Members of the Committee on the Judiciary will explain the bill. I am sure the chairman and others on the majority side have definite views and information. I ask the Members on our side especially to listen to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], who have been on the subcommittee and who have given their special attention to this measure.

I shall support the bill. I yield to no Member of Congress in my conviction that the Congress should not surrender to the Executive any powers not absolutely necessary at this time.

I realize that the powers asked for here are strictly war emergency powers and are necessary for winning the war. We must take the chance of getting them back at the end of the emergency. President Wilson had these powers and gladly returned them after the emergency.

There is a time limitation in this bill on titles I and II. Titles I and II expire at a definite time after the ending of the emergency. I understand the committee will offer an amendment making it possible for the Congress by joint resolution, if that be constitutional, to end these powers in case the Executive does not see fit to issue the terminating proclamation which is contemplated in the bill.

The really vital part of the bill, as far as anything new is concerned, is found in title II, affecting contracts. I was very loath to concede legislation granting the powers contained in that title, but under all the conditions I feel that that is the thing to do.

I hope we will all have a better understanding of this bill when a technical explanation has been made by members of the Judiciary Committee who have given to this most stringent legislation such time and thought as the occasion permitted.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan 1 additional minute.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Permit me to suggest to my colleague that the committee has included in the bill a provision that sections 1 and 2 may be terminated by concurrent resolution of the two Houses.

Mr. MICHENER. I am glad that is in the resolution as now printed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone in this House who dislikes more than I do to see the power of the Congress given to the Executive, I do not know that Member. To give the Executive power that should only be exercised by the Congress hurts me more than pulling teeth or toenails, but I am going to vote for this bill because I think it is necessary in order to fix responsibility for the conduct of this war. It is the only thing we can do.

We have given the President more money than he can possibly spend economically and efficiently. He has exercised, whether they were granted or not, some powers never before used by a President. With the billions of dollars given him, with the authority given by this bill, there can no longer be any divided responsibility for the conduct of the war or for the program for national defense.

OUR PRESIDENT

Out of the sky came a vicious assault by a skillful and determined enemy and ere it was ended a representative of the Democratic Party, who was President, became our President. He became the actual commander of the Army and Navy.

In stirring appeals, he called for a declaration of war against three major world powers. From a patriotic Congress, without hesitation, his call was answered. He appealed to the people of the country for unified support and there arose no dissenting voice.

Today he stands forth as the most powerful ruler in the world. He is your President. He is my President. He is our President.

The President called upon the people of these United States, he called upon the Congress, for support, and his call was answered, as ever such a call will be answered by our people.

Having given the President unqualified support, the people of the United States are now calling upon him for a like response to their demand that he be, as President, not the representative of a political party, but the President of all the people, a Commander in Chief of all

as well as of the Army and Navy, demanding of all, of the civilians as well as of the Army and the Navy, that all work in unity and for the sole purpose of winning the war and preserving our Nation.

Last night the President spoke of the Bill of Rights, of the necessity of maintaining the rights therein set forth. The people of the United States are thinking of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which, among other things, provides that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

In this land of ours, under the Constitution, under the Bill of Rights, every man is entitled to exercise the unqualified right of earning his own livelihood.

On the 14th day of November, last, the President of the United States, in the captive coal mine controversy, uttered these words:

> The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

Facing John L. Lewis, the President, referring to the miners in the coal mines who refused to join Lewis' union, uttered these words:

> The Government will never compel this 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

The President's National Defense Mediation Board having refused the closed shop, the President later appointed a board of three arbitrators. The arbitrator who held the deciding final vote was a representative of the Federal Government, Mr. Steelman, who took leave of absence to serve on that Board.

That board of arbitration ordered a union or closed shop in the soft coal mines of the country.

We all know that that closed-shop order will be followed by other similar orders and that, throughout industry, the Government will compel men to join a union, because of the President's action.

We know now that men will be compelled, without due process of law, to give up their property right—the right to work when and where they will—and be forced into a union. This the President has done, notwithstanding his statement made on the 14th of November, last, that such a procedure "would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor."

At the President's call, there is now sitting in Washington a council or board charged with solving the disputes between labor and industry. On that board are representatives of organized labor, representatives of industrialists; but there sit on that board no representatives of the unorganized worker, who in number exceeds several times the number of union employees. Nor on that board does there sit any representative of the consumer, who must furnish the funds which enable organized labor and industrialists to function.

The cards are stacked against the unorganized workers, against the consumer, against the public.

Although the President has called for an all-out effort from all of us; although he will receive the unqualified, the unlimited, support of the vast majority of the American people, organized labor has announced that there must be no labor legislation; that there must be no interference with the laws which limit hours of employment, which protect wages.

Organized labor has pledged its support to the President, but with the reservation that there shall be no disturbance of minimum wages, of maximum hours. Organized labor has agreed to cooperate, provided it receive double pay for holidays, pay and a half for all hours spent in the service of the Nation over 40 per week.

While our boys serve in Iceland; while they die in the Atlantic off the shores of Iceland; while they perish in the waters of the Pacific; while they are blown to bits in the Philippine Islands, in Pearl Harbor, where they serve 24 hours a day, 7 days in the week, for the paltry sum of $21 per month, here in America we call upon the President of the United States to be the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the President of all the people, and to see to it that no one, whether it be organized labor or the individual worker, shall refuse to serve his country longer than 40 hours per week unless he be paid double wages or wages and a half for all hours spent in national defense over and above the 40 hours per week.

If there is any one thing that every Member of this House knows, it is the fact, and the people of the country know it too, that this war never can be won by speeches or proclamations or declarations of might. Secretary Knox can write all the articles for the American magazine that he wants to, but that article he wrote telling about our Navy, its power, and its invincibility, never prevented the falling of one bomb or the killing of one man. There is only one thing in this country that will win this war, and we all know it, and that is production in our factories, in our mines, and in our mills.

The responsibility which the President assumed, which was laid upon him when we pledged our unqualified, unwavering allegiance to him, is the responsibility of seeing to it that we get production. Upon him rests the responsibility of creating behind each fighting man a reserve not only of men but of matériel—and there must be 18 civilian workers behind every soldier in uniform and there must be inexhaustible matériel.

No war against Germany, Italy, or Japan can be won on a 40-hour week. Nor is the winning of that war hastened by raising the cost of the munitions of war by pay and a half or double pay.

The President is Commander in Chief of a people at war and this bill gives him all the power that mortal man can have or for which he can ask. This bill which we are passing today gives the President the power of a dictator.

Thirty-two days ago, John L. Lewis demanded of the President that he grant him the right to levy tribute upon every American workingman who might desire to work in defense of his country, in support of the men in the Army and the Navy. Let me repeat what the President said on that occasion. He said:

> The Government will never compel this (remaining) 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

That declaration was a declaration in accord with the principles of the Constitution. It but reiterated the declaration of rights contained in the fifth paragraph of the Bill of Rights. It was a statement of good, sound American doctrine, courageously made by Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

But on last Monday, we were told by a board to whose action I have just called your attention, that, if men and women would work for their country, they must buy a license of Lewis. That news came to us on Monday last, the same day that we received the news of this disaster across the Pacific.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. American citizens were in effect told by the President's arbitrators that, notwithstanding his declaration that the Government would never compel a man to join a union, he could not work in a factory to make the ammunition to load the gun that was being fired by his brother on the fighting line, in bomber or on warship of the Navy, unless he paid tribute.

I call upon the President of the United States for unity of action. I call upon the President of the United States to enforce his statement that the Government would not compel a man to join a union before he could uphold the hands of our fighting men.

We have not forgotten how another President sent our Navy to destroy the Barbary pirates because they demanded tribute for the right to sail the Mediterranean.

I call upon our President, as Commander in Chief of our Army, knowing the success of our arms on land and sea depends upon production here at home, to extend to every man and to every woman who desires by his toil to support our armed forces the right—and to protect him in the right—to work when and where he will, and without fear of coercion, of violence, or fear of being ostracized

Then we can cheerfully, enthusiastically go along with the President—aye, to the end of any policy he may advocate—but in return I ask him to give to these boys who are serving this country, to those who are about to be added to the armed forces of the United States, the assurance that here at home we who remain are going to be required to serve to the limit of their ability, and that everyone who wants to serve his Government shall have that opportunity—the opportunity of serving without let or hindrance, without restriction.

I call upon the President of the United States, as he has called upon the people, to forget all thought of politics and of party, of pressure groups which claim special privileges because of their voting strength. I call upon the President of the

United States to be the President of all the people; to be my President as well as your President.

Let the President, acting as Commander in Chief of all the people, call upon the Congress—especially that portion of the Congress which now has under consideration labor legislation—to act upon that legislation and to give to the people, to organized labor, to the independent worker, who far outnumber the members of the unions, to employers, to the consuming public, legislation which is just and fair; a complete overhauling and rewriting of the N. L. R. A., which is one of the basic causes of our present lack of production, growing out of slow-downs, stoppages, and strikes in industry.

I call upon Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be the Commander in Chief of the working men and women who do not belong to any union, who desire only to perform in the rear ranks, in the ranks here at home, the services which are absolutely essential if the war is to be won, and to protect them in the rendition of that service, without which services neither he nor we can win.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, of course, this bill proposes the granting of great powers to the President. They are war powers, necessary war powers. I believe the reason why there have been so few dictators in the long history of Anglo-Saxon governments—and I speak of Anglo-Saxon government not in a racial but in a governmental sense, of course—is the fact we seem able instinctively almost to sense the condition which requires a quicker pick-up and a stronger power than our institutions, functioning normally are able to develop.

In such a situation as this in which we find ourselves, instead of our people turning everything over to a dictatcr, they have been able to concentrate what would ordinarily amount to a dictatorial power in their Executive, at the same time retaining the power in themselves to control its exercise, and to recapture and distribute those powers when the emergency has ended. Now, we are going to be put to another test to determine whether we can do that. It is well for us to take a little time and consider how we are going to do that job this time. We have got to concentrate these emergency powers, and we have to retain the power to control their exercise, and we have to retain the power to recapture and distribute them when the emergency is over. There is no difference between the efficiency of a democracy that will do that sort of thing and the efficiency of a dictatorship. It is the glory of the Anglo-Saxon system of government that we have been able to carry on wars and still not imperil our liberty, a thing which other government systems do not seem able to do. Your Committee on the Judiciary is undertaking to do that sort of thing in this instance. We have provided these great extraordinary powers to the President, and we have retained in the two Houses of Congress the power to terminate these extraordinary powers, delegated to the President in titles 1 and 2 of the bill. I would like to have the Members of the House constantly keep that plan and that pattern in mind, because we are headed into deep, dark waters. No one should mistake where we are headed. Only the greatest people can win through for this country. We are rapidly becoming a great people fit to survive. It is a great thing to see the solidity in this House and it is a great thing to observe the solidity of the country. We propose to give the necessary power to the Commander in Chief and the support necessary to win this war.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I think his criticism of the President is entirely unfair. It is criticism of that character, derogatory as it is, that undermines public confidence in our President. The President is not the President of a mere group, as is implied from the gentleman's statement. He is the President of all the people. His actions indicate that he wishes to represent all of us in this country including the gentleman from Michigan. His implications that he acts solely for labor is as fallacious as it is ridiculous.

I also state that labor is just as loyal as the gentleman from Michigan is loyal and that labor wants to produce just as much as the gentleman from Michigan wants labor to produce. The President is setting up the Mediation Board to which the gentleman refers, in the interests of greater production of bringing about cessation of labor difficulties. If the gentleman from Michigan will examine history, he will find that our President is doing just exactly what President Wilson did during the last war when he authorized his Secretary of Labor to create a War Mediation Board. I may not have the name correctly, but it is a name similar to that—to be composed in part of representatives from labor, representatives from capital and industry and from the general public. That board, as set up, functioned most successfully, because there was not a single strike or stoppage of work for the duration of the last war. I predict that a similar situation will occur during the pending war and under that pending War Mediation Board, so-called, there will be no strikes, particularly because of the widsom, perspicacity, foresight, and ability of our great and noble President.

Finally, as an example of the desire of the administration to increase production, let me point to the recent order of Judge Patterson, able Under Secretary of War, which ordered the five big munitions industries—the manufacturers of ships, planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition—to go on a 24-hour day, 7-day week.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6233), to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6233, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Kansas is entitled to recognition for 1 hour.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hardly know what additional statement would be helpful to the Committee in the determination of what we ought to do with reference to this bill.

As the gentleman from Michigan stated, it is a rather involved bill in a sense, but from the standpoint of what seems to be in the minds of the members of the committee it is a very simple bill. The bill reenacts the Overman Act, eliminating section 3, with such modifications as I believe nobody considers material.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I notice that in Title III there is section 303, which provides for the establishment of authority for censorship for communications between this country and other countries. I am wondering if the original Overman Act did not carry such a provision, or if it did, what are the changes between this proposal and the previous act?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The Overman Act did carry a provision with regard to censorship. No; I believe it was in the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the censorship part is in the Trading With the Enemy Act and not the Overman Act.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is correct. It is the Trading With the Enemy Act and not the Overman Act. This bill attempts to bring into one legislative enactment what is regarded to be those provisions of the Overman Act and Trading With the Enemy Act which it is required to legislate relative to now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the provisions with regard to the censorship of communications does not differ materially with what it was in previous law, whether it is the Overman Act or the Trading With the Enemy Act?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think that would be a correct statement.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Would it not be well to state that there is no domestic censorship involved in this legislation at all?

Mr SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I think the gentleman understands that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I understood that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But I think for all practical purposes it is a correct statement to say that there is no substantial difference.

I do not know that there is anything further to be said about it.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I notice on page 5 that you have included securities, which were not included in the old Trading With the Enemy Act. That makes provision that during any period of national emergency declared by the President for all time he may prohibit the hoarding of securities. What does that mean?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. To what language does the gentleman refer?

Mr. KEAN. I refer to page 5.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Has the gentleman made an examination of the provisions of existing law, appearing in the appendix of the report?

Mr. KEAN. I looked at the changes in existing law on page 4 of the report, and it included in existing law the hoarding of gold and silver bullion or currency, but the word "securities" is something new.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This possibly is an expansion to incorporate securities.

Mr. KEAN. I am just wondering what the hoarding of securities is.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know.

Mr. KEAN. It seems to me that under the language of this section the administration could say to anybody that he had too many securities.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the alien property custodian features under the old law, they could just take over property, securities, plants, and so forth, and hold them; but under the provision we are now considering the Government cannot only take them over and hold them but can use them as well.

Mr. KEAN. I do not believe this refers to foreign securities only, but might be construed to refer to securities held by anybody in the United States.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not believe so. This is simply a section dealing with alien enemies.

Mr. KEAN. If it deals only with alien enemies I think it is perfectly all right.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I believe there is no doubt about that.

Mr. KEAN. That is all right, certainly.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman may have covered the point I am about to ask him for; I was not here when he started. Has the gentleman covered the main differences between this bill and the powers granted to President Wilson in the first World War?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I made the general statement that I believed for all practical purposes we may say there is no substantial difference. Some modifications have been made that were deemed necessary. Guided by experience certain modifications have been made, but I believe I can state generally and that the members of the committee will generally agree, that there is no substantial difference between the provisions of this bill and the similar grants of power in the Overman Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. One further question, if the gentleman please.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have the most profound respect for the gentleman and his committee but have wondered whether there was any controversy at all over this bill. The reason I am asking these questions is so that if I am asked about the bill I will know something about it, and want to say that the great Judiciary Committee of the House considered it and unanimously agreed on its report.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The Committee on the Judiciary did examine the bill. We recognize that it was a technical matter and pretty difficult for us to know all the details. The committee was largely persuaded by the discovered facts, the recognized facts, that there is no substantial difference insofar as the committee could discover between the powers we propose to grant to this President and the powers which President Wilson had. That is about as much as I can say.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Title II, section 201, relating to contracts is the only entirely new section in the bill. Would my distinguished chairman explain that thoroughly to the Members of the House so they may fully understand it?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I appreciate my colleague's calling attention to it. The statement I made therefore is not entirely accurate, because this provision with reference to contracts, title II, is a new section. It authorizes the letting of contracts without competitive bidding. This, as you know, has of course been done pretty largely already in certain situations. The reason the administration asked for this as explained to us is that frequently small contractors are unable to comply with requirements with reference to bonds and things of that sort. Sometimes they are not able to make these war materials as cheaply as big concerns can. Frequently their financial condition requires advances. It was because of these conditions that this provision was inserted in the bill in order that we might have an opportunity to give the small manufacturer a chance to participate in the production of war materials.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LEA. I have noticed with interest that the bill includes title III, an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act. This is a subject matter which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I recognize that this is no time to quibble over the question of committee jurisdiction in view of the national situation, but title III has no direct relationship to the other sections of the bill. It would seem therefore to be a case where apparently our committee's jurisdiction has been invaded. I hope it is not the purpose of the gentleman's committee to attempt permanently to take this jurisdiction away from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which originally reported the bill to the House.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. To whatever degree this particular bill trespasses upon the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am sure the Committee on the Judiciary will not attempt to hold this as a precedent.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that the statute of limitations was changed in 1934 from 6 to 3 years. Does not the gentleman feel that in the enactment of this legislation possibly we should again extend the statute of limitations to 6 years?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I may say to my friend from Ohio that the members of our committee have been considering it. Yes; I think the statute of limitations ought to be extended. I think it ought to be certain that the statute of limitations will not bar any prosecution of persons who should be prosecuted in connection with this war activity.

There are some other things that I think ought to be done, and I believe our committee is going to be able to bring some additional legislation before you. I certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will be permitted to go through without amendment for the reason that the House bill and the Senate bills as introduced are identical. This legislation is deemed by the administration to be urgent and that is the reason we are trying to rush it through.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, when the framers of the Constitution met in Philadelphia to construct the framework of a government for the preservation and evolution of human liberty, they found themselves sharply divided between those who favored an energetic system, a powerful central government with great executive powers, and those who, remembering experiences with kings and arbitrary rulers, opposed a powerful centralized government and favored a government of more limited powers and of weaker structure.

While Thomas Jefferson was not a member of the Constitutional Convention, being at that time our Ambassador to France, he took up the fight of those who favored a weaker government, and, as Secretary of State, represented that

element that came into conflict with Alexander Hamilton, who had stood for a more energetic system of government in the convention which framed the Constitution.

The Constitution was the result of many compromises between these extreme and conflicting views of government. In order to produce a constitution which could be agreed on in the convention and have a good chance of ratification by the States, neither of these opposing elements had their way.

Then probably in spite of all the compromises that eliminated any extreme executive powers, the fact is probable that the Constitution would never have been adopted without the understanding that the Bill of Rights should constitute the first amendments to the Constitution. Even then it was only adopted after fiery conflicts between these two opposing elements.

No government is any stronger than it is in a crisis. And it followed that when our Government was confronted by a great crisis, the Congress supplemented the provisions lacking in the Constitution and granted powers to the Executive not specifically authorized in the organic law as set forth in the written Constitution In a great crisis it becomes necessary for the Nation to strike as one man, with the resistless force of a united people. So the Congress with unanimous approval of the people supplied the machinery which the Constitution failed to provide.

During the War between the States, which was the greatest crisis ever faced by our country, President Lincoln was given extraordinary powers so that he could act in accord with swift decisions. This was our greatest crisis, because we were a divided people in which brother was arrayed against brother and State against State. In the Spanish-American War, President McKinley was given expanded powers also.

In World War No. 1, great executive powers were granted to President Woodrow Wilson, and the statute we are asking the House to enact today is, with a few amendments, similar to that act known as the Overman Act, which contained the necessary powers to prosecute that war to a successful conclusion. So, today we are asking you to pass this legislation granting the proper powers which are in the power of the Congress to revoke and to terminate with the end of the war.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope that the gentleman in his remarks will explain the last proviso in section 1 of the bill. My reason for making that request is that section 1 of title I, as I understand it, is practically a reorganization bill in itself, and even gives more powers for the reorganization of Government agencies than was proposed in the so-called Reorganization Act. At that time we had some exceptions in the case of certain specific agencies. This proviso, I believe, takes care of that situation.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, there are several safeguards on the powers granted by the first title which I shall try to point out as I go along.

This bill was introduced at the request of the executive department. They feel very strongly that this bill is urgently and promptly needed for the successful prosecution of the war and for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy. They are asking for the same powers that President Wilson had and used extensively in the last World War. I may point out that those powers were returned to the Congress and to the people when the war was over. It is true it took a change of administration to do it, but history may repeat itself when this crisis is passed.

As has been pointed out to you, this title is practically the reenactment of a bill passed by the Congress and approved by the President on May 20, 1918. It was a war bill, known as the Overman Act. The first title of the present bill is identical with that act except it omits section 3 of the original act which is no longer necessary or desirable. That section set up a special agency to regulate and control the production of aircraft. The provision has been dropped from the present bill.

There is one other change. Under the original act the rules and regulations of the President for redistributing functions among the executive agencies before becoming effective were obliged to be filed in the offices of the chiefs of the agencies or bureaus affected. Now those orders and regulations to be effective under the Federal Register Act of 1935 must be deposited with the Archivist before they have the effect of law. The bill is changed accordingly. The gentleman from South Dakota pointed out that at the end of section 1, title I, this language occurs:

Provided further, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war.

There is a further safeguard to the same effect in the opening line of the first section, which reads that this bill is for the purpose of—

national security and defense, the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

It is provided in section 5 that upon termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, and so forth, shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided. In other words, when the war and the emergency passes, the various bureaus and agencies of the Government will return to their normal functions. They will be placed in status quo except as changed hereafter by act of Congress. Further, the very last paragraph of the last title provides that titles I and II of this bill shall remain in force during the continuation of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier date—we were rather careful to insert this safeguard—as Congress by a concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

So there are four distinct limits on the danger of these vast powers becoming permanent law. I believe that the President had all of these powers under the Reorganization Act that we passed a few years ago. Perhaps some of you gentlemen are better informed than I am in reference to that. Under that act, however, the Congress had the power of veto and there was a 60 days' waiting period before the regulations issued under it became effective. This will permit the President to reorganize immediately.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The principal difference, of course, is that under the Reorganization Act the reorganization had to be done within a specific period. That date has long since passed.

Mr. HANCOCK. The powers have lapsed?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. We have done something similar to this even in times of peace, and that is perhaps the point I should emphasize, with this difference: At that time there was a waiting period, and the Congress had the power of veto. We are now giving these powers to the President for the limited period of the duration of the war, and without those other limitations. The bureaus and departments affected by these rules and regulations will return to normal when the war is over, so that any reorganization now made will be temporary.

Perhaps the most far-reaching provisions of the bill are contained in title II, which permit the President or any of his agents to enter into contracts without regard to the provisions of any other law. This means that it will not be necessary to have competitive bids or to demand faithful-performance bonds, and it means that progress payments may be permitted, as well as various other things that are prohibited by general law. The President will be allowed to use these powers during this emergency, with the exception that these new powers will apply only to contracts in connection with the prosecution of the war, and with the further exception that nothing in the law shall authorize the use of the discredited cost-plus-a-percentage method of doing business.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I know that under the present conditions the War Department or whatever agency functions for the Government is building mammoth plants over the country without asking for bids. The plants are built under what are called negotiated contracts.

Mr. HANCOCK. We passed special laws authorizing the Army, the Navy, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Maritime Commission, and other agencies to violate various features of these restrictive laws of ours. We have gone quite a way in emergency legislation to relax the old safeguards, but we are now taking a very long step when we extend this to all departments of the Government engaged in the prosecution of the war.

The purpose is obvious: We wish to be able to make contracts quickly and to modify them when necessary, to distribute contracts geographically, and to encourage the use of subcontractors. We are taking risks, I admit. We may have graft, waste, and extravagance. However, it is the opinion of the responsible authorities of this country that speed in production is of the essence in our great national effort. Further, the section will greatly facilitate the award of contracts and the spread of contracts where there are factories and facilities available to produce articles which the Government needs. We hesitate to vote for anything as dangerous and far-reaching as this title, but I think the reasons for it justify it; it is speed in negotiating contracts and distribution of contracts to those who are qualified to produce what we need.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I call the gentleman's attention to subdivisions (A) and (B) of section 301 of title III. One of my colleagues has called my attention to some of the language in these sections. There is no question that it is the intention of this bill to regulate and control the property and securities of foreign countries and nationals thereof, but the language there is confusing. I think we should clear up some of that confusion.

For example, on line 16 on page 5, this and the following language might cause confusion about whether or not it means both foreigners and citizens of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. I believe the gentleman will find the limitation quite clear. If the gentleman will look at line 15, he will find that this whole section applies to property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest. It deals with alien property.

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; but it then reads—

> by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Of course, if it were not in the United States we would not have jurisdiction of it. I believe there is some confusion in the language. There is no question about the intention of the committee that this is to deal only with foreign property. That is the point to which I call the gentleman's attention.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Does not the gentleman think that the entire bill covers nothing but aliens and alien property? There is no question about that, is there?

Mr. O'HARA. I still say you have to be careful of this language.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is perfectly clear that it is intended by section 301 to deal only with property, bullion, gold and silver coins, foreign exchange, evidences of indebtedness, securities, and all kinds of real and personal property belonging to aliens.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Referring to paragraph (A) of section 301, found on page 5 of the bill we have, will the gentleman point out how that is limited to foreign property in any way?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is the language of the present law, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It is not quite the language of the present law. In any case, we are reenacting it here under a heading, "Trading with the enemy." The language before me simply permits the President during any period of national emergency, not necessarily war, to investigate, regulate, or prohibit importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency, or securities.

Mr. HANCOCK. (A) has to do with the investigation, regulation, and control of various forms of securities, money, and bullion. (B) has to do with the investigation, regulation, and so on, of other forms of property. The limitation is this, and I quote from lines 14 and 15 on page 11:

> Any property in which any foreign government or a national thereof has any interest.

This lim.tation applies to both (a) and (b), as I see it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Where does the gentleman read those words?

Mr. HANCOCK. I shall have to get the new bill. Most of us have studied the old bill. Lines 14 and 15, page 11.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the gentleman is probably mistaken about subsection (a) of section 301 applying only to nationals of a foreign country. Apparently the purpose of subsection (a)—and I think it is absolutely necessary—is to prohibit our own citizens from sending money or currency into other countries, which might be our enemies, or to prevent them from hoarding securities or money that might be needed by this country. So, I think that provision in subsection (a) does apply to our own nationals, but I think it is absolutely necessary that the power should be given to the President in wartime.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman, I think, is partially correct, so far as Americans are concerned. The law which we passed in 1933 prohibited the hoarding at least, of gold bullion. Other types of hoarding should be taken care of in a different bill. This one is intended to apply to alien property.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think substantially the only difference between this provision and what the law is, is that one says "securities" on page 5, whereas the present law probably defines "securities" as evidences of indebtedness.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentleman explain what the preventing of hoarding of securities means and what that has to do with trading with the enemy beyond the fact that something is in the present law and, of course, the hoarding of securities is not in the present law?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 more minutes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Let me go along for a moment. There is another very important change in section 301 from the present Trading With the Enemy Act. Under our former law I think we still have power to seize enemy alien property and under our present law of export control we have considerable additional power over alien property, but this goes much further and gives the agents appointed by the Government the power to seize any property, any and all alien property, whether belonging to friend or enemy, and to put it into use. This is a power that has never been enjoyed before by any specific provision and it is important. It gives us the right to utilize the property we take over. The bill covers considerably more ground in this respect than the old act. I assume the purpose is this: Quite frequently there will be property bound for some neutral country which it is expected will eventually reach an enemy, and in that event the Custodian of Alien Property is authorized under this bill to seize that property and to utilize it for our own purposes. This is a power that was not granted in 1917, when a similar bill was passed.

The acquittance provision at the bottom of page 6 is in the present law:

> Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same.

You will find it in sec. 7 (e) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

There is nothing new or strange or startling about this, although a good many people have asked me about it. It simply means that if operating under a regulation or order, you turn over some property which belongs to another person to the Alien Property Custodian, that person has no cause of action against you, but his remedy must be sought against the Alien Property Custodian.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Section 302 is a very common sort of clause, a sort of saving clause, that is put into many bills of this kind. I assume the real purpose of it is to legalize certain seizures, contracts, and censorships that have already been made in anticipation of the passage of this bill. The committee narrowed the scope of the section as far as we could by adding the rather clumsy language at the end of the section.

Section 303 is exactly the same as section 3 (d) of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, with the exception that a penalty is added at the end of the section, and that same penalty can be found in section 16 of the old act for similar violations.

We believe that the passage of this bill will make it possible for the Executive to act promptly in Government reorganization and in the distribution of contracts geographically and to small subcontractors and to small business. It will permit the Government to seize and utilize alien property and will establish the right of censorship over mail and communications between this country and abroad. These powers will terminate when the war is over, and they will help win the war. They are necessary for the successful prosecution of it. Other drastic steps will be taken, but the American people are reconciled to them and will not hesitate to make any sacrifice to save what we hold most dear. At last our Nation is angry and determined and united.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call the attention of the members of the Committee to this language which seems to be confusing to some degree. When you examine the bill you find that (A) and (B) do not constitute separate sentences and the language contained in (A) and (B) is connected up with this language, reading now beginning at line 13, to get the connection:

> power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest.

This is limiting, and I think definitely fixing, language, and for the purpose of the record, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I make this statement, and I speak for the committee—I know I have the privilege to speak for the committee—that it was the intent of the committee and the understanding of the committee that what preceded in sections (A) and (B), on page 5, title III, Trading with the Enemy Act, are controlled by the language which I have just read, and I think that would remove any question.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Then the chairman of the committee says that there was no intention to set up under (A) a system of control on strictly domestic property, but it was the intention of the committee to have the controls refer, both in (A) and (B), to transactions involving property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has an interest?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Absolutely. I think most of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary are present on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains three titles, and three separate and distinct subjects. Title I, reenacting the Overman Act, has been pretty well discussed. There is no use of denying the fact that this gives the President tremendous powers to reshuffle bureaus and commissions, and to take the duties and powers from one Government commission or corporation and put them somewhere else. There are, however, certain limitations. For instance, there is no authority granted to consolidate executive departments, and no authority is given to abolish a bureau or an agency. The President's authority there is limited to making a report to the Congress before taking further action. The fourth and probably the most important of all is that all moneys appropriated by the Congress must, under this bill, be expended for the purpose for which appropriated, and the net result is that the spending may be done by different personnel or by a different bureau than at present.

I have nothing to say about title II except that of course it is a power that we would never give except in time of war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. What happens at the close of the war with reference to changes made under title I? Would the changes continue, or would the original conditions revert back?

Mr. GWYNNE. That is taken care of in this bill. They all go back. As to title II, of course, we have been forced by necessity to change the law. We here permit contracts to be made without regard to the provisions of existing law as to bidding and without regard to provisions for bonds. We now take the lid off entirely, with the exception that we still outlaw that sort of contract known as cost-plus. We put in some safeguards, in that we direct the President to adopt certain regulations to safeguard the Government. There is, of course, great possibility for fraud and favoritism and partiality, and I think we will not have completed this job, and I am for title II, unless we pass stringent laws prohibiting frauds and favoritism, and cause criminal penalties to be imposed on any person who takes advantage of the Government in this emergency, under title II.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under title II there may be opportunity, as I see it, for the small manufacturer of the country to get some of these defense orders.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct, and that is one of the purposes of the title, and we hope that it will accomplish that very thing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why would it not be feasible to require monthly report under title II, showing in detail every contract negotiated when, and with whom?

Mr. GWYNNE. Let me say that we considered that but did not do anything about it as it is such a tremendous job. I think that ought to be considered, however. We will now come to title III, about which there seems to be more or less confusion. You all remember that in the last war we passed the Trading With the Enemy Act. I think the first law was passed in October 1917. Thereafter from time to time we amended the law, and passed new laws, and thereafter from time to time we repealed parts of it, and parts of it have been held by the courts to be no longer in operation. I confess that it is difficult to say just how much of that law is now in effect. Back in 1933 and in 1940 we amended the law, we amended section 5 (b) of the original law, and we passed that law at a time when there was a great deal of difficulty in respect to banking, and the matter of foreign exchange. In this bill the committee has amended the first sentence of section 5 (b) of that act, and I think it confers on the President the following powers. Of course it is not self-executing and nothing happens until the President exercises the powers conferred upon him under the law. I think he may exercise powers as follows: First, he may regulate or prohibit transactions in foreign exchange, and the importation or the exportation of certain articles, and so forth.

Apparently there is some confusion as to whether that does or does not cover transactions other than those involving aliens and alien property. It is my understanding, as suggested by the chairman of the committee, that our committee had no thought other than to regulate alien property, and if clarification is necessary, perhaps that will be supplied at the proper place and at the proper time.

The second authority is this: To regulate and prohibit the transfer or use of property of any foreign nation or of any foreign national in the United States.

Third, the President is given authority to vest the ownership of such property in any person designated by the President. For example, I presume later on we will carry out the purposes of this statute by creating an Alien Property Custodian.

Fourth—and this is the principal difference between this law and the one we had during the last war—the President may hold and use—that is the new part—or sell such property for the benefit of the United States.

Fifth, he may require the keeping of records by all persons so that the purposes of the law may be carried out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the gentleman agree that under the present law as amended in 1940 it applies to citizens of the United States and that subsection (a) of the bill on pages 4 and 5 is just a reenactment of the present law, substituting the word "securities" for "evidences of indebtedness"?

Mr. GWYNNE. Of course, the gentleman knows what happened there. That long, involved first sentence of section 5 (b) was revamped and the construction changed, and I am inclined to think the gentleman may be right about it. In any event, I do think that should be clarified some time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman will read section 5 (b) of the present law he will find that the first part of it refers to exporting, melting, or earmarking of gold, silver coin or bullion or currency, and "any transfer." Then the second part of it refers to the interest of a foreign national in the securities. Under the first part, before the word "and," is the authority the President used to seize the gold during the depression and to freeze it.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct. That is my understanding. I might say in answer to that question I do not know how far we should go along that particular line, but we should make up our minds and write language which would clearly express it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In any event, this does not go any further than the present law?

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct. There is no doubt of that. That is exactly the present law and the confusion that we now find is in the present law.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. There may be some inference by the question asked by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] that this was to apply to other than property of nationals of foreign nations. Will the gentleman clear that up?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In my statement I did not mean to leave any inference. I meant to say directly that subsection (a) does apply to American nationals and always has. Subsection (a) is the law today, with the word "securities" added.

Mr. O'HARA. You mean with reference to the hoarding?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It does.

Mr. O'HARA. Do you mean that section (a) applies entirely to all American citizens?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It applies to any person, whether an American citizen or a foreign national, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, who may hoard or melt or earmark any silver coin or bullion, currency or securities. That is the law today under section 5 (b) as amended by the act of 1940, except that instead of using the word "securities" in the old law, the old law says "evidence of indebtedness," or "evidence of ownership of property."

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman agree with me that section (b) of title III certainly is intended to apply to foreign nationals and foreign governments?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. Section (b) does apply to property in which some foreign national has an interest, and section (a) applies to anyone under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is true.

Mr. GWYNNE. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, does not the gentleman think there is necessity for rearranging that sentence, so that the desire of the Congress is clearly expressed as to whether it should or should not from now on cover the nationals of our own country as well as nationals of other nations?

Mr. KEFAUVER. If you will read the present section 5 (b) on page 4 of the report, which is the old act as amended by the act of March 9, 1933, and May 7, 1940, I do not see how there can be any question in the mind of anybody but that the first part applies to anybody in the jurisdiction of the United States and the second part applies to foreign interests or the interest of foreign governments. I think it is entirely clear.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. When your committee discussed section (a) in the matter of gold or silver coin or bullion, did your committee take into consideration other metals, such as platinum? It has been called to my attention that a considerable amount of platinum bars have changed hands on the New York Metal Exchange for the purpose of some safety for the individual. Was this question brought up in the gentleman's committee in the discussion of this bill?

Mr. GWYNNE. The committee gave that no consideration. The intention of the committee was to make a beginning of regulation of aliens and alien property in this country.

Mr. STEFAN. This, of course, is applicable to American nationals as well, is it not?

Mr. GWYNNE. The one provision with regard to foreign exchange is probably applicable.

Mr. STEFAN. Why not take into consideration platinum when you take into consideration gold and silver bullion?

Mr. GWYNNE. If that is property that belongs to some foreign nation or national it is, of course, subject to our jurisdiction.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly, but the gentleman knows and will agree, I am sure, that considerable wealth has been brought into this country in the way of metal and so on by foreigners. It would stand to reason we should take into consideration platinum the same as gold and silver bullion.

Mr. GWYNNE. Let me say to the gentleman that this provision covers all property belonging to aliens that is within our jurisdiction.

Mr. STEFAN. It would not be necessary then specifically to mention platinum.

Mr. GWYNNE. No.

Mr. STEFAN. It would cover platinum?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, the gentleman has stated that subsection (b) of section 301 applies only to nationals of a foreign country who have interest in property in this country.

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes; I think that is clear.

Mr. SPRINGER. And is it the gentleman's thought that subsection (a) which immediately precedes on page 5 applies to our own citizens as well as to nationals of other countries?

Mr. GWYNNE. I am inclined to think that is correct. I think, however, it should be clarified.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, under this bill we give to the President the power to take what is needed to meet the emergency. We round out and supplement whatever powers he now has. He has a herculean task to perform and it needs herculean powers. These powers are given him in this bill. I desire briefly to comment upon section 303 found on page 8 which concerns international communications.

I wish to emphasize that there is no attempt in section 303 to establish any control or censorship over domestic internal communications by radio, telegraph, press, or by word of mouth. This is an attempt only to control international communications.

Now let me give you something of the condition of confusion that exists today with reference to communications. There are many agencies of Government engaged at the present time in some form of defense information service. There are 10 such agencies. The defense branches include among others the new Office of Facts and Figures, the Office of the Coordinator of Information, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the War, Navy, Treasury, and State Departments, the Office of Emergency Management, the Selective Service System, and the Office of Government Reports. Members of the press, radio commentators, and others seeking information have a great deal of difficulty in getting the true state of facts from these 10 different agencies. At times they give out conflicting reports; and this bill by section 303, so far as international communications are concerned, seeks to remedy this defect and would empower the President to set up some sort of bureau to control or some other measure of control over this situation. For example, at the present time broadcasting is not controlled in any sense of the word. Many of the United States stations can be heard in South America. Most of the naval censorship

is now exercised on news dispatches going through by cable and wireless. It is obviously not a complete system when press dispatches going for instance to Buenos Aires are being carefully scanned while broadcasts of activities and news bulletins are absolutely free. With the passage of this bill we shall go a great ways in changing and remedying that situation.

I feel that with reference to domestic communications we should pattern after what occurred during the last World War when there was set up between the radio, the press, and the Government a sort of voluntary restraint, a sort of voluntary censorship. George Creel was empowered by President Wilson to establish a mild sort of censorship, for want of a better term, whereby the news commentators, editors, and publishers agreed to submit to the appropriate agencies of Government, or to George Creel and his colleagues, information they had received. They got clearance in that way from the centralized bureau. I believe the President could very readily set up some sort of bureau of that character upon which there would be representation from the press, representation from radio, representation from the public; and, as Walter Lippmann in a very interesting article in the New York Herald Tribune pointed out, we could do this without the loss of any of our rights and without risking the loss of public criticism which is so essential to good government. If the press and the radio are called upon openly to assist in setting up this sort of voluntary censorship and are continuously represented in the administration of the censorship it will work satisfactorily, for responsible newspapermen and radio commentators are quite able to recognize and enforce the distinction between information which is off the record and information which can be published.

It is far better to have this sort of voluntary control over press and radio set-up by some sort of Executive order rather than have compulsory censorship by legislative fiat. The English system is one of voluntary action and agreement between press, radio, and government. It works admirably well in England. It does not preclude criticism of the government, because they know in England wisely and prudently that it is only an aroused public opinion which can for example get rid of an inefficient, worthless officer of the government or officer of the armed forces. Criticism is freely permitted. The truth can be told. The only restraint is that the report or communication cannot be such as to give aid and comfort to the enemy. I think we could well pattern after the English system. Indeed, I hope that the Executive authority not only under the power that we give him in this bill but under his present powers will set up some sort of a bureau of the character that President Wilson set up during the last war. There were some abuses of power, but they can be avoided. We can readily profit by our experience during that last war.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States decided, by a 5 to 3 decision, that no matter what the decision of an administrative agency was, the Court would not review it. This, of course, has added greatly to the discomfiture of those who are opposed to a highly centralized form of government in their consideration of this legislation. I have asked for this time in order to call attention of the committee to the statutes that relate to the advertising of bids, and I ask unanimous consent to insert a list of those statutes at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The list referred to follows:

STATUTES PERTINENT TO TITLE II CONCERNED WITH THE LETTING, ADMINISTERING, AND PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTS

I. ADVERTISING

A. Statutes requiring advertising for bids for Government contracts:

41 United States Code: Section 5 (general provisions).

10 United States Code: Sections 310, 1200, 1201 (specific provisions).

34 United States Code: Sections 561, 566, 567 (specific provisions).

41 United States Code: Section 7 (specific provisions).

B. Neither 41 United States Code, section 5, nor any other of the above provisions apply to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the subsidiaries of that Corporation, such as the Defense Plant Corporation, or any other Government-owned corporation.

C. Statutes dispensing with the advertising requirement under certain circumstances not necessarily related to emergency situations:

10 United States Code: Sections 6-6 (n) (n), 1205.

34 United States Code: Sections 565, 569, 571.

D. Emergency appropriation acts authorizing the President to dispense with the advertising requirement:

Seventy-sixth Congress: Public, Nos. 611, 703.

Seventy-seventh Congress: Public, Nos. 9, 28.

E. Statutes authorizing the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Maritime Commission, and the Federal Works Administration to dispense with the advertising requirement under emergency circumstances:

50 United States Code, section 96:

Seventy-sixth Congress: Public, Nos. 43, 168, 309, 629, 635, 671, 703, 781, 849.

Seventy-seventh Congress: Public, Nos. 9, 22, 46, 48, 101, 137, 139, 143, 247.

II. PROVISIONS CONCERNING BONDS

A. Statutes requiring bonds for Government contracts and related provisions:

40 United States Code: Sections 270 (a)-270 (d).

41 United States Code: Section 7 (3).

34 United States Code: Section 562.

B. Statutes dispensing with some of the above restrictions under emergency conditions:

Seventy-sixth Congress: Public, No. 809.

Seventy-seventh Congress: Public, Nos. 5, 46, 139, 309.

A. 31 United States Code, section 529, is a general prohibition against paying for any Government purchase before delivery or before title is taken to it.

B. Statutes presently giving some, but inadequate, relief against these provisions:

34 United States Code: Section 562.

Seventy-sixth Congress: Public, Nos. 671, 703.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, it is hoped through the enactment of this legislation that title II will show the way to some of these governmental agencies to the end that the chaotic condition that now exists with respect to bidding will be eliminated. I know of one case after another where the Government agencies are actually in open competition with each other to secure materials, with, of course, the inevitable result that the taxpayers of this Nation are paying more for the essential war materials than they should. I sincerely trust that out of title II will come something which will remedy that situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I did not think I would take time on this measure, but since I expect to vote for the bill and I expect to do everything within my power to see that it is passed because it is a defense measure, and so the people may be protected under certain provisions contained in it, I want to say just a few words at this time. On December 7, just passed, our course was fixed. We became involved in this war. This very morning it was my very sad duty to report to the Members of the House that two boys, both of whom reside in my congressional district, were the first two casualties from my congressional district in this war. They fell on the 7th of December, when that vicious and unwarranted assault was made upon our Nation by Japan.

The bill which is before us is intended to meet the serious situation which is ahead. We are involved in war. We must meet the challenge of war. It is essential that powers be delegated to the President of the United States, and this bill contains practically the same delegation of power as was given to the President in the last World War. Title I of the bill is practically identically the same as the measure which was in force during the last World War, with the one exception that section 3 thereof has been eliminated.

Title II of the bill which is at the moment before the House is the only new feature in this bill. That title has been detailed and described fully by our distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. There are one or two observations I would like to make in this connection. Under this bill great power is given with respect to awarding contracts, as is provided under title II, section 201, of the bill. There should be a limitation of that power. In other words, after passing this particular legislation, which is extraordinary in character, there should be legislation passed following it to protect our people against frauds, deceit, abuses, and against favoritism which may become involved under the provisions of this particular section of the pending legislation.

Another observation I want to make in this connection is this: Under section 201 there is the opportunity in the letting of contracts, and in the distribution of contracts, for small business to have the chance of receiving a fair share of the

war-production contracts in which our Nation is now developing. That would be very helpful to small business all over this great Nation of ours. I sincerely hope and trust that in awarding these war contracts, and in letting the contracts for production of war materials and supplies, and in the development of our national defense, which will be necessary from time to time, that small business will be fully considered when those contracts are let, to the end that the small business men of this country may receive a fair share thereof, and ultimately be saved from destruction.

The other provision of the bill, and I refer to title III, with respect to "trading with the enemy," has practically the identical provisions, as I understand it, that the bill contained which was in force during the last World War. There has been added by the Judiciary Committee an extra precaution under section 401 of this measure. This precaution relates to the time such proposed law would terminate. This extraordinary power must end when the war is over. No one knows who will be President when this war ends, and provision is made for the termination of this proposed law by concurrent resolution of both Houses of the Congress. This provision assures the right of the representatives of the people to recapture this great and extraordinary power, and to again vest the power in the people when this war ends.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to vest great power in the President of the United States. Vast power has been delegated to the President—greater than has been delegated to any other President of this great Nation. But we are now involved in war, and it becomes necessary to delegate great power to the President. In the face of our national-defense requirements and the necessity of this hour of peril, I expect to support this measure and grant the power to the President which he requests—but with this power goes the responsibility involved. The President owes a sacred duty to the people of this Nation. He must not fail to discharge that duty to our people and to our Nation in these sad days.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first legislation of this type we have had up for consideration since the declaration of war, and I think it is very commendable and speaks well of the unity we have in the Nation and in the Congress in the fact that everybody has joined together in trying to accomplish the result that we all seek to accomplish. I want to largely direct my remarks to title III, the trading with the enemy feature of this bill.

It was explained to us by representatives of the Treasury that it was absolutely necessary for the present act—5 (b)—to be reenacted in order to enable the Treasury to carry out its policy of freezing certain credits and of handling certain financial interests during the war. The explanation made to us, and I think it is carried out in this bill, is that the only change the Treasury wanted in 5 (b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act was to give the executive department power not only to passively freeze credits and to negatively handle the operation of some manufacturing plants by a system of licenses or controls that they have to work under at the present time, but also to give the President the power to actively put into operation those interests or those securities or plants that might be taken over and be seized under authority of 5 (b) of the present act.

If you will look at page 4 of the report, you will find the present section 5, as amended by the acts of March 9, 1933, and May 7, 1940. It is quite apparent upon reading it that the present law gives the President the power to investigate, regulate, or prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit, or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency. The only thing that has been added there is the word "securities." I think that makes the law a little stronger. I understand the provisions of the first part of this act came into it by amendment in March 1933. The purpose was to authorize the President to restrict credit transactions and prevent hoarding during the bank emergency period. I think subsection (a) applies to citizens of this country as well as foreign nationals. The debate in March 1933 indicates that this is true, and I think the language is clear. When this section was amended in May 1940 there does not appear to have been any debate in the House. However, the question was fully debated in the Senate. The report of the argument will be found in the RECORD, beginning at page 5168. Subsection (b) is the same as the old law, except that it gives the President the right to use and to operate anything that may be taken over in which a foreign national or government has an interest.

It seems to me, in view of the action that has already been taken by the Treasury Department and by the President in freezing credits and preventing the hoarding of certain money or gold, this would not be the time to change the existing law in respect to subsection (a). I think it is well that we extend it as it is enlarged in subsection (b).

Of course, this bill does not cover everything that will have to be done. There are some parts of the Trading With the Enemy Act that are still in force, and there are some parts of it that are not in force. I think it is going to take a very careful examination of all these laws to see what other parts it may be necessary again to make vital during the continuation of the war, but that will take several weeks. For the present, the officials in the executive departments tell us that this is what they can as a minimum get by with until they have an opportunity to study some of the other provisions that may later be necessary.

As to the section that deals with contracts, we considered trying to write into this section a provision protecting the Government from fraud and extortion by so-called contract brokers. However, this subject should be covered by comprehensive legislation and I hope it will be appropriately taken care of at an early date.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time for the purpose of trying to clarify what the present law is with reference to the financial and property transactions as set out in subsections (A) and (B) of this bill.

It so happens that that legislation originated in and was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, I believe, in May 1940, and was passed by unanimous consent. It amended the original act that was passed, as we all know, in 1917.

I believe I can say without any question that the present act applies only to those transactions and those properties in which foreign governments or subdivisions thereof or their nationals have an interest. There seems to have been some confusion about that matter here. There is no doubt that was the intention of the legislation at the time it was enacted, and there was a very definite reason for it. It followed immediately the invasion of Norway, Belgium, and Holland by Germany, and it was enacted for the very purpose of protecting their nationals and their property in this country from transactions and transfers forced upon them by the Germans at that time. That was the purpose of it. There was no intention and there is no intention at all now that it should be applied to any transaction or any property in which an American citizen has an interest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this is a tremendously important bill. It grants to the President most extraordinary powers. There can hardly be granted greater powers. Section 1, at the beginning of the bill, gives the reasons for the granting of these extraordinary powers:

> That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

These powers rest upon those declarations. We have declared war against Japan, Italy, and Germany, and the executive branch insists these powers are essential now to enable us to prosecute this war successfully.

Section 1 is the Overman Act. We are giving to President Roosevelt war powers granted by Congress to President Wilson. Title II gives me considerable concern. The Congress up to this time, or when we complete the consideration of the $10,000,000,000 bill, will have actually appropriated and given contractual authority for the expenditure of more than $70,000,000,000 since July 1940 for the national defense. That is a tremendous sum of money. If we could pick the men who are to administer this law down to

the point where it becomes effective, we would not have so much concern, but there will be thousands of persons going out and making contracts for the Government almost without limitation. We can already begin to see where selfish interests and greed have raised their ugly heads, and graft has begun to show itself in some of the contracts where mere brokers, with perhaps nothing more than a set of books, have in a single contract pulled down approximately $100,000.

Further, we see in the press that a suit is pending in court where a lawyer claims for his services in securing certain contracts he is entitled to $700,000.

I am pleased to hear what the members of our committee say about protective legislation—criminal statutes—so that this Government may put its hands upon the fellows who are dipping into the United States Treasury and committing fraud and grafting on our country in this hour of her peril. We are calling a lot of the young men of America to serve for $21 to $30 a month. We should see to it there is no graft or unjust profits.

The trading with the enemy provision in title 3 is necessary now. In the last World War under the Trading With the Enemy Act this Government took over $500,000,000 worth of property and held it until after the war, and then adjudications were made by the Alien Property Custodian.

Up to this time our Government has already taken over $7,000,000,000 worth of money, credits, and other property. There is no sense in this Government holding this $7,000,000,000 worth of property inactive, allowing it to rust, plants to remain idle, and bear the expense of its maintenance. This bill gives the Government the right, not only to take it over, but to convert it, to sell it, or to use it, and that is one important amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, and it ought to be adopted.

Your committee was not idle and did not fail to scrutinize this important measure when it came before us from the Executive branch. There are several important amendments that were put into this bill by your Committee on the Judiciary.

I wish to call your attention to page 7. The bill that was brought to us was very broad, indeed. It provided to make active and vitalize all acts, actions, regulations, rules, orders, and proclamations that had been made theretofore, from October 6, 1917, when the Trading With the Enemy Act was first passed. Amendments were adopted by our committee; but your committee, realizing that we must protect the Government for its actions during recent months when it took over this $7,000,000,000 of assets and property of foreign nations, made the necessary provisions in this bill.

Another thing that your committee insisted be written into the bill is our right to recapture these extraordinary powers given to the President. And how was that done?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In section 401 it is provided that this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war. This is too uncertain. We might quit fighting as we did in the World War on November 11, 1918, but there was no real declaration of peace for more than 2 years. Now if we should quit fighting and the Executive was not willing to declare that the war was over, perhaps we could not fix the 6 months because we could not tell whether the war was over or not; perhaps no treaty of peace had been made or accepted—we never did ratify the Treaty of Versailles—so we wrote into this bill that both Houses of Congress, one concurring with the other, could at any time recapture these powers. Congress might not be able to repeal this act. We might pass the law, and it would go to the President and he would veto it. Then we would have to have a two-thirds majority, but under the provision put in this bill we can recapture or stop these powers simply by a majority vote of both Houses. It is insisted these extraordinary powers are necessary. We will put them in the hands of the President. We have given him the money; we have given him the power; Congress will give him the men and the ships and the planes, and then the American people will hold him and those who are associated with him responsible if they do not give America victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill today I am reminded of the fact that last evening over our national radio systems it was celebrated with dramatic effect the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of the Bill of Rights. It occurred to me that in discussing this bill there are, perhaps, powers granted herein affecting the Bill of Rights greater than in any single act of this Congress. Yet we all recognize that under war conditions or under extraordinary conditions, certain powers must be vested in the President, as in the control of the property, moneys, and securities of foreign countries and foreign nationals with whom we are at war. The matter which troubled me about this bill was the fact that when the bill was originally presented to the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee was very much dissatified with the drafting of the bill, and as a result I think a much improved bill has been brought out of your committee and one which plainly sets up what is intended to be the law by which all of us are to be guided.

I was particularly grateful to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his observations as to the effect of sections A and B of title III. I certainly feel that that language should be applicable only to the properties of a foreign national or a foreign country, and I am particularly grateful to him for his observation that there was no question that the Trading With the Enemy Act, as passed in 1940, was intended solely to apply to foreign nationals.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman may recall that in the hearings of a subcommittee considering another piece of legislation, I raised a question before that subcommitte about the possible danger from some foreign government or agency attempting to secure control of American properties by indirect methods and the desirability of requiring anyone who took part in such transaction to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. I ask the gentleman whether, in his judgment, the provisions of the bill now before the House unquestionably prevents anything such as that taking place?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I recall distinctly in connection with another bill that the gentleman from California very ably presented his views with reference to an amendment which he desired on that particular bill. We also discussed it in connection with this bill, and it is my hope that the language of this bill is broad enough to cover what the gentleman from California had in mind and which he discussed so ably before our committee; and if it does not, then I should like very much to see in substance the gentleman's idea incorporated in some other act which we are now considering before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that the gentleman is still going ahead with the consideration of H. R. 6045.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is correct. I agree with the gentleman from California that in connection with an amendment to control the action of these foreign individuals who attempt to come in and obtain control or some controlling interest in our domestic corporations, that if this act does not cover it, we should have legislation that will embrace his views.

I think in title IV of this act it is wisely provided the provision that the Congress may, by a concurrent resolution, designate a cutting-off period. I recall that following the last war there was a long period of time where, in our State, at least, it was necessary in obtaining a judgment to go to the trouble of making out an affidavit that the judgment debtor was not in the military service of the United States, and that requirement continued for a period of some several years after the war was over. It resulted because of the fact that there had been no definite legal action taken determining the termination of the existence of a war condition in this country, and I feel the provision in title IV is a very wise provision.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there are any additional requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further request for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—COORDINATION OF EXECUTIVE BUREAUS IN THE INTEREST OF THE MORE EFFICIENT CONCENTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935: *Provided*, That the termination of this title shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this title and during the time that this title is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war.

SEC. 2 That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices, or officers now existing by law to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said functions except to the extent hereafter authorized by the Congress in appropriation acts or otherwise.

SEC. 4. That should the President, in redistributing the functions among the executive agencies as provided in this title, conclude that any bureau should be abolished and it or their duties and functions conferred upon some other department or bureau or eliminated entirely, he shall report his conclusions to Congress with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this title are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this title is in force.

Upon the termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this title to the contrary notwithstanding.

TITLE II—CONTRACTS

SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting.

TITLE III—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

SEC. 301. The first sentence of subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise—

"(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and

"(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest,

by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof shall vest, when, as, and upon the terms, directed by the President, in such agency or person as may be designated from time to time by the President, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, and such designated agency or person may perform any and all acts incident to the accomplishment or furtherance of these purposes; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision either before, during, or after the completion thereof, or relative to any interest in foreign property, or relative to any property in which any foreign country or any national thereof has or has had any interest, or as may be otherwise necessary to enforce the provisions of this subdivision, and in any case in which a report could be required, the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require the production, or if necessary to the national security or defense, the seizure of, any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers, in the custody or control of such person; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, take other and further measures not inconsistent herewith for the enforcement of this subdivision.

"(2) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder.

"(3) As used in this subdivision the term 'United States' means the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, arising under this subdivision in the Philippine Islands and concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts of the United States of all cases, civil or criminal, arising upon the high seas: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing shall not be construed as a limitation upon the power of the President, which is hereby conferred, to prescribe from time to time, definitions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this subdivision, for any or all of the terms used in this subdivision."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 6, line 2, after the word "President", strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, under the bill as written the President may require whoever is appointed Alien Property Custodian—and I assume that such a person will be appointed—to keep a record of the transactions that take place during the tenure of his office. It seems to me that, conferring the tremendous powers conferred under this section on some individual, we should compel that person to keep a full and complete record of all the transactions that take place, and I submit that that is a very reasonable thing to expect. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. All acts, actions, regulations, rules, orders, and proclamations heretofore taken, promulgated, made, or issued by, or pursuant to the direction of, the President or the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, which would have been authorized if the provisions of this act and the amendments made by it had been in effect, are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 303. Whenever, during the present war, the President shall deem that the public safety demands it, he may cause to be censored under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time establish, communications by mail, cable, radio, or other means of transmission passing between the United States and any foreign country he may from time to time specify, or which may be carried by any vessel or other means of transportation touching at any port, place, or Territory of the United States and bound to or from any foreign country. Any person who wilfully evades or attempts to evade the submission of any such communication to such censorship or wilfully uses or attempts to use any code or other device for the purpose of concealing from such censorship the intended meaning of such communication shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation

shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

TITLE IV—TIME LIMIT AND SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

SEC. 402. This act may be cited as the "First War Powers Act, 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6233, and pursuant to House Resolution 389 he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 390, Rept. No. 1511) on the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for about 5 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter to the President of the United States from the Providence Association of Ukranian Catholics.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping concerning the first tuberculosis-free graded county in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 262.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1544, a bill to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "two hours" and insert "1 hour."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the time on the minority side is under control of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], but since he is not present I yield now 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think all the time will be consumed on this rule. Briefly, this rule is for the consideration of a bill which has for its purpose an appropriation of $20,000,000 to be used in the construction of 1,550 miles of international highway which will connect the border of Mexico, through Central America, to the Canal Zone. The report states that probably better and in a more concise way than I can, and I will now read from the report:

The Inter-American Highway section in question is approximately 1,500 miles in length. The proposed route reaches from the Panama Canal to the border between Guatemala and Mexico and passes through the capital cities of every country except Honduras, where a road which would connect the capital city of Tegucigalpa with the Inter-American Highway is already in service.

The highway through Central America would connect at the border between Guatemala and Mexico with the Mexican section of the Inter-American Highway and provide direct communication by road from Laredo, Tex., to the Canal Zone.

Expenditures by the United States during the first 12 months of the operation of this plan are estimated at $5,400,000. Expenditures during the 4 years following until the completion of the highway should average slightly under $4,000,000 yearly.

I may say there is in the report a letter from the President of the United States asking favorable consideration and passage of this bill and also a very lengthy letter from the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, in which he goes into a complete discussion of the reasons which he deems make it imperative that this road be constructed.

Under the provisions of the bill any country through which this road passes would have to contribute at least one-third of the funds expended on the road within the country. It seems to me that probably this is all that should be necessary on the discussion of the rule, because ample time is provided for discussion of all phases of the bill when it comes on for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, personally I do not favor this bill at this time.

I should like very much to see a splendid international highway running from Alaska to the southernmost part of South America. This is idealistic, devoutly to be hoped for, and would be a fine thing for the Americas. The portion of such a road, provided in the bill before us, is not essential at this time as a part of our national defense. If consideration is to be given to our Treasury and our taxpayers, then the necessities of our national defense and our war program should be the limitation of our spending.

Is this proposed highway a national-defense highway? The witnesses appearing before the Rules Committee made it clear that the road to be constructed is not suitable for the transportation of modern military equipment, and that the bridges already built are intended to meet the needs of tourist travel and are not such as are necessary on a military highway.

Then again, the structure of the road is adequate for warm-climate countries but is not sufficiently heavy to serve for military purposes.

In these circumstances, this is certainly not a national-defense highway.

On the other hand, it is contended that our good-neighbor policy is a part of our national defense and that anything done by this country tending to stimulate and encourage our neighbors to the south is a potent part of our national defense at the moment. I favor all reasonable encouragement in connection with activities linking us more closely with these neighbors. I believe, however, that our first job right now is to defend the Western Hemisphere against aggression and, while the time will come when we can again set ourselves about the task of expanding our cultural and commercial relations with our neighbors, that time is not now.

This is just another case where the desirable things in this time of war must give way to the necessary things.

This bill contemplates that the countries through which this road passes will pay one-third of the cost of construction and our country will pay two-thirds of the cost. Be it remembered, that in many cases the one-third contributed by these countries will be provided through lend-lease or export bank loans. In short, it is our money that is going to build most of these roads. When the road is built, this country has absolutely no jurisdiction over it. Our engineers, our material, and our money largely build the roads and then we move out and leave them under the control of the local governments. There is not a thing in this bill that would guarantee any control by our country or any privilege or right for our nationals or our military authorities to even pass over the road without the consent and permission of the local government. Yes, if the local government so desired, after we have finished the road, it may place toll bridges and charge our nationals toll for driving over the roads we have built for it.

Right now we do not have sufficient materials, such as steel, cement, and the other things that go into bridge building and road building, to carry on our defense program. Does it seem sensible that we should rob ourselves of what little defense material we have in order to build a good-neighbor road in these southern countries at this time? It seems to me those very countries had rather have us use this material in the preparation of our common defense in the war that is now upon us. We need airplanes, ships, and cannon more than we need friendship highways.

This bill carries an authorization for an expenditure of $20,000,000. I do not believe anyone seriously contemplates but that the completion of this project will cost many times that amount. Do not forget that after our country builds a road as a gift to one country to the south of us, fairness, justice, and good neighborliness will require us to extend the same courtesy to all those countries through which this contemplated road will pass. And if the road goes to the southern part of South America, of course that will mean billions. Where is all this money coming from?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the road will cost only $4,000,000 a year for 5 years. This makes quite a difference in the initial payment, that between $20,000,000 and $5,000,000.

The War Department advocates this bill very strongly and I earnestly hope the bill will pass.

Mr. MICHENER. The very able gentlewoman is kindhearted, goodhearted, and generous at all times, to all persons and under all circumstances.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I am not.

Mr. MICHENER. And I wonder if she differentiates between essentials and luxuries. By legislative action the Congress has already limited our own road-building program during the coming year. We are building only such roads as are necessary in our national defense. I am, therefore, wondering what our farmers and taxpayers are going to think when we tell them that we are spending millions of dollars of borrowed money to build scenic, cultural, and friendship highways hundreds of miles from home in foreign countries at this time. That is going to be a pretty hard thing to explain.

Mr. Speaker, it takes courage to even question appropriations asked by any department of the Government at this time. I certainly want to vote for every dollar necessary for our national defense. Earlier in the afternoon I spoke for and voted for a measure giving almost unlimited power to the Chief Executive to carry on the war we are now in. I did that because it was necessary in the interest of national defense. If I thought this contemplated project would furnish any appreciable physical assistance in carrying on our national defense, I would then be willing to increase our indebtedness to whatever amount was necessary to build the road. However, after hearing the representatives of the State Department, the Bureau of Roads, and others, I am thoroughly convinced that this project has no real defense value other than the cultural value to which I have already referred.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. No; I cannot yield because I do not have the time. There will be plenty of time for debate on the bill during which the gentleman can express himself and tell why this country should build a road in Central America over which we shall have no control or dominion after it is constructed.

This bill should not be passed hurriedly. I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] will make a more explicit and compelling case for this expenditure at this time than it made before the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] who is now opposing this bill continually spoke as if it provided for building roads in South America. There is nothing in this bill whatsoever that refers by direction or indirection to South America. This bill which authorizes the expenditure of $20,000,000 seeks to construct a continuous road from Mexico to Panama through six Central American countries: Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Salvador, Honduras, and Panama. When the bill was reported out after extensive hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs we were at peace but we felt even then that it was a meritorious measure, that it was sound, and would be beneficial to us and likewise to all the Central American countries. Conditions have vitally changed since then. We have now entered the war. War actually was made and declared upon us and we in our turn in the American constitutional way declared war on Japan and upon Germany and Italy. War was never declared upon any of these Central-American nations by either Japan, Germany, Italy, or any of the Axis allies, or satellites. I want nevertheless to say, as a pan American of long standing, as a supporter of the good-neighbor policy, and the efforts of Secretary Hull and Under Secretary Welles to promote mutual understanding and cordial relations with our sister republics to the south, that this friendly pan-American policy is producing a precious harvest.

For more than 8 years Secretary Hull has been sowing seeds of friendship and cooperation with Latin-American countries and in time of need the tree of goodwill has brought forth an abundance of good fruit.

As a result of that policy, a policy primarily of good will, these little Central American nations which I have just named, each one in turn, though not attacked by any nation, officially declared war upon the Axis Powers. I believe that was the fruit of the "good neighor" policy. These were our real neighbors to the south of us, between us and the Panama Canal, and at the very first opportunity to show their friendship with no connection whatever with this measure, but as a result of a policy of long standing, of mutual friendship, understanding, and of common interest, these little sovereign nations all in turn declared war against the Axis Powers.

Let me say to you that these Latin Americans are a proud race and they are a warlike race. They won their independence by fighting and in blood many years ago, and they are prepared and have always been prepared to defend their own sovereignty which was won in their battles for independence. They can be relied upon to use their own armed forces in the defense of their own liberties today against any attack from foreign foes or any of the Axis Powers. They are friends

worth having, because they came willingly to our side. They have offered their airfields, harbors, and railroads in the fullest cooperation to win this war in which we are engaged.

The bill that we now have under consideration was passed by the committee after extensive hearings 6 months ago. It was endorsed 100 percent by the State Department and by Secretary Hull. It was reported unanimously by Republicans and Democrats alike in time of peace. But how much more necessary it is today in time of war. This is both a peace measure and a defense measure at the same time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today it is a defense measure and that was so stated by the War Department and its officials only a few days ago before the Foreign Affairs Committee. Today these Central American nations and ourselves are at war with Japan and Germany and that highway is vitally important. Those small nations with their harbors and airports are near the Panama Canal and are doubly important to us.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I concur in the gentleman's very eloquent statement. To me this is imperative. But I wonder if the gentleman would concur with me in the thought that the construction of a highway to Alaska is also immediately imperative?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I am in favor of that, and I would presumably vote for it when the time comes. In the old days I used to hunt in Alaska and I know there are very few roads up there. I think it would be advisable to build them, but that is not the issue before us now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. In support of what the gentleman said about the War Department now supporting this bill as a national-defense necessity, may I read for the RECORD a statement a few days ago made by the Chief of Staff:

> The Chief of Staff is of the opinion that the road would be of great military benefit, that it would insure military communication, insure land communication, no matter what the situation might be by sea.

Mr. FISH. That was signed by General Marshall, who is charged with the successful prosecution of our war program.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman's statement that this is now a military necessity is proven by what has been read. In other words, it would be the Burma Road of America, if constructed now?

Mr. FISH. I think that is a logical comparison. It would be a military road, or could be easily used as such.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is this not one of the few measures that came out of our committee with the support of every member of the committee and it has unanimously passed the Senate?

Mr. FISH. Yes; and that was in peacetime. In wartime I can assure the gentleman it will always be by unanimous consent if it has to do with our own national defense.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Let me ask the gentleman this further question. This is not a sudden thought. The survey for this road was first thought of in 1926, 15 years ago. It originated under a Republican administration while the Republicans were in power. We have spent at various times money in various amounts since 1926 in surveying this highway and a good portion of it has already been built.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It is true that this survey was ordered in the twenties at a time when the country was prosperous, when we were reducing taxes and paying off the debt of the last World War. It was a good-neighbor gesture that could be afforded at that time. The gentleman says this is a military road. The hearings before the Rules Committee, and the gentleman from Texas was present, disclosed that the engineers told the Rules Committee that this road as now constructed could not be used as a military road because of its construction, that the bridges would not carry military equipment, that the construction of the road was not strong enough at its southern end, particularly where there is no frost line. Now, the gentleman tells the House this is a military road, when it is a good-neighbor road and is to go to the end of South America before it is finished.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. If my friend the gentleman from Michigan had been listening he would have heard the gentleman from Oklahoma read a letter just a moment ago from General Marshall, Chief of Staff, in which the General stated over his own signature that this road would be valuable for carrying materials from Panama to the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. General Marshall evidently did not have the information from the men who built the road, the experts who testified.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think General Marshall always has the information about anything he speaks on.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The construction of this road was born in the mind of Mr. Thomas McDonald, Director of the Bureau of Roads. Many of us who served on the Committee on Roads know about that. I think it would be a fine thing if we can build a road there not only for friendship but for aid in case of war. Has the gentleman any information to indicate that it is being built in a way that will be helpful in time of war?

Mr. FISH. This road is already built from our own border in Texas to south of Mexico City. It is a hard-surfaced road. Mexico is completing the road to its own southern border without benefiting from this bill. The purpose of the bill is to complete the road from the southern border of Mexico to the Panama Canal. Guatemala has already completed most of its share of the road without this bill. Most of the money authorized for the new construction will be spent in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras, where there exist jungle trails that must be connected up and made into a highway. As far as they can, they propose to construct hard-surfaced roads that will be good for the use of automobiles and trucks, and try to finish the road all the way down to the Panama Canal. We have already built the road 100 miles north from the Canal Zone.

I not only believed the construction of this road through Central America to be a good thing for us in peacetime and voted for it as being beneficial to us in trade and likewise beneficial to those little nations, friends of ours, our sister republics, but I believe that today it is a national-defense measure linking us with the Panama Canal, the most vital and probably the most dangerous situation we have on this continent. If we are cut off in any way on the west coast, then a road of this kind would be almost a necessity. Both as a peacetime measure and as a national-defense measure, I am strongly for it and urge favorable and prompt action.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with what the gentleman says and with the necessity of having this road built down to the Isthmus. I wonder if the gentleman can inform the House just what progress has been made or is being made on the trans-Isthmus road, which was very late in starting over a year ago. The Bureau of Public Roads was to have it finished in about 6 months. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us whether we have yet completed the highway from the Pacific to the Atlantic side of the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. FISH. I have to go by my memory, and if anybody knows otherwise I should be glad to be corrected. I am under the impression that the trans-Isthmus road has just been completed. This is the first road that has ever been started across the Isthmus, and I think it is about completed.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On page 13 of the hearings a question was asked by a member of the committee of Mr. James of the Bureau of Public Roads. The question was:

> Will you have the roadway completed within a reasonable time across the Isthmus?

Mr. JAMES. Yes. Probably by June 30, or July 1.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I should like the RECORD to show that we were informed over a year ago in Panama that it was to be completed by June of this year.

Mr. FISH. I either read in the papers or was informed by someone in the last few days that the road is just about completed. I am not positive, however.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The defense authorities there were very much concerned because of the Atlantic and Pacific fortifications having in the past been connected solely by this single-track railroad.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has brought out very clearly and I should like to reemphasize that in connection with the defense of the Panama Canal the friendship of the small countries that surround it on both sides is of inestimable importance. May I ask the gentleman what in his opinion the effect would be upon these very small nations which came to our side in this crisis if we should refuse to pass a bill of this character to cooperate in the construction of this highway?

Mr. FISH. This House has no intention of voting down this measure.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand that.

Mr. FISH. I hope there will be very few votes against the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is hard for me to understand why there should be any votes against it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California raises the question of what might happen. Of course, these countries did not declare war because of this bill, they declared war because they are our friends and we have interests in common. But suppose that were not the fact, suppose they were enemies, they could have provided air bases for the Japanese right near our Canal. Thank goodness, they are our friends.

I am glad to stand here as a member of the minority and support and praise the policy of Secretary Hull and Under Secretary Welles in promoting friendship between the Latin-American nations and ourselves through the good-neighbor policy. They are today our real friends. This is more than a friendly gesture; it will be beneficial to us in peace and in war. The highest authority in our Army, our Chief of Staff, says it is almost a war necessity, that it is for our national defense, and that we need it now. It must be self-evident to everybody today that we need direct communication with the Panama Canal not only by sea but by land, and we need it immediately.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know it seems to the gentleman that those of us in the Western Hemisphere must go forward with a united front, as we are doing. I know the gentleman will ask that the work be speeded up in order to have the road built at the very earliest possible moment.

Mr. FISH. I hope this bill is passed today with very few votes against it and that it is put into effect at once so that the work can be begun without delay. We want to have the road completed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief observation. I am confident the gentleman from New York will accept an amendment of the observation he made a few moments ago when he referred to himself as a member of the minority. Last week this entire body evidenced a leadership which is an example for the people of the United States to follow. We took action last week when a crisis confronted our country and in this body there is no majority or minority party. It is the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and I am suggesting this amendment to what the gentleman from New York said. I know he had it in mind and will accept the suggestion. I am proud of what this body did last week, and, speaking as a Member and as the majority leader, I know that that example, not of leadership of an individual but of leadership of this body, is going to be carried on as long as this crisis exists and the middle aisle will mean nothing during the crisis. We are all Americans, and, speaking for myself, I say that any reference to the majority or the minority party is laid on the table during the period of the crisis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to the majority leader that we all know we have a job to do and unless we are united it cannot be done. On foreign affairs from now on we are united. Republicans or Democrats, we are all Americans, determined to win this war.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment upon the words of the majority leader and also of the minority leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am very happy, indeed, to add my word to the nonpartisan attitudes that we have heard expressed. I hope that it means what it has meant to some of us on this side of the aisle since we came here—that America is all that matters.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5925. An act to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2129. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726), entitled "An act to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the Government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

INTERAMERICAN HIGHWAYS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly appreciate what was said by the majority leader and also by our colleague from Ohio who just spoke. In the past we have differed in respect to some matters of foreign policy. They have been honest differences of opinion on questions that obviously had two sides. But I think everyone who on occasion has found himself in disagreement as a member of this body with some of the proposals that were made, always knew and felt that when the issue of war is settled, as it is now settled, it is no longer debatable. The Congress of the United States has clearly evidenced its views in that regard. That there is unity in this country on that issue cannot be questioned. We all stand together to win this war, and win it we will. Let there be no mistake about that.

But while that position is taken, I do not think it should be urged that other issues and other questions that involve legislation responsibility and that will arise from time to time should not be considered and weighed and debated by the Congress of the United States. The Parliament in London considers and debates such questions with bombs raining around them. To my mind such debate and consideration is democracy in action.

I think, however, that we must recognize in time of war that a greater responsibility and a greater discretion rests upon the administration and the War Department and the Navy Department and the State Department. We in the Congress, while we reserve to ourselves the right to offer constructive, not obstructive, criticisms, must also recognize that additional primary responsibility, and be most careful to see to it that our considerations and our deliberations and our criticisms are kept on a high plane.

Now, in respect to this particular measure, it was first presented as a national-defense measure. I was led to believe when I first heard about it, when it was presented to the Rules Committee, that somehow or other it had to do with the

defense of the Panama Canal, as a military road, even as we are yet talking about it here today. I was led to believe that it had to do with the transportation of tanks and munitions of war from our country to the Panama Canal to defend that area. Now that is not the situation, and it was so disclosed by the representative of the General Staff and by the representative of the State Department before the Rules Committee.

The road is to be 3,200 miles long. Let us not deceive ourselves, because we were definitely told that it would be impossible to transport things over that road necessary to defend the Panama Canal if the Panama Canal could not otherwise be defended.

This proposal was advanced years ago as an extension of the good-neighbor policy. The thing I objected to was the placing of the proposal in any other or different light. Now, that is not to say that it was not contended, and cannot now be contended, that the road has no defense value, but bear in mind that the only real argument that can be advanced for this road as a defense measure is that it is expected it will tend to the social and economic stabilization of the countries to be traversed by the road and that it will develop a friendlier feeling toward us.

Certainly no one should minimize the value to this country of the economic and political stabilization of our sister republics to the south. And it is certainly to be hoped that not only as a matter of national defense but also as a matter of friendship between nations they feel kindly toward us. When this proposal is urged on these grounds I find no objection except as to the extent to which this country can go in such expenditures. But there is question, if not objection, to its being urged as a military road.

A moment ago I referred to the added responsibility and discretion of the President and the State, War, and Navy Departments in time of war, and of the position of the Congress in respect thereto. We are now at war. We are determined to win that war. All our efforts shall be put to that end. Our administrative leaders, so I am informed, are very anxious that this bill be passed. That the Congress will respond on this particular measure I do not doubt.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment to the resolution was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1544) to provide for cooperation of Central American republics in the construction of an inter-American highway.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 1544, with Mr. SANDERS in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. We have under consideration at this time Senate bill 1544, and I call attention to the fact that this bill passed the Senate unanimously on May 26, 1941. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who preceded me stated that there were certain things about this resolution that were not quite fully understood, and that it seemed to have been introduced for just a specific purpose. If the gentleman had read the report with reference to the bill he could not have been deceived in any way nor have any misunderstanding, because the report specifically goes into all the details. I shall read a few of them from a letter written by the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, dated April 28, 1941, and which is included in the report. In this the Secretary of State enumerates seven different points. First there is the improved transportation within and between the several Latin-American countries and the United States; second, the development of new lands and new natural resources, and increased consumption of American imports; third, increased employment and maintenance of economic structures; four, increased tourist traffic; five, increased market for American automobiles, parts, garage equipment, and so forth; six, defense value—that seems to have been what the gentleman from Indiana is complaining about. That is what Mr. Hull was saying.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman read No. 6 in respect to defense value for the benefit of the House?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts I read No. 6:

6. Defense value. While defense considerations have not motivated the suggestion for an outright contribution by this Government to the construction of the highway, the War and Navy Departments believe that a through highway from the United States to the Panama Canal would be of real value from the standpoint of the defense of the Caribbean area. The importance of political stability in all the countries of the Western Hemisphere at this time can hardly be exaggerated and this is in turn largely dependent upon the maintenance of economic stability. The project contemplated by this proposed legislation will contribute directly to the maintenance of order, as improved communications will give the established governments in these countries materially more effective control over any attempted subversive activities within their borders and the actual work of construction would substantially assist in safeguarding the economic situation in these countries.

I think that answers the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and there are other things which answer all of the objections which have been made, if any one will take time to read the report on the bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has been very anxious to get all the information possible to present to the House. When we realized that this matter was likely to come up at this time, last week, I think December 10, the Committee on Foreign Affairs called an informal meeting, and invited the Chief of Staff and other people to appear before the committee so that we might bring that information down to date. We wanted to know what is really happening today, and not last week. At that time the members who were there, Democrats and Republicans, were, I believe, all of the same opinion that the bill should pass and pass immediately. When the matter was before the Committee on Rules the question was asked as to how this would aid in the matter of defense. I had no idea of making this a defense measure. It was partly a defense measure and partly for other purposes, as outlined by the Secretary of State, and at the suggestion of the Committee on Rules the Chief of Staff wrote a letter under date of July 16, 1941. The letter is signed by General Marshall, Chief of Staff. In that letter he says:

As stated by Mr. Hull in his letter to the President, dated April 28, 1941, this highway would be of importance to national defense in that it would assist in maintaining the political and economic stability of Central American republics. By improving communications within these countries, the maintenance of order therein would be facilitated. The friendly attitude toward the United States of all countries in the Western Hemisphere is of great value to the United States.

The Foreign Affairs Committee did not feel they wanted to bring this before the Committee on Rules as a defense measure.

We wanted to stand on what the Secretary had said and other people who had appeared before our committee. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to this statement. This statement was authorized to be made after war was declared.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman state what was the date of that?

Mr. BLOOM. December 10. This was before the informal meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Chief of Staff is of opinion that the road would be of great military benefit, that it would insure military communications, insure land communications, no matter what the situation should be by sea.

I would like to state that about half of the road—please do not confuse this now. This has nothing to do with the road that Mexico is building. Mexico has built its road from Laredo down below Mexico City about 365 miles. But this road starts at the end of the Mexican road and goes from the Mexican border down to the Canal. About 50 percent of this road has already been built. The engineers stated before the committee that they could use this road for military purposes or for any other purpose. The bridges are strong enough to carry the load; 50 percent of the road through these different countries has already been completed, but the completed sections are not contiguous. They have to complete this road to make it a connecting road.

There has been something said about one-third that the countries of Central America will contribute. They will contribute that mostly in labor. Most of this money is spent in this country for material, but they furnish the labor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Supplementing what the gentleman has said about the majority of expenditures being made in this country, Secretary Hull's report states that at least 80 or 90 percent of the appropriation will be spent for materials in this country—machinery and otherwise; and that practically 80 to 90 percent of our appropriation will be spent for materials in this country.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. Is it to be financed wholly or in part by the United States?

Mr. BLOOM. Two-thirds by the United States and one-third by other countries, but that will be done after the different countries by their governments have agreed to contribute that much money so as to complete the road.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Now, this is a good bill, and the bill should be passed.

Mr. BLOOM. Then we will stop right now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I will not stop. I want to stop you from making a mistake. There is no defense in this bill. Do not try to tell us that all of this money is going to be spent in the United States. It is not. Ninety percent of all road-building money is spent for labor, and we know it. We are not going to furnish labor in the United States. So why do you not predicate your case upon the fact that we will make this donation to establish good will?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman take another minute? I want to give him a little advice.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield myself an additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why do you not predicate your case upon the fact that we are building good will, which will redound to the benefit of the United States for generations to come, and let it go at that?

Mr. BLOOM. I am satisfied.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If you predicate it on that, you would not be doing justice to the military and diplomatic implications in this bill. Simply because some people cannot see that is no reason why it does not exist.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] says that 90 percent will be spent for labor. The gentleman was not before the Rules Committee and did not hear the engineers testify that this would be peon labor and would cost very little down there.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry.

Mr. MICHENER. And in answer to the question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], Secretary Hull's letter was written before we were in war and when we had material. If this road is built now it is to take steel and iron that we need for our national defense, and I again charge that everybody from the State Department and from the Engineers' department and the road builders of the country stated that there was no national defense here other than the good-will or the good-neighbor phase of the matter and that this road could not be used as a military road.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation for this international highway is not new to this House. This is road legislation which has been in our regular road committee as a part of our regular Federal-aid plan. I wish that our Road Committee, which is so conversant with road construction, had this bill and that we could give it calm and more thorough deliberation.

The bill has been before us on numerous occasions on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, and was objected to several times because in my opinion it carried too much money for such hasty action. It was passed over without prejudice on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar at a time when we were attempting to pass a road bill which had to do with our own national-defense highways and access roads to our various camps and defense industries.

But we have the bill here today with the recommendations of the Secretary of State and the War Department that it is for national and hemispheric defense and is also needed to tie in with our program of the good-neighbor policy.

Much work has already been done on this road, and, of course, no one in this hour of our grave crisis would argue against roads from the United States to the Panama Canal nor from the southern countries northward to the Canal. This is absolutely necessary. No one opposes that argument.

But we should know what we are doing and our people who are anxious about the roads in our own country are entitled to know what we are doing. This legislation authorizes the expenditure of $20,000,000 for our participation in the construction of the International Highway. In other words, we match funds with the foreign governments south of us to build this road. We know that the $20,000,000 will not be enough. Much more money must be spent.

We are told here that about 90 percent of the money expended will be spent in our country for bridge material, steel, and machinery. I wonder about priorities. I wonder about how we can spare this machinery and steel and material now. We should know something about who will have jurisdiction over this highway and who will maintain it after it is completed. These and many other questions I sincerely hope will be fully discussed and explained before final passage. The entire program is far beyond the dreams of our highway builders who know of the incomplete conditions of the roads and highways in our own country. Of course, the bill is going to be passed because we are at war and because our Army officials and the officials of our State Department tell us it is needed for our national and hemispheric defense. But I hope that we will give the matter full and careful consideration and at the same time do not forget our own American needs so far as roads and highways are concerned. I hope that the passage of this legislation for highways in foreign countries will in no way stop the orderly method of Federal and State highway programs in our own country.

I appeal at this time to those of you who are so interested in this road to give as much attention to our farm-to-market and secondary roads in our own country. Many of our farmers who are loyal and patriotic still live on mud roads and do not have all-weather roads. We are in a war which, God grant, we will win. Our farmers are united with all of us in this mighty task to win victory. They are now called upon to feed our Army and Navy and our civilian population. Roads to the great storehouse of American food are badly needed. So, in passing this legislation let us not forget the farmer and let us help him also to get out of the mud in order that the badly needed food can move rapidly to our distribution centers.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to ask a few questions of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]. Is this a real national-defense measure in this bill?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, there is no question about it. I read it to you. Everyone says that.

Mr. STEFAN. It has been testified that that testimony was made before we went into war.

Mr. BLOOM. General Marshall, Secretary Hull, the Army and the Navy and everyone says so.

Mr. STEFAN. I also want to know whether or not any members of the House Committee on Roads were consulted in connection with that, or did they appear before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BLOOM. They were not exactly consulted, but the chairman of the Roads Committee asked at one time if I would consent to have this joined with the omnibus roads bill. I believe I took it up with the committee or some of the members of the committee and they thought we should let this road stand separately.

Mr. STEFAN. I should like to know who is going to have jurisdiction over this road? How wide is the road going to be? How long is the road going to be? Will it use the bridges already installed and constructed in Central America at our expense?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York to answer my question.

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will read the report and the letter from the Secretary of State he will see that jurisdiction over the construction of this road is practically within the Government of the United States; and, furthermore, please remember there are quite a few of these bridges already built.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman. I ask that he do not take too much of my time, which is limited.

Mr. BLOOM. I am trying to answer the gentleman. He asked me a question. He should let me answer.

Mr. MICHENER. Just one minute; is not the gentleman from New York mistaken over the question of jurisdiction? Jurisdiction of the road is entirely in the country through which the road passes; at least we were so told by the State Department. The State Department said it would interfere with the sovereignty of those nations if we attempted to exercise control over the road.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask one more question of the chairman of the committee. We built a bridge in one of the Central American countries some years ago at a point where it has been frequently said there was no road either north, south, east, or west. If it is true, as the chairman said, that this is going to be a national-defense road, I should like to know whether the road is still laid out as to take advantage of this bridge.

Mr. BLOOM. I have heard that story often. I should like to say to the gentleman that there is absolutely no truth to the story——

Mr. STEFAN. Just a moment. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman asked me a question. I am trying to give him an answer. There are roads up to that bridge from both directions and the roads are being used. There is absolutely no truth, I want to say——

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked me a question. Certainly I am entitled to answer him.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STEFAN. I yielded to the gentleman to answer a question, and he has answered it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield further.

Mr. STEFAN. I asked the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee whether this bridge was being used. He said it was completed and was being used. The distinguished gentleman has answered my question, and I thank him.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I realize the serious crisis we face, and I am glad we can have such frank debate because we are all united in the main objective—to win this war and in no way obstruct anything which will add to our defense. We from the Middle West have long been without good roads and we are anxious to eventually have an all-weather road to all of our farms. The people in Nebraska can be depended upon to do their full share in this crisis. I join with many others who have taken the floor today in this debate to second the statement made by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I know he has expressed the feeling that is in my heart at this moment. I know the same feeling exists in the hearts of every Member here. I agree with him that we are not Republican Congressmen nor Democratic Congressman so far as party affiliation is concerned. That we are all American Congressmen and that we, all of us, are united together behind the administration to win this war is a true fact. It is something, Mr. Chairman, which, in my opinion, will win this war. It means that America and every American is united today as never before in our entire history. God grant that we will always be so united.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself sufficient time to read a letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I have before me a letter from the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency written to me under date of July 7, 1941, giving definite information regarding the Choluteca Bridge in Honduras which was built cooperatively by the United States Government and the Government of Honduras. When rumors first started to be circulated about this bridge I went into it very carefully. I do not want to make any statement of which I am not sure, or state any fact which I have not investigated. I read from this letter the following:

> The bridge is located contiguous to the city of Choluteca, which is the largest city on the Pacific side of Honduras, having a population of approximately 14,000. The bridge approach at the city end is through a city park completed after the construction of the bridge and gives access to the main streets of the city. The approach at the other end of the bridge is approximately 1 mile long, constructed to connect the bridge with an existing highway, partly macadamized, extending approximately 26 miles to the only port of Honduras on the Pacific coast at San Lorenzo.
>
> The Choluteca River, which is crossed by the structure, is nearly 1,000 feet wide, and the bridge from out-to-out of masonry anchorages is 1,088 feet long.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Committee that the Foreign Affairs Committee went into this matter thoroughly. If there was any complaint or any suggestion, we took it up with the proper authority to get the information. This proves that your committee wanted to be absolutely correct in any representation that it made before the House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that my views on this legislation will have very much weight, but, nevertheless, I would like to get rid of them. First of all, may I say with reference to the road to which reference was made up through British Columbia to Alaska, I have long been an advocate of that road as a means of defense for the United States. We have in Alaska one of our greatest and richest possessions and it is amenable to attack, very dangerous attack. But with a road properly constructed through British Columbia behind the mountains, this country would be able to transfer its defense materials and its normal commerce to that great section of our country in a way that would be as free from attack as any road that I know of.

With reference to this proposed Central American road, I am almost afraid that you gentlemen will think I am a theorist, and you practical men, of course, have no use for a theorist. This road to me is a symbol of one of the greatest historic realities in the history of the world. For long years I have watched our beloved country, greatest of all nations, gradually emerging through the mist and gloom of historic uncertainty into a position of world leadership. And the first portion of the world over which the light of our leadership must shine is the Continents of North and South America and the nations of Central America. This road I have looked upon as an undertaking to open up an artery through which could flow back and forth the moral, the intellectual, and economic exchanges and influences which would place this Nation of ours in the position of recognized friendship and leadership on these continents, which position it must occupy if we fulfill our destiny and assist the other American nations to fulfill theirs.

So, for this reason, and this reason alone, not because it is a great defense necessity—I hope to God that the defense necessity will not last very long—but because it will open an artery for the exchange of those divine realities that create the unity and brotherhood of men, I support this measure. I want to see these countries, these republics with a representative form of government, gradually take within themselves through this and other avenues those influences that will make this a country spiritually united with South America, as it is with Canada to the north of us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I interpret my distinguished friend's remarks correctly, in addition to the national-defense significance, this has a far greater significance, a moral value which cannot be estimated in terms of dollars?

Mr. EATON. The gentleman is exactly correct. This war is not going to last forever, I hope. If we cannot win this war in a reasonable time, I shall be

surprised and grieved beyond measure. When it is won, then we will have to live in this world, not as a conqueror, not as an embattled force, but as a friend, as a brother, as a leader, as an inspirer of freedom everywhere, and the way to do that is to open and enlarge all useful lines of communication with other peoples. This proposed road is one of those useful lines. I agree with every member of my committee that we ought to vote for this measure today and get on with the job of building the road.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid, forthright, honest, fine statement as to his reasons for supporting this proposal and to say to him that, insofar as this road represents an extension of the good-neighbor policy, as we call it, I can see very much argument in its favor; and particularly do I want to commend the gentleman because he has based his support for this proposal on those values as distinguished from some of these other alleged military values about which I think there can be serious question.

Mr. EATON. I thank the gentleman, and may I say in reply that I have a vision of John Smith and his wife and children from Ohio or Indiana or Iowa or other outlying districts, even from New Jersey, driving down, getting acquainted with these various peoples, carrying the message of friendly North America to them, and bringing back their friendly message to us. That is the basis upon which I support this measure.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman believe that John Smith and his wife and these others are going to have any money to buy an automobile if we keep on building roads in South America and paying for them when we are in debt as we are?

Mr. EATON. My answer to that is this: Once Henry Ford got busy producing millions of cars, John Smith somehow got the money to build the necessary roads and buy the automobiles.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman would not make the same kind of a speech in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway, would he?

Mr. EATON. No. I do not think that project is necessary at this time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, when this bill came before our committee last June I was against it. I said, "We are not going into a policy of putting Central America on W. P. A." But during the hearings and from information obtained outside of the hearings I saw a great light. I saw that in these critical times one great difficulty, one great embarrassment is that our currents of trade and culture run too much east and west, and it is a vital matter to the defense of our hemisphere that these currents of culture and trade run north and south.

I, like many of you, have voted for hundreds of millions of dollars to make those currents run north and south in the name of the good-neighbor policy. Another name for that policy is hemispheric solidarity or hemispheric defense. That is what is involved in this bill and that is all that is involved—a broad, diplomatic, economic, political, military view of what is involved in our national defense.

There are two phases to defense. One is strictly military, the other involves the other considerations. As to whether this road could be used for strictly military purposes, it is in the testimony that it can be so used. Certain sections of the road are heavily built for full military use.

On page 13 of the hearings, in answer to questions which I asked, Mr. James, Chief of the Division of Highway Transport, told us of the strength of the bridges to be used on this road. A road is only as strong as its bridges. I said:

Do you have a uniform test for the bridges?

He said:

Yes.

I said:

What would that test be?

He said:

We are using, to use the technical lingo, our H–15–SW. That means roughly two 15-ton trucks parallel on the bridge lined up at ordinary running distance.

He defined it this way:

It is just like Cooper's railroad loading for locomotives. It corresponds to a formula and is a standard of recognized capacity of bridges.

I do not believe it is telling any secret to you to say that Mr. James' testimony given in the committee was not stated in terms of trucks but in terms of military equipment, but because of the precarious diplomatic situation last June we gave the engineers and the others the right to revise their testimony and to eliminate any words that would be embarrassing to any of our departments in the tense diplomatic situation which faced us then.

Let us not forget, as far as our defense is concerned, that one of the six Central American nations has changed its government since this bill was reported. Mr. Arias, of Panama, is no longer the President. The diplomatic situation existing when this bill was under consideration and since that time was the reason the Department of State desired to have this bill postponed rather than come up for open debate, because they knew that some of the things that are being said today would have to be said to get this bill through.

As the result of my study, as the result of things I learned on and off the record, I was one of those who were strong for this bill and helped to make our committee unanimous in favor of it last June, long before war was declared.

I invite your attention to the last significant sentence on page 4 of the report, which has far more meaning than the words can convey, because we do not wish to give information to our enemies, as we did not then wish to give information to prospective enemies:

Information developed by the committee shows that the rules and regulations for the operation of the Inter-American Highway will insure the free use of the highway by the United States and the other American countries.

Part of these assurances are by treaty obligation, as shown by a letter from Secretary Hull dated June 5, in which he stated:

I feel fully warranted in assuring you that the "satisfactory assurances" stipulated in the pending bill can be promptly secured.

He mentioned the treaties between the United States and the other 20 American republics, and said these—

stipulations are already in fact a matter of treaty obligation under the provisions of the "convention on the Pan-American Highway" signed at Buenos Aires in 1936.

So we have assurances which do not leave the control of this road to the will of these countries through which it passes. True, the sovereignty is preserved, but the jurisdiction of the conduct of the road, as to whether there shall be tolls, as to the age of the drivers, as to discrimination between drivers, as to use for national defense—all of those matters are guaranteed to us by treaty stipulation and by further firm understandings with these nations.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. To what extent is this country committed to the maintenance of this road after it is constructed?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It is not committed to the maintenance of the road. The maintenance of the road is presumably to be taken care of by the nations involved. I do not kid myself as to what this eventually may mean. If it is necessary for our national interests to keep this road maintained, and it is not maintained, we shall probably be doing it with American money. However, the understanding is that we have no commitment to maintain it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I understand that under the terms of this bill the United States is supposed to pay two-thirds of the cost, one-third of the cost to be borne by the local governments.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I have heard also in the debate this afternoon that the one-third will represent principally labor cost. Can the gentleman inform the Committee whether or not the one-third the local countries will pay will be based on American labor prices or on the wage scales down there?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understand it will be based on the local prices. Both labor and material where available will be furnished by the local governments.

The gentleman from Michigan said this road is a good-will gesture, to be built through such countries as may be decided. This bill provides that unless and until all of the six countries are in the club and all of them agree either to contribute their third or, in certain instances, more than the third, and until the whole deal will not cost the United States more than two-thirds, none of the road is to be started. These provisions can be put in there because I have a very strong idea that such arrangements are already probably well under way.

One more word as to defense. I urge your careful study of this section 6 of the report on "defense value," to get the significance of statements that must be made in diplomatic language and not in the sometimes offensive language of the street as to the stability of the Central American sister republics of ours.

The report states, under "Defense Value"—

The importance of political stability in all the countries of the Western Hemisphere at this time can hardly be exaggerated.

The political stability of those countries under friendly governments is what? Part of our hemisphere defense.

Section 6 continues on page 3:

The project contemplated by this proposed legislation will contribute directly to the maintenance of order, as improved communications will give the established governments in these countries materially more effective control over any attempted subversive activities within their borders.

What is the opposite of an established government? A revolutionary government. What do we mean by attempted subversive activities? This road running between these States will give more effective control to the friendly governments now in power over any revolutionary activities which might be tied up with the Axis influences that we know are in those countries now. So the preservation of the economy of these countries on a sound basis, preservation of our diplomatic relations with these countries and the political stability of the countries—every one of these elements is an interest in what? In our defense, in the defense of our hemisphere, and that is why I say that it is perfectly proper to say that this is primarily a defense measure, just as all the phases of the good-neighbor policy at this time constitute a defense of our hemisphere and our system in opposition to those that would destroy it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think there is no question but what there is a great deal of merit in the gentleman's argument about the defense characteristics of this road, and we are all determined to win this war, but I want to say to the gentleman that this bill is dated May 27, and the hearings before the gentleman's committee were in June.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The rule was reported in July. I hope through our interest in national defense we will not be led through hysteria created by our declaration of war to adopt the policy in the Congress of scratching our brains to put the label of defense on everything that comes along and try to cram it through the House 6 months later.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and I will be the first to oppose measures brought over here under the spurious name of defense.

We also have assurance to comfort some of you that this road will not be carried on at the expense of more important defense matters.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. BLOOM. I just want to make the correction that the rule was reported on December 10, and not in July.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think my chairman will agree that it has been the policy of this Government not to have this bill come up for the sort of debate we are having here now during the precarious times we have gone through in the past 6 months, but now since we are joined in declarations of war against our common enemies by all of these republics, now it can be told.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that many people now on the Government pay roll in other departments will be used for national defense, thereby saving money in these departments? Huge national activities will in the end save some money being expended by the different departments not on actual defense.

Also, is it not true that much of Hitler's efficiency and success is because of the excellent road system he installed?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree, of course, with the statement of the chairman of the committee, but the rule was dated July 9, and it is generally recognized, I think, that the Rules Committee is pretty well controlled by the administration.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to know how long after this road is started it will be before it is completed.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It would take five years in the normal course of events. They had hopes of completing it in two and a half years. This will depend on how much money is spent and also upon a number of considerations, but that was the testimony before war was declared. Now they are thinking in terms of 18 months.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The gentlewoman from Illinois asked when this road would be completed. This road has been started and is being worked on at the present time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] states that this road is now being built. I may call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there was a very interesting picture shown here within a week at one of the local theaters, showing the progress being made in the construction of this road. I am sure every Member of the House would be tremendously interested in seeing this picture.

Mr. Chairman, the people of San Francisco endorse this proposed highway and we hope you will pass unanimously S. 1544 this afternoon.

The highway will provide a supply and communication line to the Panama Canal, which under present war conditions will greatly facilitate the defense of the entire North American Continent. It will tend to make this portion of the Western Hemisphere well-nigh impregnable to invasion.

The war in Europe has demonstrated that good roads for the movement of mechanized units are almost as important as are the different types of equipment.

With the highway completed it would be possible for the United States to keep a moving wall of fighting machines along every inch of the continent and make almost impossible the massing of troops and equipment by any foreign enemy.

Not alone for war purposes but also in times of peace, this highway should prove of inestimable value.

With the road completed to the Canal we may look forward confidently to some time in the future of building a road in South America from the Canal to Cape Horn and all our neighbors will be drawn closer and closer to us.

We of San Francisco hope you will give the signal for this great project to go ahead.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I recently took a trip through each and every Central American country and I made it a point to go out and take a look at this road in each Central American country. A question was asked here awhile ago, based on the supposition that these countries have not as yet started to construct this road. That is erroneous. The road is under construction in each and every Central American country at the present time. I rode over it for hundreds of miles.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Then some of the arguments on this floor are very much out of date.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest to the lady from Illinois that I am not responsible for the arguments made on this floor.

I had seen the road, it is there, it is being constructed by the engineers of the Public Roads Administration who are employed by these Central American countries. I saw those men; I had contact with them in each of these countries, and I went out over the road with them.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Of course this road has been under construction for a long time. What they are trying to do is to finish connecting links through the jungles.

Mr. CARTER. That is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. I said in my remarks that 50 percent of this road is already completed, but it is not continuous. What we are trying to do is to complete the road, and the engineers the other day said it would take about 16 to 18 months to make it solid through to the Panama Canal.

Mr. CARTER. The statement of the gentleman from New York is correct. There are gaps that must be completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Some of the best engineers of the Public Roads Administration are down there on this construction work. Their salaries and expenses are being paid by the country in which they are working. They are building a splendid highway. They are building it on the standards that we use in this country in the construction of highways. I have a number of pictures of this highway, and I regret that I do not have them here with me at this moment. Outside of the jungles, in going through the mountains and the uplands, the road is far less expensive than building on similar terrain in the United States, because they do not have a rocky formation. I could show pictures of cuts 150 feet deep that are just earth, which is readily handled. I believe this road will be a decided asset to this country, and while in times when our taxes are increasing I hesitate and very carefully scrutinize expenses other than those strictly for military purposes, yet I believe an expenditure of this kind for this purpose is justified.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT].

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly trace the history of the Pan-American Highway.

In 1924 a group of Latin American engineers meeting in Washington with highway leaders of the United States, first proposed one continuous highway joining all the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In the furtherance of that idea the United States always has maintained a position of leadership. Our system of highways under the wise guidance of the Public Roads Administration is second to none on this hemisphere and in the world. Because of the interdependency of the American nations it has long been considered to our economic, cultural, and diplomatic advantage, highly necessary that our sister republics to the south should have a fully developed system of highways. The forerunner of that system is the Pan-American Highway.

United States leadership in highway affairs has been manifest in many ways. The meeting of the Latin American engineers at the Pan American Union on June 30, 1924, was preliminary to the first Pan-American Highway Congress, held the following year in Buenos Aires, Argentina. At Buenos Aires began an interchange of technical information between the nations that provided the latin countries, then in the early stages of their highway development, with invaluable benefits of research and investigation that would be difficult to evaluate in terms of dollars and cents. The engineer of the United States and the engineer of Latin America came to know each other, and each to respect the qualifications and abilities of the other. Through successive congresses, by means of publications, by the translations of our technical data into Spanish and into Portuguese, by the preparation of a glossary of technical terms in English, Spanish, and Portuguese, there has developed a sense of comradeship and understanding among the men who administer and who build the highway transportation systems of the New World.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of a Pan-American Highway had spontaneous and almost instant acceptance on the part of the public. Work progressed in each of the several countries as the economy of the respective nations would permit, but planning was necessary, surveys were needed, routes had to be determined, and funds forthcoming for a project whose total cost would be staggering in any times but these.

As the highway progressed, with each country devoting large sums to its construction, it became important that roads should meet at boundaries, that standards of construction should be uniform that signs and signals generally used in one country, likewise should be familiar to those of every nation.

In 1929 and 1930 the Pan-American Highway Confederation, which the Latin American engineers had organized to make a reality of the Pan-American Highway, took the initiative in arranging a reconnaissance survey to determine the route of the highway from the United States-Mexican border to the Panama Canal.

As the United States share in the costs of that survey, the Congress authorized an appropriation of $50,000, to pay the expenses of engineers from the United States Bureau of Public Roads taking part in that reconaissance. Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala also gave engineering assistance. This was followed by a location survey and, as funds would permit, by construction projects on the part of the countries of Central America. By arrangement with the Mexican Government, the Mexican-Guatemala road will be joined at the Suchiate River. The results of our participation were reported to the Congress by the President in a message dated March 6, 1934.

Following this notable achievement, the engineer of the United States and the engineer of Latin America worked harmoniously for a common aim. Technicians from the United States Bureau of Public Roads, now the Public Roads Administration, were assigned to the task of giving technical aid and counsel to the Latin-American Governments.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress will recall that later this Government appropriated $1,000,000 for the cooperative construction of a number of bridges over the principal streams in Central America, providing impetus and encouragement for nations whose economy could not at that time afford the purchase of the raw materials necessary to this construction. I should hasten to add that the countries themselves provided the labor used in the construction of these bridges, our funds being devoted solely to technical advice, when requested, and to providing the necessary steel, cement, and other materials going into bridge construction.

Since that time the United States has found it desirable to extend credit to many of these countries for the specific purpose of constructing important sections of the Pan American Highway, with every reason to believe that the improved economy of these nations will enable them presently to repay the money we loaned.

But, if we are to see the completion of this highway, it is felt that the United States must give an even greater measure of cooperation than it has heretofore, demonstrating in a very practical way, at this critical time in the Nation's history, the need for inter-American and pan-American solidarity in our common defense against a common enemy.

In connection with the tragic events of the last few days, I would remind the Congress that certain of these nations, apprised of the unwarranted and treacherous attack upon the United States, hastened to aline themselves on the side of this Nation by a declaration of war against Japan before we ourselves took that formal step.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to attend the Fourth Pan-American Highway Congress in Mexico this year as delegate on the part of the United States. I am happy to report to the Congress the serious consideration given by the engineers of the 21 republics to highways and highway-transport problems of this hemisphere. With due consideration to the troubled affairs of the world, the Congress, nevertheless, was enthused at the great progress in the construction of this overland link uniting the peoples of the Americas. But the problem given the most serious debate was how best to provide funds for the construction of this important highway. It was the considered opinion of the Congress, embodied in a recommendation to the Pan-American Highway finance committee, that the committee prepare a report embodying a formula allocating the cost of the highway on the bas's of benefits received by the several governments. The delegates to the Fourth Pan-American Highway Congress, the members of the United States delegation among them, recognized that those countries whose exports are not great, are not able to provide exchange sufficient to purchase in our markets the materials for the completion of

this road. Furthermore, the Congress of the United States should recognize the military value of the Pan-American Highway en route to the Canal and be prepared to aid our neighbors to breach those uncompleted portions of the road.

Mr. Chairman, the Pan-American Highway is the Burma Road of the Western Hemisphere, an integral part of the defense mechanism of the North American Continent, and vital to the economy, safety, and well-being of the people of the New World.

While two-thirds of the 3,200 miles from the Mexican border to the Canal is open, the highway is valueless for overland traffic until the mountainous regions of Costa Rica, the lowlands of Nicaragua, and all uncompleted portions are open to our tourists, our commerce, and our defense agencies. This Congress should authorize the appropriation of $20,000,000, sought in this bill, in frank recognition of our debt to our neighbors and of benefits to be received from the completion of that portion of the Pan American Highway from our border to the Canal.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND].

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, it is especially heartening to me as the Representative of the people of Alaska in this body to see such virtual unanimity of opinion with respect to the building of a highway to the south of the United States as far as the Panama Canal. If it were in order today, and if I thought it could be done without injuring the chance of the passage of the present bill, I would offer an amendment providing for the construction of a highway that, in my judgment, is at least equally necessary from a military standpoint, and that is the construction of a highway to the Territory of Alaska. I am grateful to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], also to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who spoke on the subject a few days ago, for having invited the attention of the House to the feasibility, the propriety, and the necessity of building a highway to the last great frontier Territory of the United States, Alaska. For every reason that can be adduced for our support of the measure now before us, even more appealing reasons can be given for the building of a highway to Alaska through the Dominion of Canada. There seems to be some argument, dispute, or question as to whether or not this highway to the Pamana Canal can be justified on the grounds of national defense.

With respect to the highway to Alaska that question can never arise. The road to Alaska will indisputably serve the purposes of national defense. And in time of stress or danger it may serve the same purposes of national defense with respect to our Nation that the famed Burma Road serves to the present Government of China, a road which has saved China and the Chinese Government from annihilation.

It is singular, indeed, that the executive authorities of our Government have not been here before asking for the construction of a highway to Alaska upon the ground of national defense alone. That highway which, contrary to the opinion of so many people will be impassable a great part of each year, is readily traversable for every day of every year, and without which it may some day, and that soon, be impossible to supply our defense forces and the civilian population of Alaska.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time entirely for the purpose of replying to a question directed to the chairman a few moments ago by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. Although he has temporarily left the chamber I am sure I shall say nothing to which he would object. The gentleman asked the chairman of our committee if he did not know as a matter of fact that about 80 percent of the cost of highway construction was for labor, and indicated that, therefore, the statement which the chairman had made that 80 or 90 percent of this money would be spent in America, could not be correct. I read from a letter from the Secretary of State to the President on this subject:

> A most significant factor in this connection is that at least 80 percent, and possibly 90 percent or more, of the entire amounts appropriated under this bill would be spent for the purchase of American machinery and equipment for transportation thereof on American vessels and for salaries of American engineers.

What the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], I think, overlooked was the fact that each of those countries is to contribute at least one-third of the cost of the road in it and further the low cost of labor in those countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 1½ minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use all the time allotted me.

Much debate has been heard. I think if the entire membership of the House could have been present when the Foreign Affairs Committee was holding hearings upon this bill and could have heard all of the evidence with reference to it as did the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who admits that his opposition was changed to support by the hearings, there would not be a single vote in this House against the bill.

I am for the bill not only for the reasons so well stated by those who have heretofore spoken in support of it but for the further reason that it is necessary for us to pass this bill in order to cash in upon the sums we have already spent upon this highway. During the last 12 years the United States has appropriated and spent $330,000 for surveys on this highway, engineering advice, and assistance, and $2,540,000 for surveys and construction work in Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. With $1,500,000 of this amount appropriated to the War Department, and with an Export-Import Bank loan of $2,500,000 to Panama, which is now constructing 56 miles of reinforced concrete pavement between the Canal Zone and Rio Hato, the site of a United States Army airport.

I am for this bill because it is a good peacetime measure. It is good for commerce. It is for the good-neighbor policy. But it is more important now when we are attacked both from the Atlantic and the Pacific and we want hemispheric solidarity and defense. I am for it because the countries in which this money will be spent have shown their patriotism and their loyalty to the United States by declaring war upon our common enemies, and we cannot better respond than by passing this bill for our benefit, for their benefit, and for the benefit of American solidarity and American defense. It is a peacetime measure. It is also essential as a wartime measure. I shall not detain the House longer, but hope that this measure will pass by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum not to exceed $20,000,000 to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the proposed Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid republics. Expenditures of such sums in any such country shall be subject to the receipt of a request therefor and of satisfactory assurances from the government of that country that appropriate commitments have been made by such government to assume at least one-third of the expenditures proposed to be incurred henceforth by that country and by the United States in the survey and construction of such highway within the borders of such country. In no such country shall the expenditures of this Government from the appropriations herein authorized exceed two-thirds of the total expenses henceforth incurred for said survey and construction in that country. No expenditures shall be made hereunder for the construction of said highway until the government of each of the above-named countries shall have given satisfactory assurance to the United States that it will assume at least one-third of the expenditures proposed to be incurred henceforth by that government and by the United States in the survey and construction of such highway within the borders of such country, or has given other assurances satisfactory to the President that it has made appropriate arrangements to complete such survey and construction within a reasonable period. All expenditures by the United States under the provisions of this act for material, equipment, and supplies shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the country in which such survey or construction work is being carried on.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the idea underlying the military necessity for this highway is not a new one. It is more than a century old. Immediately following the War of 1812 the military experts of this country and the political leaders of the Nation had two definite and clear ideas as to military preparation in the future. One was that

this country should have a much larger navy. The action of our Navy at that time demonstrated the value of such as a military necessity.

Andrew Jackson, afterward President Jackson, said after the battle of New Orleans he was convinced of the absolute necessity for a military system of transportation in the United States running from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

About 1832 he attempted to execute his ideas and appointed Army engineers to make surveys looking toward the construction of a railroad or a military highway running from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, or the southeastern seaboard. These engineers made surveys. Plans were worked out for the construction of such a system. The thought was that the road should run from the northwestern part of our country through the central Midwest to the Gulf of Mexico or some other southern point, preferably to a port on the South Atlantic seaboard. The idea was that the Midwest would furnish the food necessary for an army and would also furnish the equipment necessary for waging a war.

The prediction of these military experts of that time have practically come true a century afterward. A very large percentage of our defense industries today are located in that section of the country where President Jackson and others over 100 years ago said was destined to be the part of the country to manufacture and equip this Nation in case of war.

One of the greatest liabilities, as I see it, if this country should be further involved in the present war by having to repulse actual invasion of our continental territory would be the deplorable lack of this great military necessity, a great, you might say super, highway running from the Great Lakes to the southeastern seaboard and through Mexico. I just wanted to make this observation in connection with this bill, because if I am able to interpret and see aright, or catch the spirit of Andrew Jackson and others, the next step to be taken by this country in preparation for war, in preparation for national defense, will be the construction of military highways to meet any emergency that might arise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

(By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The survey and construction work authorized by this act shall be under the administration of the Public Roads Administration, Federal Works Agency, which shall consult with the appropriate officials of the Department of State with respect to matters involving the foreign relations of this Government, and such negotiations with the governments of the American republics named in section 1 as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act shall be conducted through, or as authorized by, the Department of State.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall not create or authorize the creation of any obligations on the part of the Government of the United States with respect to any expenditures for highway construction or survey heretofore or hereafter undertaken in any of the countries enumerated in section 1, other than the expenditures authorized by the provisions of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1544) to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway, pursuant to House Resolution 262, reported the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHEAT-MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. WICKERSHAM, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for printing under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
ELMER THOMAS,
E. D. SMITH,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill (H. R. 5726) as passed the House changes the method of determining the farm-marketing quota for wheat for 1941 and subsequent crop years for any farm producing less than a normal crop. The House bill provides that, in case of any such farm, penalties will be applicable only to the amount of wheat produced on the farm in excess of the normal production of the farm-acreage allotment instead of upon the actual production of the acreage planted in excess of the farm-acreage allotment, as is provided in existing law. The burden of establishing the actual production of any such farm is placed upon the producer.

The Senate amendment provides that the penalty on wheat shall not be applicable to that portion of the farm-marketing excess of the 1941 crop for any farm which is used as feed for livestock or poultry, or as seed, on the farm where grown.

The conference agreement accepts the House provision and omits the Senate provision.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
E. D. SMITH,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5726) "to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the conference report does?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I can best explain the conference report by asking that the Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read and the reservation of objection by the gentleman from Massachusetts to the consideration of the conference report will stand.

Is there objection to the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it this applies only to the feeding proposal?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This eliminates the Senate amendment and restores the bill to the condition in which it was when it left the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill now is the same as it passed the House in the first instance?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a brief letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a program of celebration in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights and addresses by Hon. Paul D. McNutt and Mr. Henry Monsky.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be helpful at this time to place in the RECORD and bring to the attention of the Members the farm supply situation over the Nation. I find that there is apprehension in some sections as to whether or not there is an adequacy of food and fiber to supply the population, the land and naval forces, and our Allies under war conditions. I find that in some quarters there is a tendency toward hoarding, and it is mainly to show the utter uselessness of attempting to hoard that I am taking this time.

It has also been suggested by a few that all restrictions and limitations on production should be lifted and the farmers be permitted and directed to go to producing without limit. Such action would not only wreck the A. A. A. program, deplete our soil, undo everything the farmer has worked for during the last 8 years, cause the loss of all soil-conservation payments, and strike down the protection the farmers now have through commodity loans and associated programs, but is not necessary in view of the supplies on hand.

Supplies of food in the United States are the largest we have ever had. The wheat supply is this year larger than ever before. It is as much as we use in 2 years. The supply of corn, the most important of our feed grains, is nearly the largest on record. The total supply of all feed grains is the largest in 20 years. The supply of the high protein feeds, cake, and meal from cottonseed, peanuts, soybeans, and so forth, is at a record level—10 percent above a year ago. Hay supplies are 3 percent larger than last year, 21 percent larger than the 1929–32 average.

These generous supplies of livestock feeds have made possible a large increase in our production of meats, dairy products, and poultry products. We have not only met domestic demands for livestock products but also furnished large quantities to our allies. Currently, the production of livestock products is at a high level and stocks of these products are large.

As in the case of foods, the supplies of other farm products are very large. In the case of cotton, our supply this year is 23,000,000 bales. This is more than our mills can spin in 2 years. If we do not have enough cotton goods it will be because of inadequate mill capacity, not because of too little raw cotton. Tobacco supplies are also very large. Our supplies of the flue-cured types are larger than ever before.

This enviable agricultural situation is the result of a farm policy which provides for strong reserve supplies of the chief farm products, for the adjustment of current production to market requirements, and for the conservation of our agricultural resources. It is a policy of balanced abundance. This policy has protected both producers and consumers. More important, it has given us an agricultural industry fully prepared for this emergency, capable of directing farm production so as to make the maximum contribution to the winning of this war.

The directing of farm production to wartime requirements does not mean unrestrained increases in the production of all farm products. It means the careful adjustment of each commodity so that land, labor, and equipment will make the maximum possible contribution. The production of some commodities will need to be increased substantially. For others smaller increases will provide for all contingencies. For some commodities no significant change will be advisable while there are a few which require downward adjustment or definite restraint on production.

Such a program of farm production has already been formulated for 1942 under the legislation enacted by the Congress. Agricultural production goals for 1942 were announced last fall. These provide for material increases in the production of those commodities for which expanded wants are in prospect, but these goals do not provide for increasing the production of such crops as cotton, wheat, and tobacco. For these crops restraining allotments and marketing quotas are provided. These are needed to avoid burdening our markets and storehouses with unneeded supplies, to save waste in the use of our resources, and to direct production efforts to those commodities of which we need more.

Mr. Speaker, I shall incorporate in my remarks a summary prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture showing in detail the amount of the principal farm commodities now on hand, the production for this year and the probable or estimated consumption for this year and in some cases the estimated needs and consumption for 1942. Those commodities include cotton, wheat, corn, feed-grain supplies, including corn; burley tobacco, flue-cured tobacco, hogs slaughtered, cattle slaughtered, egg production, milk production, fats and oils, and the sugar situation.

With respect to sugar, I would like to point out particularly that that is one of the commodities where the threat of hoarding has arisen. There seems to be some people who think we will not have enough sugar. I am sure by reference to this table, which will be incorporated in my remarks, you will observe that we now have an ample supply of sugar on hand and in prospect to take care of all the needs of the United States, the United Kingdom, and other countries which may find it necessary to call upon us for agricultural supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for every Member of Congress to understand and appreciate the Agricultural Adjustment Act enacted by the Congress in 1938. It is one of the most comprehensive measures that I believe the Congress has ever passed. It shows how foresighted were those who prepared the law, and it was mostly prepared by the conferees after the House had passed a bill and the Senate had passed a bill. I want to read one section which will allay the fears of many who seem to think that some particular legislation might be needed at this time in order to permit an increase in the production of farm commodities. I read from subsection (b), section 371, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act:

> If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency any national marketing quota for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, or tobacco should be increased, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase is necessary to meet such emergency. If on the basis of such investigation the Secretary finds that such increase is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding and the amount of the increase found to be necessary and thereupon such quota shall be increased.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that it was with foresight that this section was put into the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It covers the five commodities which were the original five under marketing-quota regulations, since amended so as to include the commodity peanuts. The amendment to the act including peanuts also amends this section to include them under it. In the case of any of the six quota commodities, therefore, there is today ample legislative authority whenever the need arises, if it should arise, for the Secretary to make an immediate investigation and either entirely lift the quotas or increase the quotas by such amount as he may think is necessary.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure we have enjoyed our colleague's discussion of this matter. There is one very important problem in connection with this production matter. I think the gentleman will agree that this accumulation has taken place during the time the farmers were able to secure ample labor. I would like to have the gentleman incorporate in his speech his opinion as to what might happen in connection with our national production due to a possible labor shortage that can take place very easily on our farms during the next year or two.

Mr. PACE. I do not think there is any doubt but what in some sections there will be a shortage of labor in 1942. I think that probably it will be the most critical situation the farmer has ever had. Then there is also going to be a shortage of farm implements. As the gentleman knows, the O. P. M. finally, reluctantly, I am afraid, agreed to supply the manufacturers of farm implements with 80 percent of previous requirements for farm implements. So

when we take that into consideration and when we take into consideration the number of those working on the farm who will be drafted into the military service and those who have answered the call of higher wages than the farmer can pay, going to defense projects, I am sure that many farmers in many sections of the country are going to encounter a serious labor shortage.

It is hoped, however, that there are still millions in the cities who are not in the military service or otherwise engaged who can supplant those who will leave the farms.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. I have a great deal of confidence in the gentleman's knowledge and experience and the work he is discussing right now.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAINES. What is concerning me quite a bit is that there is a revolt in my section, as well as in other sections in nearby Pennsylvania, particularly among the wheat growers, as to the marketing quota. I understand they are telling the people there is no need for curtailment of production of wheat. What does the gentleman know about that? If I understood him correctly, he stated that we had sufficient stores of wheat on hand to last us 2 years.

Mr. PACE. Let me give the gentleman the figures on wheat as prepared by the Department. We had a carry-over from 1940 of 387,000,000 bushels of wheat. We produced this year 961,000,000 bushels of wheat, about 100,000 000 bushels more than has ever been produced in this country since the Nation was founded. This gives us a total supply of 1,348,000,000 bushels. The average annual consumption is between 700,000,000 and 750,000,000 bushels, about one-half of the amount we have on hand.

Mr. HAINES. The gentleman refers to domestic consumption.

Mr. PACE. In addition, the Dominion of Canada now has on hand sufficient wheat to feed Canada and Great Britain for 2 years if they do not plant another seed.

I hope the gentleman understands, and I know he does, but I want to call it to his special attention, that there is an ultimate absorption point of wheat, and this country has just about reached it. In other words, try as you may, this Nation cannot consume over approximately 750,000,000 bushels of wheat, because it does not matter whether a boy is in the Army, on the farm, or in the store, he eats so much wheat. When we talk about getting rid of the surplus wheat, we may as well understand that we shall never get rid of it in a domestic way. The only way we shall ever get rid of any surplus wheat we may have will be either finding some new use for it, if possible, or else getting rid of it through export. So I say to the gentleman that wheat is one of the commodities, along with cotton and corn and rice and tobacco, where it is not necessary and it is not now contemplated that there will be any increase in the quotas.

Mr. HAINES. Let me express my appreciation to the gentleman for his illuminating explanation of something with which I was not fully acquainted.

Mr. PACE. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Of course, for the benefit of his own files he will have all the figures in the RECORD in the morning.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. Carrying on the thought expressed by our colleague from Pennsylvania, you can also show that our supply of agricultural products not only in Canada but in all the other countries that are friendly to us is such that these countries have the real surpluses of agricultural products, and I refer to Australia, New Zealand, and all the South American countries.

Mr. PACE. That is true. There is a bare possibility—I do not think it will happen—that 2 or 3 years from now there may be a little shortage in what we call fats and oils. To show how we have hedged against that possibility, the Department has already requested the soybean producers and the peanut producers of this country—and they, with cottonseed, are the great oil-producing commodities—to increase their production enormously next year. In the case of peanuts for oil, an increase of 77 percent has been requested.

In addition, as the gentleman has just stated, happily in South America there is today a surplus of wheat and a surplus of fats and oils. If anything should happen to our supply, it will not be necessary to pass through any war zone to get supplies of those commodities.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Certainly.

Mr. HAINES. As I understand, in the gentleman's opinion, it is absolutely necessary in our economy that we have a curtailment in the production of wheat this next year.

Mr. PACE. Not a further curtailment. I believe the quota has been set at 55,000,000 acres, and this means there will not be any change in that figure.

Mr. HAINES. Is that the amount of acreage we had this past year?

Mr. PACE. I think it is a little less than what we had, but let me mention this to the gentleman. Not only are we encountered with a large surplus, but we are also encountered with the problem of storage. We really have so much wheat and so much grain I am afraid much of it is going to be damaged because we do not have adequate storage facilities.

Mr. HAINES. The gentleman is very convincing to me, but I should like to have him come up and talk to my farmers on this subject. They will not agree with him.

Mr. PACE. It certainly would be a privilege to talk with your constituents whenever I had the opportunity.

Now, there is one other matter before I yield again that I would like to bring into the discussion about the Triple A, and that is many people seem to think it was enacted for the sole purpose of aiding the farmer. As I said before, it is a well-balanced act, and that was not its sole purpose. It has been very helpful, I think, to the producers of this Nation, but we have a saving clause that was put in there to meet the situation as it exists today, and that is this:

> In carrying out the purposes of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to give due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities through domestic production adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both the producers and the consumers.

I have always contended there is no need for price fixing, so far as farm commodities are concerned, because the Secretary of Agriculture under this act has absolute control of the surplus and the supply and is in position to dominate the price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the membership will take note of these tables. They are not mine, they are prepared by the Department, but when you go to your homes, if we have the opportunity to go there for the Christmas season, and you see any who have fears of a shortage in the supply of food and fiber, you can assure them that the Department of Agriculture is wide awake, the Committees on Agriculture of the Congress are wide awake, and whenever there is the slightest indication that there might at any time in the distant future be a shortage, we will go into action and see that the supply for the citizens of this Nation, the supply for our naval and land forces, and the supply for those allies who join with us against the common enemy, will be adequate for all needs.

Mr. Speaker, along with the tables I have referred to, I am also placing in the RECORD a statement by the Surplus Marketing Administration showing the commodities delivered for shipment to Great Britain for the period from April 29, 1941, to November 1, 1941:

Summary for chief commodities

Cotton:	*Bales*
Carry-over from 1940	12,000,000
Production in 1941	11,000,000
Total supply	23,000,000
Probable consumption and exports in 1941–42, 11,000,000 to 12,000,000 bales.	
Wheat:	*Bushels*
Carry-over from 1940	387,000,000
Production in 1941	961,000,000
Total supply	1,348,000,000
Probable consumption and exports in 1941–42, 700,000,000 to 750,000,000 bushels.	
Corn:	*Bushels*
Carry-over from 1940	632,000,000
Production in 1941	2,675,000,000
Total supply	3,307,000,000
Probable consumption and exports in 1941–42, 2,700,000,000 to 2,750,000,000 bushels.	
Feed-grain supply, including corn):	*Tons*
1939 supply	111,000,000
1940 supply	115,000,000
1941 supply	120,000,000
Burley tobacco:	*Pounds*
Carry-over from 1940	793,000,000
Production in 1941	389,000,000
Total supply	1,137,000,000

Probable consumption and exports in 1941–42, 350,000,000 pounds.

	Pounds
Flue-cured tobacco:	
Carry-over from 1940	1,593,000,000
Production in 1941	646,000,000
Total supply	2,239,000,000

Probable consumption and exports in 1941–42, 770,000,000 pounds.

Hog slaughter under Federal inspection (October to September):	
1938–39	39,720,000
1939–40	47,651,000
1940–41	47,999,000
Cattle slaughtered under Federal inspection (November to October):	
1938–39	9,452,000
1939–40	9,624,000
1940–41	10,742,000
Egg production (November to October):	
1938–39	37,889,000,000
1939–40	38,918,000,000
1940–41	40,184,000,000
	Pounds
Milk production (November to October):	
1938–39	111,000,000,000
1939–40	111,000,000,000
1940–41	116,000,000,000

FATS AND OILS SITUATION

Stocks in the United States are large, both of domestic and imported fats and oils. Production of oil in 1942 from domestic materials and imports from this hemisphere is likely to be larger than ever before. While imports from the Far East cannot be estimated accurately, the stocks already on hand and the increase in domestic supplies are sufficient to offset a very large decrease in such imports in 1942. In the meantime plans already are under way for large increases in the domestic production of oil crops to provide for increased requirements or reduced imports, or both, in late 1942 and in 1943.

Fats and oils

[Figures in millions of pounds]

Commodity	Estimated production and imports		Stocks Sept. 30, 1941	Estimated domestic consumption and exports	
	1941	1942		1941	1942
Butter	2,270	2,300	203	2,235	2,285
Lard	2,200	2,450	218	2,430	2,600
Other animal fats and oils	2,070	2,265	556	2,083	2,272
Corn oil	195	220	41	170	200
Cottonseed oil	1,500	1,250	272	1,615	1,265
Linseed oil	800	750	161	805	755
Peanut oil	175	200	34	157	203
Soybean oil	600	830	68	615	810
Coconut oil	850	900	250	810	875
Palm oil	300	450	125	335	425
Other imported oils	380	445	136	405	500
Total	11,340	12,090	2,063	11,660	12,190

Summary of sugar and high-test molasses situation, United States, United Kingdom, and Canada, for 1944

	Long tons
Estimated stocks, Jan. 1, 1942, in Cuba	279,000
Estimated cane available for 1942 crop, in terms of sugar	3,800,000
Total 1942 potential supply in Cuba for sugar and high-test molasses requirements	4,079,000

Summary of sugar and high-test molasses situation, United States, United Kingdom, and Canada, for 1944—Continued.

	Long tons
Estimated 1942 United States requirements from Cuba [1]	2,300,000
Cuban local consumption	200,000
Estimated requirements of United Kingdom and other countries	500,000
Total sugar requirements, United States, United Kingdom, etc.	3,000,000
Balance available for high-test molasses for United States, United Kingdom, and Canadian requirements	1,079,000

(NOTE.—Estimates of our requirements of high-test molasses for the manufacture of industrial alcohol vary from 600,000 short tons to 1,200,000 short tons, depending upon how much alcohol is counted upon from surplus grains.)

[1] This figure is calculated as follows:

	Short tons
Probable 1942 requirements for consumption (actual estimated consumption of 1941 plus 10 percent)	7,425,000
Further addition to excess stocks during 1941	None assumed
Available supplies:	
Beet sugar	1,750,000
Mainland cane	500,000
Puerto Rico	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,000,000
Philippines	300,000
Foreign countries other than Cuba	200,000
Total excluding Cuba	4,850,000
Required from Cuba	2,575,000
Same in long tons	2,300,000

Statement on the sugar supply situation for the United States, 1941, from hearings on price-control bill before Committee on Banking and Currency, p. 644

	Short tons, raw value
Stocks of sugar, Jan. 1, 1941:	
Stocks held by refiners, processors, etc. [1]	2,205,000
Stocks held by sugar-using manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, etc. [2]	918,000
	3,123,000
"Offshore" quota supplies, 1941 [3]	5,399,000
Continental sugar production, calendar year 1941 (estimated) [4]	2,035,000
Total supplies (excluding reserves in Cuba and elsewhere)	10,557,000
Distribution by primary distributors [5]	7,808,000
Stocks of sugar, Dec. 31, 1941	2,749,000
Additional increase in invisible stocks during 1941 [5]	540,000
Total actual stocks in the mainland, Dec. 31, 1941, excluding various reserves	3,289,000

(NOTE.—Other nearby reserves exist, the largest of which is approximately 1,000,000 tons of carry-over sugar in Cuba. This sugar is now divided into several categories: (1) About 400,000 tons reserved either for the United States or world market (which was financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in part), and (2) a reserve for the world market. With the limited world demand for sugar, at present, most of these sugars could, no doubt, be made available for the United States market, if required.)

[1] Including stocks by seaboard cane refiners, continental sugar processors, and importers of direct-consumption sugar, less over-quota sugars held by refiners or importers. Department of Agriculture official figures cover 100 percent of the industry.

[2] Stocks held by industries producing articles in which sugar is an ingredient, wholesalers and retailers. Above estimate is based on official data obtained by the Department of Agriculture covering firms who handle about half of the volume of sugar usage or distribution.

[3] Represents the quota established under the Sugar Act for sugars from the Caribbean area (Puerto Rico, Cuba, Virgin Islands, Santo Domingo) as well as Hawaii, Philippine Islands, and Peru. Also a few minor sources of supply. Of the total, 3,840,000 tons were entered against quotas during the first 7 months of the year. No shipping difficulty is anticipated in obtaining delivery of the remaining 1,559,000 tons of quota supplies.

[4] Based on current crop estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

[5] Assuming that distribution during the last half of the year is the same as in the last half of 1940, in view of the very heavy and abnormal deliveries of the first half year, and the establishment of the ceiling price which, in itself, is likely to prevent more than the normal movement of sugar in the last 5 months of the year. Actual consumption, viz, consumption by sugar-using industries and homes, including stocking up in the latter case, is estimated at 7,263,000 tons, on the basis of data covering the first half of the year. Therefore, 540,000 tons of the total distribution by primary distributors represents an increase in invisible stocks.

Estimated deliveries for British shipment (Apr. 29, to Nov. 1, 1941)

	Pounds
Dairy products and eggs:	
Cheese	75,329,625
Eggs, dried	10,410,573
Eggs, frozen	33,434,160
Eggs, shell (20,805,780 dozen)	31,208,670
Milk, dry skim	21,433,634
Milk, evaporated (5,376,413 cases)	233,873,966
Meat, fish and fowl:	
Beef, dried	10,994
Fish, canned	32,898,812
Hog casings	1,765,639
Pork-meat products	210,828,234
Sausage, canned	57,525
Fruits, vegetables and nuts:	
Apples, dried	3,924,950
Apricots, dried	7,602,650
Beans, dried	180,097,500
Beans, baked (454,889 cases)	20,015,125
Beans, soy	9,068,200
Fruit, dried	1,962,150
Fruit pulp	27,707,452
Fruit, canned (457,565 cases)	19,904,090
Peaches, dried	3,123,625
Pears, dried	940,000
Pomace	374,892
Potatoes, canned (140,357 cases)	5,684,459
Prunes, dried	54,096,175
Raisins	59,527,075
Tomatoes, canned (2,160,505 cases)	69,136,170
Grain and cereal products:	
Biscuits	539,750
Corn (8,217,651 bushels)	460,188,456
Flour, wheat (149,998 barrels)	29,399,510
Soya flour	5,305,700
Oatmeal	3,280,100
Starch	88,851,679

Estimated deliveries for British shipment (Apr. 29, to Nov. 1, 1941)—Continued

	Pounds
Lard, fats and oils:	
Lard	186,714,762
Margarine	1,120,000
Other foodstuffs:	
Glucose	5,662,600
Carotene	225
Chicory	224,400
Citrus juice concentrate (163,374 gallons)	1,960,488
Pectin	140,000
Sorbose	3,300
Vitamins	21,558
Ascorbic acid	3,390
Pectinal enzyme	3,360
Nonfoodstuffs:	
Cotton (408,789 bales)	195,401,142
Cotton linters	36,420
Tobacco	98,451,825
Rosin	7,166,482
Turpentine (250,525 gallons)	1,803,780
Grand total	2 200,695,272

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to a bill I have just introduced, authorizing the appointment of an officer of the Veterinary Corps as assistant to the Surgeon General of the Army with the rank of brigadier general.

This bill, which I hope will receive the early consideration of the Military Affairs Committee, provides as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Medical Department of the Army, in addition to such assistants to the Surgeon General as are now authorized by law, an assistant with the rank of brigadier general who shall be an officer of the Veterinary Corps.

Mr. Speaker, in urging immediate enactment of this measure, I propose to review briefly the history of the Veterinary Corps since the World War, and to outline a few of the very important accomplishments of this vital component of our defense forces.

When I have finished, I am sure you will agree with me that the duties and responsibilities of the Veterinary Corps have increased to such an extent that the recognition I propose is warranted.

Prior to the World War, the United States Army did not have an adequate, well-organized veterinary service. The National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, provided for the commissioning of veterinarians in the Army, but examinations were not completed and commissions actually issued until April 1917. In that month commissions were approved for 41 veterinarians of the cavalry and field artillery, and 22 quartermaster veterinarians.

The act referred to provided for ranks ranging from second lieutenant to major, which was the maximum rank that could be reached by veterinary officers.

When war was declared in 1917 there were 118 veterinary officers authorized for the Regular Army. There was no organized Veterinary Corps Reserve, and it thus became necessary to immediately take steps to recruit a necessary number of Reserve officers.

It may interest you to know that during our participation in the World War we had at the peak a total of 2,313 veterinary officers in the service. The enlisted strength of the Medical Department, Veterinary Service, when the war ended was approximately 15,000.

When the Army was reorganized in 1920, provision was made for a Regular Army Veterinary Corps of 175 officers. Rank was authorized starting with the grade of second lieutenant and providing for promotion to first lieutenant, captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, after periods of 3, 7, 14, 20, and 26 years, respectively.

In 1935 the grade of second lieutenant was eliminated in the Veterinary Corps, and its officers were placed on the same basis as the Medical and Dental Corps as regards initial appointment and promotions. Thus veterinary officers now enter the Army as first lieutenants, reach the grade of captain in 3 years, major in 12 years, lieutenant colonel in 20 years, and full colonel in 26 years.

When the present emergency started the Army Veterinary Corps consisted of 126 officers of the Regular Establishment and a complement of 590 enlisted men. Today we have on active service about 750 officers and something over 2,200 enlisted men. The Veterinary Corps Reserve consists of approximately 1,350 officers.

When the present defense program was inaugurated the number of horses and mules in our Army stood at approximately 23,000. Today it is close to 50,000, and it probably will be further increased in the future.

During the World War the Army had to buy almost anything that would pass for a horse. More than a half million animals were utilized by the Army in the United States and overseas. After the war it started a new system. It bought several hundred stallions, mostly thoroughbreds, and put them in the hands of private breeders. The breeder must choose good mares with which to mate the stallions.

For nearly 20 years this program has been continued with 750 stallions now owned by the Government and loaned out. The Government keeps no strings on the foals, but it knows where to look for them when it needs good horseflesh. And although the horse population of the country is only about half what it was 20 years ago, the Army authorities believe the supply of good saddle horses of the kind it wants is much greater, thanks to this infusion of sound blood. The Veterinary Corps has seen to this.

The Army Veterinary Corps has many functions. In wartime major emphasis is placed on the first of these—the evacuation, hospitalization, and treatment of sick and wounded animals.

Of equal importance, however, is the second function—the inspection of meats, meat food, and dairy products. In this the Veterinary Corps renders a vital service.

Aside from protection of the health of troops against disease transmitted through spoiled, unsound or contaminated foodstuffs, this inspection service practically pays for itself through savings in the rejection of below-standard foods.

During the year 1939, for example, the Veterinary Corps inspected over 162,000,000 pounds of meats, meat-food, and dairy products. Of this amount about 9,000,000 pounds were rejected. The difference in value between what was initially offered and what was finally accepted was over $350,000.

How this inspection service has increased during the emergency is illustrated by the figures for the first quarter of 1941. During this 3-month period, the Veterinary Corps inspected 193,000,000 pounds of meats, meat-food, and dairy products. Rejections amounted to nearly 8,000,000 pounds with an estimated equivalent monetary saving of about $300,000.

Veterinary station service is provided all important posts and stations in the United States as well as foreign possessions. Posts and camps having animals are assigned as many veterinary officers as are required, and an adequate detachment of enlisted men. At posts where there are few or no animals, but where considerable quantities of foodstuffs must be inspected, veterinary officers and enlisted assistants also are assigned.

Army expansion and reorganization, and plans for training on a huge scale, have necessitated the enlargement of many posts and the establishment of new camps and training centers. Further, there has been a number of shifts in the location of Army animals. All this has made it necessary to provide increases in veterinary hospital facilities.

Another important Veterinary Corps activity is its laboratory service. The Army Veterinary School at the Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., maintains one of the finest veterinary laboratories in the world. This laboratory is engaged in various research investigations of importance to the military service.

There have also been established corps area laboratories in each of the nine corps areas and department laboratories in the Panama and Puerto Rican Departments. Provision is made for a veterinary section in each of these laboratories.

Research men of the Veterinary Corps, at work in these laboratories, are constantly conducting studies into the possible causes and cures of animal diseases. In many cases their findings have had a profound effect on the study of related diseases of the human. Permit me to illustrate this briefly:

Within the past few months, a very serious and extensive outbreak of encephalomyelitis, more commonly known as sleeping sickness, has occurred among persons in Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana and, to a lesser extent, in several adjacent States. According to reports, the mortality of this disease is running around 10 percent.

Investigation indicates that the causative agent of this disease is the so-called Western type virus of equine encephalomyelitis, or horse sleeping sickness.

During the past few years this malady has been of major importance insofar as horses and mules are concerned. It

reached a peak in 1938 when approximately 185,000 cases of the disease occurred in different sections of the United States, with a mortality rate of about 21 percent.

The Army Veterinary Corps has done a great amount of work with this disease as it affects horses. The present chief of the Veterinary Corps, Col. R. A. Kelser, conducting research experiments with this disease, was the first to prove the ability of mosquitoes to transmit it. This was a finding of tremendous scientific as well as practical importance. Since this finding, nine additional species of mosquitoes have been found capable of transmitting the disease.

Colonel Kelser's discovery, it is readily seen, was of equal importance to the medical profession, and doubtless is responsible for the saving of thousands of lives.

In closing, let me again state that the Veterinary Corps of the United States Army has a place of increasing importance in the present emergency. I know from personal experience, having served in the corps as a reserve officer for many years, that its leaders are fully alive to their responsibilities and obligations, and that they are responding splendidly to the challenge of our enemies in the Atlantic and Pacific.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein numerous tables and references prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of our Government saw fit to arrest and take into custody many thousands of aliens in this country whose freedom of action at this moment he felt might not be for the best interests of the country.

I have no doubt that these aliens will receive a fair and impartial hearing, and that those who are harmless will be permitted to go back to their families. In a time of emergency of this kind, we cannot and should not criticize any action taken in this manner. But, Mr. Speaker, there is something more to be done in this country and by this Congress. While we are able to pick up a number of aliens, we are unable and helpless to do something about certain naturalized citizens coming from the Axis countries who hide behind the cloak of citizenship.

It is pretty difficult at this time to do anything about it, despite the fact that these individuals take advantage of every possible right they may have as citizens of this country to indirectly help the Axis countries with whom we are at war. I am happy to say that at the request of the Attorney General of our Government, and our own Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I have today introduced a bill (H. R. 6250) that will take care of that situation, and will put some teeth into the law by which the Government can dispose of saboteurs and this un-American group, parading under citizenship colors, and by which we will be able to dispose of them as circumstances may warrant. I shall put into the RECORD in connection with my remarks an analysis of the bill I introduced. Had this Congress listened to me 3 or 4 or 5 years ago when I appealed on the floor almost every day, giving names and addresses of persons, both aliens and citizens, who were subversive, we would not find ourselves in the position that we are in today. But it is never too late, and I hope when I bring this bill out, as I expect to do in the next few days, that the House will give me an opportunity to rid this country of all subversive groups, citizens or noncitizens.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES IN THE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The bill contains (1) a number of substantive changes in the code in the interest of national defense, (2) a number of desirable changes which experience has taught us are necessary, and (3) certain technical changes to correct typographical or printer's errors.

The order of discussion hereunder does not follow the order contained in the bill but is considered in the order of importance as indicated in the caption.

(1) Gives the Government authority to revoke naturalization on the ground that the naturalized person's conduct establishes that his political allegiance is to a foreign state or sovereignty.

(2) Reduces from 60 to 30 days the notice to be given in a cancelation proceeding when the United States is at war or during the existence of the national emergency.

(3) Provides for a judicial determination of the issue presented through the expatriation of a naturalized citizens through residence in a foreign country.

(4) The requirement of 6 months' residence in the State immediately preceding the filing of a petition is eliminated as to members of the military or naval forces.

(5) As to aliens 50 years of age or over, with at least 10 years' continuous residence in the United States, and otherwise qualified, certain requirements for naturalization are waived. This is in the interest of national unity as to citizenship.

(6) The so-called misinformation section, by which a person not an alien enemy who has resided in the United States for a period of 5 years next preceding July 1, 1920, is amended by advancing the date to July 1, 1925. This would permit women who were not in a position to vote in many States until August 26, 1920, the effective date of the nineteenth amendment, to apply for naturalization under that section.

(7) The prohi' ition on the final hearing or admission of a petitioner within 30 days next preceding a general election within the jurisdiction of the court has been reduced to 30 days, as the 60-day provision served no real purpose except to delay action on petitions which were ready for hearing.

The remainder of the bill merely involves a number of minor changes to clarify ambiguous language and clerical errors.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 298. An act to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1486. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Murray, Jr., a patent to certain land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1688. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Bessie Walden; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1889. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the county of Macon, Ala., in a strip of land located at Veterans' Administration Facility, Tuskegee, Ala.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2012. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Togus, Maine, to the State of Maine, for road-widening purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2080. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration Facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River;

H. R. 1546. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 4853. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 4905. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of

Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite-coal-producing regions of the United States.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2077. An act amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 17, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of this committee at 10:30 a. m. Wednesday, December 17, 1941, to consider private bills.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the committee in executive session on Wednesday, December 17, 1941, at 10 a. m., room 304, House Office Building, to consider bills which have been referred to this committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1168. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 26, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Nolin River and tributaries, Kentucky, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Flood Control.

1169. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of $300,000,000 for the national-defense housing (H. Doc. No. 459); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1170. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $2,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 460); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FULMER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 588. An act to give the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (Rept. No. 1509). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 390. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6215. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the of United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1511). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FULMER: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 5726. A bill to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 1512). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Albert Barrett; with amendment (Rept. No. 1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6246. A bill to provide $100 monthly compensation for service-connected disability to World War veterans after age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6247. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, so as to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of floricultural products in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6248. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6249. A bill to waive the limitation in title II of the act approved July 1, 1941 (Public Law 146, 77th Cong.), with regard to the cost of a courthouse at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 6250. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6251. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6252. A bill to amend the act approved October 16, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States (Public Law, 274, 77th Cong.);" to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 6253. A bill to establish a Department of Defense Coordination and Control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia:

H. R. 6254. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 6255. A bill for the relief of Petros Spanos and Mrs. Anna Spanos; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2175. By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution of the delegates to the Twentieth National 4-H Club Congress, urging favorable consideration of House bill 4530, a bill for the expansion of the work of the 4-H Club; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2176. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Resolution of the New York State department of health concerning present system employed by the military authorities in the regulation of houses of prostitution; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2177. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Ridgewood Democratic Club, Inc., Ridgewood, Long Island, N. Y., that the Ridgewood Democratic Club, Inc., pledges itself for the duration of this war to fight for a successful termination thereof in our favor and in favor of our Allies so as to bring a permanent peace to this world on a democratic basis, and it pledges its efforts, lives, and material possessions to the President, Congress, and to the country in order, to bring about a successful conclusion of this war, and it is prepared to make whatever sacrifices that the welfare of our country demands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2178. By Mr. RAMSAY: Petition of Richard Brantigan and 26 others, of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House Resolution 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2179. By Mr. VREELAND: Joint resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey, memorializing the President of the United States and the Federal Loan Administrator to designate the Delaware River tunnel heretofore authorized as a project for immediate construction through the medium of a Federal loan under the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2180. By the SPEAKER: Petition of G. R. Mitchell, of Knoxville, Tenn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2181. Also, petition of Rose M. Palmer, of New York City, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2182. Also, petition of 4-H Club representatives, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to 4-H Club activity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2183. Also, petition of the Regular Veterans Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 16, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Merritt F. Williams, canon of Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast taught us in Thy holy word to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free," give us grace to remember that this liberty comes to us only because we are Thy sons, created in Thy image; that it is the liberty of doing what is eternally right; that it is the blessed freedom of knowing the truth, loving and serving the truth.

Quicken within us the sense of our sonship. Put far from us any temptation to think meanly of our humanity. Strengthen us in our devotion to the cause of eternal right. Guide us into Thy truth. Help us to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 16, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2096) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River;

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 4858. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 4905. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite-coal-producing regions of the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Austin	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hatch	Reed
Bilbo	Hayden	Reynolds
Brewster	Herring	Rosier
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Holman	Schwartz
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lodge	Tobey
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Wagner
Davis	Maybank	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Wiley
Gerry	Nye	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL WORKS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2096) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 10, after "land", to insert:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire Floyd Bennett Field, Kings County, N. Y., and adjacent suitable areas, including buildings, improvements, and facilities at a cost not to exceed $18,750,000, and to establish the same as a naval air station: *Provided further*, That in the purchase of Floyd Bennett Field the Navy Department shall take into consideration expenditures by any Federal agency from Federal funds in or for developing such field prior to acquisition thereof by the United States.

And on page 2, to strike out all of section 3 and insert:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall transmit to the Congress on or before January 10, 1943, a statement by projects of the obligations incurred pursuant to the authorization provided in this act.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the two House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CONTROL OF INFLATION—RECOMMENDATIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, setting forth an important part of the economic program of that organization as developed at the recent twenty-third annual convention held in Chicago.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 11, 1941.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Delegates to the twenty-third annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, assembled here from 40 States and Puerto Rico, representing at least 2,000,000 farm people, acutely aware of the threat of inflation to our domestic economy, unanimously adopted the following resolution and ask you to give it your earnest consideration:

Inflationary forces are being set in motion which, unless Congress acts, will prove disastrous to all economic groups. Uncontrolled inflation must be avoided at all costs. Agriculture knows from bitter experience the disastrous consequences of inflation of prices,

wages, and profits, and the inevitable deflation that follows.

In order to prevent disastrous inflation, we urge prompt action by Congress to establish, for the period of the national emergency and for an adequate time thereafter, a Federal authority to establish maximum prices for commodities on a selective basis to the extent necessary to prevent inflationary price increases. We insist that such legislation recognize the parity principle as between labor, industry, and agriculture. In order to prevent the average price received by farmers for any agricultural commodity being depressed below parity through the operation of price controls no price ceiling should be established on any agricultural commodity or the products thereof, at a price less than 110 percent of parity.

To be effective such legislation must include authority to control inflationary wages as well as inflationary prices. We cannot give our support to any legislation to control prices which does not provide for control of inflationary wages comparable to the control of industrial and farm prices.

Tax powers should be used to a greater extent to control inflation and to meet the current fiscal needs of the Nation by recapturing excess earnings and excess profits due to defense expenditures, and by lowering exemptions and levying increased taxes based upon ability to pay. Safeguards should be provided to assure that all such powers granted be terminated at the close of the emergency. In view of the inevitable effects of war upon monetary and exchange relationships and price levels—both nationally and internationally—we renew our insistence at this time for the establishment of a monetary authority, which shall be charged with maintaining a stable price level. In the meantime every legitimate means available to the administrators of fiscal and monetary policy should be used so as to maintain a stable price level and avoid inflation.

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 16th instant.

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, reported it on December 16, 1941, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 915) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 916).

By Mr CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 6219. An act to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 917)

PROCEEDING IN RELATION TO SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 208 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 208), submitted by Mr. HATCH on December 15, 1941, was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 81, agreed to March 10, 1941, and Senate Resolution 167, agreed to September 15, 1941, and Senate Resolution 186, agreed to November 1, 1941, all of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, relating to the proceeding now pending before the Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine whether WILLIAM LANGER is entitled to retain his seat in the Senate, is hereby increased by $6,000.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 16, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson;

S. 1190. An act for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville;

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson;

S. 1623. An act to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes; and

S. 2077. An act amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural conservation-program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BULOW:

S. 2138. A bill relating to the claim of Louis H. Deaver; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2139. A bill to provide for performance of the duties of chiefs of bureau and the Judge Advocate General in the Navy Department, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2140. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2141. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2142. A bill to provide for the automatic issuance of national service life insurance to all persons in active service in the land or naval forces in such amounts as are necessary to give them $10,000 of free insurance for the period of the war; to the Committee on Finance.

PRICE CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House bill 5990, the so-called price-control bill, which I ask to have appropriately referred. I am offering this amendment at the request of the commissioner of insurance of the State of Massachusetts, who is fearful that unless some corrective action is taken, the enactment of the bill as it is now drawn would seriously affect State supervision of insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and printed.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER—AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri, viz: Strike out section 11 and insert the following new section:

"SEC. 11. Section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) (1) Any person in the active service, and while in such active service, shall be granted such insurance without medical examination upon application therefor in writing (made within 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act), and upon payment of premiums: *Provided*, That after the expiration of such 120-day period any such person may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

"'(2) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, dies or has died in line of duty (including death resulting from disease or injury incurred in line of duty), without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance as of the date of entry into active service on October 8, 1940, whichever is later, in the sum of $5,000 payable as provided in section 602 (h), except that payments hereunder shall be made only to the following beneficiaries and in the order named—

"'(A) To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried;

"'(B) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

"'(C) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

"'(3) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, suffers total disability in line of duty without having in force at the time of such disability insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War

Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance in the aggregate sum of $5,000 effective as of the date such disability was so suffered but not prior to October 8, 1940. Such premiums shall be waived during the continuation of such total disability. The administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from the national service life insurance appropriation to the national service life insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

"'(4) The benefits and privileges extended by this section are hereby so extended by the Congress because many of the personnel of our armed forces (1) were unable to comply with the prerequisites necessary to the granting of insurance by reason of extended duty in the North Atlantic, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other outlying bases; (2) had failed or neglected to apply for such insurance in the expectation that their service would be peacetime service only; and (3) by reason of the suddenness with which war was thrust upon us, had not sufficient time to apply for such insurance prior to engaging in combat. The Congress hereby declares that no further relief of such character will be granted.'"

BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 6208

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, several days ago both the Senate and House passed House bill 6208, known as the black-out bill. In that bill there is a provision for the purchase by the District Commissioners of certain equipment and also a provision that the District Commissioners may borrow from the Treasury of the United States money to the extent of $1,000,000. The language of the bill is not in form to suit the Treasury of the United States and they have requested a correction of the language. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution dealing with the subject and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6208) entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", be, and the same is hereby, rescinded; and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reenroll the said bill with the following change, namely: In the engrossed Senate amendments, at the end of amendment No. 6, strike out the word "section" and the period, and insert the following: "section, and there is hereby appropriated for this purpose $1,000,000 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States not otherwise appropriated."

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. COLIN P. KELLY, JR., BY HOPSON OWEN MURFEE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., by Hopson Owen Murfee, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRICT MOTOR-VEHICLE-FUEL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have been adopted. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, when the Senate took the recess it was considering House bill 5558. I desire to state briefly the status of the bill and its effect.

The bill as it is before the Senate, including the three committee amendments agreed to yesterday, provides for an increase in the District gasoline tax, which at present is 2 cents, to 3 cents per gallon from January 1, 1942, for 9½ years, through June 30, 1951, to cover the highway development program of the District as presented. That increase will produce one and one-half million dollars a year. In the opinion of the District Committee, that is sufficient to meet the needs of the program, and any larger tax is not necessary at this time.

I will state briefly the history of the bill. As introduced in the House, the bill provided for a 1-cent increase per gallon. The District Committee of the House recommended a 1-cent increase per gallon; but when the House passed the bill it raised the tax by a 2-cent increase per gallon, making the tax a 4-cent tax instead of the present 2-cent tax. The Senate committee now concurs with the House committee, and says that a 1-cent increase at this time under these conditions is adequate; and that is what is before the Senate in the bill as now amended, with the committee amendments.

I may point out that this tax is, of course, in addition to the Federal 1½-cent tax, which applies throughout the country.

While I believe the issue should be determined on the basis of the needs of the District; the question is constantly asked as to what the taxes of other States are. Therefore, I will state them briefly for the information of the Senate.

The tax in Maryland is 4 cents a gallon.

The tax in Virginia is 5 cents a gallon.

There is one State in the Union that has a 2-cent tax.

There are 10 States that have a tax of 3 cents, as this bill would make the tax in the District of Columbia.

There are 17 States that have a tax of 4 cents, 11 that have a tax of 5 cents, 5 that have a tax of 6 cents, 1 that has a tax of 6½ cents, and 3 that have a tax of 7 cents.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Would the Senator mind informing the Senate as to the average gasoline tax in the country?

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the average, computed flatly, is 4.4 cents a gallon, and that the average weighted so as to allow for the volume of purchases is 4 cents a gallon.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator think the District of Columbia should have at least the average tax throughout the country?

Mr. BURTON. No; I should say not. The reason is that the District of Columbia does not represent an average of the highway requirements of the Nation. It is clear that in most States the bulk of the gasoline tax is collected in the metropolitan areas, but out of it must be paid also the expense of the primary and secondary rural road systems; whereas here in the District, although, of course, all of the tax is collected in a metropolitan area, because the whole District is metropolitan in character, it does not have to bear the burden of any intercity or rural primary and secondary systems. Therefore, inasmuch as all of the District's gasoline tax goes into the District's highway fund, I believe it is quite appropriate that the District gasoline tax be at a rate that is a little lower than the rate in those States that also pay for a rural system of roads out of such tax.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator say whether the proposed 3-cent tax is adequate for all highway improvements for the District?

Mr. BURTON. I should say that it, together with the existing resources and the ordinary Federal aid that comes to the District as it does to other States, is adequate not only for the present needs but to carry out, so far as we can now see under the emergency, the requirements of the District due to its increased traffic.

I may add the statement, which I think is pertinent in the consideration of the bill, that the District of Columbia has had the 2-cent tax since 1924. The needs of the District for improved highway conditions have increased with the increased population and volume of traffic; but the District has not increased its gasoline tax. If it had done so about 7 years ago, it would have met the need for improved freeway and modified freeway construction which is necessary to take care of the increased volume that comes with increased traffic. Therefore, the condition today is that the people of the District are about 7 years behind in their construction program. The proposed increase in the gasoline tax would enable them to catch up with that program over a 10-year period.

Mr. BYRD. What revenue will be derived from the additional 1-cent tax?

Mr. BURTON. About one and a half million dollars a year.

Mr. BYRD. Is there not great need for improvement of many of the streets in the District of Columbia by underpasses and other very expensive construction of that kind?

Mr. BURTON. That is exactly what is contemplated under this measure. The District of Columbia has made one of the best surveys of its engineering requirements that has been made in the United States. It was prepared by the Department of Highways of the District of Columbia from facts gathered by it and also by the United States Public Roads Administration and the District of Columbia Department of Vehicles and Traffic. The result of such surveys is the recommendation that the improvements that should have been made and are now needed constitute a program

that will cost about $35,000,000. There is now available toward that program out of the present income, without any increased tax, about $1,700,000 a year.

Mr. BYRD. From what source does it come?

Mr. BURTON. It comes from the present highway fund; and the present highway fund is made up primarily from gasoline taxes, motor-vehicle fees, and certain assessments, as they are called; not from the general fund. No money of the United States has been placed in the highway fund since 1937. It has been carried by District funds since that date; in fact, it has so carried since 1934, in the larger part.

Mr. BYRD. I cannot follow the Senator when he says that the present highway fund is $1,700,000 and that we now have a 2-cent gasoline tax, and that the revenue from the additional 1-cent tax will be $1,500,000.

Mr. BURTON. One million seven hundred thousand dollars is the portion of the highway fund that would be available to apply to this $35,000,000 program. Some of it, of course, has to be used for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Does that include the additional tax?

Mr. BURTON. The $1,700,000 does not include the increase of 1 cent. If there is an increase of 1 cent, there will be available from the District $1,500,000 more annually, making a total of about $3,200,000 for this program. The program is a $35,000,000 program, extending over 10 years. An annual revenue of $3,200,000 would make $32,000,000 during the 10 years. The other $3,000,000 or so which the program calls for will come from the normal operation of the Federal highway aid or its contribution on access roads, such as any State would get.

Mr. BYRD. Does any part of this revenue come from taxes on real estate?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. BYRD. It comes from no other source of taxation than the gasoline tax?

Mr. BURTON. There is a table attached to the report of the committee which shows exactly the sources from which the highway-fund money comes. The report is on the desk of the Senator, and the table is on the last page of the report.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator think the fact that the District of Columbia, up to this time, has not increased its gasoline tax makes it more important now to make a larger increase than 1 cent?

Mr. BURTON. It might be argued that if we were in a condition of peace, when there were no priorities involved, and if we were in a condition where there were no other great taxes being thrust upon our taxpayers, we should advocate a 2-cent increase, and complete this program in 8 years. But under present conditions I think it is perfectly clear that the municipalities and the Nation owe it to the Nation to defer, where possible, their nondefense items, so far as they can defer them, and insofar as priorities are not involved in them. Municipalities also owe it to the Nation to keep taxes for their local purposes as low as possible, so that their citizens may be better able to pay the defense taxes that are being forced upon them at the same time. That is what we are proposing to accomplish by holding this increase down to an increase of 1 cent per gallon.

I may add that what has taken place in the last year here in the District and in Virginia is of importance when we are passing on the matter as it stands before us. Within the last few months there have been located on the Virginia side of the river War Department and Navy Department buildings.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It is a fact, is it not, that up until the time of the present emergency the 2-cent gasoline tax was sufficient to take care of the ordinary requirements of the District of Columbia with reference to street and road construction, repair, and improvement?

Mr. BURTON. I should say not. The survey which has been carefully made over a period of years indicates that the revenue derived from the 2-cent gasoline tax has enabled the authorities in the District of Columbia to keep the roads in repair, and to take slow forward steps toward the needs of the highway department, but that we are far behind, about 5 to 7 years behind, on what have been called the major operations needed by the District, insofar as its highway engineering is concerned.

Mr. OVERTON. I was advised as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee that until the time of the present emergency there were sufficient funds to take care of the highway needs of the District of Columbia, and that there was no necessity for any increase in the gasoline tax, and in some years we had a surplus of unappropriated highway funds. We have always adopted any recommendations made by the Commissioners and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to appropriations for highway improvement in the District of Columbia.

When this emergency arose—and I shall be very glad to call the attention of the senior Senator from Virginia to this fact—and when it was decided to erect the tremendous War Department Building on Virginia soil, it became necessary to make a considerable outlay for street improvements, for access roads to the bridges across the Potomac, in order that Federal employees, and people who may be visiting the District, and Senators and Representatives may be transported into the balmy atmosphere of the State of Virginia when they have business to transact with the War Department. A very large amount of this fund is to be used to build the access roads leading to the grand and glorious old State of Virginia. Am I right about that, I ask the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BURTON. A part of these funds will contribute toward the construction of access roads, and the Federal Government will also contribute some, because they will have to relieve the congestion at the several bottlenecks at the entrances to each of the three principal bridges which lead into Virginia.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct, and an increase in the highway fund has been rendered necessary very largely by reason of the establishment of this tremendous, grand, and glorious War Department Building in the State of Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to remark as to that, Mr. President, that it was the War Department which insisted that this building be erected in Virginia, and one of the objections of the Senator from Virginia to this increase of 1 cent in the gasoline tax is that the fund will not be sufficient to make adequate the outlets both in Virginia and within the District of Columbia.

I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the streets of the city of Washington are becoming practically impassable, and that underpasses should be built, and large sums must be expended, for the purpose of enabling the people in Washington to go over the streets. I think an increase of only 1 cent in the gasoline tax, if that is all the money that is to be available—and I understand the Senator to say it will be, that no appropriations will be made except from the gasoline tax fund—it will be totally inadequate to meet the great traffic problem which now confronts the city of Washington.

Mr. BURTON. With reference to that very point, I think it is important for us all to realize that there is a point beyond which it is not possible efficiently to tear up the streets in a city at one time, even to aid in the reconstruction of its highway system. The million and a half dollars which will come from this fund, plus the million seven hundred thousand available from existing resources, plus the fund of about a million nine hundred thousand which was included just a few days ago in the deficiency appropriation bill, having to do with the highways of the District of Columbia, and access to the Virginia side, will provide in 1942 every bit of reconstruction that can be handled within the District of Columbia, with due regard to moving the traffic in the District during that period of time.

As a matter of fact, due to the location of the new War and Navy Department buildings in Virginia, the whole program is being shoved ahead about 2 years, with the idea of completing these access roads, if possible, before the end of the year 1942. If we can complete those access roads before the end of 1942, we will have moved the $35,000,000 program ahead about 2 years. That can be done within the resources made available in this manner, providing a 1-cent increase in the tax, plus the Federal funds.

I may refer to one other factor which will appear if we increase the tax by 2 cents. There is a peculiar and interesting situation which developed in the testimony, which may be well known to Senators now in the chamber, that outside of the District of Columbia the price which the public pays for gasoline, including the larger taxes of Virginia and Maryland, is the same price that is being paid within the District. Obviously some one is taking the loss in order to bring that about, or making a contribution, or

absorbing the difference. That situation arises from the fact, evidently, that retail dealers outside of the District would not be able to add, in the case of Virginia 3 cents, and in the case of Maryland 2 cents, to the District's 2-cent tax, and still sell their gasoline.

It was testified before the committee that the wholesale companies were absorbing that difference, and that therefore within the area of the metropolitan long-range operations of Washington, perhaps 50 miles around Washington, there is a substantially uniform "Washington" retail gasoline price to the public, although the full Virginia taxes are paid and the full Maryland taxes are paid where the gasoline is sold in those States in the neighborhood of the District, but outside of the District limits.

The gasoline companies are taking the loss, which is all right with me if they choose to do so, but when we increase the tax within the District of Columbia by 1 cent, and thereby add one and a half million dollars to the District's resources for public purposes, the retail price also will go up in Virginia and Maryland. As a result, people outside of the District, but near to its borders, will pay their additional 1 cent also, and the beneficiaries will merely be the wholesale companies which have been absorbing the difference. If we raise the tax by 2 cents, that result will be doubled outside of the District, and still with no benefit to the public outside of the District.

Mr. BYRD. I am not disturbed about the differential between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia, but I think the gasoline tax is the fairest tax that can be devised to pay for road construction. I think the city of Washington is lagging behind in a tremendous way in the construction of its streets. It used to take me 5 or 10 minutes to get to my hotel from the Capitol. Now it takes 15 or 20 minutes, or a half hour, due to the congestion. I suggest to the Senator that the program is totally inadequate to meet the situation as its exists now, and as it will be in the years to come.

Mr. BURTON. The program as supported by the Committee on the District of Columbia is based upon a survey made by the United States Public Roads Administration, and the Director of Highways of the District, approved by the District Commissioners. I believe that it provides for all that can be done in tearing up the roads within a given time so that the improvements can be completed in a 10-year period. I think that will meet the needs suggested by the Senator from Virginia as well as it can be done.

As the bill now stands before the Senate, with the amendments that have been agreed to, it stands as a bill for a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax for the period from 1942 to June 30, 1951 It is in that shape before the Senate, of course open to further amendment, but it is now in precisely the shape in which the Committee on the District of Columbia recommended its passage.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments about this bill to increase the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia. The bill was brought before the Senate for action late yesterday evening, and while I have no more interest in this particular measure than every other Senator should have, I thought it would be preferable to withhold action on the bill until more Senators were present, as it was quite apparent that a quorum was not present when the bill was being considered yesterday evening. Therefore, at my request, the arrangement was made to hold the bill over so that more Senators would have an opportunity to learn the merits and demerits of the bill and to be able to protect their constituents back home.

Mr. President, I have an interest in the bill because I feel that the tax in the District of Columbia should be more nearly equalized with the tax in the adjoining States. I feel that the tax should be more in line with that in the immediate surrounding territories. I feel that if the tax is not properly adjusted it is quite likely that the State of Texas and other States will be called upon to contribute to the maintenance and upkeep of the streets and roads of the District of Columbia, because there will be a lack of funds from the tax which is now in effect or from the 1-cent increase which is proposed by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. BURTON. I wanted to remind the Senator that the table, carried in the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which the Senator is a member, emphasizes the fact that since 1937 there has been no contribution whatever from the general fund, and practically none since 1934. With the addition of one and one-half million dollars which will be added to the gasoline-tax fund from the proposed increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax, does the Senator still feel that there would be a danger or likelihood that the general fund of the United States would be called upon to subsidize the District?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I base my statement that there is a likelihood that we all shall be called upon to contribute to it, upon past history. I refer to the contributions that have been made from the general fund to the District of Columbia since the year 1925, up to and including the year 1940, ranging from $5,000,000 a year to $9,000,000 a year, and making a total of $118,875,000 which has been contributed by the States represented by the Members of this body.

In that connection I wish to show how some of that money has heretofore gotten from the general fund over into the road fund of the District. I quote from a letter written by Engineer Commissioner Col. David McCoach, Jr., dated June 5, 1940, in which he says in part:

> For your information, there is enclosed a statement showing highway department appropriations from the fiscal years 1925 to 1941. This tabulation does not include the amount appropriated for police traffic control, Officer of the Director of Vehicles and Traffic, and the Division of Trees and Parking of the Highway Department. Up to and including the fiscal year 1933 strictly highway activities of the District of Columbia drew more than $2,000,000 annually from the general fund of the District for its work.

That, Mr. President, is what has taken place. I should now like to read from the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia, submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] on House bill 5558. I read from page 2 of the report:

> Due to the limited amount of these appropriations, they have been insufficient for at least the past 7 years—

Mr. President, these appropriations of $2,000,000 a year were made up until 1933. Since 1933 this is what has happened, according to the committee report:

> Due to the limited amount of these appropriations, they have been insufficient for at least the past 7 years to provide for the major operations on the highways of the District, which have become increasingly necessary to meet, to the best advantage, the rapidly increasing demands of motor-vehicle traffic.

That shows that for the last 7 years road funds have not been sufficient. We all know that a very disgraceful traffic-congestion condition now exists in the District. We do not need the services of some expert engineer to make evident to us that a large expenditure of money will be necessary to remedy the traffic conditions which at present exist in the District of Columbia. It is my opinion that the necessary road money should come from a gasoline tax in the District. I do not think there is any doubt that an enormous amount of money will be necessary for this purpose, and if a sufficient amount is not raised by an increased gasoline tax, I expect the deficiency must and perhaps will come from citizens of Texas and every other State in the Union.

Mr. President, another point I should like to bring out for the Senate is that this little pocket of the District of Columbia now has only a 2-cent-per-gallon gasoline tax, whereas the adjoining State of Maryland on one side has a 4-cent tax and the adjoining State of Virginia on the other side has a 5-cent tax. It is to be assumed that the price of gasoline within the District would be from 2 to 3 cents less than the price in Maryland and Virginia immediately outside the District, but from practical experience we all know that is not always true. We find the price of gasoline in some places in the District to be just as high or higher than it is outside the District. We find that it is very difficult to drive our automobiles on the streets of the District because of the congestion. If we want to take a little automobile ride, we must cross the line and get out into Virginia or Maryland to enjoy their highways, which have been paid for by a higher gasoline tax in those States, and while driving in those States it has been my experience that I can generally find a place where I can buy gasoline at a lower price than I can within the District.

I do not accuse anyone of any ulterior motive, but I do claim that by the existing set-up we have created a situation whereby those who are engaged in the distribution and the sale of gasoline can profit by the existence of this low-tax pocket between the higher-taxed States, and it is my humble opinion that, of course, they are profiteering.

Mr. President, I do not wish to impose upon the citizens of the District an ad-

ditional burden of taxation, but it is my opinion that they are already paying the tax, and, instead of the money going into the treasury of the District, it is going into the coffers of the major oil companies that have a monopoly and control the prices in the District of Columbia and in the surrounding States. It is my opinion that through their manipulation the general motoring public is paying this tax, but it does not go into the treasury of the District of Columbia. It is my contention that this tax should be equalized.

I could give many illustrations of how those engaged in this business are trying to cover up a little thing here and uncover a little thing there in order to make us believe that they are not collecting this tax. The able Senator from Ohio has explained to us that an imaginary boundary has been set up beyond the real boundary of the District of Columbia by commercial interests whereby they try to equalize this tax by what they call a refund to the dealers within the no-man's land existing between the real boundary of the District and the imaginary boundary. The dealers within that no-man's land try to meet the lower District prices, and in order to offset the loss which they take, the major companies or the distributing companies are supposed to make a refund. How they do that within the law I do not know. But, inasmuch as it is quite likely that all retail dealers within the States of Maryland and Virginia pay the same wholesale price for their gasoline exclusive of the tax, I do not consider it to be right for the distributor to make a refund to some of the dealers in Maryland and Virginia who live in the no-man's land and not make the same refund or rebate to the dealers in Maryland and Virginia who live just beyond the border line of no-man's land.

This is a difficult situation; one which I do not think we should expect the commercial interests to work out. I think the Congress of the United States should solve the problem which exists by raising the tax to a point approximating the tax imposed in the two adjoining States and other surrounding territory. As I understand, the average of the taxes in all the States is something over 4 cents a gallon. To equalize the tax as between the 5-cent tax in Virginia and the 4-cent tax in Maryland and the 2-cent tax in the District, the tax in the District should be made 4½ cents a gallon. I think that is what should be done.

If there is no immediate need for this money—which I very much doubt—I think it is better that the money be in the treasury of the District of Columbia than in the treasuries of the oil corporations which sell gasoline and obtain higher prices on account of the discrepancy in taxes which exists.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. BURTON. I do not quite follow the last argument of the Senator. As I understand the present situation in the area outside the District of Columbia to which the Senator refers, the gasoline companies themselves are refunding something like $1,000,000 for every cent of difference in the tax. Therefore, if we should raise the tax within the District, such action would benefit the public within the District; but insofar as the area outside the District is concerned, if we should raise the gasoline tax in the District, such action would then simply place additional money in the hands of the oil companies. To increase the tax in the District would benefit the oil companies outside the District without benefiting the public outside the District.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am not quite so sure that the refunds to stations outside the District are being made in full. We all know that an ideal situation would be an identical tax on gasoline in every State. Then the people would not cross State lines to buy their gasoline in States having lower gasoline taxes. The tax should be equalized in that manner. Possibly it will not be equalized in that manner; but we can today contribute to the equalization of the gasoline-tax situation in some degree by leveling it up in the territory consisting of Virginia, Maryland, and the District. We can do that without endangering the interests of anybody and without it costing anybody much, if any, more than he is now paying for gasoline. It is my contention that this should be done by raising the tax in the District from 2 cents per gallon to 4 cents.

I do not have available experts to go into the situation and disprove all the statistics which have been presented to us. The Senate endeavored to obtain some help along that line, but the House of Representatives concluded that we did not need experts in our offices to do research work for us. So we are denied that facility and are forced to rely upon the rule of thumb and what we think is the common-sense policy. The House of Representatives evidently has all the research experts it needs. It has gone into this matter fully; and although the House committee recommended exactly what the Senate committee has recommended and reported the bill with a 1-cent increase, the House of Representatives, with the aid of its expert advice, which we are denied, discovered that that was the wrong policy, and on the floor of the House the gasoline tax was increased from 2 to 4 cents a gallon. That is exactly what I think we should do by the Senate.

If hereafter there should be a shortage in the highway funds of the District of Columbia, the individual States which are levying taxes on their own citizens which average more than 4 cents a gallon may be called upon to make up the deficiency here in the District. I do not think the citizens in Texas and other States should have to tax themselves to build their own roads and then on top of that tax themselves to pay for roads and streets here in the District. The gasoline tax here in the District should be high enough to pay for its own streets and roads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment in line 7, striking out "2 cents" and inserting "1 cent", was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, of course it would be ideal, as suggested by the able junior Senator from Texas, if there were no disparity in the tax rates prevailing in the various States of the Union. It might be a very happy situation if the Congress had the authority, and should exercise the authority, to abolish all taxes on gasoline levied by the various States and impose a Federal tax which would be equal in all the areas of the United States, and then distribute the funds among the various States.

But that is not the situation and cannot be the situation. Each State levies a gasoline tax in accordance with what its legislature and its constituted authorities deem to be necessary to meet the highway requirements of that State. That is generally true, although some of the States do divert gasoline taxes from highway purposes to other purposes.

I think there can be no question that no tax should be imposed upon a people greater than the requirements of the particular locality in which the tax is imposed, whether it be a Federal, State, county, or municipal tax. The requirements of the District of Columbia were thoroughly investigated. This matter has been studied, not for days or weeks, but for months. A report has been made that the requirements of the District of Columbia do not call for the imposition of a gasoline tax greater than 3 cents a gallon.

If we are to undertake to raise the tax beyond the necessities of the District of Columbia, as presented to us by the report of experts who have studied the requirements of the District, in order to meet the tax rates in the various States, we shall be thrown into hopeless confusion. I do not know what the gasoline-tax rate is in the State of Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is 5 cents.

Mr. OVERTON. In some States it is 7 cents. In other States it is 4 cents. In others it is as low as 2 cents. We cannot undertake to impose a gasoline tax in the District of Columbia which will be in harmony with the tax prevailing in other States, because the rates vary so radically and there is not the slightest semblance of uniformity. If nearby States wish to get in harmony with the tax levied in the District of Columbia in order, for instance, that more gasoline may be sold in Virginia and Maryland than is presently being sold, those States can meet that situation by lowering the gasoline tax in their States rather than by having us unnecessarily increase the gasoline-tax rate in the District of Columbia. I take it that the State of Virginia requires 5 cents a gallon in order to meet its highway requirements, and that Maryland requires 4 cents.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia has spoken about the bad condition of the streets of the city of Washington. It is my observation that the streets of the city of Washington are in better condition than are the streets of the city of Richmond or of the city of Baltimore.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator entirely misconstrued what I said. I was referring to the congestion in the streets, which makes it practically impossible to travel up and down the streets. The Senator will not deny that.

Mr. OVERTON. I will not deny it.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator will not deny the further fact that if there were money available for the improvement and widening of the streets, and for building underpasses and overpasses, if need be, there would be much less congestion on the streets.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator; but I am taking the report of the experts who have made a study of the question, rather than the opinions of individual Senators.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator need any experts to tell him that he can hardly traverse the streets of the city of Washington? All he has to do is to get into an automobile and try it.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, the highway program will meet that condition of congestion.

If we follow the argument of the Senator from Texas to its logical conclusion, the Senator from Texas ought to prevail on the States of Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other States adjoining the great Lone Star State of our Union, to levy tax rates exactly in accord with the tax rate on gasoline levied by the State of Texas. Of course, there is a disparity. There is a disparity ranging from 2 cents a gallon up to 7 cents a gallon in the different States; but how are we to correct it? Are we to correct it by levying a 7-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline in the District of Columbia? Are we to correct it by levying the 5-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax which prevails in the State of Texas, or the 4-cents-a-gallon tax which prevails in the State of Maryland, or the 5-cents-a-gallon tax which prevails in the State of Virginia? There is only one way to handle the problem and that is to levy a tax which is sufficient to meet the necessities of the taxing authority; and that is what this bill proposes to do.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I had no intention of conveying the thought that the equalization should be on the basis of equalizing the District of Columbia gasoline tax with the taxes in all the other States. I did make the statement that I believed it would be an ideal situation if the tax in the District of Columbia and in all the States should be the same; but my purpose regarding equalizing the tax in the District of Columbia is purely and simply to equalize it with the gasoline tax paid in the immediate surroundng territory. The Dstrict of Columbia is a little pocket between States paying larger gasoline taxes.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me interrupt the Senator, if he will permit me to do so. Is the tax rate levied on gasoline in Texas equalized with the tax rate levied on gasoline in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, Louisiana, and the other States surrounding Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; and that is exactly what I am proposing here. It is not identically equalized, but it is equalized to such a degree——

Mr. OVERTON. Is there not a considerable disparity between the taxes levied on gasoline in the various States adjoining Texas and in Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Wherever that disparity has existed it has been a great inconvenience; but it has been eliminated to such a degree that today the differential is not so great as to tempt residents in one State to drive for miles to patronize gasoline stations in another State.

That is exactly what I contend for here—that we should equalize the District of Columbia gasoline-tax rate with the gasoline-tax rate in the immediate surrounding territory, so that citizens living in each district will contribute to the upkeep of their own highways by buying gasoline in their own district or their own State.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, automobile drivers might have some apprehension in going into the illimitable reaches of the huge State of Texas, because they might lose their way and not get out. [Laughter.] So I can understand the contention made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. We should not care if they never did get out. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana will give me some information relative to the amendment which commences in line 9, on page 1. I have read the report, but I do not see any reference in it to the amendment. The amendment to which I refer is the one which provides that when motor-vehicle fuel is sold by an agency of the United States for use in privately owned vehicles certain provision for the payment of the tax shall be made. Can the Senator give me information as to what governmental agencies are selling to privately owned vehicles?

Mr. OVERTON. I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is in a better position than I am to answer the question. I will yield to him if he desires me to do so.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I may say that under the law as it now stands there is a section, known as section 14, which provides that if any agencies of the United States sell gasoline they shall pay the same tax. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Iowa is merely for the purpose of making the law conform to any increase in the tax that may be made. I was not advised in the hearings that any such sales are now being made, but I understand that some such sales have been made in the past, whereby the Government actually did retail some gasoline; and section 14 was enacted to make sure that when the Government retailed gasoline it was required to collect the same District tax as applied to other retail sales. The amendment merely continues the present law so as to include the proposed increase in the tax.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. No testimony or information was presented in the hearings to the effect that Federal agencies were in fact selling gasoline for use in privately owned motor vehicles?

Mr. BURON. There was no such information; but if the amendment were not made in the bill, section 14 of the existing law would provide that if any governmental agency should sell gasoline under such circumstances it would charge only a 2-cent tax, while everyone else would charge a 3-cent tax; and, of course, that would be highly detrimental.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I will conclude by making the observation which I made at the beginning of my remarks: That is, that it is a sound proposition that taxes should be levied only in such amounts as are required by the necessities of those upon whom the tax is imposed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana says that no taxes should be levied which are higher than the necessity for which the taxes are imposed. I submit to the Senate that if there is complete satisfaction with the program of street improvement in the city of Washington, in view of the terrific congestion which exists in Washington and the need for overhead passes, underpasses, widening of streets, and perhaps new streets, then, of course, we should not increase the gasoline tax. I agree with him that no tax should be levied which is higher than the necessities require; but it should be remembered that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is adopted it will provide $1,500,000 more for street improvement in the city of Washington, and I believe the motorists in Washington will gladly pay the $1,500,000 if they have to do so. As a matter of fact, in some instances the tax is not passed on to the users of gasoline. However, I feel sure that they will gladly pay it in order to improve the streets in Washington.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is my understanding that action is to be taken on the bill prior to 1 o'clock today. If that be the case, I should like to have the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will conclude by saying that no fairer tax can be levied than the gasoline tax, because it imposes the cost of road construction and road improvement upon the users of the roads. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas and give to the city of Washington $1,500,000 more, paid by the users of the streets, for the improvement of the streets of Washington and to relieve the terrific congestion which now exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from

Texas to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I understand that the question will come up in the form of a vote on the original committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore it will be before the Senate in the form, Shall the bill be amended by substituting "1 cent" for "2 cents"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, a vote in the affirmative will be in conformity with the action of the District Committee in making an increase of 1 cent a gallon, or $1,500,000 increase in money; and a vote of "nay" would be a vote for an increase of 2 cents, or $3,000,000 in money?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the committee amendment strikes out "2 cents" as provided in the House bill; and therefore the vote is simply on the committee amendment, and not on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 7.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Chair please restate the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out "2 cents" and inserting "1 cent."

Mr. O'DANIEL. So that a vote "yea" would be for a tax of 1 cent a gallon and a "nay" vote would be for a tax of 2 cents a gallon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is attending a conference at the White House. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	George	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Brewster	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Hughes	Thomas, Idaho
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Bunker	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Butler	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lodge	Van Nuys
Caraway	Lucas	Wagner
Chavez	McCarran	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	White
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wiley
Danaher	Maloney	Willis
Davis	Mead	
Ellender	Norris	

NAYS—27

Bankhead	Green	O'Daniel
Brown	Hayden	Pepper
Byrd	Herring	Radcliffe
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Doxey	McFarland	Smathers
Gerry	Maybank	Spencer
Gillette	Murray	Truman
Glass	Nye	Walsh

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Connally	Smith
Bailey	Hatch	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Murdock	Tydings
Bilbo	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Bone	Reed	
Bridges	Shipstead	

So the amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If no further amendment be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill—H. R. 5558—was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REENACTMENT OF OVERMAN AND TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take up for consideration Senate bill 2126.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6233, to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I inquire what bill is it?

Mr. VAN NUYS. Yesterday the House passed House bill 6233 which is identical with Senate bill 2129 passed by the Senate, except for one simple provision, making it mandatory instead of optional to file certain reports, which I will explain later on.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6233. Is there objection to that request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6233) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed a bill identical with the one which we had under consideration and passed yesterday, Senate bill 2129. The House made one change. It changed the word "may" on page 6, line 14, to "shall." The bill at that point refers to reports required of the Alien Property Custodian, or whatever agency the President may designate for the custody of alien property. The change makes such reports mandatory instead of optional. It strengthens the bill along the line proposed in some of the committee amendments yesterday. I was in consultation today with Chairman SUMNERS, of the House Committee, and I ascertained that his committee will agree to all the amendments adopted by the Senate yesterday. If the Senate will permit that additional change in the bill, it will make it unnecessary for the bill to go to conference, and it can be enacted at once.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. From the parliamentary standpoint, the House bill having been passed and messaged to the Senate, and the Senate bill having been passed and messaged to the House, is it the purpose of the Senator from Indiana to take up the House bill and move to strike out all after the enacting clause and include the text of the Senate bill as passed yesterday, with the additional amendment which the House has put into its bill?

Mr. VAN NUYS. That is my purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. This morning I had a conference with the legislative draftsman, the adviser to the Senate on legislative matters, and also with Mr. Ginsberg, who has been acting before the Banking and Currency Committee as counsel to Mr. Henderson, on the point of whether, under title II, we were making adequate provision for price-control legislation if and when it is enacted. Since the Banking and Currency Committee has already spent many days in hearings, and there is under consideration a bill to effectuate price control, it was the opinion of Messrs. Wood and Ginsberg, as well as my own for what it is worth, that if we do not now say something about the impact of the price-control legislation on title II, we may be opening the door wide to the modification of contracts which will completely

destroy the effectiveness of the price-control legislation.

Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that I mention the matter at this time so that the legislative history of the pending bill will reflect the fact that it has now been discussed. It is probable that, when the price-control bill is written, we can incorporate therein language which will refer back to title II of the pending bill in such fashion as to make it perfectly apparent that title II will function, or be caused to function, subject to the price-control limitations in the bill to be reported. Since it is not as yet existing legislation, we naturally do not wish to say that title II is subject to the provisions of a bill yet to be passed.

I mention the matter, therefore, let me say to the Senator from Indiana, so that he may be advised of what we have in mind and the point that we shall wish to take up. I assume that there will be no objection on the part of the Senator from Indiana to at least a tacit understanding in that particular.

Mr. VAN NUYS. On the contrary, I think the Senator from Connecticut has made a very material contribution to the history and intendment of the Congress in the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I now move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, and insert the provisions of Senate bill 2129 as passed yesterday, with one change; namely, on page 6, line 14, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall", so as to read:

And the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision—

And so forth.

Mr. VAN NUYS' amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 6233, and to insert:

TITLE I—COORDINATION OF EXECUTIVE BUREAUS IN THE INTEREST OF THE MORE EFFICIENT CONCENTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935: *Provided*, That the termination of this title shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this title and during the time that this title is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war: *Provided further*, That no redistribution of functions shall provide for the transfer, consolidation, or abolition of the whole or any part of the General Accounting Office or of all or any part of its functions.

SEC. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said functions, except to the extent hereafter authorized by the Congress in appropriation acts or otherwise.

SEC. 4. That should the President, in redistributing the functions among the executive agencies as provided in this title, conclude that any bureau should be abolished and it or their duties and functions conferred upon some other department or bureau or eliminated entirely, he shall report his conclusions to Congress with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this title are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this title is in force.

Upon the termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this title to the contrary notwithstanding.

TITLE II—CONTRACTS

SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contracts in violation of existing law relating to limitation of profits: *Provided further*, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record under regulations prescribed by the President and when deemed by him not to be incompatible with the public interest.

TITLE III—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

SEC. 301. The first sentence of subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise—

"(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and

"(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent, or prohibit any acquisition holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation, or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest,

by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof shall vest, when, as, and upon the terms, directed by the President, in such agency or person as may be designated from time to time by the President, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, and such designated agency or person may perform any and all acts incident to the accomplishment or furtherance of these purposes; and the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision either before, during, or after the completion thereof, or relative to any interest in foreign property, or relative to any property in which any foreign country or any national thereof has or has had any interest, or as may be otherwise necessary to enforce the provisions of this subdivision, and in any case in which a report could be required, the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require the production, or if necessary to the national security or defense, the seizure, of any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers, in the custody or control of such person; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, take other and further measures not inconsistent herewith for the enforcement of this subdivision.

"(2) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder.

"(3) As used in this subdivision the term 'United States' means the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, arising under this subdivision in the Philippine Islands and concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts of the United States of all cases, civil or criminal, arising upon the high seas: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing shall not be construed as a limitation upon the power of the President, which is hereby conferred, to prescribe from time to time, definitions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this subdivision, for any or all of the terms used in this subdivision."

SEC. 302. All acts, actions, regulations, rules, orders, and proclamations heretofore taken, promulgated, made, or issued by, or pursuant to the direction of, the President or the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, which would have been authorized if the provisions of this act and the amendments made by it had been in effect, are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 303. Whenever, during the present war, the President shall deem that the public safety demands it, he may cause to be censored under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time establish, communications by mail, cable, radio, or other means of transmission passing between the United States and any foreign country he may from time to time specify, or which may be carried by any vessel or other means of transportation touching at any port, place, or Territory of the United States and bound to or from any foreign country. Any person who wilfully evades or attempts to evade the submission of any such communication to such censorship or wilfully uses or attempts to use any code or other device for the purpose of concealing from such censorship the intended meaning of such communication shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

TITLE IV—TIME LIMIT AND SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

SEC. 402. This act may be cited as the "First War Powers Act, 1941."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6233) was read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER

Mr. REYNOLDS obtained the floor.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the motion made earlier by the Senator from North Carolina to proceed to the consideration of the bill then referred to by him been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let us have that motion agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry. Was this bill reported yesterday?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was reported yesterday.

Mr. McNARY. So it is on the calendar?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is on the calendar. In answer to the Senator's inquiry I will state that it is listed as order of business 952, Senate bill 2126, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2126.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I very much hope the Senator from North Carolina will not press his motion to take up today the bill on the subject of draft ages. It seems to me that we have not the necessary information on which to determine what we should do. Personally, I do not know whether I want to oppose lowering the ages to 20 and 19, and I shall not know until I can read the testimony of General Hershey, the various Army officials, and the other men who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

The hearings before the Senate committee are not on our desks. They are not available to Senators. The hearings before the House committee have only just been made partially available. I sent for one a short time ago, and obtained it from the House.

This is a question of numbers. All of us agree that we probably need a much larger Army than we have today. Certainly I am prepared to admit that that should be done; but how many men can be taken from the existing registration? Is it necessary yet to go on to those who are 20 and those who are 19? Is it necessary to register those from 45 to 65? Frankly, I do not know today, and if I should make an argument on the subject I should make it with no confidence that I was right.

This is a numerical calculation. There are only a million and a half men in the Army today, and 17,000,000 are already registered under the existing draft law; 1,200,000 men will attain the age of 21 years between now and the first of next January; and my impression is that the Army itself does not expect to draft more than a million men during the coming year.

Is this step necessary yet? I do not know; and I make a serious and solemn plea to the Senator from North Carolina not to put us in the position of opposing what we may not wish to oppose, of making arguments without sufficient facts, without an opportunity to go into the reasons and the facts that are presented. The reasons are not presented in the committee report; and any Senator who reads our committee report is still left completely in the dark as to the reasons for this action, and whether or not it is necessary.

So I ask the Senator from North Carolina if he will not be willing to make this matter a special order of business for tomorrow, instead of pressing it for action today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Naturally the members of the Committee on Military Affairs desire to bring about a favorable vote, and the passage of the bill. We have considered the bill to some extent. We have had before us representatives of the War Department, including General Hershey, of the Selective Service System, and those who are in charge of matters pertaining to national defense are particularly desirous that we give immediate consideration to the subject now in hand.

With reference to the testimony of General Hershey and others who are familiar with and have at hand and in mind the figures mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, I may add that it is not only the intention of the Senator from North Carolina to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the testimony of General Hershey, but it is also the intention of the Senator from North Carolina to bring to the attention of the Senate the statement of General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, himself, the statement of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, in regard to this matter, a statement by the Secretary of War, and statements by numbers of others.

Insofar as the availability of men is concerned, we shall be in a position during the debate to provide the able Senator from Ohio with answers to all his inquiries in reference to the availability of men in the draft, men who have already been registered, the number who have been called, the number who will be called, and the number we might count upon securing from those who registered in the draft, aged from 21 to 36, under section 2 of the original Selective Service Act.

In view of the fact that those in charge of our national defense, those who are in charge of the armed forces of the United States, are insisting on and requesting immediate consideration, I trust that without objection we may be permitted to proceed with the debate, in order that the bill may be explained to Senators now present, and those who may come in later, and who are interested in this question, which I concede is an extremely important one to the American people.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it not a fact that the House has already refused to lower the draft age as recommended by the Senate committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The House has not refused, according to my understanding. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House, under the direction of Chairman MAY, held hearings for several days, when a number of the authorities of the War Department, and some representing the Selective Service System were present and testified. I have before me the typewritten transcript of the hearings before our committee.

It is my understanding that in reporting the bill the House committee recommended that the age limits of those liable

to military service should be 21 to 44, inclusive, whereas after our consideration, on the recommendation of the President of the United States and the Secretary of War, of General Marshall himself, of General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service System, and of innumerable others, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in executive session yesterday, after having for several days considered the provisiosn of the bill, voted unanimously—that is to say, every member of the committee of 18 who was present voted—to adopt the recommendations of the President to require military liability or military service on the part of citizens between the ages of 19 and 44.

Mr. DANAHER. When did the House Committee on Military Affairs take the action stated?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand the House Committee on Military Affairs reported their bill fixing the ages from 21 to 44 day before yesterday.

Mr. DANAHER. What happened between the time when the House Committee on Military Affairs voted not to drop the age limit below 21, and yesterday, when the Senate Committee on Military Affairs voted to drop it to 19, which was so impelling on the minds of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, I am not aware of any information which might have been given to the whole House committee in public hearings, or to the committee or members of the committee in executive hearings, or any information which any member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House might have had other than that obtained in the committee in executive session, or in public hearings. I do know, however, that every member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate who was present during all the hearings and during the time when the questions were directed to the authorities who appeared, voted to report the bill including men from 19 to 44 years of age. They voted to report it for sundry reasons which I shall endeavor to explain.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. How long would it take to make available to us the report of the hearings which were held before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have before me now the transcript of all of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in typewritten form, but I have no knowledge that they have already been put into printed form.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to pay due tribute to the unanimity of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in whom I have great confidence, but the fact remains that on Monday or Tuesday of this week the House committee refused to lower the age from 21 to 19. Yet the Senate committee, on evidence not before us, has voted unanimously, the Senator says, to drop the age from 21 to 19. I may be very much in favor of dropping the age, too, but I certainly should like to know why it should be done, and I should like to see the transcript of the hearings, just as the Senator from Ohio has so pointedly remarked that he would.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to our majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. On a motion to take up a bill I do not know that it is pertinent to inquire what may have actuated a committee of another body in taking action different from that taken by a committee of this body. It seems to me we might very well adopt the motion of the Senator from North Carolina to proceed to consider the bill. No one can tell how long it will be debated. My judgment is that probably the only controversial matter in the bill is the matter of age.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true, section 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that is not a complicated problem. Men may have their views about it, and I might suggest to the Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, in charge of the bill, that if as the debate proceeds there appears any good reason for withholding the vote on the bill until tomorrow, I do not know that there would be any objection to that. It seems to me we should proceed, however.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am sure there would be no objection to postponing the vote. Of course, in all fairness, I am not desirous of pressing for a vote today, as mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Every Member of this body is interested in the bill on account of its tremendous, widespread importance, and I would not insist upon a vote on the bill finally until every Member of this body who wanted information had an opportunity of securing it. As the debate proceeds in the Senate, if Senators have not, as a result of the debate, secured information which they desire and do not feel that they are in a position to make up their minds as to whether to support any one section or all the sections or the bill itself, naturally I should not object, and I do not believe any member of my committee would object, to the bill going over until tomorrow for a final vote, in order that Senators might have an opportunity to read the report of the hearings in printed form.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Conceding the necessity for expedition, I wish to ask the Senator a question bearing upon the necessity for this imminent action today. I wish to read the Senator three sentences from an Associated Press dispatch, and ask him if it is a correct presentation of the facts. I quote the Associated Press:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., December 14.—War Department officials made clear today that it would be a long time, if ever, before any men outside the 21–35 age group are drafted for the Army, despite the proposal to require all aged 18 to 64, inclusive, to register.

I read another sentence:

> Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, warning against any hysteria—

Warning against any hysteria—

> in connection with the draft extension, said there was no way of telling when it might be necessary to tap the reservoir of men outside the 21–35 group. "We can meet the situation today and tomorrow with the present draft-age limits of 21 to 35," Hershey said.

Now I submit to the Senator that if that is an accurate reflection of the situation as it has been presented officially to the Senate Military Affairs Committee, there certainly is no 24-hour pressure to proceed to a conclusion.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator, in answer, that I would not be so presumptuous as to undertake to say what the War Department intends. That is a matter for the War Department to determine. Insofar as General Hershey's statement is concerned, I naturally concede that we are not going to need these additional men today or tomorrow, but the Nation is now at war, and therefore I deem it our duty to meet the issue as it arises from day to day. I can see no necessity for putting off until tomorrow the question of deciding whether we shall reduce the registration age from 21 to 18 and raise it from 36 to 65, or for putting off the question of inducting into the service for military liability those who have reached the age of 19 and those up to the age of 44. Why put the matter off? The War Department officials have been here and have testified. General Hershey has been here and has testified. It is certainly conceded that we shall need millions of men if we are to bring about ultimate, complete victory, which we all agree we shall do. So why put off until tomorrow that which we can accomplish today? At least we can go into the methods of dealing with the question, at least we can discuss the measure, and then if there are Senators here who are not desirous of voting upon the bill today because they have not had the opportunity to read the hearings, they will have tonight for that purpose, and tomorrow we can vote on the measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's fervid dedication to the cause which we all embrace, and I have no quarrel with anything he has said. But the Senator has not answered my question. I should like to refer to my question, upon the answer to which I should like to base my judgment as to whether it is necessary to move today. I ask the Senator whether the Associated Press statement which I read is a correct reflection of the situation, namely, that General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, warning against any hysteria in connection with this action, announces that it will substantially be a long time, if ever, before the draft will reach below the age of 21?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If General Hershey made that statement, I would not undertake to deny any statement he made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, did he make it? That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know whether he made the statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator think he would like to have a day to find out whether General Hershey made the statement?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not think it makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It makes a great deal of difference to me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think the first thing this Nation should do is to make a tabulation of its manpower available in order to——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with that statement 1,000 percent. I am not objecting to the registration completely. Without any doubt whatever we ought to know what our manpower is between the ages of 18 and 65.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is what the bill calls for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The bill also reduces the draft age to a point where we have no business reducing it unless it is necessary. If it is necessary, of course, we must do it. I am asking the Senator whether the Selective Service Director has said it is not necessary for some time to come.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know that such a statement was made by General Hershey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Neither do I.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I assume it was, since it is authored by the Associated Press, a most reliable organization. But since I do not know, I cannot undertake to say whether he made it or whether he did not. General Hershey is the head of the Selective Service organization, and General Hershey certainly would not have appeared before the House committee and before the Senate committee on yesterday, and the day before, and the day before that, and testified with regard to this matter, unless he was interested in the passage of such a law. I shall in the course of this discussion bring to the Senate's attention the testimony of General Hershey, not only before the House committee but his testimony before the Senate committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wanted to suggest that I do not know whether the article which the Senator read purports to quote what General Hershey said in the committee, or whether it is from a statement he gave out, or whether it is a quotation of something he said otherwise; but in either case it is difficult to point out a single sentence, from what may be the long testimony of a military officer, and base any opinion upon it. It must be qualified by other things he said in connection with the whole program. It seems that on a motion to take up a bill we cannot accurately interpret something that a military officer, or a Senator, or anyone else has said, based simply upon an isolated sentence that someone picks out of a long statement and uses for publicity purposes. Whatever General Hershey said before the committee undoubtedly appears in the hearings, and I certainly trust that printed copies of them may be available today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say that we have the hearings before us in typewritten form, and it is the intention of the Senator from North Carolina to bring them to the attention of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator will.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Where are the hearings? If I could have a copy of them, I should be very glad to see what General Hershey said. I do not have a copy of the hearings on my desk.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not have a printed copy of the hearings. I have a typewritten copy.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly there are no printed copies. The testimony is not generally available to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say in answer to that question that the hearings will be ready in printed form tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I recall very well what General Hershey said before the committee. I do not think the A. P. dispatch which the Senator from Michigan has quoted is a correct interpretation of General Hershey's position at all. I recall that General Hershey told us it was his business to have the men ready when they were called for by the War Department. He said that was his job. He knows nothing about when they will be needed. He said he simply writes the checks. He compared his position to that of a banker. When the money is called for the banker has to have the money. General Hershey said that when the Department calls for the men he wants the men there so he can supply them. He is in no position to know when the War Department will need the men. He made that very clear to us. That will appear time after time in the testimony. So I do not think the press dispatch which has been quoted is a correct interpretation of General Hershey's attitude toward the passage of this bill. I think every member of the committee knows that General Hershey wants the measure passed and wants it passed promptly, so that he will be assured of the men when they are called for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator from Colorado concede that the establishment of the falsity of this quotation is as important from his point of view as is the establishment of its truth?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with that statement; but as our leader has stated, I do not think we can pick up a stray sentence somewhere and pin a whole decision on it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have not picked up a stray sentence. I have picked up the opening summary made by the Associated Press in respect to the existing situation. All I am asking is whether it is true, and that I have an opportunity to find out whether it is true. If it is not true, I want to know it as much as does the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All I am trying to say is that I do not think it is a correct interpretation of General Hershey's attitude; and I am sure that after the Senator from Michigan reads the testimony of General Hershey he will agree that General Hershey had no such thought in mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what I want an opportunity to do. That is all I am asking for. I cannot do it now, because the hearings are not available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator should have the opportunity of reading the hearings.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak only because the Senator from Colorado seemed to bind all the members of the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, by what he said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I had no such intention.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator spoke of what we all felt.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senators who sit across the aisle that for many days I very patiently listened to General Hershey and the other military witnesses. At the end of that time—and I am merely expressing my own opinion—I had heard so many conflicting and contradictory expressions of opinion upon this very issue that I have no idea, after having listened to all the testimony, what the attitude of the Army is at the present time with respect to immediately taking into service boys between the ages of 19 and 21.

Senators will find in the record, when it comes into their possession, several statements exactly indicative of what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said—that there is little probability of any boy between the ages of 19 and 21 ever being called. They will find other statements to the effect that the Army considers this group of boys the best Army material. It may be concluded from those statements and from many other statements that the Army expects to use them immediately. So I say to distinguished Senators that, in my opinion, when they read the hearings they will not be very much further advanced than they now are.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have no disposition to delay this matter, but the House is now considering a similar bill. I am informed that there is no probability of the House bill being passed today. If it is passed today, it will be very late. If the motion which is now before the Senate should be agreed to, would it not be well further to agree that there will be no vote today, so that if the House bill is passed today and is sent to the Senate tomorrow, we can then substitute the Senate bill for the House bill, or make arrangements for immediate action?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, I am not desirous of pressing for a vote on the bill today if it is desirable to defer the vote until tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am reminded that situations similar to this have arisen many times. I recall the practice of the Senate. I have no objection to immediate consideration of the bill, but in view of what has been stated, I do object to its immediate disposition.

Heretofore when the record of hearings has not been made available to Senators we have discussed measures informally and deferred the vote until a day or two later. That has always been the practice. It is a wholesome one and a fair one. Senators who are not on the committee should have an opportunity to read the testimony. It now appears that there is only one copy available—a typewritten copy in the hands of the chairman. I assume that by tomorrow the record will be available in printed form for all Members of the Senate. We cannot expect an intelligent vote unless Senators have access to the evidence taken before the committee. That is perfectly plain. The practice to which I refer has been followed in the Senate ever since I first came to the Senate, nearly a quarter of a century ago, and I insist that it is a wise practice. It is one which has the sanction of usage in a case such as this. The chairman of the committee may discuss the matter, and then it may go over until opportunity is afforded to Senators to read the testimony. Then we can vote tomorrow or the day following.

I submit that we should follow the usual practice, and should now come to an agreement that there will be no vote today, and that tomorrow opportunity will be given to every Senator to express his view after familiarizing himself with the printed testimony.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in this discussion I suggested that we go ahead with consideration of the bill, and that if it should develop that there is any reason for not voting today, it should go over until tomorrow. The only difficulty about that is that nearly always when we enter into an agreement of that sort at the beginning Senators feel at liberty to leave the Chamber, and do not remain to listen to the discussion.

I should not like to agree now on any hour tomorrow when we should vote. I think that a delay of 24 hours in the consideration of the bill will probably not be a vital matter. However, I hope that officers of the Senate will see to it that the hearings are printed and made available for every Senator. I hope that can be done this afternoon, even if the Printing Office finds it necessary to put on a special shift of printers to do the work. Therefore I suggest that the motion of the Senator from North Carolina be agreed to, and that we have an understanding that there will be no vote today on the bill or on the controversial age question.

Mr. McNARY. And that fair opportunity be given tomorrow for debate upon the subject.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is perfectly agreeable to me. I hope it is agreeable to other Senators.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, all the minority and those associated with the minority are asking for is a fair opportunity to determine the issues involved in any bill so that they may cast an intelligent vote. We want to go along: we are going along, and have been going along, and expect to continue to go along if we have fair treatment, which we know we shall receive.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina very much appreciates what the able Senator from Oregon has stated. I wish to repeat that there is no disposition whatsoever on my part to insist upon a vote today, either on the question of age limits insofar as liability for military service is concerned, or on any other section which pertains to registration or military liability. I know that Senators desire to familiarize themselves with the testimony. I appreciate the suggestion which has been made. It is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. With that understanding—and there will be no difficulty about it—I suggest that a vote be taken on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

PRICE CONTROL—OILS AND FATS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of 28 Members of the Senate I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have it read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 209), as follows:

Resolved, That the Price Control Administrator be, and he hereby is, requested to suspend the order issued by him on the 12th day of December 1941, fixing a ceiling on oils and fats, and take no further action in the matter of ceilings on oils and fats until final action has been taken on the pending price-control bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask that the clerk read the names of the Senators sponsoring the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the names will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The resolution is offered by Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BILBO, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. DOXEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LEE, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HILL, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. PEPPER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. McNARY. I am wholly uninformed and unaware as to the situation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to make a statement in explanation of the resolution.

Mr. McNARY. I should be glad to hear the statement; but in fairness to everyone concerned, I think we should probably have statements from both sides.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am hopeful that there will be only one side.

Mr. McNARY. I should prefer to have action taken tomorrow or another day. Is the matter impending, immediate, or emergent?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not exactly; but the situation is somewhat similar to that in connection with another measure which was under discussion; and some of us would like to get away.

Mr. McNARY. I wish we all might.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The exchanges are closed, and all the markets for sales of these commodities are closed; and from that standpoint I think it is a matter of emergency.

I should like to make a statement; and then, if the Senator does not want the resolution considered it will be all right to put it over.

Mr. McNARY. I should be very glad to have the Senator make a statement in explanation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As the Senator from Oregon knows, 28 Members of the Senate—practically all the Senators from the regions affected by the order which applies to cottonseed oil and lard, desire to have the resolution agreed to at once. The order issued last Friday night by Mr. Henderson in his position as price administrator fixes a ceiling on edible oils and fats. I shall not undertake any discussion of his right to issue the order; I am assuming, for the purpose of this discussion, that he had the right to do so. I will merely point out, representing the group of 28 Senators, the reason why we think the Senate should agree to the resolution.

The order did not fix the price as of the closing of the exchanges on the day it was issued. If it had done so, we would not now be making our request. Instead of fixing the price as of that time, the order was made retroactive, in the nature of an ex post facto order, and went back to November 26, a date arbitrarily selected—we do not know why it was selected—at which time the prices of cottonseed and cottonseed oil were much lower than they were the day the order was issued.

The result is, as I have said, that the whole trade has been thrown into confusion. The effect is a very great loss to the owners—farmers and dealers—of a large quantity, nearly a million tons, of cottonseed, and to the independent crushers of cottonseed, who have on hand, and ready for the crushing process, nearly 2,000,000 tons of seed, and who have a very large quantity of cottonseed oil which they have crushed from seed bought from the farmers at a price higher than the price Mr. Henderson has fixed in his order.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have just come in, and I did not hear all the Senator's statement. Is not one of the effects of the order that it virtually takes money out of the pockets of the little manufacturers and the little dealers, and puts it into the

hands of the big concerns, which are commonly called the trusts?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think there is any question about that; the order has given the processors a great windfall. In connection with the order fixing this price, let me say to Senators, there is no sale for cottonseed oil except to a few refiners; and the refiners own approximately one-half the "crude" mills in the South. The others are independent mills. Of course, the independent mills must sell their oil to the refiners. There is no other outlet for it.

When the order was made fixing the price of crude cottonseed oil 125 points lower than the market price—from 12½ down to 11¼—it provided a cheap price on crude cottonseed oil for processors; and, although I do not know why it did so, the order excepted from its effect and its operation shortening made by the refiners from cottonseed oil. In other words, they get it cheaper under the order, and their product made from cottonseed oil is expressly excepted from the operation of the order. There is no appeal; there is no judicial procedure provided.

This matter comes up when we are just about ready to pass a price-control measure which will contain formulas in some form to guide and direct the Price Administrator in fixing price ceilings.

Now let me say, for the benefit of Members of the Senate who are not on the Banking and Currency Committee, that at a meeting of the committee this morning it was agreed that after the appointment of a subcommittee, which has been appointed, the full committee will meet on the last Friday in December—before Congress reconvenes in January. I do not know the calendar date, but it is just 2 or 3 days before Congress will meet. It is further understood—the majority leader was present, and he participated in the understanding, and there was unanimous agreement by the members of the committee—that every possible effort will be made to have the bill ready to be taken up on the floor of the Senate immediately when the session convenes after the first of January.

So the resolution merely requests Mr. Henderson to suspend further action until the Congress shall have an opportunity to act on the price-control measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the resolution require him to rescind the order already made and to establish the status quo as of that time?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct—to preserve the status quo as of the time he made the order; then, if he shall subsequently make an order, he will make it under the measure which we shall consider early in January.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon in a moment.

We are all very much interested, as the Senator can see, in getting action on the measure. We want to have the markets reopened. The order has brought about terrible financial suffering. We are all flooded with telegrams from all sections of the Cotton Belt. Every Senator from that entire section is intensely interested, as the Senator from Oregon can well see.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion let me say that I took occasion to ask Mr. Henderson to state why he set the price on cottonseed oil, and I have received a reply from his office, given to me by Mr. Lee in his office, to the effect that he set the price in order to protect the consumers. We all know that the consumers of cottonseed-oil products buy cottonseed-oil products from retail grocers, and we can go anywhere in the land and will be unable to find how the order has benefited any consumer, because there is too much play between the producer and the consumer. Mr. Henderson sets the prices on the farmer, and the farmer is the one who pays the bill. The consumer does not receive any benefit.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The resolution simply makes a request of Mr. Henderson; we feel sure that he will observe a request made by the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am convinced from what has occurred this morning that it will be very difficult to enforce a price-fixation bill if we are going to disturb it every few days by a resolution. That statement does not concede that there is any real authority in the Administrator to enforce this edict upon his part.

I recall some months ago what occurred in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when Mr. Henderson was there. I asked him directly to exhibit his authority, by statute or otherwise, or even under an Executive order. He was unable to do so. I think the testimony clearly indicated, in response to some questions I propounded, that he was only acting upon the theory that there would be general compliance with his request. That, unquestionably, is the only authority he is exercising in this instance. But the pending proposal is a manifestation of what will occur if we shall enact a price-control bill. Those displeased will present resolutions requesting the Senate to take action to suspend orders made by the Price Administrator. We find today a number of Members of the Senate, representing the South most capably, asking that the Senate express its views concerning a matter of which I have no knowledge at all. I do not think a third of the Senators have any knowledge of the subject. I think, if the issue is drawn here, it should be thoroughly considered, and it would be fair to the Administrator to ask him to give us a statement concerning his attitude. There must be some reason why the Price Administrator, so-called, has enforced his order on the cotton producers, but here we are proposing to express an ex parte view and to say that the action which has been taken is wrong, and that the Administrator should not have taken it. The Senate is asked to confirm the action of a very representative group in the Senate.

I do not like the policy; I do not like the practice; I can foresee what we are coming to. If we desire to legislate in that field, it should be done by a repealing or modifying statute and not by resolutions similar to the one now presented.

I think I may say that I have exhibited a great deal of fairness in my attitude toward cotton and those interested in cotton, and my position has been well known. I think I expressed myself most generously a few days ago when a bill was offered by the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I entertain a very warm, healthy, and pleasant feeling for those engaged in growing and making cotton, but I cannot sit idly by and permit a practice to become established here that would, in the future, embarrass every Member of the Senate.

For the reasons I have stated, I hope the very reasonable and able Senator from Georgia will permit this resolution to remain on the table, if he does not want it referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction. It should not go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for that committee has no jurisdiction in this case. Jurisdiction has been conferred by action of the Senate on the Committee on Banking and Currency. Thus the resolution should either go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, or remain on the table, to be brought up under the rule after an adjournment as a resolution coming over from a previous day for automatic consideration, or it could be called up by any Senator any day on his own responsibility. That would be fair; that would give an opportunity to the so-called Price Administrator—I speak of him with no disrespect; but I am sure he is without authority, although probably acting in the best of good faith and intention—to make a statement, for I submit that we may have to determine whether there are two sides to this question and not only one side to it.

With that statement, I object to the consideration of the resolution today, and I suggest to the Senator that he either at this time have the resolution referred to the committee or have it go over for a day, and it can be brought up at any time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolution goes over under the rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, under the rule, if the resolution lies on the table, can it be called up tomorrow for action?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate adjourns today, it may be called up tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will then withdraw the request for consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, have there been any hearings upon this bill at all?

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is not a bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, upon the proposal which has been submitted by the Senator from Alabama, have there been any hearings or any testimony?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; the order of the Administrator was only issued a few days ago. It put everything into confusion and disrupted the markets. Not only with respect to cottonseed oil but with respect to other oils and fats.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish the Senator from Alabama would make that point clear. The impression seems to prevail in the Senate that the action taken by the Administrator affects only cottonseed. I was advised by the office of the Price Administrator that it affects 1,800 different fats and oils derived from vegetables, plants, and animals. It certainly affects the soy bean oil market, the lard market, and the market for all fats and oils. It is not confined merely to cottonseed. Perhaps the situation is more acute with respect to cottonseed now because this happens to be the exact season when cottonseed is being marketed and crushed, but the order also applies to all vegetable fats and oils; it affects the producers of soy beans, and indirectly affects the butter market.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I have not read the order; it has not been available; but my understanding is the same as his, that it applies to all edible oils and fats, of every sort and character and description, except butter and shortening made from other than cottonseed oil.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the resolution which has been offered is a simple Senate resolution. If adopted it would have no force and effect in law save as a request backed by the sentiment of the Senate. The order which is asked to be rescinded has had a vast effect upon a large interest in my State. In my State there are a great number of mills which buy cottonseed and process it into oil and cake and other incidental products. These mills have purchased the cottonseed in my State at a higher price than will be permitted under the order issued by Mr. Henderson, and, as the result, stand to lose a considerable sum. The mills have sent me telegrams and letters protesting against this order, and naturally they are asking for some relief.

Mr. President, I do not desire to place in the RECORD copies of all the messages and letters which have come to me, but I do desire, if I may have permission, to place in the RECORD, as a part of my statement, a memorandum which has been handed me by some one qualified to pass upon this question. I stand sponsor for the memorandum, and ask that it may be made a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

While it may be possible farmers have sold 95 percent of their this season's seed, surely this fact alone is unworthy of any honest, equitable, or fair consideration of the matter, for ginners and oil mills may have 25 percent in seed or products unsold, and the futures market is carrying more than 1,500 contracts, offsetting hedges.

Futures markets, ginners, and oil mills have relied on Mr. Henderson's assurance about September 1 and following his announcement after the close of the market August 28 to the effect that futures markets would not be disturbed unless speculation brought about unreasonably high prices.

December futures contracts closed on August 28 at 12.43 and on September 2, the next trading day thereafter, and following Mr. Henderson's assurance, December closed at 12.86 and during the succeeding 30 days and in perfectly normal markets December advanced to above 14 cents on October 2. December 12 December futures contracts closed at 13.65 bid offered at 13.95, or 25 to 50 points below the high of October 2.

After the close of the market at this price, Mr. Henderson announced his proposed ceiling of 12 50. In doing this, and to express it in the very mildest of terms, Mr. Henderson broke faith with the futures markets and with the cottonseed oil trade as a whole.

His argument that his action is of minor importance to the farmers because they have sold 95 percent of their seed is a disgraceful one coming from a Government official, and does violence to the most elementary principles of honesty and fair dealing. On its face it is deliberately designed to unwarrantly rook one group of American citizens simply because it affects only to a minor degree another group. Nothing could be more undemocratic, more dictatorial, or more contrary to the principles for which we are fighting; and in the last analysis and in the long run could do no greater harm to the cotton farmers themselves.

The only free money which the poorer class of cotton farmers, and which constitutes the vast majority, have comes from their cottonseed. Farmers have no facilities for holding their seed; excessive moisture content often prohibits holding, but, regardless of these two facts, the farmers' urgent need for free money requires them to sell seed as fast as harvested.

Therefore, someone must carry 75 percent of the seed, or their products for distribution between the end of one harvest and the beginning of another. The burden of carrying this has heretofore been distributed between the ginners, oil mills, refiners, and the futures markets. The ultimate consumer picks up the load only from day to day. The present is not the only cotton season. There will be another cotton season next year. If the cottonseed and cottonseed oil trade is faced with the unbearable condition which Mr. Henderson would impose, who will stand in the breach between the farmer and the ultimate consumer next year and make a ready cash market for the farmers' seed day after day as they bring it to the gin?

If Mr. Henderson considered the price above 12.50 to be unreasonable, why did he not so announce on August 28, when December closed at 12.43?

Is there a scintilla of honesty in his withholding his announcement until the cottonseed oil trade had functioned, as was their custom in taking up the burden between the farmer and the ultimate consumer, and assuming that burden from harvest end to succeeding harvest?

As to the reasonableness of Mr. Henderson's price of 12.50, it is worthy of note that in June 1917 futures contracts reached 16.25, and in May 1918 they reached 20.25, at which price a ceiling was placed by the Government Food Administration. In other words, the ceiling fixed by President Wilson's administration in 1918 was 62 percent higher than that proposed by Mr. Henderson.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that when the question of the tax on oils and fats was before the Finance Committee it proved to be a very complex and elaborate question. Coming from a State which is a great consumer of fats and oils, both individually and in a number of different industries, I certainly hope that there is something to which the Senator can direct me and which I can read or study in anticipation of a vote on this proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are not trying to seek anything by this resolution except time; that is all. We are asking the Administrator to suspend his order and that it may go over until the Congress acts, if it shall act, and gives him authority and a formula under which he may act. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LODGE. I presume the Senator will have a statement to make giving the details in justification for this proposal at the proper time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I will be glad to go into the matter further, as will other Senators. This is not a matter in which merely the Senator from Alabama is interested. Do not let the Senator get the impression that this is an individual proposition. It is a matter of concern to the constituents of all the Senators who sponsor the resolution and to a great many others. We have been bombarded by our constituents—farmers, cotton mills, and many other interested parties—urging us to do something to obtain relief from this totally unexpected order. No hearings were held on it by the Department. The Administrator consulted nobody. The proper officials of the Department of Agriculture, I am informed, were not consulted about it. Like a bolt out of the sky came this order which upset values and took value out of the cottonseed still in the farmers' hands, cottonseed in the crushers waiting to be crushed, and out of the raw product of the cottonseed. There is a degree of consternation, and all we are asking, I will say to the Senator, is not the writing of any statute on the subject or the taking of any legislative action, but we are asking for delay—a suspension of this order—so that the trade may go ahead about its business for the next 2 or 3 weeks; that is all.

I have pointed out to the Senate that there is a clear-cut understanding by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the majority leader that the bill which will regulate and control price fixing will be taken up, if the Senate is willing to take it up—the majority leader will do what he can to have it taken up—the very first thing after Congress reassembles about the 5th of January. So no indefinite delay is sought. We simply ask to delay it long enough to let Congress itself write the formula under which these price-fixing orders shall be made. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not seen the resolution because it has not been printed. Am I to understand that it simply seeks to prevent the Price Administrator from interfering with the prices of these oils and fats?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It requests him to suspend his order and postpone final action until Congress acts on the price-control bill.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think there is a likelihood that similar action would be requested by every other interest in the country if we should take it in the case of one?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Price Administrator should make retroactive orders as injurious as this one has been, I think there ought to be such requests; but I do not know of any other orders he has made which have been so injurious to so many persons as this order has been. If the Senate makes this request, I do not think the Price Administrator will make any more orders of that sort until his authority is established and formulas are adopted and standards are set up to govern him in issuing price-fixing orders.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement at this time about this order of O. P. A. C. S., and to offer for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Oscar Johnston, of Mississippi, one of the best-informed men on agricultural problems in the United States. He is president of the National Cotton Council of America, and a man who knows more about marketing and marketing conditions than a great many men who are here in Washington engaged in price fixing, particularly as they apply to agricultural products.

I wish to call attention to one or two facts.

This order was issued on December 12, but the price ceiling was fixed on the basis of the levels prevailing on November 26. The order applies to all fats and oils except butter and perhaps one or two other exceptions. It is, of course, a fact known to all who have given study to it that many of the oils and fats are interchangeable. But this is the situation which has been created by Mr. Henderson's order, or his organization's order:

Early in the season a statement was issued and action was taken which had the effect of driving down the price of oils. Thereafter, some modification of the action taken was made, and the O. P. A. C. S. became a party to what is tantamount to an agreement with the producers of oils and fats in this country, and, as the producers and processors contend, made the statement publicly that no further effort would be made to place a ceiling on cottonseed and cottonseed oils, peanuts, and peanut oils, and other oils, including soybeans, unless there was a run-away price which threatened to get out of hand. Nobody wanted a run-away price. At the time of the peak movement of cottonseed to the market, when the crushers were buying the cottonseed, O. P. A. C. S. tacitly approved of the movement at the then level of prices.

Now, get the picture: When cottonseed was moving and reaching the peak of the movement, O. P. A. C. S. sat still, in view of its former statement that no ceiling would be placed on oils unless run-away prices were threatened, allowed a great part of the cottonseed to move to the market at a certain level of prices, and then, on December 12, when prices were back where they had been when a large part of the crop was actually moving to the market, fixed a ceiling, but not at the level of prices on December 12, but at the level of prices on November 26.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but let me first make a further statement.

Mr. Johnston summarizes the whole thing in this paragraph, and he is entirely correct. This is a letter written to Mr. Henderson. He says:

> Your action may not have been so intended, but, regardless of intent, the action constitutes a serious breach of good faith on the part of a governmental agency.

And this is sound.

> No governmental agency or bureau is ever justified in imposing an arbitrary and artificial ceiling upon the price of cottonseed oil, or any other manufactured product, at a level below the maximum price which prevailed for cottonseed oil, or any other such product, during the marketing season when processors were acquiring their raw materials at prices based upon the then prevailing prices of the products of those raw materials.

And O. P. A. C. S. tacitly approved the prices at which the raw material moved into the hands of the processors, and then fixed a ceiling at a prior date in the season, which means bankruptcy to many of the small crushers.

This is what happens:

The buyer of cotton seed, the small crusher, goes to his local bank and makes arrangements to buy seed. He buys them on a market that Mr. Henderson has tacitly approved. He buys them at a level that O. P. A. C. S. has approved during the peak of the season. He puts up his money. The capital borrowed is invested in this product. He cannot crush all these seeds. He can crush only what he can conveniently store or can immediately sell. The smaller crusher does not hedge. They think, over here, that he hedges; but the ignorance of some men who are fixing prices is simply abysmal.

They think they hedge, but they do not hedge. The big refineries hedge, the big crushers hedge, but the little crusher does not, as a rule, hedge. He cannot hedge cottonseed; he cannot hedge peanuts; he cannot hedge other fats. He can only hedge in the oil market, and he does not do it, and he cannot do it, practically. So he borrows money, buys at the prevailing market price, which has the apparent approval of Mr. Henderson, and then Mr. Henderson puts the price under the level at which he has bought his raw material, meaning, of course, that the oil crusher will be bankrupt, and the farmer who has yet held his cottonseed—and many of them do hold it for the purpose of purchasing fertilizer in 1942 or in the subsequent year—will stand a terrific loss.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not desire to interrupt my colleague in the very able argument he is making, and I know he will make this matter entirely clear to the Senate. I hope, however, that he will point out in terms of dollars and cents the effect of this order issued by Mr. Henderson. O. P. A. C. S. stood by and saw the little ginners and the little independent crushers purchase cottonseed at $60 a ton. Then, without warning, at this season of the year, when they could not possibly have disposed of those seeds or the oil therefrom, he has fixed the price of oil on the basis of slightly more than $51 a ton for cottonseed, imposing a loss of practically $9 a ton on hundreds of little businessmen, small ginners, and independent crushers, scattered throughout the entire cotton section. All farmers who have seed naturally sustain the same loss.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague is entirely correct; and the loss is terrific. No one in the South wants to see run-away prices, wants to see inflation, in the sense of rapid price rise, which will be destructive, and more destructive than even direct taxes; but at the same time, when early in the season an effort was made to hold the price of oils in check, and when throughout the season the Price Administration allowed everybody interested in cottonseed and peanuts to go in the market and buy at a price, and when they now propose to fix a ceiling which will crucify them, it simply cannot be justified. Mr. Johnston's conclusion is eminently sound.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that yesterday Mr. Henderson and two or three of his assistants appeared before a committee, not a regularly constituted committee of the Senate, but a group of Senators who are interested in this subject. He said he desired to stop what he called "run-away prices." If that was the purpose, why did he fix some other price than the price on the day fixed by the order? Why did he not fix December 12? Why did he select another date? Did the Senator understand that Mr. Henderson ever explained that feature of the matter? I did not understand him to explain it at all. In my judgment, he could not explain it. If he wanted to stop run-away prices, why in the world did he not select the day when he issued the order, which was December 12? Why did he go back of that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me to interject, several weeks prior to the issuance of the order prices were higher than when Mr. Henderson made the order. It was not the result of any run-away prices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Inasmuch as we are discussing Mr. Henderson's order, and some of the Senators have suggested that they had not had opportunity to read the order, I ask unanimous consent to present for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the order issued by Mr. Henderson, together with my telegram to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE SCHEDULE NO. 53—FATS AND OILS

The outbreak of war has disrupted trade in certain fats and oils with the result that normal price relationships are disturbed and inflationary price increases threaten to develop. Supplies of domestic fats and oils are substantial, and no serious shortage for defense or civilian requirements is in prospect. Nevertheless, because of recent speculative activity, the danger of serious inflation and price spiraling has made it imperative to issue

immediately a schedule temporarily establishing maximum prices. Because of the interchangeability of fats and oils it is necessary that maximum prices be established for all fats and oils. To effect this purpose of price stabilization it is necessary to limit prices to those which preceded the recent speculative and sharp rise in prices which distorted the normal price relationship between the various fats and oils. The date of November 26, 1941, when the closing price of the December future for cottonseed oil on the New York Produce Exchange was 12.50 cents per pound best accomplishes this purpose.

Should unwarranted price rises occur at stages of distribution not covered in this schedule, appropriate action will be taken by this Office.

Accordingly, under the authority vested in me by Executive Order No. 8734, it is hereby directed that:[1]

SEC. 1351.151. Maximum prices for fats and oils:

(a) On and after December 13, 1941, no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver, or transfer fats or oils, and no person shall buy, offer to buy, or accept delivery of fats or oils at prices higher than the maximum prices, except that contracts entered into prior to December 13, 1941, providing for a price higher than the maximum prices, may be carried out at the contract price. The maximum prices shall include commissions and all other charges.

(b) For any kind, grade, or quality of fat or oil the maximum shipping point price shall be the highest shipping point price at which the seller sold, on November 26, 1941, such kind of fat or oil of approximately the same grade, quality, and amount to a similar purchaser for nearby delivery. The maximum delivered price shall be this maximum shipping point price plus actual transportation costs.

(c) In the event that the maximum price cannot be determined under subsection (b) above, the maximum shipping point price shall be determined as follows:

(1) When the sales price per pound, exclusive of transportation charges, in the seller's most recent sale between October 1, 1941, and November 26, 1941, for nearby delivery to a similar purchaser, of approximately the same kind, grade, quality, and amount, exceeded the December future price of cottonseed oil on the day of such sale, the maximum shipping point price shall be 12.50 cents plus the number of points by which such sales price, exclusive of transportation charges, exceeded such future price; or

(2) When the sales price per pound, exclusive of transportation charges, in the seller's most recent sale between October 1, 1941, and November 26, 1941, for nearby delivery to a similar purchaser of approximately the same kind, grade, quality, and amount, was less than the December future price of cottonseed oil on the day of such sale, the maximum shipping point price shall be 12.50 cents minus the number of points by which such sales price, exclusive of transportation charges, was less than such future price.

(d) In the event that the maximum price cannot be determined under either subsection (b) or (c) above, the maximum shipping point price shall be the highest price for which approximately the same kind, grade, quality, and amount of such fat or oil was purchased by the purchaser from any other seller on November 26, 1941. The maximum delivered price shall be this maximum shipping point price plus actual transportation costs.

(e) In all other cases, the maximum prices shall be the market price for such product of the same kind, grade, quality, amount, and type of purchaser on November 26, 1941.

[1] Secs. 1351.151 to 1351.158, inclusive, issued pursuant to the authority contained in Executive Orders Nos. 8734, 8875, 6 F. R. 1917, 4483.

(f) The above prices shall be the maximum prices for all transactions except for cottonseed oil and lard futures contracts traded on the New York Produce Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade, respectively. For such contracts the maximum prices shall be the closing prices on these exchanges as of November 26, 1941, for all the months then traded in as follows:

Cottonseed oil

	Cents per pound
For delivery during 1941:	
December	12.50
1942:	
January	12.47
February	12.47
March	12.49
April	12.49
May	12.50
June	12.50
July	12.53

Lard, Chicago

For delivery during 1941:	
December	9.77
1942:	
January	9.95
March	11.32
May	11.52
July	11.72

SEC. 1351.152. Less than maximum prices: Lower prices than the maximum prices established by this schedule may be charged, demanded, paid, or offered.

SEC. 1351.153. Records and reports: Any person receiving or delivering fats or oils on and after December 13, 1941, under any contract entered into previous thereto at prices higher than the maximum prices established by the schedule shall report such delivery or receipt to the Office of Price Administration within 10 days thereof stating (a) the name and address of the buyer and seller; (b) the actual date of the contract; (c) the date of delivery or receipt; and (d) the price, quantity, and description of the product sold. A transaction involving the transfer of less than $250 need not be reported.

Every person making any purchase or sale of fats or oils on and after December 13, 1941, shall keep for inspection by the Office of Price Administration, for a period of not less than 1 year, complete and accurate records of each such purchase and sale amounting to $500 or more, including the date thereof, the name of the purchaser, the price paid or received, and the grade, quality, and amount sold.

Every person affected by this schedule shall submit such reports to the Office of Price Administration as it may from time to time require.

SEC. 1351.154. Modification of the schedule: Persons complaining of hardship or inequity in the operation of this schedule may apply to the Office of Price Administration for approval of any modification thereof, or exception therefrom: *Provided*, That no applications under this section will be considered unless filed by persons complying with this schedule.

SEC. 1351.155. Enforcement: In the event of refusal or failure to abide by the price limitations, record requirements, or other provisions of this schedule, or in the event of any evasion or attempt to evade the price limitations or other provisions of this schedule, the Office of Price Administration will make every effort to assure (a) that the Congress and the public are fully informed thereof; (b) that the powers of government, both State and Federal, are fully exerted in order to protect the public interest and the interests of those persons who comply with this schedule; and (c) that the procurement services of the Government are requested to refrain from selling to or purchasing from those persons who fail to comply with this schedule. Persons who have evidence of the offer, receipt, demand, or payment of prices higher than the maximum prices, or of any evasion or effort to evade the provisions hereof, or of speculation or manipulation of prices of fats or oils, or of the hoarding or accumulating of unnecessary inventories thereof, are urged to communicate with the Office of Price Administration.

SEC. 1351.156. Evasion: The price limitations set forth in this schedule shall not be evaded whether by direct or indirect methods in connection with a purchase, sale, delivery, or transfer of fats or oils, or by way of premium, commission, service, transportation, or other charge, or by any other trade understanding, by making discounts or other terms and conditions of sale more onerous to the purchaser than those available or in effect on November 26, 1941, or by any other means.

SEC. 1351.157. Definitions: When used in this schedule, the term—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, or other business entity dealing in fats or oils.

(b) "Fats and oils" means all fats and oils, whether raw, crude, or refined (including olive oil and lard) sold in tank cars, drums, tierces, and sacks, except "essential" mineral and chemical oils, butter, and finished fats and oils products not specified above.

(c) "December future price of cottonseed oil" means the closing price of the December future contract calling for delivery in December of bleachable prime summer yellow cottonseed oil as established on the New York Produce Exchange.

(d) "Points" means the number of hundredths of 1 cent per pound.

(e) "Nearby delivery" means delivery not more than 60 days after the date upon which the contract was entered into, except where, by well-established custom, the term is used to describe deliveries within a somewhat longer period.

SEC. 1351.158. Effective date of the schedule: This schedule shall become effective on December 13, 1941.

Issued this 12th day of December 1941.

DECEMBER 16, 1941.

Mr. LEON HENDERSON,
Price Control Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

Confirming telephone conversation with your Mr. Lee in answer to my telegram of December 13, asking why you set a maximum price on cottonseed oil, your answer was that the price was set to protect the consumers. I congratulate you on such a worthy motive but I cannot approve your roundabout and ineffective method. Consumers buy their vegetable shortening and oleomargarine at retail stores and not from farmers, therefore, if you sincerely want to protect consumers why don't you set the retail prices on cottonseed oil products? This loose-jointed procedure which you are following can only be construed as another deliberate blow against our impoverished cotton farmers of Texas and the South. I strenuously object to your setting a maximum price at this time on any agricultural products, but if you are determined to pursue this policy, I want to urge that the price of cottonseed oil be raised considerably and under no circumstances should it be set below prevailing price at the time your edict was issued. I urge you to immediately make this correction.

W. LEE O'DANIEL.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that I may have the privilege of putting in the RECORD, in the body of my remarks, the letter from Mr. Oscar Johnston, of the National Cotton Council of America, dated December 13, addressed to Mr. Henderson.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Memphis, Tenn., December 13, 1941.

Mr. LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: The press reports today that you have imposed "temporary emergency price ceilings over all fats and oils except butter at levels prevailing on November 26."

We fully recognize the necessity of proper steps to prevent hoarding, profiteering, and inflation, but your order of Friday, December 12, if correctly reported, is, in our judgment, a complete repudiation of the policy announced by you August 29 last with respect to cottonseed oil. The announcement refererd to is your press release of the date stated, which was issued simultaneously with and referred to your order Schedule No. 25, entitled "Elimination of Speculation and Inflationary Price Practices With Respect to Fats and Oils and Their Products." The press release referred to contained at the outset the following statement: "At the same time he withdrew an earlier statement by his office that ceiling prices would be placed on cottonseed oil. If action becames necessary in the face of a run-away-price situation, it will cover both cottonseed oil and competing products. Mr. Henderson stated that no such situation was now expected." On that date crude cottonseed oil was selling in the Cotton Belt at approximately 11 cents per pound and refined oil was quoted in New York at approximately 12¼ cents per pound.

Thereafter, the price of both crude and refined oil advanced steadily and by September 11 crude oil was selling in the belt at prices averaging 12½ cents to 12⅝ cents per pound, with refined oil quoted in New York at prices ranging from 13¾ cents to 13⅞ cents per pound. At this time the movement of cottonseed from the farms to the mills was approaching the peak. Evidently you did not then regard these prices as being a run-away-price situation. You took no action. On the contrary, on September 11 you issued a supplemental order intended to clarify the order of August 29 and permit resumption of futures trading in fats and oils.

Accepting your announced policies in good faith, the cottonseed oil mills proceeded to purchase the cottonseed crop from the producers at prices based primarily on the prevailing prices of cottonseed oil during the marketing season. These prices remained at or near the 12½-cent level for crude oil throughout September and well into October. After mid-October the oil market declined somewhat, due in major part to forecast of an unprecedented soybean crop and in part to substantially increased imports of coconut and palm oils; but, even with the decline, the price has generally remained above the level of 11¼ cents, which you have selected for the ceiling. It should be emphasized that, due to an unusually early and rapid harvesting season, the great bulk of the cottonseed crop, especially in the central part of the belt, was purchased during September and the first half of October when the higher oil prices were prevailing.

In your press release of August 29 you stated: "Since new-run seed is now beginning to flow to the mills, it is desirable that the threat of specific action directed toward cottonseed oil be removed. In this connection, consideration has been given to the fact that cottonseed is the source of the only unpledged income of a large number of small producers. Today's action will permit them to seal this year's crop at prices which represent a fair and proper relation to other fats and oils or oil-bearing products." You were correct. Because of that statement, the bulk of the cottonseed crop moved from producer to crusher at prices averaging well above $53 per ton, basis prime. Much of this seed was sold at or above $55 per ton. With the price of cotton linters arbitrarily controlled and fixed at a relatively low level by the Government, the price of oil was the chief factor sustaining prices paid to producers for their seed.

Concluding your press release of August 29, you stated: "An advisory panel, which will include representatives of crushers, refiners, manufacturers, processors, and distributors, including retailers of all of the products involved, as well as representatives of the consuming public, will be appointed by Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply to consider any hardships, inequities, or other problems arising from operations of the schedule and any adjustments, modifications, or supplements that may be warranted." We respectfully ask if such a panel has been appointed.

The price fixed by the order of last Friday is substantially below price levels which prevailed during the time in which the bulk of the seed crop was marketed. A price of from 13¾ cents to 14 cents per pound on the New York Commodity Exchange, justifying a price of not under 12½ cents for crude oil in the belt, was not regarded by you as a run-away price in September and October last. What, then, can justify a ceiling now of approximately 11¼ cents for crude oil?

Producers who have not completed the marketing of the current crop are seriously injured by the order. When the producers come to market their 1942 seed crop they will be further seriously adversely affected as a result of the inconsistency of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply in permitting a price level to obtain throughout the period in which a large part of the seed crop is purchased by the mills and then arbitrarily, and without apparent reason, breaking the price of the products of the commodity before those products have been marketed. Fear of similar action in the future and sound business practices will necessitate the purchase hereafter of cottonseed by crushers at prices which will allow margins sufficient to protect them against a similar situation in subsequent years.

Your action may not have been so intended, but, regardless of intent, the action constitutes a serious breach of good faith on the part of a governmental agency. No governmental agency or bureau is ever justified in imposing an arbitrary and artificial ceiling upon the price of cottonseed oil, or any other manufactured product, at a level below the maximum price which prevailed for cottonseed oil, or any other such product, during the marketing season when processors were acquiring their raw materials at prices based upon the then prevailing prices of the products of those raw materials.

We are thoroughly sympathetic with the many problems involved in efforts to prevent inflation and appreciate the consideration and cooperation heretofore shown by you in efforts to work out difficulties which have arisen with respect to ceilings on products of the raw-cotton industry. We are confident that it is not your intent or desire that the grave injustices which will arise from this situation shall continue. We urge that you direct your personal attention to the correction of this situation at once.

Very truly yours,
OSCAR JOHNSTON, *President.*

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I give notice that tomorrow morning at the first opportunity I shall seek to call up my resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will come up automatically just before the close of the routine morning business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its readings clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1544) to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5726) to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should have been glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], who has been waiting to make some remarks, but he is not in the Chamber at the present moment.

Mr. President, before proceeding with the general discussion and an explanation and description of the bill to extend the selective service, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that the Selective Service System has nothing to do with determining what men shall be selected for service insofar as military duty is concerned. It is the business of the Selective Service System merely to register men and make a tabulation of the manpower, as required under the basic Selective Service Act, which covered men between the ages of 21 and 36. It is the duty of that organization to have ready and to make available men for service in the different branches of the armed forces of the United States of America when called for by the Army or by the Navy.

With reference to men whom we need for service, or whom we may call upon, and in particular reference to the question at issue, that of the age limits, whether there should be included young men from 21 upward to men who have attained the age of 44, or whether younger men should be included, as under the Senate bill, men between 19 and 44, I wish to read what I might properly classify as secondary testimony, testimony given by the Assistant Secretary of War for the Chief of Staff, who at the time of the meeting of our committee unfortunately could not be present.

Nevertheless, statements made heretofore by General Marshall, according to my recollection, would verify the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. John J. McCloy.

I read from the testimony before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs of yesterday, December 16:

The CHAIRMAN. We would be very glad to have the Secretary make any statement that he has.

This statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs was made as the result of a suggestion by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who stated that the Assistant Secretary of War was present and that we might hear him.

Hon. John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, testified as follows:

I don't know that I can add anything to the discussion. I did have a long chat this morning with General Marshall.

That was yesterday morning.

I asked him how he felt as to the necessity of this bill, and he was quite emphatic. I think that there are a number of considerations that we cannot cast aside, but I will stress only those that he spoke of.

In the first place, he said that he thought there ought to be a leavening of younger men in the Army, from a purely military point of view; that they were young and vigorous; and that to mix them in with the older men was a good thing.

But what he was perhaps most concerned with was the over-all effectiveness of our manpower as it relates both to military effort and production effort.

Referring, Mr. President, I may add, to the registration of those within the ages of 18 and 65, as provided by this bill, and as provided likewise by the House bill.

Mr. McCloy, continuing, said:

He felt very strongly that to the extent that you excluded the men below 21, you would be impairing the productive effort of the country, because the men that had the skills were in the higher ranges. He felt that the younger men had not yet developed their industrial capacities; they had not yet assumed dependents; and that, generally, to the extent that they were not called upon, it would place a greater strain upon the production effort of the country. He stressed that point particularly.

He also pointed out that we didn't know when we might have to oppose these men against other armies, which are composed to a large part, incidentally, of very young men; that it would probably not be for some time before we would do that or could do that, but he did not feel that it was fair to the age groups above 21 to put all of the strain on them, when by broadening the base you would have a more sensible solution. In that way you don't place too heavy a strain and you don't gouge out of any one age group too many men.

In other words, Mr. McCloy said that General Marshall stated to him that he believed in the leavening process.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has referred to the age limits in other armies. Can the Senator tell what the age limit is in the British Isles under the British draft at the present time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not believe I have that information at hand, but I shall procure it. I collected some data upon that question and, according to my recollection, General Hershey presented some information in regard to age limits which, as I recall, refers only to the wars in which the United States has participated. According to my recollection, the minimum age for registration for military service in the British Empire is 18 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not talking about registration. I am talking about draft.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The minimum age for registration for draft is 18 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wonder if the Senator is correct in that regard?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand from the military authority at my side that it is 18½.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was advised this week from a source which meant nothing in particular, and therefore I cannot attribute any authenticity to it, that the British House of Commons within the last fortnight had declined to reduce the age limit for draft purposes to 18½. I submitted the inquiry to General Hershey, but as yet have had no response. That is not his fault. He has not had time to respond. I was wondering if the Senator from North Carolina knew whether there was any truth in that statement.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not. I thank the Senator very much for making the inquiry, because I think it would be very well for the Members of the Senate to be informed as to the minimum age limits of those in all armies, even including those of the Axis Powers. I think such information would be very well received by the Members of this body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has no information at the present time, for instance, as to what is the minimum draft age in Canada?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I have not. I will try to procure it by tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like very much to have it; and I should also like to know, yes or no, if it be true that the British House of Commons within the last fortnight has legislated against a reduction to 18½ years as the limit for those to be drafted into service.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That the House of Commons had refused to make such a reduction?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is the Senator's information? I shall endeavor to procure that information for the Senator. No doubt, General Hershey has it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator understands that, if this measure is passed, of course the lower limit will be 19. All men above 18 years will be registered, but will not be called into service until they become 19.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that, but I want to know what the British do.

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot answer that. But we are well within the suggested limit in that respect because, under the provisions of this bill, the age for military service will start at 19.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That does not mean anything.

Mr. CHANDLER. It means what it says.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I mean as respects the British attitude.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I shall secure for his information, and for my own likewise, the minimum-age limit for registration and for military and other service, not only in the Allied nations but among the Axis Powers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. The information would in no sense be controlling so far as our problem is concerned, but yet it would be illuminating in view of the long war experience the other powers have had.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so. I thank the Senator very much for directing the inquiry to me.

Mr. President, proceeding with the statement made yesterday before our committee by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy, of his conversation with General Marshall:

Now, he also suggested that these men might be 20 or 21 years old by the time they are called upon to fight, but he hastened to add, and he made it very clear, that he didn't want to have any limitations, if possible, in this bill, excluding from combat the 19-year-olds, because they would be assimilated in units, and he didn't want to have to have a roll call before they went into action and say, "All men below 21 stand to the left, and all men above 21 stand to the right."

There was one other thought he had. We are going to have to rely on a great many young men, particularly for our Air Corps. A great many of our volunteers go into the Air Corps. We are going to get the cream and the flower of our young men into the Army by volunteering. Is it fair that they should go and leave the other fellow at home? I don't know that we will ever get to the point where we are going to compel men to become flying cadets in the Air Corps, but a great many young men, 19 years of age, are going to volunteer for flying, and we are looking forward to it. Pilots these days have to be young.

You will have some drain on them, and I don't think, as an element of fairness, we should say, "All right, you volunteer for this hazardous duty, but we won't draw your brother for perhaps a somewhat less hazardous duty."

I have stated rather inadequately the conversation I had with General Marshall, and also with the Secretary briefly after I had talked with him.

He is referring to Secretary of War Stimson.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can the Senator tell me what the present low age limit is for volunteering for pilot service in the Air Corps? Is that 18?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think 18 is the minimum.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can the Senator have the information definitely procured for us?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to procure that information, I will say to the Senator from California.

Mr. President, let me add preliminarily and very simply that, according to my construction of the bill, it merely provides for the orderly registration of the manpower of the Nation; that is to say, for the military, agricultural, industrial, and civil defense of the Nation. Secondly, it merely provides for the extension of the years of service in Group A down to the age of 19, and in Group B up to the age of 44. The report of the Military Affairs Committee was presented yesterday and was printed, and is now on the desks of all Senators.

This bill merely makes a number of amendments to the basic Selective Service and Training Act, which we passed in 1940. The principal purposes of the bill now under consideration are to extend the age limits of the persons who may be required to register under the act, and to extend the age limits of the persons who are liable for training and service under the act. The bill also amends the present act in several minor respects.

The first section of the bill amends section 2 of the present Selective Service and Training Act. Section 2 of the present act fixes the ages of the persons who may be required to register. That section of the present law reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States and of every male alien residing in the United States who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 21 and 36, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

I have just read section 2 of the present Selective Service and Training Act.

The bill as reported by the committee merely amends the section above quoted by extending the requirements of registration to men between the ages of 18 and 65, instead of men between the ages of 21 and 36, as provided by the existing law.

The bill also extends the requirements of registration to all male persons residing in the United States who are within the prescribed age limits. Thus there would be included some persons who are residents of the United States and are nationals of the United States but who are not citizens of the United States and are not required to register under the existing law. Otherwise, the bill leaves section 2 of the present act unchanged.

Section 2 of the bill amends the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the present law. That provision of the present act states what persons are liable for training and service under the act, and reads as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien residing in the United States who has declared his intention to become a citizen, between the ages of 21 and 36 at the time fixed for his registration, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

The bill changes that provision in the following respects only:

First. The liability for training and service is extended to men between the ages of 19 and 45, instead of to men between the ages of 21 and 36, as provided in the present law.

Second. Several changes are made with respect to the liability of aliens. Under the present law, aliens are liable only if they have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. Under the terms of the bill reported yesterday by the committee, aliens would be liable whether or not they had declared their intention to become citizens. However, aliens who are citizens or subjects of a neutral country would be relieved of liability upon making application in the manner prescribed by the President; but the making of such application would debar them from ever becoming citizens of the United States. It is provided that enemy aliens shall not be inducted unless they are acceptable to the land or naval forces.

Third. Liability for service would be extended to certain persons resident in the United States who are nationals of the United States but who are not citizens thereof, as in the case of some citizens of our insular possessions.

Mr. President, returning to the question of registration and the question of military liability, the difference between the House bill and the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is that the House bill places the lower age limit at 21, and the Senate committee recommends that the lower age limit be 19 years.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that I have before me a letter from the White House, over the signature of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, who approves of the proposed registration, and who writes under date of December 15, 1941, as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I write to confirm that I fully approve and endorse the bill for the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. MAY in the House on Friday last.

I approve the proposed congressional declaration of policy, the provision for the registration of all our manpower between 18 and 64, inclusive, and the extension of liability for military service so as to include all the age groups from 19 to 44, inclusive.

That is what is embodied in the bill as reported from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, whereas, as I stated a moment ago, the age limits in the House bill are 21 and 44.

The President's letter continues:

I consider the registration provision an essential instrument for the orderly planning of our national effort.

As to the extension of liability for service, I approve it as a means of providing a sufficiently large pool of men available for service in our land and naval forces (including the air forces) adequate to meet all contingencies now foreseeable.

These two features of the bill supplement each other. I consider them of equal and prime importance.

The reasons for the bill are more fully set forth in the letter sent by the Secretary of War on Saturday last to Representative MAY and Senator REYNOLDS. I endorse without qualification the Secretary's statement in that letter.

I am sending an identical letter to the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Speaker, and the majority and minority leaders of the House.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

In view of the fact that the President of the United States made mention of a letter directed to me by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, I desire to bring the letter of Mr. Stimson to the attention of the Senate, to read it into the debate, and to make it a part of the RECORD. The letter reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 13, 1941.

MY DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I submit herewith the following statement concerning the proposed bill which was discussed with you and certain members of the Military Affairs Committee on Friday providing for comprehensive amendment of the Selective Service Act.

The heart of the measure lies in three features:

(1) The proposed congressional declaration whereby it is set forth that "the Nation is fighting for its existence and its future life," will "accept no result save victory, final and complete, over all the enemies of the United States" and that consequently "it is imperative that liability for military service be extended to further age groups and that a complete inventory of the manpower of the Nation be taken by registration";

(2) The extension of the present registration provisions of the present law so as to provide for the registration of all males between 18 and 64, inclusive, instead of between 21 and 35, inclusive, as now provided; and

(3) The extension of the liability for military service to the ages 19 to 44, inclusive, in lieu of the provisions of the present law.

The purpose of the proposed registration provisions is to obtain a comprehensive and accurate survey of the whole mature manpower of the Nation. This is in line with the experience of the other principal nations engaged in this war and is, in my judgment, a necessary measure to enable the orderly application to the task in hand of our whole manpower, both for military purposes and for the vast production which we are undertaking. On the other hand, this registration is merely a registration to enable an inventory of our whole manpower so that we may know what we have with proper data as to occupations and skills; and the bill carries no power whatever to draft men for other than strictly military service.

Indeed, it has been suggested by some of the Members of the Senate that this is a labor-conscription bill.

The letter continues as follows:

The purpose of the provision extending the liability for military service to the ages 19 to 44, inclusive, is to make available, if and when necessary, a great pool of men to meet all contingencies now foreseeable. While the traditional age for liability for military service in this country is 18 to 45, it has been deemed wise to place the lower limit at this time at a year later—viz, 19.

The broad purpose of the bill is to provide a framework into which we can steadily and solidly build, stone by stone, the structure which will accomplish victory.

I wish most respectfully to express a caution against the inclusion in the bill of any restrictions as to the priorities whereby men may be called for military service or restrictions or as to administrative procedure, because all such restrictions might turn out to be shackles that would hamper the organization of our land and naval forces and the conduct of the war.

I wish to express a similar caution against asking the war-making departments to pin themselves down to statements of policy as to the size of the forces contemplated or the age groups to be called for military service. Naturally we must have plans, but in a vast cataclysm such as is now in progress with its rapidly changing developments, it is apparent that plans must change with events and that any statements now made might be subject to change almost overnight.

I desire to emphasize the psychological or moral effects of the passage of a great measure along these lines. It will make clear to the American people the character of the effort that will be required to defeat the vast forces arrayed against us. To the outside world it will be a symbol that we are providing the means to make good our declared policy to "accept no result save victory, final and complete."

I believe the enactment of a measure substantially in accord with this bill is indispensable to the national effort and that it will constitute one of the great foundation stones upon which victory will be built. Finally, I urge that such a measure be enacted with all reasonable promptness. We need it now.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

In addition to that letter, I desire to call attention to a letter which was directed to Capt. Francis V. Keesling Jr., Legislative Officer, Selective Service System, under date of December 15, 1941, dated at Washington, D. C., and written by the National Committee on Education and Defense, an organization which for some time past has been vitally interested in the subject of age groups and deferments and registration. The letter reads as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1941.

Capt. FRANCIS V. KEESLING, Jr.,
Legislative Officer,
Selective Service System:

According to your request, I am submitting a copy of the resolution adopted by the subcommittee on military affairs of the National Committee on Education and Defense on Friday, December 12, 1941:

"That, recognizing the gravity of the present situation and the necessity for mobilization of total manpower, the subcommittee endorses the proposed legislation extending liability for military service of men between the ages of 19 and 44, inclusive.

"Fully aware of the solemn responsibility placed in the hands of the President and of his representatives in administering the provisions of this proposed legislation, the subcommittee expresses confidence in national headquarters, Selective Service; it urges the continuing exercise of wisdom in selecting for the administration of this legislation only those persons who have demonstrated a deep sense of human values; and emphasizes the necessity, both in the successful promulgation of the war and for the period of reconstruction of maintaining an adequate supply of men trained for leadership and in occupations and professions vital to national safety and interest.

The members of the subcommittee on military affairs present at this meeting were: Walter C. Eells, American Association of Junior Colleges; Guy E. Snavely, Association of American Colleges; W. A. Lloyd, Association of Landgrant Colleges and Universities; Morse A. Cartwright, Institute for Adult Education; George Johnson, National Catholic Educational Association; Willard E. Givens, National Education Association; George F. Zook, American Council on Education. Also present, President E. C. Elliott, Purdue University. Members not present: L. H. Dennis, American Vocational Association; Fred Engelhardt, National Association; Isaiah Bowman, Association of American Universities; Harry Woodburn Chase, chairman of subcommittee (confirmed by telephone).

FRANCIS J. BROWN,
Executive Secretary,
Subcommittee on Military Affairs.

I have already brought to the attention to Members of the Senate the statements made by General Marshall as to the age groups and the leveling off of age groups as conveyed to us by the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy. I shall, in a moment, bring to the attention of the Members of this body the age limit minimum and maximun. as utilized during the wars in which th. United States has participated, which information was provided the committee by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I have been troubled by section 6 of the bill now before the Senate, and, though I have spent some time reading it and rereading it and the law which it amends, I am not sure yet that I have a clear understanding of its effect. Let me state what I understand to be the purpose and effect of the section. Then I wish the Senator from North Carolina would either confirm my statement or correct it.

I take it that section 6, in effect, strikes out the last six or seven lines which follow "(2)" in subsection (e), of section 5 of the present law. Those lines being stricken out, the draft boards under rules and regulations prescribed by the President are given authority to make classifications according to age, with the net result that the registration boards will have authority to defer, first, because men are employed in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employments the continuance of which is deemed vital; second, to defer because a man's presence is necessary in civilian life and the maintenance of the national health or safety; third, to defer because of dependents; and now this amendment gives a fourth ground for deferment, which is age.

Am I right in my understanding?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am afraid the Senator is not correct in his understanding in regard to the deferment groups.

Mr. WHITE. If I am not right, let me ask another question. Does the amendment take from the registration boards authority to defer because of dependency?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It does not.

Mr. WHITE. Does it take from the registration boards authority to defer because they believe a man's presence in civilian life is essential to the maintenance of public health and safety?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In answer to the question, I call the Senator's attention to section 2 of Public Law 206, Seventy-seventh Congress. That law provides for certain deferments and exemptions under Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

I merely call the Senate's attention to paragraph (2) of section 2:

Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, there shall be deferred from training and service under this act, in the land and naval forces of the United States, until Congress shall declare otherwise, the men who, on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year, (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth.

Mr. WHITE. I had overlooked that provision of the statute; but there is retained in the draft boards the powers of deferment which they now have?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted to be sure about that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is my understanding. Inquiry was made about that yesterday before the committee, and my recollection is that the statement is correct.

Mr. President, in pursuance of the matter pertaining to ages, on yesterday General Hershey brought to our attention, from the records of the office of The Adjutant General of the United States Army, certain figures with respect to the ages of soldiers who have served the country in time of war.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will yield in a moment. The figures furnished the committee show that in the War between the States the enlistments consisted as follows in particular reference to minimum ages:

There were 25 who served who were only 10 years of age; there were 38 who served who were but 11 years of age; there were 225 who served who were but 12 years of age; there were 300 who served who were but 13 years of age; there were 1,523 who served who were but 14 years of age; there were 104,987 who served who were but 15 years of age; there were 231,051 who served who were but 16 years of age; there were 884,891 who served who were but 17 years of age; and of the age of 18, the year below that fixed for military service by the pending bill, in the War between the States, 1,151,438 boys actually served who were only 18 years of age.

The statement continues:

Twenty-one years and under (these two classes make the total number of enlistments), 2,159,798; 22 years and over (these two classes make the total number of enlistments), 618,511; 25 years and over, 46,626; 44 years and over, 16,071; total enlisted, 2,778,304. The estimated number of individuals in the service is given as 2,213,365.

There is a notation as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 55, part II, page 1131, Sixty-fifth Congress.

Further in reference to ages, I desire to say that our committee was informed that the minimum age limit for military service—that of 19 inclusive to 44—has been recommended by the Navy, the Ma-

rine Corps, and the Army, and all branches thereof.

I now yield to the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

I wish to have the Senator revert, if he will, to his answer to the question put by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. The Senator from North Carolina stated that his understanding was thus and so, and that he interpreted the matter thus and so. In view of the fact that section 6 actually rewrites paragraph 2 of section 5 (e) of existing law as amended, I ask that the Senator, in order to clarify the RECORD, read precisely what the existing clause is which is being rewritten and superseded by the proposed language appearing on page 4 of the bill. Does the Senator feel free to do that?

I have no desire to cause the Senator to digress from his studied plan of presentation; and it is quite agreeable to me that, when the authority shall be located, he recur to this point.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I will say to him that in the statement which I prepared for the Senate, in brief, but I hope understandable, explanation of the various changes in paragraphs, I was coming to paragraph 6, but I had intended this afternoon only to read the letters in support of the age groups from the President, the Secretary of War, and others particularly interested in the age groups, and thereafter to suspend, because I understand that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], desires the floor for a brief while in reference to the passage of some legislation that he desires, and also the able Senator from Ohio. I shall be glad to revert to that matter.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator. There are on the calendar of the Senate two bills——

Mr. REYNOLDS. If the Senator will pardon me, I will yield to him in just a moment. I wish to complete a statement which I dictated this afternoon in reference to the bill, and then I shall endeavor to accommodate the able Senator from Massachusetts and also the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question concerning the pending bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Am I to understand that the authorities are asking that the age limit be dropped from 20 to 19 because the men in that group will likely be needed, or because they feel that such men constitute splendid soldier material, or both?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Both.

Mr. TYDINGS. What was the testimony before the committee as to the primary reason for lowering the age limit from 21 to 19?

Mr. REYNOLDS. General Marshall has stated that he is desirous of bringing about a leveling of the group. Of course, we all know that the real fighting men in the armies of the Axis Powers are the younger men; and we know, of course, that particularly in our air forces we must have the younger men, because they are possessed of more daring, and they like the service, and they are more active and more alert. We find that our volunteers who are going into those forces are young men; and, as I believe General Marshall stated, it is not exactly fair to permit some of these young men to volunteer for that dangerous, hazardous branch of the service and permit others who are equally strong and who may in some instances not have the dependents that the volunteer has, to avoid service. For the two reasons the able Senator mentions it has been suggested that the age limit be reduced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Both those points were brought out before the committee, were they?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My recollection is that they were, and I think they were brought before the committee particularly by way of the statement by General Marshall, through the aid of the Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the question because, so far as I can, in war I should like to give the Army, and I hope to give the Army, and believe I will, so far as my support is concerned, everything they think is necessary to provide an efficient force.

Mr. REYNOLDS. We know that to be so.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I was curious to know of the reasons offered. As I understand the situation, in round numbers about a million and a half more men are available between the ages of 21 and 35, allowing for disability, dependency, and what not.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; generally speaking.

Mr. TYDINGS. There probably will be a million and a half more in that group in addition to the million and a half Regular Army that we now have, making in round numbers between three million and three and a half million men.

In this war—which probably will not be as short as we should like to have it because of the widespread area over which it is being fought—if we are to have a larger Army than three and a half million, it obviously will be necessary either to let in some who, for one reason or another, have heretofore been excluded, or to find a place where we can get additional men.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator whether I am substantially correct in saying that if the age limits were fixed from 21 to 35, allowing for those who would be excluded because of dependents, for physical disability, and for other reasons I have not mentioned, the Army probably would get only about a million and a half more effectives.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would depend entirely upon the physical and mental requirements.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am assuming that the standard is something like it has been in the past.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, therefore, counting Regulars, National Guard, and draftees, who now number 1,600,000 in round figures, with the million and a half who would come in between 21 and 35, we should have somewhere between three and three and a half million men in the total land forces of our Government, including the air force. So if we are to have a larger Army, including the air force, of three and a half million men over a period of years, it will be necessary either to go back again into that group and take some who were originally eliminated, or to lower the age to 19.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me ask the Senator if that statement is not subject to a very important correction, which I desire to point out to the Senator from Maryland. In the next 2 years we shall have young men becoming of age to the number of 2,400,000. The majority of those young men will be in good physical condition and without dependents.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why does the Senator say "in the next 2 years"?

Mr. DOWNEY. Every year approximately 1,200,000 young men become 21. In 2 years we shall have 2,400,000; and General Hershey's figures are that that would yield, in very fine material, 1,200,000, one-half the number, in 2 years.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. So I desire to say to the Senator from Maryland that if in the next 2 years we should be able to officer and train and house an army of another 1,600,000, say, plus three or four hundred thousand volunteers under 20, at the end of that time we should still have a vast reservoir of 1,200,000 men.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the arithmetic of my friend from California is correct, but I think he has overlooked the fact that when we take in a man 2 years from now he does not immediately become a soldier. We should have to put another year, at least, on top of that before a man would be able, with a tremendous expansion of this kind, to be an effective, all-around, well-trained soldier. Therefore, if we take the figures given by the Senator from California, it would mean we would be 3 years away from that day, rather than 2 years.

As I see the matter, we may not now have all the equipment which should be furnished these men, but there are certain things which a soldier must know before the equipment is required. I assume that the Army is not going to ask for men in such quotas that when they reach a certain stage, when weapons become a part of their training, the weapons will not be reasonably available. That is the reason, I assume, why they wanted this larger reservoir, namely, so that they could get an early start, and have the Army of the strength required in a year or two at the outside, rather than in 3 years at the outside, because in a war time is of the essense.

Mr. HILL and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator

from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama, then I will yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. HILL. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Maryland has stated, that the testimony showed that the War Department has no idea of having what we might call a "broomstick" army. We are not going to take men in more rapidly than we are prepared to train them.

Being a distinguished soldier himself, the Senator from Maryland knows that plans have to be made in advance. The War Department has to know now what it can draw from, what the pool is, where the men are coming from, what their ages are to be, what kind of men are to be available. The Department has to know now in order to make plans for the war in which we are engaged.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not profess to know what the Army's plans may be in the kind of war we are now fighting, but I do know that we are going to hold the Army responsible.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. And we can look only to the Army to win.

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore, if they make out a reasonably common-sense case for any particular piece of legislation, all of us in this body having voted for war on all three fronts—that is, against Germany, Italy, and Japan—we are almost bound to give the Department anything which has the semblance of common sense attached to it. Otherwise, we will be in the position later of holding the Army accountable; but they will say, "We wanted to do that, but you would not let us do it."

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from North Carolina will yield further, in connection with what the Senator from Maryland has just stated, as the Senator well recalls, in the resolutions recognizing a State of war to exist with Japan, Germany, and Italy, the President was authorized and directed by the Congress to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the three different countries, and "to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."

The War Department says, "We are going to make our plans for this war, and we have to know what these resources are. What are you going to let us have?" The Senator from Maryland, being a distinguished soldier himself, as I have said, knows that the War Department is going to make its plans, and those plans must be predicated on the idea of taking care of any and all eventualities. The War Department should know what these resources are.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is perfectly obvious we had better have a larger standing army than we will need than have a smaller standing army than we will need. In other words, we had better have all the forces the Department indicates we need—and I hope we may never have to use them—than to need them desperately in the future in some unforeseen situation and not have them. We are in a war which is "all out," and therefore it seems to me that, hard though it may be, if a reasonably common-sense case is made out supporting any request of the Army, it is up to the Congress to give to them everything it possibly can in order to make it overwhelmingly certain that the war will be won. Nothing could be worse than to give them less than they need.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may add that we cannot give the Army all it requests and feels it necessary to have unless we have the registration provided for, and thereby know where the manpower is, where it is to come from, and the physical condition of the men.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maryland indicates that we cannot afford to be too late and we cannot afford to have too little. If we are to err, we must err on the side of doing too much. Some gentlemen entertain the idea that perhaps we should let some other nation win this war for us. Of course, I want our country to do all it can to help any other nation that is fighting on our side, and I rejoice every time one of our allies wins a victory against the common enemy. We want to do all we can to carry out the lend-lease program. But I for one believe we should make our plans, lay all our predicates, so that if it comes to a point where it is necessary, we can rely and will rely on our own strong right hand.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, then I will yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] fails to consider in his statement, I think, the fact that there are already men in these age groups in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and that volunteers are coming in from all over the country. We have taken into account 300,000 of those young men for the Army.

It is important, as the Senator from Alabama has stated, to register these men, so as to know where the men are, and how many of them there are, in order that when we get ready to call them, they will be available.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield again?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], himself a distinguished soldier, reminded me this morning of the fact that the average enlistment age in the Navy today is 19 years. In that connection, I remember that one of the ablest and strongest arguments I have heard on this floor was made by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], another able soldier, by the way, who made the point that many men in this age group—fine men—are now volunteering and crowding the recruiting stations, and if we have to use them, if we have to have men of that group, then we should equalize the burden; we should make all men within that group liable for the same service, and for the same defense of their country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his very generous comment. I make no claim to any eminence as a military man—or otherwise, for that matter. I had a very unusual and unique experience. I was in the Army during the Spanish-American War, and I was in the Army during the World War, and I claim to have been in more wars and fought less than any other American. But that is aside.

I wish to ask whether the Committee on Military Affairs had considered the practicability of registering all men of 19, or even 18, but putting men under 21 years of age in a deferred classification, not calling them for compulsory service, until we had combed over the lists of those over 21. I have a feeling that that should be done.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There was some discussion of that subject in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the War Department wants them as young as it can get them, because when young they are easily impressed, they have more optimism, they think more of a general than we do, they salute more quickly, they run errands very readily, and all that sort of thing. But I dislike to vote to send boys off to the war when there are sitting around on cracker barrels discussing how the Government should be conducted so many men who should be in the Army themselves. Does the Senator get my point?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do; yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say that I am in entire agreement with the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who says that we must not be too late in providing a certain-sized Army; but let me point out to him that we are too late today in many respects. We have already been so very neglectful in many particulars that the size of our Army for the next year, and 2 or 3 years, is definitely fixed. I expect to argue more at length tomorrow, and I shall then produce facts which are unassailable, and which I think were admitted by General Hershey.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that we cannot arm, and officer and train, and equip more than a million additional soldiers in the next 12 months. We now have a million eight hundred thousand in the Army. A consideration of all the figures shows that we cannot handle more than a million during the next 12 months. That is the maximum, that is the optimum. As a matter of fact, if we tried to call out that number many of them would not have

proper cantonments, or ammunition, or officers. But if we spread ourselves, if we reach the maximum we might hope for, we might take 1,000,000 more men. The point I desire to make to the distinguished Senator from Maryland is that we have in this reserve men from 21 to 36 years of age—1,600,000 men, and the selective-service officials themselves said that in the next 12 months we cannot possibly assimilate and officer and handle any more than an additional 1,000,000 men.

I also desire to point out, as I said to the distinguished Senator, that in the next year 1,200,000 young men will become 21 years of age. Six hundred thousand of them will make fine material. So if we take the maximum the Army itself says it can use, 1,000,000 men, we will have 600,000 of the present reservoir left, and we will have another 600,000, or we will still have a total of 1,200,000 at the end of the year.

Sufficient ships are not available, and we cannot build them for 2 or 3 years, to transport an army of 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 men. We have not the steel with which to manufacture the guns needed by them. Today we have not the rubber necessary to provide the trucks to provide the necessary transport.

Mr. President, I am told that on February 1 an order will go to Detroit which will result in hundreds of thousands of men being unemployed, for by reason of the order, after February 1, not one new automobile may thereafter be constructed except strictly for military purposes; only trucks may be constructed. The O. P. M. says that if the Army shall attempt to place another million men in military service in America we must have five or six million additional men producing for them, and that our lend-lease program in Siberia and China will suffer.

Mr. President, these facts have not yet been considered. No witness has appeared before the committee who even knew how to analyze these facts which are now being considered in Washington. We on the Military Affairs Committee acted in the dark and in confusion. I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that he will not have before him the facts from which he will be able to form an intelligent opinion, and I intend tomorrow to endeavor to demonstrate this to the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, in connection with a motion to recommit this great and important bill to the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has been very kind in answering questions with respect to men who are between the ages of 19 and 21. Why did the registration go so high as to 64 years of age? What reason was given for registering men, we will say, over 45 years of age? What was the purpose of registering men from 45 to 65 years of age?

Mr. REYNOLDS. In the first place, if we register every male citizen in the United States between the ages of 45 and 65, every single man between those ages will have impressed upon him the fact that he is subject to be called by his Government when the Government finds it needs him. In addition to that, it will make him feel that he is a part of the great machinery being organized for victory. Further, we do not know how many men we shall be obliged to call upon to serve in the armed forces; we do not know how many men will be called upon to put on uniforms, for conditions are changing from day to day. We want to register men between 45 and 65 years of age in order to ascertain their physical condition, in order to ascertain what they have been doing, what they are doing now, and, therefore, what they are capable of doing when they are called.

Let me say also that it would have a fine psychological effect upon the American people. It would serve notice on the people that every single man within the length and breadth of this land is called upon to serve now, during black-outs, in the defense of his country, and to bring about the victory which the people are demanding. It would let the world know that, instead of doing a lot of talking, we are taking action, and that we have actually gone "all out." The first step in that "all out" program is nothing more nor less than registering every male in the land from 18 to 65 years of age.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator understands that I am not critical. I am simply seeking information.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. Mention has been made of the size of the Army. Frequently I have heard it said that we do not want an Army of over 3,200,000 men. We are going to fight all over the world. We shall need a large Army. Germany itself, as we all know, and as has been testified before our committee, has a minimum of 8,000,000 men in uniform and under arms.

Mr. TYDINGS. And fully trained and equipped?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Fully trained and equipped, as the Senator from Maryland suggests. No one knows how many men are fighting in Russia, but it has been estimated that the total number of men under arms and in uniform on the Axis side is about 15,000,000, and on the allied side about 15,000,000. We must take into consideration the number of men we shall need to defend our country, to defend our possessions, and to send abroad, because in all probability we cannot win the war merely by the utilization of battleships and airplanes and submarines.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will yield in one moment. We should take into consideration the fact that we must have thousands upon thousands of armed men in our outlying possessions. We must keep thousands and thousands of our men, and great quantities of equipment, in Iceland, Greenland, Newfoundland, and probably some day we will take over St. Pierre and Miquelon, islands which belong to the French. We must have men in Bermuda, perhaps in the Bahamas, perhaps in Jamaica, where we have a naval base in Trinidad, in Puerto Rico, and farther south, including British Guiana, and if we ever take over French Guiana we must have men there, and in addition to that we must have men in the Pacific.

The Senator from Maryland, as chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, knows that for the first time we are now recognizing that we must build fortifications and develop naval bases, and man them with American manpower, in Alaska, in the Aleutian Islands, which extend 1,500 miles from our most northern base at Unalaska to the back door of Japanese territory.

Mr. TYDINGS. I asked the Senator the question assuming that his answer would be somewhat along the line he has so painstakingly expanded.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say further that my general impression is that registration in the higher ages is not always necessarily for purely combatant service, but it is to get a line on the manpower of the country, and the presumption is that, at least as we stand today, those in the higher age brackets will to a large extent be either completely or largely eliminated from consideration for military service.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the purpose is to get a line on the total manpower of the Nation that might conceivably be used either in active combat or in noncombatant service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Maryland so well says, the registration is proposed in order to get a line on all the manpower of the Nation. Such information might prove most helpful, and would be directed in a way——

Mr. TYDINGS. That does not mean the men in the higher ages will be drafted.

Mr. HILL. No; there is no idea that they will be drafted at this time, but it does mean that the men who are subject to draft can be drafted more intelligently, for if it is known what the older men can do, it can be determined whether certain industries may be dislocated by drafting younger men engaged in such industries. If there are a great many mechanics among the older group, we will know what can be done so far as drafting the younger men is concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Such registration is necessary. It would be foolish to take a specialist in some vitally necessary field where there is a deficiency and use him as a private soldier. In such a case the national welfare would be better served by leaving him where he is, where he can render the greater service.

I asked the question only because I could not conceive that we would include those of the age of 65 in a purely military draft, and I desired to elicit the information which has been given.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the committee should also make it clear that the idea is to keep current information about the men of the Nation. When once they are registered it becomes their duty under the law

to advise their local boards as to any change in their status, their address, or their occupation, and any other information the War Department may need. When there is a change in their situation it is their duty to advise their local boards.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is absolutely correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has been very patient. I promised to yield to him. He wishes to obtain consideration of a bill.

Mr. WALSH. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I shall shortly conclude for the day and yield the floor to the Senator from Massachusetts. However, I ask that I be recognized tomorrow when the Senate reconvenes. I am concluding at this time for the purpose of accommodating the able Senator from Massachusetts, and for the reason that I am trying to have the record of the hearings printed and placed on the desk of Senators as quickly as possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Referring to the question raised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] in connection with section 6 of the bill, that section provides as follows:

SEC. 6. Paragraph (2) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the men so deferred."

In order to clarify the situation, section 6 strikes out subsection (2) of section 2 of Public Law 206, Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to section 5 (e) of the Selective Service and Training Act. It strikes out the entire subsection as it appears in Public Law 206, and substitutes the language which I have just read.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] raised the question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent to have that part of Public Law 206 to which I have referred made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, there shall be deferred from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States until Congress shall declare otherwise, the men who, on the 1st day of July 1941, or on the 1st day of July of any subsequent year, (1) are liable for such training and service, (2) have not been inducted into the land or naval forces for such training and service, and (3) have attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth: *Provided*, That any of such men may after volunteering for induction be inducted pursuant and subject to the provisions of section 3 (a) of this act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War shall, as soon as practicable and when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, release from active training and service under section 3 (b) of this act, and transfer to a reserve component of the land forces for the same period and with the same rights, duties, and liabilities, as any other person transferred to a reserve component of the land forces under the provisions of section 3 (c) of this act, regardless of his period of training and service, any person who has heretofore been inducted into the land forces under this act, who requests such release, and who had attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of his birth on or prior to July 1, 1941, and prior to such induction: *Provided further*, That any person so released under this paragraph who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect which shall be in the same form and have the same force and effect as a certificate issued under the provisions of section 8 of this act.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, section 4 of the bill amends section 5 (a) of the present act, which now provides that certain specified classes of aliens shall not be required to register and shall not be liable for service under the act. This amendment provides that there may be added to these classes persons who are not citizens of the United States, and who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

Section 5 of the bill amends paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the present act, which now authorizes the deferment of men who have dependents or who are physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. The amendments made by the bill give authority to provide for different classifications for the purpose of determining order of availability for selection for induction.

Section 6 of the bill amends paragraph 2 of section 5 (e) of the present act. This paragraph was added by the act of August 16, 1941, and contains the provisions of the present law which provide for deferment of men over 28 years of age. The amendment made by this bill eliminates all those provisions of the present law and substitutes therefor provisions which authorize the President to provide for the deferment of men by any age group or groups, as he deems to be advisable in the national interest, and to terminate any such deferment upon a similar finding.

Section 7 is a technical amendment to make the definition relating to age groups correspond to the new age limits for registration and liability for service.

Section 8 of the bill, repeals section 15 (c) of the present act, which defines the term dependent and reads as follows:

(c) The term "dependent" when used with respect to a person registered under the provisions of this act includes only an individual (1) who is dependent in fact on such person for support in a reasonable manner, and (2) whose support in such a manner depends on income earned by such person in a business, occupation, or employment.

Section 9 of the bill provides that persons inducted under the act into the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard shall be members of such components, and further provides that during wartime the periods of service of such persons may be extended for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. Similar legislation has recently been enacted with respect to persons inducted under the act into the Army and with respect to enlisted personnel in the Navy.

Section 10 amends the first proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the present act, which now permits persons between the ages of 18 and 36 to volunteer for induction under the act. This amendment raises the age limits for such volunteers to 45 years.

Section 11 of the bill as reported by the committee gives all personnel on active duty in the military or naval forces 120 additional days within which they may secure, without medical examination, insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. This section further provides that after the expiration of such 120-day period such personnel may be granted such insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and satisfactory evidence showing them to be in good health.

Mr. President, I have previously requested that I be recognized tomorrow on the reconvening of the Senate. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVY—CONSTRUCTION OF NAVY VESSELS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there are two identical bills on the calendar, Nos. 950 and 951. Calendar No. 950 is Senate bill 2125, and Calendar No. 951 is House bill 6223. The title of both bills is, "To establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes." I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6223, Calendar No. 951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6223) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to increase the authorized composition of the Navy in underage vessels by 150,000 tons of combatant ships and to authorize the President to undertake the construction of such types and tonnages of combatant ships as he shall determine to be necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that Senate bill 2125 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2125 will be indefinitely postponed.

PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS AND EXPLOSIVES ON BOARD CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2119, Calendar No. 946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2119) to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this bill was introduced at the request of the Department of Justice in order to protect ships against sabotage by persons bringing explosives on board. The subject is not now adequately covered by our statutes, especially in the case of ships which have been recently seized under our new statutes. The Judiciary Committee unanimously recommends the passage of the bill, and urges that it be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who brings, carries, or has in his possession any dangerous weapon, instrument, or device, or any dynamite, nitroglycerin, or other explosive article or compound on board of any vessel registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, or any vessel purchased, requisitioned, chartered, or taken over by the United States pursuant to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1941 (Public, No. 101, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), without previously obtaining the permission of the owner or the master of such vessel, or any person who brings, carries, or has in his possession any such weapon or explosive on board of any vessel in the possession and under the control of the United States or which has been seized and forfeited by the United States or upon which a guard has been placed by the United States pursuant to the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220, U. S. C., title 50, secs. 191–194), without previously obtaining the permission of the captain of the port in which such vessel is located, shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned not more than 1 year or fined not more than $1,000, or both.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the personnel of the armed forces of the United States or to officers or employees of the United States or of a State or of a political subdivision thereof, while acting in the performance of their duties, who are authorized by law or by rules or regulations to own or possess any such weapon or explosive.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, nominating Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

John H. Flynn, of Pelham Manor, N. Y., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Nan Wood Honeyman, of Portland, Oreg., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg., to succeed Judge Fred Fisk, whose term of office will expire on April 30, 1942.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers for appointment to temporary rank in the Air Corps; a Reserve officer and several honor graduates for appointment; and sundry officers for promotion, all in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion, and several citizens for appointment, in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 17 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

POSTMASTERS

MAINE

James G. O'Connor, Bangor.

MISSOURI

William T. Scott, Centerville.
William H. Fleahman, Jonesburg.
Joseph F. Suellentrop, Linn.
Edna B. Wood, Nixa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, storms may come and adversity may break upon us, even there shalt Thy hand lead us, and Thy right hand shall hold us. This is the trust to which Thou dost invite us and the promise which Thou dost make to the untroubled heart. Even the darkness hideth not from Thee, but the night shineth as the day.

In such a world as this, with its deep sorrow, with hearts that ache and backs that break, with its humiliating yokes of unseen crosses, forbid, O Lord, that we should leave unexpressed the thought of good cheer, the gracious word which may come as a ray of light in the earthly house of some poor tenant. Help us to be conscious debtors, living by each other and for each other. Heavenly Father, do Thou lead us to do good to the bad, to the ungrateful and to the ungracious, thus joining hands with the Saviour of the ages, as He went forth to war against falsehood, selfishness, and all manner of evil; let us follow in His train. We pray in His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Committee on Appropriations to bring up for consideration on Friday next a joint resolution providing for emergency appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Who has the floor?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserved the right to object and got the floor in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to object to the request of the gentleman from Missouri, but I think we must realize the fact that we are still a legislative body. I do not believe it is good judgment to give permission to take up a bill when we do not know really what the text of the bill is going to be. The gentleman from Missouri will have no difficulty in getting up any emergency bill on Friday. I think the gentleman should withdraw his request until he gets his bill ready, and then we will cooperate fully in seeing that it is brought up.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, of course, I will withdraw the request if that is the wish of the gentleman from Massachusetts. May I say there is nothing controversial in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is all the more reason why we can wait and take it up in the regular way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws his request.

"SEND US MORE JAPS"

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are many stirring phrases in American history, but a new one has been added this morning.

We are familiar with the great words of great Americans on great occasions, both in victory and disaster. In defeat, there is Lawrence's despairing appeal, "Don't give up the ship"; in victory, Perry's laconic message, "We have met the enemy and they are ours." There is Farragut's terse order, "Damn the torpedoes. Go ahead"; and many here remember the quiet command of Dewey at Manila, "You may fire when ready, Gridley."

But yesterday morning, when contact was again established with Wake Island, and the gallant little remnant of American marines still holding the shell-torn atoll beneath a tattered American flag, was asked what was most urgently needed, the word came back defiantly, "Send us more Japs." It was a message in keeping with the finest tradition of American heroism and service, and it speaks the spirit of united American sentiment today—"Send us more Japs."

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE WRIGHT MEMORIAL, KILL DEVIL HILL, N. C.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BONNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

DECEDENT ESTATE LAW

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEOGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

THE VOTE ON WAR RESOLUTION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I left Washington Thursday, December 4, and arrived in San Francisco Sunday morning, December 7, for the purpose of accompanying the chairman and a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands on an official visit to Hetch Hetchy, relative to San Francisco's hydroelectric power—a matter of very great importance to the United States Government and to my city; also to study and hold hearings with reference to legislation now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which is most vital to the future of the American Merchant Marine.

I was in San Francisco but a few minutes when word was received of the cowardly and unprecedented attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor. War was declared on Japan the following day, Monday, December 8. Had I been here I would have voted "yes" for the declaration of war against Japan—likewise I would have voted for a declaration of war against the other Axis Powers.

NAVY YARD WORKERS OFFER LIFT TO F. D. R.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday will probably be observed as "Give Day" at the Portsmouth Navy Yard, with the more than 10,000 workmen prepared to work without pay as they expressed it, "to give our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, a lift in the all-out effort to defeat the Axis Powers."

The 350 employees of the foundry were the first to announce that they were going to work next Sunday without pay and by the close of the day shift, approximately half of the other shops had signified their intentions of doing likewise. By tomorrow morning when employees of the three shifts in the larger shops have had an opportunity to express themselves it is believed that the entire personnel will have fallen in line.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MILITARY CENSORSHIP

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree I am sure that some censorship is necessary to protect our interests in times like these. I believe we agree also that the effectiveness of military censorship will depend pretty largely upon cooperation of press, radio, the people, and perhaps to a greater degree upon the Director of the Censorship. It is for this reason that I believe the Nation will appreciate the appointment by the President of Mr. Byron Price, executive news editor of the Associated Press, to direct this censorship.

During a long experience on the staff of a daily newspaper it was my pleasure and privilege to know Mr. Price quite intimately, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Nation may depend upon him to allow publication domestically of as much news as is wise to be published, and to reduce to a minimum the publication of news abroad that might be of value to our enemies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and permission for a second extension of remarks and to include therein a statement by the Trade Union Committee to Defend America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short quotation from the Times-Herald of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not go away the first of the month so I was here to vote for the declarations of war. I was hanging around the House hoping that perhaps the distinguished and superior-in-dignity body at the other end of the building would find time to take up and consider and perhaps pass the amendments to the Wagner law which we put through last year, also that they might find time to consider the legislation we sent over the other day dealing with the strike question—the Smith bill, which seems to have been lost after it left the House.

Perhaps we made a mistake day before yesterday in not giving the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol the $4,500 each for additional assistants, for which they asked; with another executive clerk for each they might be able to learn that we have sent some legislation over there that ought to have their attention.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 391) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That IVOR D. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, be and he is hereby elected to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EX-PRESIDENT HOOVER SHOULD HEAD PRICE CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass some kind of price-control legislation very soon. A great deal of talk has been heard about harmony between the Republican and Democratic parties. I feel that should the President of the United States announce that when the price-control legislation is passed he would place ex-President Hoover at the head of that organization it would have more to do in bringing about harmony between the two parties and the people of the United States than anything else that could be done. Mr. Hoover is the only living ex-President of the United States. Administering the price-control legislation will be one of the most important jobs during this crisis. I think that Mr. Hoover, with his wide experience during the last World War and the ability he has shown at all times, would be a good man for the job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address which I delivered recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some figures from the War Department, also a statement from the New York Times giving the comparative size of the armies of the world.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Dr. William E. Masterson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include a copy of a bill I have introduced to appropriate funds for the construction of Douglas Dam, copy of a letter from the President of the United States, one from Mr. Batt, of the O. P. M., and a statement from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning in the column entitled "Washington Daily Merry-Go-Round" an article under the signature of Mr. Drew Pearson and Mr. Robert S. Allen which contains this excerpt:

The outbreak of the war obscured the incident, but the House ate crow in a big way on its action last summer barring David Lasser, former head of the Workers Alliance, from Government employment. After a careful investigation the Appropriations Committee completely exonerated Lasser of any Communist affiliations. Representatives JOHN TABER, New York, J. W. DITTER, Pennsylvania, and EVERETT DIRKSEN, who made the original accusation, ducked the committee session when Lasser was cleared.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the language clearly invades the legislative integrity of a Member of the House in that I was not a member of the subcommittee which handled the matter, and therefore could not duck any committee of which I was not a member. I believe this constitutes an invasion of the privileges of the membership.

The SPEAKER. The rule covering this matter states:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members individually in their representative capacity only.

The Chair thinks the gentleman states a question of personal privilege.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not trespass upon the patience and good nature of the House under the rule which admits of a presentation for 1 hour. I can say what I have to say in 5 or 6 minutes.

First, may I say that I recognize that Drew Pearson and Bob Allen are busy men getting out a daily column and appearing on the radio once each week. It is to be assumed that they cannot always verify the things that come to their attention, and certainly there must be information placed at their disposal which comes from other sources. Inasmuch as unverified information sometimes finds its way into the columns, one can readily understand how this language may have appeared in the Daily Merry-Go-Round.

The only trouble with it, of course, is that it is a good deal like the definition of a crab that a little boy got from his father. The boy wanted to get a definition of a crab and his father said, "My son, a crab is a small red fish that walks backward."

The young man was quite dissatisfied with the definition, so when he next encountered a Gloucester fisherman he said to him, "My father told me that a crab is a small red fish that walks backward." He asked the fisherman if that was correct, and the fisherman said, "Son, it is substantially correct, except that a crab is not a fish; it is not necessarily small; it is not red; and it does not walk backward."

That is the trouble with this article. It impeaches me at home in those papers which carry the Merry-Go-Round and make it appear that I ran out under fire and ducked a committee session. Obviously, I could not duck a session of a subcommittee on supplementary deficiency appropriations which considered the matter of David Lasser for the very good reason that an examination of the subcommittee list will indicate that I was not and am not a member of that subcommittee.

Secondly, the insertion of the legislative provision in the third supplemental defense appropriation bill for 1942, which provided for the reinstatement of Mr. Lasser upon the W. P. A. rolls, or to that effect, does not constitute, in my judgment, an exoneration of Mr. Lasser.

In the third place, the subcommittee sessions of the Appropriations Committee are closed sessions. I was not advised that Mr. Lasser was to appear on the 14th of November; I was not invited to

appear; and I did not have an opportunity to refute the testimony that may have been offered there. I was in attendance at the full committee hearing on the 3d of December, when the entire bill was considered by the Appropriations Committee. One cannot make a point of order in a committee session; consequently, this provision, being subject to a point of order, could not have been taken from the bill in the full session of the committee.

I was on the floor on the 4th of December and on the 5th of December when the third supplemental appropriation bill was being considered. I camped on this floor religiously at that time, and when we got to the Lasser item on the 5th day of December I think everybody in this Chamber who was present will know that I reaffirmed my position with respect to Mr. Lasser, and insisted that he ought not to be reinstated on the rolls. I stated to the House I would not make a point of order, but would offer an amendment to strike that provision and let it be tested on its merits. I did not duck a subcommittee meeting not the meeting of the entire Appropriations Committee nor the floor sessions when the Lasser matter was considered.

In the next place the House did not eat crow, as is indicated in this article, because Mr. Lasser is not on the pay roll today. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made the point of order on the floor, and I am satisfied from a survey of the sentiment that prevailed here on the 5th day of December that Mr. Lasser had no show whatsoever of ever getting on the pay roll of the Government if it were left to the disposition of this body. It is doubtful whether a half dozen votes could have been obtained in his behalf.

In the next place, it seems that the subcommittee may have done me the courtesy of advising me of the Lasser proposal, because a Member of this House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies on the 14th of November, and there presented the case for Mr. Lasser. I was not informed of the fact and had no opportunity to appear although I was available on that day.

On the same day the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], also a Member of this House, sent a memorandum to the subcommittee on deficiencies under date of November 14, 1941, in which he stated that he also thought Mr. Lasser was a pretty good fellow, and not a Communist.

There is nothing in the testimony that I can find to indicate that Mr. Lasser was exonerated or that the Committee on Appropriations made any extensive investigation at all. All that appears in the record is, first of all, the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]; second, the memorandum from the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]; third, a statement by Mr. Lasser; fourth, a statement that was made by Mr. Lasser to the Workers Alliance in June 1940; fifth, a statement made by Mr. Lasser to the national executive board of the Workers Alliance the same day; sixth, an editorial from the Baltimore Sun; and, seventh, an editorial from the Washington News. That is all you will find in the record.

On the 5th of December I appeared on the floor and reaffirmed the statements I made about Mr. Lasser, and I think they are incontrovertible.

Finally, I stated that if Mr. Lasser had gone to the other Members of the House in his own behalf, certainly he should have come to the author of the amendment to the Emergency Relief Act in June of 1941 which separated him from the W. P. A. rolls, but he never came. However, last Tuesday morning, December 9, Mr. Lasser called and we had about a 30-minute conference. I said, "Mr. Lasser, did I do you an injustice, and were there any inaccuracies in the remarks I made on the floor of Congress?" He said, "No; there were not, but the inferences are unjust."

I said, "Mr. Lasser, inferences are the things a jury, for instance, gets from all the testimony. I presented the testimony. The inference is a wholly individual thing. It is a matter of opinion with various individuals. You may feel that you have been unfairly treated in that there were unjust inferences drawn, but I believe the record still insists that you have been running with subversive groups who have the communistic taint, and you ought to stand up now and take your medicine and not ask to go back on the rolls of the United States of America"

Finally, it should be observed that on December 5, when, for the second time, I reaffirmed my position with respect to Mr. Lasser and presented Mr. Lasser's own words from the testimony which he offered before the Appropriations Committee and from documents issued by his own organization, not a single Member of this House offered to take the floor in Mr. Lasser's behalf. No member of the subcommittee which heard the case, no member of the Appropriations Committee, and no other Member of the House rose in his place to defend the provision which the subcommittee inserted. Can it then be said that the House ate crow since Mr. Lasser is not on the Federal rolls today?

As for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the Members of this body are so familiar with the courage which they have exhibited over many years of constructive legislative service that it is unnecessary to refute the assertion that they ducked the subcommittee meeting.

Let me conclude the whole matter by stating that the record shows the inaccuracy of the item in question and that it is one of those unverified things which sometimes creep into the press. I submit the matter to the Congress without temper or animus and only for the purpose of keeping the record accurate.

PAYMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 1 of the House engrossed amendments strike out "1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice and tobacco" and insert "1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945 and 1946 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
W. J. BULOW,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) giving the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

(1) The bill (S. 588), as passed by the Senate, eliminated those provisions of section 7 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which provided for State plans to effectuate the purposes of such act, and for the making of grants to States to carry out such plans. The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make soil-conservation payments to agricultural producers was made permanent. The House amendment does not disturb the existing provisions of section 7 relating to State plans. Instead, it retains those provisions but extends to January 1, 1947, the period during which the Secretary of Agriculture may make payments and grants in aid to agricultural producers under section 8 of such act. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

(2) The House amendment extended for 3 years the period during which the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized under the act of May 26, 1941, to make loans at the rate of 85 percent of parity upon certain agricultural commodities. The conference agreement adopts the House provision with an amendment extending the loan authority of the Commodity Credit Corpora-

tion for 5 years instead of 3, and including peanuts among the commodities on which such loans are to be made.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House has just adopted the conference report on Senate bill 588. One section of this bill provides for loans at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price upon the 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

With regard to peanuts, I wish to make the following statement to avoid any future misunderstanding with respect to the intention of the committee and the Congress relating to loans on peanuts.

First. Subsection (e) of section 359 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts," approved April 3, 1941, directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available loans upon peanuts if quotas are approved by not less than two-thirds of the farmers voting in a referendum, and further provides that such loans shall be made "only on the marketing quota for each farm."

It is, therefore, understood that such 85-percent loans shall be made only on the quota peanuts for each farm and it is not intended that such 85-percent loans shall be made on nonquota peanuts or excess peanuts.

It is further understood that said act, so approved April 3, 1941, authorizes, permits, and contemplates the production of excess peanuts or nonquota peanuts and provides the method in which they shall be marketed, and that by the production of such excess or nonquota peanuts the producer does not thereby become a noncooperator. It is, therefore, the intention that said 85-percent loans shall be made on quota peanuts notwithstanding and without regard to the fact that the producer of such quota peanuts may have also produced and marketed excess peanuts or nonquota peanuts or peanuts for oil.

I desire that this statement be considered as a part of the legislative history of said bill and report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. R. M. Evans, National A. A. A. Administrator, on the 28th of November before the convention of the Illinois Agricultural Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Alexander Seversky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 390.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 1, line 13, after the period, insert: "It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill."

On page 2, line 1, after "adopted", insert "and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and now yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6215, which has for its purpose, as you are already advised, a further extension of the draft. The amendment just adopted merely insures that the committee amendment may be considered as an original bill, and therefore makes the rule a more open one, if such a thing is possible.

It allows the House to amend the bill so as to work its will. The maximum age limit for service may be cut down or raised, and the minimum age limit may be raised or lowered as the House may see fit. I am sure that every Member of the House must feel most keenly a responsibility in arriving at his decision on this momentous question affecting, as it does, millions of our youth and our manhood in every walk of life in the Nation's domestic and economic life. This Congress in the past several months has been called upon to face stupendous issues. This is but another one. I am confident that the House will approach the issue with but one thought in mind—to face the issue squarely and fearlessly, regardless of political repercussions, thinking only of the ultimate welfare and safety of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's house is on fire. We, the Members of Congress, may be the fire station which must first answer the alarm and provide the materials with which to combat the flames. There is no time for bickering. The fire must be extinguished. The Congress and the American people must realize that we are engaged in no holiday excursion. We are in a death struggle on the side of the democracies who are sorely assailed by the totalitarian powers. I have no desire to appear as an alarmist or a pessimist; but need I remind you, in the light of the kaleidoscopic events which are occurring, that not only are our Government, our way of life, and our institutions threatened, but we must struggle for the salvation of our very lives. Can we longer afford to debate or falter when we realize what is going on abroad? Today the public is being prepared for the loss of Hong Kong; Singapore and the Philippines are dangerously threatened. The Axis Powers are set upon securing as their immediate objective these two barriers that now block their paths to the raw materials—principally oil and rubber—so essential to provide their war machine for a period of long operations.

If Singapore and the Philippines fall, they not only receive these essential raw materials but they remove us from the Pacific and the eastern arena of warfare. Moreover, they cut off rubber and other essentials which are necessary for our and the British machines. That these strongholds in the Pacific are vulnerable must be apparent to all who read and think. That they must be held at all costs in order that our own continental shores may be protected is quite evident.

So, Mr. Speaker, in this crisis we are called upon at the instance of the President of the United States, the Commander-in-Chief, and those in charge of the Nation's defense to further broaden the base of the draft to furnish the manpower so essential to the operation of our own war machine and the Nation's defense. That we will grant this authority is a foregone conclusion. As to whether we will give it within the exact limitations which the Army has requested is for this Congress to decide.

But that we will broaden that base is unquestioned. So far as I am personally concerned, I must confess my inability, not being fully advised in the premises, to say that the age limit shall be fixed at 65 on the one hand and 18 on the other hand. While it is hard for me to see the necessity at this time to dip into the high-school ranks to recruit the youth of the land, I shall be perfectly willing, as one who is vitally affected, to accept the aggregate opinion arrived at in the consummate judgment of the Congress of the United States. That we must have the manpower to man the machines of war is obvious. That we will have it will be demonstrated by this House today.

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot leave this momentous subject without again calling the attention of the House and the country to the thought that in this great undertaking it is going to be necessary for someone other than the young manhood of this country to sacrifice, if we are to win this gigantic conflict. You and I are agreeable to sacrificing our sons in order to prevent this country being added to the list of Hitler's victims. But I know I bespeak your sentiments when I say also that you and I want to see all of our citizens in every walk of life make whatever sacrifices are necessary in order to enhance the opportunities which these young stalwarts must have to prevent their making the supreme sacrifice in vain. There must be a complete cessation of selfish advancement in this country at the expense of these young soldiers. Profiteering in industry and the commercial activities of the land must be surrendered to the commonweal. Strikes in war production must be made as unpopular by an incensed and righteous public opinion as desertion in the Army. This Congress must say to these young men whom it calls to the front line of the Nation's defense—to the trackless waste of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, in the Philippines, on the Malay Peninsula, Iceland, Africa, and possibly even in far away Russia—that we are going to give you the sinews of war with which to fight. We do not propose that they shall be sacrificed either in the icy waters of the Atlantic or Pacific, or upon the wastes of Russia and Africa, unprepared and without the planes, guns, and ships that are so essential to giving them a fighting chance against a ruthless enemy. Let us keep faith with those whom we call to the Nation's colors. If the American people in their resolution will determine that this shall happen we can and will win out in the death struggle that lies ahead.

Let us here and now resolve in this hour, while there is yet time, that we will keep the faith with those whom we send abroad to fight the Nation's battles. Let a reunited American people resolve here and now that come the tears, the sweat, and the blood we will sacrifice, we will produce, we will forget political and personal advancement and relegate selfishness to the background, and we will win.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS].

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider the bill for the expansion of the draft. I rise today to call attention of the House to a situation that has arisen in my city of Philadelphia, and I imagine in many cities of the North. I had in my office during this week end over 500 young American boys of the Negro race, who were refused enlistment in Philadelphia because the War Department said they had no vacancies. They were refused the right to enlist, although they are included in this bill about to be passed. These boys believe in America and they want to fight to protect America. They are willing to lay down their lives. I wrote a letter to Secretary Stimson, calling his attention to this matter. I feel it is the duty of the Army at this time to make provision for the American rights for these boys, not only to be drafted, but the right to enlist to serve their country. In Philadelphia this last week we were sent over 1,500 troops to guard our navy yard and our defense industries. They are colored troops, led by their commander. They are guarding the city of Philadelphia today, the only troops guarding that city. Yet Lieutenant Reed, of the recruiting service, told me on Monday that they had received an order from Washington saying that these boys cannot enlist at this time, boys who desire to enlist and to serve their country. I hope the House will take this matter up and give them an opportunity to enlist, because we need the men, as proven by necessity for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed, as follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1941.

Hon. HENRY STIMSON,
The Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In this hour of crisis for America, thousands of our American boys and men are hastening to enlist, glad of the opportunity of laying down their lives for their country.

It is generally understood that there is a great demand for a large army, and because of this I cannot reconcile the fact that discrimination because of color has manifested itself. Many men of the Negro race of my city, Philadelphia, have been turned away by enlisting officers because they are colored. In my opinion—and I cannot help but feel that you will agree with me—this is unjustified discrimination, in definite opposition to the principles of democracy upon which this war is based.

I have taken the matter up with Lieutenant Reed, of the Philadelphia office, who informed me, over the telephone December 15, that the reason for this action was that they had orders from Washington that there were no vacancies for colored men at this time.

It is my hope, and I respectfully request, that you have this matter thoroughly investigated, to the end that those men of the Negro race, who are ready and anxious to enlist in the armed force of their country, be accorded that right and privilege.

Respectfully yours,

LEON SACKS.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. We are faced with a very difficult and serious question that we must decide here today. We must decide what we think is for the best interest of America, and that is all that is at stake in all of these measures—what is best for America. How can we help to win this war? I confess, although I have done a good deal of thinking about it, that I do not know the answer to the problem of whether we should vote for a 21-year age limit or a 19-year age limit. The War Department, those in authority, the experts, have recommended 19 years, and I have a very high regard for the advice of General Marshall and General Hershey. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, by a practically unanimous vote, has recommended to this House an age limit of 21 years.

We all know that this war is an entirely different kind of war from that we were engaged in 23 years ago. That war did not compare in magnitude to the war in which we are now involved. In the Pacific we are fighting against the greatest military and naval power of the east, and in the west against the greatest military power almost in the world's history. In the last war we had 21 Allies and 5 navies on our side—the British Navy, the French Navy, the Italian and the Japanese Navies, and our own. Up at the front there were the British Army, the French Army, the Belgian Army, the Italian Army, and a host of other armies. Other nations had been fighting for years against the Central Powers, including Russia, Rumania, Serbia, and Portugal. This is an entirely different war. In that war 23 years ago we lost only 50,000 killed in a year and a half. Today now, in 10 days of warfare, we have lost approximately 3,500 killed. In 10 days we have lost 7 percent of what we lost in a year and a half in the last war. The conflict is on a different scale. Therefore, as we consider this bill we must realize that we are obliged to mobilize our full manpower and all of our resources in order to win the war.

No one knows how long the war will last. It may be over in a year. If Russia is victorious and Japan cannot reach the oil in Java and Sumatra, the war may be over in a year; but if Japan can obtain oil and if the German Army is victorious in Russia, then this war may go on indefinitely for any number of years. The War Department naturally, in good faith, has proposed a long-distance program of mobilizing all of our manpower, and has presented to the proper committees of the Congress a plan providing for an age limit of 19 years.

I confess that I do not know the answer. I dislike voting to take boys into the service below 21 years as much as any Member of Congress. I would much prefer if we could work out a compromise between 21 and 19, and vote for 20 years, and then they may be called after their twentieth birthday—not right away on their birthday, but during the succeeding year they would be given military training, and they would not go into actual fighting before 21. Perhaps that is the proper compromise. That is at least the one that I would favor at the present time before the debate starts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. That is the compromise that I would favor in advance of debate. Perhaps after hearing

the arguments, I may vote for 19 years. I want to go into this with an open mind and listen to what is said on both sides. At the present time I favor the 20-year age limit. Call it a compromise, if you will, but I think it more generally will satisfy the American people and bring about more unity toward winning the war. It certainly will not disturb or bother me if it is made either 19 or 21.

What we must realize if we are to win this war—and we are determined to win it—is that we need more production, more merchant ships, more tanks, more warships, more airplanes, more munitions and, above all, more men—men by the millions.

I wonder if you have the same feeling that I have listening to some of these short-haired women and long-haired men talking about civilian defense and community security here in Washington, and talking at the dinner tables about being bombed, and their houses being destroyed here and throughout the Nation. I do not believe there is much chance of our being bombed. Certainly if we are bombed in Washington it might help to augment the war tempo in America. It might serve a very good purpose. But I am not very much in sympathy with these people that blather at the dinner table about their houses being bombed, and their own safety and security. It makes no essential difference whether we are bombed or not. That is not going to win the war. Our fighting forces—our Army, our Navy, our air force, and our Marines—are going to win the war. Those who are going to do the fighting are the ones that we have to back and support to the limit and depend on for final victory.

It will have very little effect on the war whether a few bombs are dropped here and there over America. Let us realize in the beginning that we must provide arms and men for the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Air Corps, and nothing is too good for them from the start. They are going to do the fighting and dying and we must furnish them with the weapons to finish the job.

Let me say to some of my friends in Congress who have been coming to me and suggesting they would like to go into the armed forces and obtain commissions, what I have invariably answered, I cannot see the slightest reason for any Member of Congress taking a desk job, an administrative job in the War or Navy Department, or any other. If they are going to serve in a combat outfit in the Air Force or on board a destroyer, or in a combat unit in the Army, that is an entirely different thing. I would urge any Member of Congress to go who wants to do that, and envy him. But there is no reason in the world for any Member of Congress to put on a uniform, and a pair of spurs, to keep his feet from slipping off a desk in the War Department. They can better serve their country right here during the war, with the experience they have in Congress.

In view of the letter read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS] in regard to denying the colored people the right to volunteer I want to make some comments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

As one who served with colored troops in the last war, and if I get an opportunity with a combat outfit, I want to serve with them in this war. I offered an amendment to the draft bill which was finally accepted on the floor after a considerable fight, providing that there should be no discrimination against the colored soldier who was drafted; that he could go into any of the branches of the Army service. That is the law today. Supporting what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS] had to say, I have received letters from Detroit and other cities stating that colored people were being denied the opportunity to enlist, to serve in our armed forces, in a war for what? For freedom and democracy! Who has a better right to serve than the Negroes? Who has a better right to volunteer in a fight for freedom and democracy than the colored men of America?

Of course, they are entitled to enlist, and I propose to find out what is preventing them from being accepted.

I served last July with a number of colored regiments at Fort Bragg, N. C., headed by southern white officers, some of the best officers in the United States Army, and they are all of one accord, that those colored troops are doing a fine job. These were in antiaircraft, artillery, infantry, and engineer regiments.

I wrote this letter today to Maj. Gen. Emory S. Adams, The Adjutant General of the War Department:

I am writing to ask if you could give me information in regard to the voluntary enlistment of our colored citizens? Many complaints have reached my office that colored volunteers are being rejected in Philadelphia, Detroit, and other places.

It seems to me that inasmuch as we are fighting this war for freedom and democracy there should be no distinction whatever between our white and colored citizens in our armed forces, and that Negroes should not only be permitted but encouraged to volunteer.

If we are to have an armed force of 7,000,000 men, approximately 700,000 will be colored soldiers. I had incorporated into the original draft bill an amendment that aimed to prevent any discrimination against colored soldiers so that they might enter into all branches of the Army.

I am further interested in knowing what is being done to organize colored divisions. Certainly, with an Army now approximating 2,000,000 and 2,000,000 more to be trained during the year, there should be at least a half-dozen colored divisions.

I will appreciate it if you will send me the information relative to the volunteering of our colored people immediately.

Thanking you for your attention to this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Let me quote what the President of the United States has to say on December 9, 1941, and I endorse every word in it:

We are now in this war. We are all in it—all the way. Every single man, woman, and child is a partner—

Not every white man, but every man—white, red, and colored—regardless of race, color, or creed—

in the most tremendous undertaking in our American history.

That is good, sound American doctrine from the President of the United States. It calls for unity, 100-percent unity, in America—not 90-percent unity, but 100-percent unity from all our people.

Now, getting back for a few minutes to this particular amendment: We have an army of 2,000,000 that has been in training for almost a year. We shall probably train another 2,000,000 during the year. This will make an army of 4,000,000. It will take at least 3 years to train an army of 7,000,000 provided for by this bill. Nobody knows how long this war will last. This bill really means mobilizing our manpower to the extent of 10,000,000 Americans,—7,000,000 or more in the Army, 2,000,000 in the Air Corps, and 1,000,000 in the Navy and Marine Corps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

If we are to go to war—and we who were opposed to it said this time and time again—if we are going into this war, there is only one kind of war to fight; that is a total war, an all-out war. This is the only kind of war the American people understand or that the Congress understands, a war to victory as soon as possible, fighting in every single continent of the world with American expeditionary forces. It would be cowardly and craven, now that we are in this war, to say to the British, to the Communists, or to the Chinese, "You go ahead and fight the war; we will supply you with guns." This is not the American way. We have declared war in the American constitutional way, and Congress has voted for expeditionary forces. I am for a total all-out war with an army of 7,000,000, one-tenth of which to be made up of colored soldiers with at least half a dozen colored divisions, an air force of 2,000,000, and a Navy and Marine Corps of 1,000,000 in order to win the war at the earliest possible moment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession a letter from the President of the United States bearing the President's own signature. The President's letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 15, 1941.

MY DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I write to confirm that I fully approve and endorse the bill for the amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, introduced by Mr. MAY in the House on Friday last.

I approve the proposed congressional declaration of policy, the provision for the registration of all our manpower between 18 and 64, inclusive, and the extension of liability for military service so as to include all the age groups from 19 to 44, inclusive.

I consider the registration provision an essential instrument for the orderly planning of our national effort.

As to the extension of liability for service, I approve it as a means of providing a sufficiently large pool of men available for service in our land and naval forces (including the air forces) adequate to meet all contingencies now foreseeable.

These two features of the bill supplement each other. I consider them of equal and prime importance.

The reasons for the bill are more fully set forth in the letter sent by the Secretary of

War on Saturday last to Representative MAY and Senator REYNOLDS. I endorse without qualification the Secretary's statement in that letter.

I am sending an identical letter to the Speaker and the minority leader of the House and the Vice President and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

That letter and the recommendations which were made to the Congress in a letter of the Secretary of War were not made facetiously or in an arbitrary manner. Those recommendations were made after deep thought and study by the President of the United States, who is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, and by his military advisers.

There is only one thing we of America must watch: We must not adopt an attitude of self-complacency. We saw what happened in France; we saw the results of the idle and thoughtless statements, "This is a phony war," made some time ago. That was worth 50 or 75 divisions to Hitler, because it indoctrinated the minds of the people of England and France with self-complacency. Then Hitler flung his mechanized legions against the soldiers of France and England, and we know the results. We in America must not be lulled to sleep; we must be constantly on our guard. The American people are determined. The American people are on guard. It is the duty and the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to be equally determined and on guard.

Last week we evidenced to the country the type of decisive leadership it sought. By our action of last week the Congress has impressed the people with an excellent example. There was perfect teamwork last week between the executive branch, the President of the United States, and the Congress. We want this teamwork to continue. By our example we have shown Hitler, Mussolini, and the war-mad totalitarian leaders of Japan that the legislative branch of our Government, the Congress of the United States, can function effectively and decisively in a crisis.

In a war there must be a leader. We have a leader—a constitutional leader. Under war conditions, of necessity, the President must be given great powers. This is the purpose of this bill. Our leader, the President, is not only the President of the United States but is also the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. We must give to the Commander in Chief the power not only to meet immediate problems and situations under war conditions, but we must give him the power to make long-range plans. He and his advisers in the War Department and the Navy Department must be supported.

The amendment to reduce the lower draft-age limit to 19 years, which will be offered, I understand, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessary to attain that purpose. With all due respect to the distinguished members of the House Committee on Military Affairs, we cannot have too many leaders in this crisis. While I recognize they are all outstanding military leaders, while I recognize they are undoubtedly great tacticians, while I recognize they probably could lead the Army to success in this conflict, yet I cannot accept their judgment in these days in preference to the judgment of the President of the United States and his military and naval advisers.

In this crisis we must all be good soldiers, and that applies particularly to the members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House so far as this bill is concerned. They cannot and they should not on a matter of policy challenge the judgment of the President of the United States and of General Marshall, both of whom have recommended that the age start at 19 years. This power is necessary. We can rely on the President and on General Marshall in war, as we must, and we can and must rely on them in these days to exercise in a proper manner the powers which are conferred upon them.

Today we are one House, with no middle aisle dividing the two great political parties. As an individual Member of this body and as majority leader, I am proud of the spirit that exists in this body. It is the spirit of America on the march. "Remember Pearl Harbor" means something to us today just the same as decades ago "Remember the Alamo" was the rallying cry of the valiant Texans in their fight for freedom. "Remember Pearl Harbor" means remembering the treachery of the Japs, a contaminated, contemptible people, for all future time. It also means our determination to revenge that dastardly and infamous act of deceit and treachery.

A week ago last Monday we declared war on Japan. A few days later, with only 17 or 18 minutes' debate, we made legislative history in the United States. A few days later we declared war against Germany and Italy without a word of debate. That was leadership on the part of every Member of the Congress, not the leadership of the Speaker, the majority or minority leaders, but leadership of the Congress itself, congressional leadership, setting an example for the War Department, the Navy Department, and all other governmental activities, setting an example to the people of the United States. We set that example last week. Are we going to upset it only 10 days later by refusing to accept the recommendations of the President of the United States?

When the amendment is offered to reduce the age limit to 19 years I shall support it. I cannot in this crisis permit my individual judgment, even if it differed, to rise in opposition to the judgment and the recommendation of the President, the judgment and the recommendation of General Marshall, whose business it is to defend our country when attacked. He made this recommendation, the President has made it, and it is the duty of Congress, as I see it, to be valiant soldiers, you and I as Members of the House, not as members of two political parties, and, above all, as Americans and as soldiers, we should vote for the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS].

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Portsmouth (N. H.) Record of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, every man in this House knows definitely who is going to do the fighting in this country; every man in this House has supreme confidence in those who are going to do the fighting in this war, and not a person here doubts the ultimate result of this great contest. It is the youth of America who are going to do the fighting, and, at the risk of repeating what I may have said on this floor perhaps several times before, I will cite a few instances of the type that makes up and will make up the American fighting forces.

I recall many incidents on the football field where you can find out what the spirit of the boys is in a great united contest where it is only a question of college prestige. I had a quarterback, and he is typical of American youth, who played a game after his jaw was broken. He came off the field, after helping to win the victory, holding his jawbones in place with his hands, and expressing the hope that he would not be criticized because his injury might have taken his mind off the game. I know of another instance where a man played a half of a game, carrying the ball for gains time after time, yet when he was examined later it was found that both shoulders were broken. That is the spirit of the American youth.

I saw a story this morning which I think is typical. You all saw it. Whether it be true or not, it really reflects the spirit of the American boy. When they managed to get in contact with Wake Island, and asked the marines what they would like to have sent to them, they said, "Send us more Japs." That is the spirit of fighting men.

I cannot pass upon the merits of the bill before the House at the present time. I shall listen to the debate. I simply know that every man who goes into the Army must have something to drill with and to fight with. This Congress, in view of this bill and the great war facing us, should cut every bit of red tape that can possibly interfere with the production of guns, planes, tanks, and things that our Army must have to fight with. I say now without fear of contradiction that some bureaus are obstructing the Army in what it desires. There is delay, there is red tape, and the responsibility for cutting that red tape rests upon the Congress.

We have another responsibility. Much as we may desire to help other countries, nevertheless in the situation which now confronts our own Nation we must see to it that essential war materials we sorely need for our armed forces are not allo-

cated and shipped away to foreign nations.

We must not strip our country of the things necessary for its defense, for we have an intensive war to the west of us, a war that must be won. So whatever you do here, keep one thought in mind is my advice—do not take more men into the camps than we can properly equip and train. Adequate equipment is a condition precedent to producing an efficient fighting force. Let the procedure be orderly, practicable, and resultful. Let the Congress never give up its responsibility to search with meticulous care every move that is made by this Government to the end that an invincible armed force takes the field, the sea, and the air in defense of the cause to which the United States is committed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss the merits of the bill at this time, although I may have something to say on it when it comes up for general debate and for consideration under the 5-minute rule.

The acting chairman of the Committee on Rules has given me this brief time in order that I may make a statement not only for myself but for the committee, of which I happen to be a member, in order to keep the record straight, or, at least, to keep it fair and to let it speak the truth.

On yesterday afternoon I was one of those who joined in the applause for the distinguished majority leader, for whom I have the most affectionate regard and the highest respect, on his statement that, thank God politics has adjourned and that unity now prevails in this House and in the country, and that it is no time for unkind or unjust criticism.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is perhaps too modest to say for himself what I want to say for him, that for the last 4 or 5 days, with the exception of Sunday, and certainly including all day Saturday until late in the evening, the Committee on Military Affairs had before them all the witnesses whom they thought knew anything about this very important subject. The witnesses were heard in great detail. Every member of the committee on both sides of the committee was given the most ample opportunity for cross-examination. After everybody who desired to testify had been heard the committee went into executive session, and I undertake to say that I have never seen manifested a finer or more patriotic spirit in order to get this bill out in the best possible form.

It is true that there was not a unanimous agreement. I happen to be one of those, along with the distinguished minority member on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], who supported the original text of the bill. But there is one thing I say, absolutely, and I think I speak for every member of that committee when I say it, that not a person on that committee set himself up as superior to the War Department or to the military experts of the country. No member of the committee claimed then or now that he is a military expert.

I simply plead for fairness to the committee of which I happen to be a member, and say that the committee, in an honest, patriotic effort to come here and do their full duty and present all the facts, together with a printed record as disclosed by the hearings which are now before you, and likewise a full and ample report, have done what I at least have always tried to do, whether in the courthouse or in legislative halls, to present the facts and let the jury determine what is fair and best to do.

I do not profess to know much about military affairs, but I do say that I and every member of that committee are just as conscientious in an effort to arrive at what is best in this critical hour as any man who undertakes to criticize us. So I say for the record that I am here to plead again for unity.

I do not know what is best to do about this matter. I was much impressed with the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I do not know whether it is best to set the limit at 19, 20, or 21 years of age. I know that after that terrible debacle at Pearl Harbor, this House, by a practically unanimous vote, with only one vote against it, pledged absolutely every resource in this Nation to the winning of this war; and that means men and material.

I hope you will give dispassionate and patriotic consideration to this bill. If you want to disregard the views of every man on the committee, you are at liberty to do so; but I assure you that there has been an honest and sincere effort by the chairman and every man on that committee to present the facts and the evidence as they were laid before us by the War Department and by those who know national defense. I am one of those who have the greatest confidence in the War and Navy Departments of this country. I am following their leadership in this mighty conflict. Theirs is the primary duty to win this war. I am one of those backing our Commander in Chief in this mighty conflict. What he says is necessary to win this war, I am for. When he sends a letter here such as that read by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I tell you that for my part I am going down the line. That is what I did in the committee and that is what I propose to do now. At the same time I am not setting myself up as knowing more than the military experts of the country, which we were charged with doing a few minutes ago. I believe in General Marshall and his staff and they have always had my support, just as they are having today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee to Investigate Air Accidents may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and condense my remarks as printed in the RECORD of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, when we left the floor on yesterday we left it in the warm glow of affection and unity of purpose. I was somewhat surprised at the remarks of our distinguished majority leader with reference to this bill. I have read with a great deal of interest the report of the splendid Committee on Military Affairs on this matter. I want to be guided by their views in the debate on this important bill. I believe it to be one of the most important matters we have had to consider in this House outside of a declaration of war, in that it deals with the lives of the boys between 18 and 21 years of age.

I could not help but think that, after all, when we consider the rosters of the football squads of the Military and Naval Academies, West Point and Annapolis, we can look at the ages of those boys and see whether they are 18 or whether they are 20, 21, and 22.

I think it is a very vital matter to consider and I am sure that the great Committee on Military Affairs is ready and anxious and willing to give us what is their solemn judgment, because there is one group that is going to know whether this is a "phony war" to which the majority leader refers, and that groups is composed of these lads who will soon give up their lives in defense of this country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we are living in a most crucial hour. A time when the whole world is on fire. A time when nearly all civilized nations of the earth are engaged in war.

The legislation before us this afternoon is for the purpose of further assisting our country in the prosecuting of our part in that conflict. This measure is an important one. It deals with the human problem. This Congress wants to do the right thing regarding it. The bill provides, among other things, that the draft age shall be increased to 45 years, and reduced to include boys as young as 18 years. The Military Affairs Committee of the House, after taking testimony from those familiar with the question, and after considering the problem in its entirety, have recommended that the minimum age for induction of men shall remain at 21 years for the present. I feel the recommendation of the committee should be followed. It may later develop that the minimum age should be reduced to 18. If so, Congress can do it, and will do it promptly, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, we now have approximately 2,000,000 men in our armed forces. It will have to be increased just as rapidly and promptly as human energy can provide for it. I understand it is expected to double that force and have 4,000,000 men under arms within a year, and to increase it to probably 7,000,000 during the following year, and to do it even sooner, if possible.

Mr. Speaker, we are advised approximately 17,500,000 registered for the draft in 1940. According to selective-service authorities, seven and a half million are eligible for service. Furthermore, 100,000 young men reach the age of 21 years every month. That means 1,200,000 additional boys are of military age each year. Another thing to be considered is that young boys are right now crowding the enlistment places by the thousands.

I know it is difficult to compare this situation with the World War. It will be remembered that while the age limits were 21 to 31, that our armed forces were more than 4,000,000, and that although the age limit was reduced shortly before the close of the war, none was drafted under 21 years. And let it be understood these 18-year-olds in the meantime will be needed especially on the farms to help produce for those who are doing the fighting.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only a question of inducting men into the Army or the Navy. The great big problem is to provide housing, arms and equipment, hospitals, and all of the things necessary to provide trained and properly equipped armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has shown that it can act, and act quick in an emergency. It will do it in this case, if and when it is necessary to do so.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we cannot build cantonments, and turn out tanks, guns, planes, and other materials just by appropriating the money, although that is necessary. It is going to take the everlasting cooperation, work and sacrifice of millions of men and women in order to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, our country has been attacked. We are engaged in the most gigantic struggle at arms the world has ever known. America is playing the most important part in that conflict.

This is so much worse than the first World War. In that war we had many countries on our side, we had a half dozen navies fighting with us. Not so today.

Mr. Speaker, the picture is not very bright this afternoon.

The Americans know how to sacrifice when they are called upon to do it. They will do it now. With a united people the United States of America will make a determined and supreme effort to bring this terrible crisis to a successful conclusion just as soon as it may possibly be done. Let us hope and pray that the day of victory is not too far distant.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to offer a word of commendation of and to express my satisfaction with a recent action of the War Department which has let down the bars considerably as to educational requirements for air pilots, as well as for navigators and bombardiers who must man the air force of the United States Army.

I maintain that it has been absolutely necessary to do this in order to conform with the proposed program of expanding the air force which the Army contemplates. As I understand the present program, it will call for some 20,000 air pilots a month. This will necessitate abolishing the old regulation of requiring 2 years of college education in order to become an air pilot. The requirements for navigators have never been 2 years necessarily. They call for, as I understand, a high-school education. However, the proposed plan calls for eliminating the educational stipulation for air pilots, and this will open a vast new reservoir for the air force of the Army, which will be built into a force second to none throughout the world. The War Department is simply following the general provisions which I advocated when I introduced a resolution to this effect about 6 weeks ago, and when I emphasized that you cannot lick Hitler with a Phi Beta Kappa key alone.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRY. What will be the minimum age requirement for the air-pilot training corps?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to the gentleman, according to the information I have had, and I may be wrong, but my information is that the age will be 21 as the minimum age. However, I believe in wartime commissions for the air force will be allowed at a younger age. At any rate, boys under 21 will be allowed to volunteer, and, if accepted, can find a place in the air forces of our country.

Mr. TERRY. Does not the gentleman feel it would be fair, if we are taking boys younger than 21 into the Army, to reduce the minimum-age requirement for those who go into the Air Corps? In other words, give them a chance.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the House so decides, I will say to the gentleman, it is only fair that it should be extended to the air force. As I understand, thousands upon thousands of young Americans have tried to get into the air force in the past and have been deliberately denied that privilege because they were unable to meet educational requirements, and I am glad that this is being changed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested a few moments ago in the remarks of our distinguished majority leader, able, fearless, patriotic, and one who has done a grand job with the majority side, and I think has done a great deal toward welding the House together as a whole. Heretofore on so many occasions the cry has been "Stand by the committee." The Military Affairs Committee is an able, conscientious, hard-working committee. They have had some tough going in the last few weeks and in the last few months. They have been closer to the military picture and the military problems of this Government than any group I know in the United States outside of some of the actual Army officials, and I am not so sure they are not in a better position to get a better picture than the department officials. Now we are met with the statement that probably they are setting themselves up as knowing more about military tactics than the officials. I do not agree with that. I think these gentlemen are just as conscientious as the gentleman from Massachusetts would have been or would like to have been or is.

We are dealing now with both a military problem and a human problem and this House has to deal with both of those problems. I am not saying that military men and naval men have never made a mistake. I am not saying the House has never made a mistake, and try as hard as we may, we are still going to make some mistakes. The public sentiment, the patriotism, the loyalty, and the unity of this country have been soaring upward. Let us not deter it. Let us not, at this time, unless there is some good reason—and I must admit that I believe this House is entitled to better logic and better reasons than just to say that somebody has said so and so would be good.

This House is willing and is going to remain willing to do whatever is necessary to defend this country, and we are called upon "to be soldiers." Yes. But the Members of this House will not be soldiers all of the time in the sense that they must take orders all of the time, because we are called upon to be thinking soldiers. We have to think, we are charged with thinking, and when a general comes in and says so and so exists or that he knows so and so, then it is our duty to say, "Give us good reasons, some good logic in support of the statement." If these boys, 18 and 19 years of age, are needed, do not worry about the youth of this land being willing and able to play their part, but let us have some good sound logic, some good reason, some figures showing that they are needed and some figures showing that they could be trained, and then some figures showing that they ought to be put into action now, before we begin to empty the farms, homes, colleges, and the schools of the country of the boys who would have nothing to do after they were drafted. If there is some good reason, give it to us.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the consent of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6233. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution relative to the reenrollment of the bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6215, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. I trust that I may be able to approach the discussion of this measure coolly and without passion and avoid in any possible way any feeling of hysteria. First I begin with an expression of my heartfelt appreciation to my colleagues on the Committee on Military Affairs, particularly my good friend and right-hand man, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], and also the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], for coming to the defense of the House Military Affairs Committee, against the groundless criticisms of our distinguished majority leader, but I am not going to take my time here in responding to the criticism that has been cast at the committee, by the floor leader. Therefore, I shall proceed to discuss the legislation without reference to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes. I yield to my friend the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman speaks about criticism having been made. If the gentleman had listened to my remarks he would have seen that there was no criticism, except that I paid my respects to the military ability of Members, and I said that in the matter of the difference between their judgment, and the judgment of the President of the United States, and the judgment of General Marshall, that I feel constrained to follow the judgment of General Marshall and the Commander in Chief in this conflict. If the gentleman calls that criticism. very well. I think it is fair debate.

Mr. MAY. There was a veiled criticism that we are not "good soldiers," in the gentleman's remarks, when I have stayed here late hours in the night, and no longer than last Monday night remained in my office until 10 o'clock, in an effort to get this legislation before the House so that the representatives of the people might have an opportunity to consider it. And I am here today to lay down a fundamental that I stand for and shall stand for so long as I live, and if it puts me on the spot, then I am on a spot where I have been practically all of my life, and never wavered at any time. I do not believe that the time has come, even though we are in war, when legislators have lost the function to do their own thinking. I regard this as the legislative department of the Government, and I regard every man on the floor of this House in his rights as the equal of every other man, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican. I reserve to myself the right to disagree even with the Commander in Chief, if it becomes necessary to do it, but let me add, that in this crisis I am ready now not only to support the Commander in Chief and the Army and Navy of the United States, but I am ready to shed every drop of blood that is in my veins, if it becomes necessary, for the preservation of human freedom and the preservation of this country that I love.

Let us see what the facts are. Why bring the officials of the War Department before any congressional committee, if it is not to get information? Why bring them for information unless the committee is going to consider it? It would be a useless, futile performance. But we brought the Director of the Selective Service System, through which these men must come when they go into the Army. We not only deprived ourselves of taking a day off on Saturday, but we worked until after 5 o'clock in the evening in order that he might tell us everything he knew.

Among the outstanding things that he told us in discussing the available reservoir of manpower for military purposes was that even with the registration of 17,500,000 men who were registered in October 1940, there was a reservoir of 7,500,000 men eligible and capable of military service. In addition to that, he told us there were 1,200,000 young men under 21 years of age who reached the age of 21 every year, year after year.

Your committee, though it is subject to criticism, of course, and sometimes ought to be criticized in the exercise of its best judgment and conscience, every one of them without reference to politics or any other thing except the welfare and safety of the American Republic, have brought out a bill fixing the military age limits at 21 to 44, inclusive, and we have not only that reservoir fixed but this great flow of eligibles coming in at the rate of 1,200,000 a year. We felt—or I did—that we could afford to let these little boys in their teens, from 18 to 21, remain back until we need them. If I am not mistaken, this House has already demonstrated its capacity to act when it needs to act. When the time comes that we must wreck the school days, destroy the youthful opportunities of boys 18 years of age in this country, then your House Military Affairs Committee will be the first to be here with a bill to draft them if and when they are needed. But let us not do it until we do need them. Let us not destroy the hopes and ambitions of fathers and mothers for their children. Let us not destroy that unity that is 100 percent in America today behind the President of the United States in the prosecution of this war. But let us go at it soberly. Let us make up a draft bill that will give them ample power to get all the manpower they need, but let us wait about taking the youngsters until we need to take them. Let us wait to see if we can find out whether or not the manpower in some European countries is going to be used. Now, let that sink in.

As I said awhile ago, we have that great reservoir of manpower. We have the machinery set up in this bill to handle—all of them. The only remaining unsettled question will be when the time comes, if it ever does come, and God forbid that the time ever will come, when we have to draft 18-year-old boys; but when the time comes the machinery is set up and the House of Representatives can in 30 minutes, as it did the other day in about 30 seconds, pass a bill extending their duties in the Army beyond the Western Hemisphere. But let us be sober and deliberate. Let us be sensible. Let us send word to the President that we are behind him 100 percent; but I think in justice to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee or any other Member of Congress who is taken to task when he perhaps is not guilty, if the President wanted me to have the information that is contained in the letter, a duplicate of which I have, I should have had it before the Rules Committee passed on the rule and had adjourned. I did not have it during the hearings. I am sorry I did not. I am following the President, and I will follow him just as long as I am able to walk. When I cannot walk I will get down and crawl. When I cannot crawl, then I will say something for the good of the Army or the prosecution of our cause, for the prosecution of the cause of humanity throughout the world. But let us be sober and deliberate about this thing and let us go along like statesmen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

When we come to the question of considering amendments I want you to remember that if an amendment is offered to reduce the age to 19, that is a matter for the House of Representatives and not for me. But I think you are entitled to know what your House Military Affairs Committee has found out in the meantime, so that you can intelligently make up your judgment along with that which you already know in your own right, by your own experience.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that he approved of keeping the family together during the teens of the young men up to 21?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Now, will the gentleman kindly inform the House why with that approval extending the age to 21, there should be any inclusion of registration from 18 to 21? Why not begin the registration at 21?

Mr. MAY. Well, that registration from 18 to 65 is very proper, I think, for this reason: The Army will have an inventory not only of the young men below 21 but they will have an inventory of the older people above 44, and out of those two inventories they will be able to determine the uses they can make of them, and they will know when they come of age and be prepared to consider those coming into military age, that is, 21 years old, while those in the age brackets above 44 can be selected for nonmilitary service and thousands of them are waiting to be given an opportunity to serve their country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that any impression has been created that an unfavorable reference has been made to the membership of the Military Affairs Committee in connection with their judgment on this bill. For my part, I have always had the highest respect for the chairman and members of this committee as being minded to conscientiously legislate in the proper way for the best interests of the Army and the War Department and the country. At this particular time, however, I find myself in disagreement with the majority recommendation of the committee as outlined in the bill which was reported as against the provisions of the bill submitted to the Congress by the President, the Secretary of War, and the General Staff. I want to remind you that I am aware of the fact that legislation in any way involving compulsory service of young men is not popular, whether the service be for war or something else. I recall speaking here during the days just before we voted the extension of the Selective Service Act. I recall a great many things that were said. I want to remind you that I was, from the start, unalterably opposed to intervention in this war on our part including an A. E. F. I opposed the measures sending our ships into belligerent ports. But there is a great difference between today and those days. We have had war declared upon us by three countries, one of which was the same country we were at war with in 1918.

In the first World War we raised 4,000,000 men, but we could not have raised more than 4,000,000 men, as has been said by some, between the ages of 21 and 31. We were obliged to change the ages from 18 to 45. Fortunately, that war soon terminated, and such will probably not be our good fortune this time.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. EDMISTON. The gentleman knows that not a single man below the age of 21 was drafted, because the war ended before the machinery could be put into action to draft anyone below 21.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct.

Mr. EDMISTON. So not a man below the age of 21 was drafted in World War No. 1.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish to emphasize the fact also that at that time the war was fought in France. The action was localized in France. The whole picture was infinitely better than our picture today. Practically all of the equipment of the American Army of 2,000,000 men in France was supplied to us by the British. Some was supplied by the French and some by the Italians.

People ask: What need have we for an army of 4,000,000 today? Any person well informed on the subject knows we must figure or at least plan on a much larger army than that whether it is used or not. In 1917 the airplane was in its infancy. In those days there were no giant airplane factories. We were not then obliged to equip and supply the forces of most of the countries whom we were going to assist. Today we have these tremendous aviation plants and the industry of America is many times what it was in those days. There is a compelling demand for mechanics of all types drawn from the ranks of the young and the middle-aged. This complicates the question of manpower.

I want to clear up one or two things that have been said with respect to the Selective Service and General Haislip, and G–1 in charge of personnel. We have in the Army today 1,750,000-odd men. It is the intention of the War Department, I believe, to call back into the service those between the ages of 28 and 36 who are now in reserve and who have had a few months' service, the men who were released pursuant to the act passed by Congress this last summer. This gives us, with volunteers, we will say, 2,000,000 roughly in all in our Army with all selectees among them between the ages of 21 and 36. We have available for the Army now classified as I–A between 21 and 36, 950,000 men. This would give us an army of roughly 2,800,000. It has been stated by General Hershey that more could be obtained from this age group only by lowering the physical requirements, and going into the families and making dependency and more hardship cases. Competent testimony is that if this were done it would furnish at the outside only 1,500,000 men completely between the ages of 21 and 36. This would give us an army of 3,500,000. The testimony given us by those who knew, was to the effect that between the ages of 35 and 45, 400,000 additional men could be obtained.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. DIES. How many men have been deferred on account of occupational reasons?

Mr. ANDREWS. A considerably large proportion. It is estimated that about 50 percent or more of those eligible between 21 and 36 have been deferred for one reason or another, either vocational, occupational, or physical.

The chairman a few moments ago asked: "Why take men 18 years old?" There is nothing in the proposal making 18 the age of liability for service; there is nothing in that proposal that says we shall take a boy 18 and put him in the armed forces. All that is required is that they shall be registered as being available. There would be only 1,500,000 available in this age group divided roughly as follows: 600,000 19 years of age; 600,000 20 years of age; and 300,000 who have become 21 since the last registration. It is not the intention of the War Department to take the boys of 19, on the whole, any more than it is to take men of 46.

I want to remind you of something else. Anyone who has had any connection with military science knows that we will need an air corps of 2,000,000 men. It will take from 20 to 35, perhaps 50, men to supply one large modern bomber such as we are going to have and must have in large numbers.

To give you some idea of what it is going to mean to have an air corps of 2,000,000 men, we know what the quality of youth is; we know that sprinkled in, on the preparations of our War Department and our General Staff, there must be a reasonable proportion of youth; we know what the proved imagination and determination of youth is in this war already. This plan is merely a framework, a set-up, under which the War Department may for once in its life be able to formulate a sound plan, giving effect to the necessity for having in our Army men of all ages. How can any man definitely say that we are going to be satisfied with an army of 4,000,000 men, even if we could get them between 21 and 45, and it is not clear that we can do that. It is beyond my belief.

We are in the greatest war we have ever been involved in. No man can prophesy what may happen in a week or a month from now. There is no intention of suddenly taking these wen who are 19 and 20. It is part of a well-worked-out program. The War Department will take them between 21 and 28 and 18 and 35, then some 36, then maybe some 20, then some 37 or 38, then some 19. I was not willing at the time of the extension of the Selective Act to gamble at that time, and I am not now. How many times must the War Department come to this body for correction? I believe this is the sound action now for every Member of the Congress who voted to declare war and to place our resources at the disposal of the President for its successful conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I would not have voted for this bill on December 6, and I doubt if there is a Member of the House who would have done so. We have not forgotten, however, what happened in Honolulu, on Sunday, December 7. Following that tragic day—perhaps the darkest page in

our whole military history—Congress, by unanimous vote, December 8, passed a resolution including these impressive words:

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government and to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan to bring the conflict to a successful termination all the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Pursuant to that declaration of war by every Member of Congress save one, and likewise by the ratification of almost all of the people of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of this country, not the President, not Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, but the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, sent a letter here, which the distinguished majority leader read this morning, saying that it is imperative that all of our manpower be marshaled, registered, trained, and prepared for military service.

Like you, I have never in all my life, uneventful as it has been, felt so keenly my responsibility, but I am as certain as I stand here that there has never been in the history of this Nation—and perhaps not in the recorded history of civilization itself—as tragic or as dangerous an hour as this. Read the headlines today about Hong Kong, Singapore, renewed threats at Honolulu, renewed threats in the East, threats in Panama and South America, then tell me that when the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, together with the men who must fight and win this war—meaning the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps—come in here and say, "We must have this legislation," you will not grant it? As for myself personally, I am willing to follow those who are charged with the duty and the responsibility of winning this war. We might just as well face the facts. We are headed for dark days. We are going to pay in "blood, sweat, and tears."

I was impressed with the preamble to this bill, which very properly from a legislative standpoint was stricken from the bill because it is not legislation. It contained in a few words what I conceive to be the tragic situation that exists today:

That (a) the Congress hereby declares that the present concerted world-wide assault upon the free countries of the world gravely threatens the security of the Republic and that the Nation is fighting for its existence and its future life.

(b) The Congress further declares that it is the national policy to accept no result save victory, final and complete, over all the enemies of the United States; and that to this end it is imperative that liability for military service be extended to further age groups and that a complete inventory of the manpower of the Nation be taken by registration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my devotion to the home and home ties, because I have children of my own. I do not want to break up homes, but I would like to know what this country is going to be worth if the Japs or Hitler get over here. There is one thing nearly as bad as death, and that is slavery. We are going to retain and preserve our liberty regardless of cost. Somebody has to fight this war and somebody has to be prepared for any eventuality, because I fear that there are many of us who have not yet grasped the tragic seriousness of this hour. If you will read the hearings before our committee, you will find that this is not an effort on the part of the War Department to rush in next week or next month, or even in the early part of next year, to have all of these young boys between 19 and 21 taken into the service. This is nothing but a long-range over-all program for an all-out war. The testimony is there from General Hershey, Director of Selective Service and Training, than whom I undertake to say no man in this Government has done a finer or fairer job. He says himself there will not be an attempt even to register these young men before next July. It should not be forgotten, too, that under the system now in vogue no man enters the service, regardless of age, at least is not attached to a unit, for approximately 5 months. We might just as well become war conscious and every man, woman, and child above 16 years of age know he has a part in it and a duty to perform.

The soldier first goes into the reception center. He then goes into a replacement center, to find out where he will fit best. Do not think for one minute that all of these young men are going to be rushed into the service in a brief period of time. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] so well said, the Army has an outfit—I believe the Army has some kind of a big word for it; they call it "cadre" or something of the sort—where they take the older soldiers, they take experienced men, they take experienced noncommissioned officers, they take some men 25, 28, or 30 years old, and then they take in some of these young fellows. That goes to make a well-balanced army. It is true the young man has the daring, courage, and physical health that a man of older years does not have, but when I look at men like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and many of the members of my own committee who saw service overseas when they were under 21 years of age, I recall that they made very brilliant records that in their modesty you will never hear them say anything about.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman at his discretion discuss some of the figures which I am sure he has?

Mr. THOMASON. Figures are sometimes tiresome and confusing. You must not forget—and I have the record before me—that Germany has an army now of between 6,000,000 and 8,000,000 men in service, with from 280 to 300 divisions. Japan has even more men than we have today, having an army of 1,800,000, with 66 divisions. The United States at present has approximately 1,800,000 men, with about 35 or 36 divisions. Great Britain has from 3,000,000 to 3,500,000 men, with 60 to 70 divisions. Russia has from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 men, with about 150 divisions.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] said, this is a new kind of war. This is a war with airplanes and tanks, mechanical devices, radio, and things like that which require young men.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Did the gentleman find out what would be the attitude of the War Department with reference to men from 25 to 30 who were under training for 6 weeks and then got jobs in the shipyards, and who are deferred from service? Would they be called before boys of 19 or 20?

Mr. THOMASON. All I can say is that General Hershey testified that he could not have predicted 10 days ago what has happened now, and he, likewise, could not undertake to predict what will happen in the future. He did say, however, that as far as he is concerned and as far as the present situation is concerned, it would be his attitude to take, first, men between 21 and 28, then men from 28 to 35, before he would take those from 19 to 21.

Mr. DIES. I am talking about those who are working in industries and are deferred.

Mr. THOMASON. The matter of deferment is largely a matter for the local draft boards. I grant that there have been some serious discriminations and perhaps some injustices, but that has not been the fault of the law or of the administration as such. That is usually the fault or favoritism of local draft boards.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman has stated that Germany has an army of 8,000,000 men. Does this include the 4,000,000 men who are said to have been killed or captured in Russia?

Mr. THOMASON. I cannot answer that. I hope the gentleman's surmise is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is very important to know how many men they have now.

Mr. THOMASON. Judging from the way they have been rushing across the continent of Europe, and are now in the continent of Asia, I would say they have lots of men, because training men to be soldiers and building death machines is all they have been doing for 20 years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. When we are given statistics we want them to be reliable.

Mr. THOMASON. These are from the New York Times, which I believe to be a reliable publication.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We would like to have the figures official.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not want to say these are official figures from the War Department. I do not know if they have them, and I doubt if they would make them public if they did.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Has it been determined whether or not there will be any deferment of boys under 21 years of age who are now receiving technical education in our colleges?

Mr. THOMASON. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that the Association of American Colleges—I am not sure that is the exact name, but it includes the presidents of a great many of the educational institutions of America—has had a conference with General Hershey and agreed to the program as worked out. General Hershey testified before the committee that there is no thought or intention of immediately disturbing a young man's college career. I may say that the gentleman will find that information on page 30. We must place confidence and trust in somebody and I have faith in the War Department doing the right and just thing. One thing is certain, we must win this war. A second-rate army is the same as no army.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have the approximate figure as to the number of men over 30 years of age?

Mr. THOMASON. Between 28 and 35, I believe those returned home were 135,000. Of course, many of them will be recalled. There are now about 600,000 men between the ages of 21 and 28, and there are about 315,000 eligibles between 28 and 45. One hundred and thirty-five thousand men between 28 and 35 were permitted to go home when we passed the amended Selective Training and Service Act. Many of these men will of course, be recalled.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Was there anything in the hearings as to married men 21 years of age and over?

Mr. THOMASON. No; the question of a man's dependents is one for the local draft boards to determine.

Mr. STEFAN. Was that question discussed?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; it was discussed. Not only that, but there have been some serious abuses in this matter of dependents. There have been a great many marriages performed for the evident purpose of evading service.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. As I understand, 1,200,000 men become 21 years of age each year.

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mrs. BOLTON. Are you also counting those men?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; those are all included. Of course, when it comes to figuring on just how large an army we can have with the number of men available, it all goes to the question of deferment. The testimony before the committee shows that you can raise an army of between four and a half million and ten million, based upon occupational dependency and physical deferment.

The House having given me permission, I conclude my remarks by giving you the present strength of the Army as furnished me by the War Department, and which I think will be of interest to you. I follow that with a statement from last Sunday's issue of the New York Times giving you the comparative strength of the chief warring powers of the world:

Strength of the Army

Enlisted strength:	
Field forces, including overseas garrisons less air force	977,236
Air force	494,865
Overhead, CASC and WD	190,413
Replacements in training	185,371
Total	1,847,885
Arms and services:	
Air Corps	352,667
Armored	43,697
Cavalry	34,262
CWS	9,257
Coast Artillery Corps	158,460
Engineers	83,903
Field Artillery	166,492
Infantry	365,868
Medical	145,827
Ordnance	42,549
Quartermaster	128,970
Signal Corps	64,360
Finance	4,358
Replacements in training	185,371
Unassigned	61,844
Total	1,847,885

Comparative strength of the chief warring powers [1]

AREA AND POPULATION

	Area	Population
ALLIES	*Square miles*	
United States	3,738,395	132,000,000
Great Britain (Empire)	13,539,113	504,218,200
Russia	8,819,791	192,695,710
China (unoccupied)	4,060,992	207,000,000
Netherlands Indies	738,267	70,500,000
Total	30,896,558	1,106,413,910
AXIS		
Germany (before September 1939)	263,618	93,000,000
Japan (before July 1937)	260,644	97,697,555
Italy	119,800	44,557,000
Hungary	59,380	13,507,993
Finland	131,588	3,834,662
Bulgaria	42,808	6,549,664
Rumania	72,525	14,098,850
Total	950,363	263,245,724

ARMIES

	Men	Divisions
ALLIES		
United States	1,600,000	33
Great Britain	3,000,000–3,500,000	60–70
Russia	3,000,000–5,000,000	(?)150–250
China	2,000,000–6,000,000	(?)
Netherlands Indies	100,000	(?)
AXIS		
Germany	6,000,000–8,000,000	280–300
Japan	1,800,000	60–66
Italy	1,500,000	60
Hungary	180,000–450,000	10–20
Finland	200,000–250,000	14
Bulgaria	180,000–450,000	10–20
Rumania	800,000–1,200,000	30–35

[1] Corrected for known losses up until Dec. 12.

Comparative strength of the chief warring powers—Continued

AIR FORCES (COMBAT UNITS)

	Number of planes
ALLIES	
United States	3,000–5,000
Great Britain	4,500–5,500
Russia	(?)
China	100–200
Netherlands Indies	500–600
AXIS	
Germany	5,500–6,500
Japan	(?) 5,000
Italy	1,500–3,000
Hungary	400–600
Finland	200–300
Bulgaria	100–300
Rumania	500–700

ALLIED NAVIES

Country and type	Built	Building	Total
United States:			
Battleships	16	15	31
Aircraft carriers	7	11	18
Cruisers	(?)37	54	91
Destroyers	171	191	362
Submarines	113	73	186
Great Britain:			
Battleships	14	(?)6	(?)20
Aircraft carriers	7	3	10
Cruisers	62–64	12–14	74–78
Destroyers	205–225	(?)	(?)205–225
Submarines	45–50	(?)	(?)45–50
Russia:			
Battleships	(?)3	[2]	(?)6
Aircraft carriers	1	2	3
Cruisers	(?)9	4	(?)13
Destroyers	(?)60–65	30–35	(?)90–100
Submarines	(?)140–175	(?)	(?)140–175
Netherland Indies:			
Cruisers	3		3
Destroyers	8		8
Submarines	15		15

AXIS NAVIES

Germany:			
Battleships	[3] 3	2	5
Aircraft carriers	(?)1	1	2
Cruisers	9	6	15
Destroyers	45–50	(?)	(?)45–50
Submarines	130–160	(?)	130–160
Japan:			
Battleships	(?)10	[3] 4–8	14–18
Aircraft carriers	7–9	(?)	(?)7–9
Cruisers	44–46	(?)10	(?)54–56
Destroyers	126	(?)10–15	(?)135–141
Submarines	60–70	(?)7–10	(?)70–80
Italy:			
Battleships	(?)5	2	(?)7
Aircraft carriers			
Cruisers	16	14	30
Destroyers	(?)90–105	(?)12	(?)102–117
Submarines	80–85	15–18	95–100

[2] In addition there are 2 pocket battleships.
[3] Possibly includes 4 pocket battleships, some of which may be in service.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is, perhaps, no one in this House more completely determined than am I to back the administration in its procedures to bring us to a constructive ending of this war. It is a pleasure to be in complete agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee in the matter of this proposal. We should think a very long time before setting up a machinery that will increase the restlessness of the boys who are between the ages of 18 and 21. We should be careful to do nothing to disrupt the newly established unity of our people. We, as a part of the governmental structure upon whose wisdom and judgment the people depend for their sense of security must use our wisdom, if we have any, to improve the solidarity of the Nation, not to disturb it. Our purpose and our

united determination is to win this war, but we must not forget that there will be a life beyond that. Upon women rests a peculiar obligation, that of protecting the future at all times. We women are constantly thinking of what will happen to us as a nation if we do not in some way protect the college-age group of young men from the implications of the suggested lowering of the age limit at this time.

It is difficult enough in normal times to bring college boys to enough seriousmindedness to make their choice of such professions as engineering, chemistry, physics, or, most of all, medicine. We are thinking in terms of a long war, and we cannot fail to look beyond war to the appalling task of rebuilding a sick and exhausted world. To do this, we are going to need doctors as the world has never dreamed of needing them. Even today the medical profession has a difficult time getting enough adequately prepared, intelligent, young men to go into medicine. If we disturb them during their college years and do not do something to point the way to them to medicine as a career, we shall be doing something very dangerous to our whole future and very possibly for the future of the world.

I want to leave with you a very earnest request that you consider these 3 years as exceedingly precious years. We do need an invincible Army. There is no question about that. But until we have exhausted every other age group should we not do all possible to keep our boys at their studies that we may have intelligent, trained leaders ready for the work of reconstruction?

I hope sincerely that whatever the final action on this measure may be, those who administer it will protect the youths of our land as long as they reasonably can from the disruption of life consequent upon conscripted service in our armed forces.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the membership of the House will support the Military Affairs Committee in respect of the age limits we have reported in this bill.

Most of the cardinal points of disagreement among the members of our committee have been presented to you, but I want to present one more thought to the men here representing agricultural districts, and after all the production of food that we may need for ourselves and for our allies in the next couple of years, may be equally as important as the number of trained men we may have in the Army. If you take these youngsters off the farm, with many of the older farmers in such areas having gone into industrial areas, you will materially reduce the agricultural production in America in the next 2 years by losing the services of these youngsters who are below 21 years of age.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think the local draft boards would take care of fair and just deferments for agricultural purposes?

Mr. EDMISTON. I will say to my friend that I do not think they will, no.

Mr. THOMASON. They have that authority and they have been doing it in a very fair way, so far as I know.

Mr. EDMISTON. I will say to my colleague that the Members on our committee who represent agricultural districts have discussed that matter fully and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] brought out that point in the discussion the other day. He does not think they have been deferred in his district.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would just like to say for the information of the committee on the question of production of agricultural commodities that the Department of Agriculture has sent notices to the various Members of Congress with respect of the effect of our A. A. A. program, and requesting them to do what they can to help put some impetus behind the raising of more food products. The local draft boards are doing as good a job as they can, but they are taking the cream of agricultural labor from their work and this is having a very great effect throughout the country.

Mr. EDMISTON. I want to impress upon you also a fact which has been mentioned, but I do not believe has been emphasized enough. As to 1917, do not let anyone kid you about having drafted any man below the age of 21 in that war.

There never was a man in World War No. 1 who was drafted below the age of 21. That Congress reduced the age from 21 to 18 years, but before the machinery to accomplish that went into effect, to draft a single man below 21, the war was over. No man below 21 years of age was ever drafted in World War No. 1, and we raised an army of more than four and a half million men between the ages of 21 and 31.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Was not that because there were so many fine patriotic young fellows like the gentleman from West Virginia, under 19 years of age, who volunteered?

Mr. EDMISTON. Oh, the young men at that time were no more patriotic than the young men who are living now in America. Another point the gentleman brought out is this. Sixty-five percent of the enlistments in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps today are between the ages of 18 and 21. You are getting plenty of them anyway without drafting them. Do not disrupt those who want to continue their education. Then there is this other thought: you not only disrupt the ones in the age limit as proposed by the letter of the President, from 19 to 21, but the boys of 17 who finish high school and have planned to go to college will say, "What is the use of my going to college? I will get 1 year or half a year there, and then they will draft me, so I might as well get in now."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Answering the question propounded by the gentleman from Texas, I call attention to a table on page 64 of the hearings giving the number of persons who volunteered during the last war, and it shows a total of something like 73,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. EDMISTON. In my opinion that many men have enlisted in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps since the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor, and I will bet even money 65 percent of them are between 18 and 21 years of age.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, everyone in this House knows that the present conflict in which we are engaged is not comparable to the first World War. I fear it is going to be a long, cruel, exhausting contest; that it will require every ounce of our energy to win. Most, if not all, Members of Congress realize what terrific sacrifices are ahead, and since we have already pledged all of the resources in this Nation—not only our treasure, our money, but our supplies, our blood and our lives—I have about reached the point where I am willing to grant the War Department anything which approaches reason that it may ask I am even going to bend over backward at times, to go along with the administration, if for no other reason than to prevent someone getting up and charging me with being an obstructionist. Yet I cannot and will not stultify my conscience or surrender my independence to allay any criticism, however bitter it might be. We are now in the war, and it is going to take the unified, combined, and wholehearted effort of us all to win this conflict. However, a declaration of war should not stop our mental processes. We need to exercise our brains more now than ever before. And we must have courage to speak truth as well as the light to see it. As the great liberal jurist, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said:

> By a declaration of war we do not lose our right to condemn both men and measures.

We cannot extend freedom abroad by losing it at home. Parliamentary government must be preserved here.

Certainly, as Representatives of our people, it is not only our right but also our duty to scrutinize and to criticize—always attempting to make that criticism intelligent, constructive, and patriotic—every measure that is brought before the various committees of this body before it is presented here for a vote. The revised bill, as passed by the Senate, provides that all men in this country between the ages of 18 and 65 must register. It provides also that all men from 19 to 44 years of age, inclusive, shall be subject to combat duty. The only difference between this revised bill, as reported by the committee in the House, and the Senate bill is that while we go along with them and require all male citizens in this country between the ages of 18 and 64, inclusive, to register, we limit the number of men

to be called into combat service to those who are between the ages of 21 and 44, inclusive. That is the only difference. The question naturally arises, Is it necessary for us to go below the age of 21 at this time?

As has been said, we have 1,750,000 men in the Army today. By combing that group of men between 21 and 28 now subject to call, we will get another 600,000. By going from 28 to 35 we will get 350,000 more. By jumping from 35 up to the age of 45 we will get 400,000 more. Now, since we are to register these men 18, 19, and 20, could they not be called, if necessary, 600,000 who are 20 and 600,000 who are 19, who perhaps could qualify for A–1 rating, could we not call those men at any later date we might choose? If the Congress of the United States can vote a declaration of war in 15 or 20 minutes—and we did it 3 times last week—certainly after having these boys between 18 and 21 registered we could within a few minutes' time dip down below the age of 21.

However, the compelling reason why I vote for the age of 21 is not so much because it disrupts our educational program and robs our colleges. That is bad enough because it drains the reservoir of our future scientists and technicians. I know this war has proved, if it has proved anything, that some of the most efficient aviators are young men from 18 to 21, because they are daring and reckless. They will take chances that older men would not. Of course, that can be a bad thing as well as a good thing, as the colonel from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] knows. I see no necessity for going below the age of 21 at this time, and for this big reason: We do not have adequate equipment or anything like it, for the 1,750,000 men we have in our Army today. If we pass this bill, as reported by your House committee, we will double the number of men in our Army, and we will still be sadly lacking in equipment.

I want to quote some military authority, and I do it for the benefit of the majority leader. I have talked to some of the officers on General Marshall's staff. Weeks ago they expressed to me great concern about this Nation turning over practically all of its equipment and production to nations abroad. They also expressed as their considered and matured opinion that it would be unwise for us to build up a huge reservoir of men when we do not have the tools with which those men can fight battles. In modern mechanized war men without weapons are helpless.

We know that appropriations are not going to win the war. You have to translate dollars into machines, into tanks, guns, and ships. You can have all the men in this country enlisted in the Army, but unless they have the implements of war with which to fight we are never going to win. So why go below the age of 21 when we can double the number of our present Army? When we have equipment for only half the men who are in the Army now?

These are the big considerations. I plead with you not as a partisan but as a patriot, let us not wreck our whole domestic economy. It will require tireless, skilled workers in our factories as well as soldiers in the field to win this war. We must gear industrial production to the maximum. Let us not go completely crazy. Let us not be so impotent that we will soon become as the German Reichstag, so indifferent that we will not stand up and speak out in the interest of those men and women we represent. Fireside chats will not win this war. We need more fire and less chat.

I know that all the education in the world is not going to do us any good if we lose this war. But to abandon education is not going to win it. In the light of future events, I think perhaps it will be necessary a little later on to reduce the age down to 18 years. I will be one of the first members of the committee to reduce that age to 18 or 16, or any other age that is necessary in order to win this war in which we are engaged. It is not necessary to do it now. One can go too far too fast. The Germans know that today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] 10 minutes.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious issue that confronts us today. I know by reason of the large number that have remained on the floor during this debate that the Members of the House themselves are conscious of the far-reaching decision that all of us are going to be called upon to make this afternoon.

No matter how we may feel with reference to the age at which these men should be inducted into service, all of us desire a speedy and complete victory for the United States of America. This is an issue we should approach in the most serious, calm, and deliberate manner. Debate today has evidenced this. I think if every Member of this House will read the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee, they will be pretty well convinced of what the actual facts are with reference to the necessity of inducting men into armed service at this time below the age of 21. I am in accord with the provisions of the bill that would register all of those who have become 18 years of age, so that we may have a catalog of the manpower of the Nation. But I believe that the facts absolutely substantiate the position of those who feel that it is unwise to induct men at this time who are under the age of 21.

What are the facts with reference to our armed service at this time?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is no intention to induct at this time.

Mr. HARTER. Well, they will be inducted, all right.

Mr. SHORT. Why register them, then, if they are not going to call them?

Mr. HARTER. The facts are with reference to the Army at the present time that we have in training and service an Army of 1,800,000. We have recently raised that by enactment of Congress to 2,000,000 men. So we will soon have under arms 2,000,000 men. Those men are housed, most of them, in various camps and cantonments in different parts of the country. Not all of them by any means are supplied with modern equipment.

We have, as shown by the testimony of the Army officers who appeared before the committee, General Hershey, head of the Selective Service System, and General Haislip, of the General Staff, in charge of personnel, in addition to those men who are already in service, some 2,000,000 men who have already been registered and classified in 1–A. One million of those fall into the age group between 21 and 28. The other 1,000,000 fall into the higher age group, between 28 and 35. In addition, we shall have coming up for registration under existing law 1,200,000 men who will be 21 years of age by next July 1. Of this number, about 600,000 will fall into classification 1–A and be subject to call as fast as they can be assimilated into our training program.

Under this bill, when we raise the limit for actual military service to 45, it is thought that in the neighborhood of 400,000 men will be available from that category of ages. This gives us, therefore, ready for training and service, if the registration comes on July 1—and they say they will have to have probably that much time in order to get ready for it—this will give us a reservoir of at least 3,000,000 men for training. What are the facts with reference to the facilities in this country?

Under the testimony offered your committee, the average selectee has had only 6 months of training at this time. You will remember, we passed the original Selective Service Act in September of 1940, but that very few men were inducted under the provisions of that law before early this spring. The principal quotas came in during March, April, and May. These men cannot be, by any stretch of the imagination, today considered fully trained soldiers. We have not the housing, we have not the equipment to supply 3,000,000 additional trainees now, or in the reasonable future. Why ask military service of the 19- and 20-year-olds when they cannot be used now and are better off in schools and colleges?

Mr. Chairman, the parents of the youths of 19 and 20 are looking at our action today. We are going to upset the plans of countless thousands of citizens if we decide at this time that men of these ages must be registered and made subject to military training and service. This war, as has been said, may be of long duration. We are going to denude the colleges and universities of the country of practically all able-bodied students of age 19 and 20 if it is decided to lower the limits below 21. What incentive will a boy have to start a college course after he finishes high school at 18 and knows he must go to the Army at 19?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTER. I cannot yield just now. I hope the gentleman will wait until I complete my statement.

The facts are that we are going to upset our whole system of educational development in this country if we take

into the camps of the country those who are 19 and 20 years of age. What is going to become of the country's technical development? Where shall we get our chemists, our doctors, or men to carry on the skills and professions so essential to our country's welfare? If we take these boys of 19 and 20 out of the technical schools, the premedical schools, the professions, we are going to pay for it in years to come. So long as there is no necessity by reason of the fact that we cannot assimilate these men into the training program, it seems very foolish to go down to those ages at this time. We have got to remember that during World War No. 1, when we had a draft law that took men from 21 to 31, we raised an army of over 4,500,000.

We have been promised by these men who appeared before your committee that they were going to reexamine all deferments; they were going to have the local boards check into all deferments whether they were because of minor physical defects, dependency, employment, or what not. All those classifications, of course, were made during a time of peace. It is only reasonable to suppose that the local draft boards were very much more liberal in their decisions than they would be in time of actual war. Such reexamination should mean large additions to class 1–A of those heretofore registered.

Mr. AREND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HARTER. I yield.

Mr. AREND. In considering the various age groups above 21 from which we might get additional numbers, does not the gentleman also have in mind the thousands and thousands of boys between 21 and 24 who are in the C. C. C. camps, and the N. Y. A., who are physically eligible to be serving in the country's armed forces? It seems to me that taking such boys would not only give us more manpower but would reduce the expense of maintaining these organizations.

Mr. HARTER. They should be considered as well as all others who have been deferred. It is my understanding, however, that very few boys are now in the C. C. C. camps who are physically fit for military training.

Of those who insist on taking in the 19- and 20-year-olds and talk of the United States fighting in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America, I wonder if they have considered our lack of shipping, our total inability at this time and for a long time in the future to send an expeditionary force to these distant continents, and, even more difficult, keep such a force or forces properly supplied. Do not let us be carried away by our righteous indignation and anger toward Japan and the other Axis Powers.

We all wish to do those things that are for the best interests of the Nation. It behooves us to approach these problems which have such widespread interest and are of the utmost import to the people of the United States with the greatest deliberation and consideration. We cannot afford to decide momentous issues of this kind upon impulse or upon the direction of others. It is the Congress, the direct Representatives of the people, who should and will make this decision upon its calm, considered, and deliberate judgment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, we have under discussion H. R. 6215, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by extending the ages within which men in the United States shall be registered and liable for military training and service. There is a great diversity of opinion among the Members as to the methods by which and the extent to which these ends should be sought at this time.

Both President Roosevelt and Secretary Stimson have stated in letters to the Congress that the registration provisions of the bill are essential for the orderly planning of our national effort. They further state that our national situation is such that the ages for military service should be changed to the period from 19 to 44 years instead of the present effective period from 21 to 27 years. President Roosevelt wrote that he endorsed without qualification Secretary Stimson's statement which was sent to the chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs. In that letter Mr. Stimson set forth that these objectives should be substantially contained in the proposed legislation upon the ground that they are indispensable to our national effort and will constitute one of the great foundation stones upon which victory will be built. He also urged prompt enactment of the bill. Undoubtedly President Roosevelt and Secretary Stimson have information and data which have not been made available to the House Military Affairs Committee. I respect their considered conclusions and shall vote for the bill in the form in which it is finally adopted by the House this afternoon.

However, I would like to refer to the testimony which was given to the committee by Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and Brig. Gen. Wade H. Haislip, Assistant Chief of Staff for Personnel. These officers rank very high in our Army and should be the men best able today to set forth the requirements of our selective-service program. On the question of registration of all males between the ages of 18 to 64, inclusive, they offered little to support the need for this registration above the age of 45. In fact, nothing was brought out to indicate what kind of information they expected to obtain from such registration which is not now in the possession of the Census Bureau, from which agency they said that the Army now gets the information needed relative to occupation, numbers of men in age groups, and other particulars. In fact, I might add that, while it is not in the testimony, I was told that the registration of the men from 45 to 64 was not sought for any purposes of military service but presumably at the request of some other agency which was not disclosed.

It was brought out, however, that to register these men will require the employment of 8,000 additional clerks on a pay basis, plus the assistance of 120,000 to 140,000 volunteers who are helping registrants to make out their questionnaires. On the evidence, there is real reason to question the advisability of placing this tremendous additional burden, perhaps unnecessarily, on these volunteers who have proved so faithful in their efforts to date.

In addition, 8,000,000 men between the ages of 36 and 45 will be registered under this bill as well as the 10,000,000 between 46 and 64. General Hershey testified that of these 8,000,000 men, probably 5 percent would be eligible for military service, "somewhere between 350,000 or 400,000." He pointed out that more of this class will have dependents and some of them will have a great many dependents. In addition, from 75 percent to 90 percent of this class will be rejects for physical and other reasons. Adding to that testimony, a chairman of a draft board in my district took occasion to telephone to me that, in his opinion, this group of men ought not to be considered. In fact, he stated that the experience of his board indicated that no age groups above 30 years, except in an emergency calling for more men than are now available, should be considered.

One of the 120,000 volunteers mentioned by General Hershey is Attorney Joseph Nowak, of Chicopee, Mass. He has told me that at the time of the first registration in Chicopee he helped 978 registrants out of 3,423 to fill out their questionnaires and at the time of the second registration he aided 64 out of 181. He came to the conclusion that it is a positive waste of time to register those over 30. He told me that he had been glad to serve without compensation and estimated that he had put in 264 hours at his work. If all the other volunteers numbering more than 120,000 have given the same amount of service, it is obvious that the country may be wasting very valuable time if it is insisted that they continue with their work among the 18,000,000 men to be registered above the age of 35 under this bill. On the evidence, scarcely 1 percent of them would ever be used for military service.

In committee I offered an amendment which would have stricken from the provision for military service the men between the ages of 36 and 45. My amendment was defeated and I bow to the decision of the majority. I would like to point out in passing, however, that some of the older men in this group will undoubtedly have been registered at the time of the draft for World War No. 1. Of these men, a leading Springfield physician has stated that if they are brought into the service, their physical stamina will be such that we must expect many of them will be hospitalized.

So much has been said about the young men under 21 years of age that I would only add that, in view of General Hershey's statement as carried throughout the country in the press, there does not seem to be any reason for believing that

anyone under the age of 21 would be drawn into the service by the terms of this bill before 1943. We have, in our 21 to 28 year group, at least a million men who will first be called upon to enter the Army. Perhaps another million can be secured between the ages of 28 and 36 by removing some restrictions. He therefore was of the opinion that 3,000,000 men, plus, can be obtained for the Army out of the 17,500,000 who have been registered. Less than 900,000 have been inducted up to the present time. He has also stated publicly that these groups will be inducted into the service before those under 21 would be taken. Such a large group certainly would not be inducted into the service before 1943. For one thing, we have not, at the present time, and will not have before January, 1943, sufficient equipment to take care of them. By that time, more than a million young men will have reached the age of 21, furnishing a further supply of at least 600,000 who would be physically fit. On the testimony, it does seem to me that we have provided a huge reservoir of men for military service already. None of us desires men to enter the service who have other persons actually dependent upon them for support. In the last war married men were drafted. At that time France and England furnished their equipment after they arrived in Europe for the most part. In this war we must furnish our own equipment as well as helping our Allies. I believe just as much as anyone else that we should always be on the alert and have a program well established which will cover the duration of the war. The President insists that this program should include possible military service for all men between the ages of 19 and 45. The House Military Affairs Committee has limited the period to the ages between 21 and 45. The reservoir of men in the age group from 36 to 45 which has been opened up by this bill is not particularly helpful. I hope that in its final form we will vote on a bill which is in the best interests of our country.

In closing I cannot refrain from referring to General Haislip's testimony, in which he, in effect, states that in the present emergency not only colleges but such famous military schools as Citadel, Norwich University, and Virginia Military Institute, from which our Chief of Staff, General Marshall, was graduated, have little, if any, value. He said—and I quote—that:

> The old Student Army Training Corps—I hope it is never revived—I can understand that it was a great failure during the last war.

After listening to other generals tell of the absolute necessity for at least 2 years' college training in order for a man to be an Army pilot, it is hard to reconcile such statements. In fact, I cannot believe that the thousands of colleges, with their facilities which have cost literally billions of dollars, scattered throughout the length and breadth of our land, cannot be put to use as a most valuable and potent factor in this great crisis. I believe every boy who can go to college and secure additional scientific and mathematical training will be far more useful to his country for his college efforts. When I asked General Haislip—

> There is no advantage in their going to college, then, other than the possibility that they will be a little better soldiers when they go into the ranks?

He replied—

> I think that is a rather fair statement.

Later he added—

> After the war is over, we might look back and see where we might have done things differently.

I wonder if during the past 20 years the War Department has looked ahead instead of back in an effort to find how one of the greatest resources ever developed in the world—American colleges and universities—could be used to advantage in wartime. Our leaders in World War No. 1 recognized their worth. Perhaps our present-day leaders are missing a very great opportunity.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this body I have no other thought in mind and no other interest at heart except the security and welfare of the United States of America. There is not a man in this body who has gone further in voting for all-out defense than I have. Why, I even went so far as to vote for the May bill and the Smith bill, which undertook to so curb our industrial disturbances that we would be able to put arms into the hands of the men we had in the Army before the advent of actual warfare. I am sorry we were not able to do this, but some of us have done our best. So I claim I have gone just as far in all-out defense as it is possible for any man to go.

Mr. Chairman, if I believed today that it is necessary to reach down into the age brackets to any reasonable age below 21, I would be one to stand up in the Well of this House and fight for it, but I do not believe for 1 minute that is necessary or even advisable. I do not think we should go down into the brackets below 21 years of age to induct men into the service today. The reason is this: If we draw as we should draw from within the brackets we are already working in, we will have more men than we can house, clothe, train, arm, and equip for the next year or year and a half. Before we drop into the age brackets below 21, let us be sure that we are going to be able to get the men the equipment and training they are entitled to before they are taken into the Army. I am not willing to disturb the future of this Nation at this time by interrupting the educational career of those below 21 years of age when I do not believe they can be properly received, trained, armed, and equipped. I am not willing to take these boys out of college and put them in the Army when there are those in the higher brackets who have either completed their educational career or have not entered into a career and who have not yet been called.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do we understand the gentleman's position to be that by the time you exhaust the reservoir beginning with 21 years of age, these 18-year-old boys will in the meantime be moving probably up into the 21-year-old reservoir and we can avoid the strain upon the morale of the country by not registering these 18-year-old boys now?

Mr. FADDIS. I am not opposing registering the 18-year-old boys, but I am against calling them into the service at this time, because I am satisfied before we are able to train, arm, and equip men 18 years of age a great deal of time will have passed. At the present time it will be at least 18 months before we begin thinking about dropping down into the age bracket below 21. Why, then, should we place them on the list subject to call?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman gets my question, does he?

Mr. FADDIS. I do, and I answered it. At the present time it will be at least 18 months before we can properly train, arm, and equip all of the eligibles in the age brackets in which we are now working.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What, then, is the reason, may I ask, if suggested by anybody, why we should subject these 18-year-old boys to draft now if we have more people above 21 years old than we can equip between this time and the time when the 18-year-old boys get to 21 years old?

Mr. FADDIS. Some one evidently desires to enlarge the field so that a more liberal deferment in the groups from which we are already drawing can be worked out.

There is another reason I do not desire to draw on this reservoir of men between the ages of 18 and 21. We will get the cream of these boys, the ones who are the best developed mentally and physically by volunteering. If we drop down into those lower-age brackets and draft the boys into the service, I feel sure that by taking many who are as yet immature, we will later on in life have a great many more break-downs among the men chosen from those age groups than we will have from men chosen from the higher-age group. That is another reason why I am unwilling to enter into this program at the present time. I am satisfied from my own investigations along this line that at the present time they have not drawn from those between 21 and 28 as closely as they should. There are a great many who have been deferred because of dependency reasons when those claiming to be dependents are not really such. There are a great many women working in this town who are being used as the reason for deferment of husbands who should be in the service today. There is no reason why any man should be deferred when his family is not dependent in fact upon his salary or his wages for a reasonable livelihood, and if his wife is working and earning a living, and they have no children, he should not be deferred.

Further, there are connected with the Army certain branches of the service, such as the Quartermaster and Ordnance Corps, which do not require men of as high a physical standard as do the combatant branches of the service. Cer-

tainly in an emergency of this kind, when we are resorting to the draft in order to provide manpower, we should make an effort to draw men who are a little bit below par physically and steer them into those branches of the service which do not require men of as high a physical standard as other branches of the service.

At the present time such a plan is not being followed at all. If we are to make economical and efficient use of our manpower in the struggle which confronts us, we must learn how to most efficiently distribute our manpower sooner or later, and we had better learn it sooner than later. There is no time as good as the present to put into effect a system that will grade the manpower of the Nation physically and utilize those men who are not up to the par required for the combatant branches of the service in connection with those branches of the service where such a high physical standard is not required.

We are going to have to face this matter as a Nation and we are going to have to face the whole truth. If we are to win the conflict in which we are engaged, we must make up our minds that as soon as possible we must furnish expeditionary forces and invade the country of the enemy, because we cannot win this war in any other manner. It may be a very long and hard war. At least to be safe, we must make our plans for such. So we must carefully plan our resources not only of material but of manpower. We must have manpower for every purpose, and probably over a range of years. We must have commissioned as well as enlisted personnel, and those who are commissioned must have an education beyond that of high school. Where are they to come from if we at this time start to break down the educational career of every able-bodied boy over the age of 18 or 19? Furthermore, if we interrupt the educational career of all of the physically fit, we will leave the professional and business field to the physically unfit. We must have doctors, chemists, engineers, and so forth, for the Army, and they must be educated and must be physically fit. In connection with this legislation, I do hope the Members will take into consideration that we are only starting in this affair, and that the Congress will be here, and I hope will be exercising its functions in the manner the people intended the Congress to exercise them. I am sure that the Congress in its wisdom and in its desire to win this war will at all times do what its Members believe to be necessary to win it.

I assure you that upon the very best investigation I have been able to make, I have made up my mind beyond the possibility of a doubt, this is not yet the time to begin to draft those of less than 21 years of age into the service. I hope this committee supports the Committee on Military Affairs in its recommendation in this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, let me say first, about the bill which is pending before the Committee, that with the exception of one single provision, which appears to be the controversial one, I think it is an excellent measure.

I rejoice especially at the provision for the registration of men between 18 and 65, a measure which I have believed in for a long, long time and which I am glad to see appear in legislation of this kind.

I also rejoice at the degree of elasticity provided in this bill in connection with the handling of the selective draft itself. I think it wise for the Congress to refrain from endeavoring to lay down any rigid schedule governing the calling of men into the service from the several military age groups. In that respect this bill, in my humble judgment, is sound and will prove very valuable to those who must administer it.

I confess to my disappointment at the refusal of the committee to lower the age from 21 to 19, as was proposed originally by the President and his military advisers. I feel very deeply upon that point. I know that the people in the War Department feel very, very deeply about it. Conversations I have had with the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff since the action of the committee demonstrate to me their very deep concern.

However, before touching upon that particular phase of this bill, may I mention one or two things which have been rather prominent in the debate thus far?

It so happened that I was in Congress during the World War and took part in the preparation and enactment of the selective-service law of the spring of 1917. As has been said here, that act provided for the registration of all men between 21 and 31 years of age and for military liability upon that same group. We started in and raised an army of something in excess of 4,000,000 men. By the summer of 1918, however, at a time when it was not then apparent that we would win the war in the autumn of 1918, it became apparent to the Congress and to the administration of that day that the age range was insufficient to carry on a long contest.

True, we did raise an army of 4,000,000 men under that law; but I may remind you, Mr. Chairman, that in doing so we took into the ranks hundreds of thousands of married men, men with wives and one child or two children or three children, with a consequent dislocation of the domestic life of the Nation as well as its industrial life. The result finally was that the Congress decided to change the age range for military duty, and we passed the act sometime in the summer of 1918 making the range 18 to 45; so you see we have good precedent in our own history for such an age range for military service.

True, the mechanism for the registration of that increased number could not get into full operation and into completion before Armistice Day on November 11, 1918, and it is entirely true that no men under 21 were actually drafted.

According to the best of my recollection the principal reason for lowering the age limit at that time from 21 down to 18, or one of the motives, was to avoid continuation of drafting so many thousands of married men. You will remember also that in drafting those married men the Government made allotments to their families out of the Treasury and also asked the soldier himself—the husband in the ranks—to make an allotment out of his own pay. It was a terrific burden; and it was not especially efficient, militarily, and it also resulted in greatly increasing the pension burden coming out of the World War.

Now, here we are today with a law that we passed in September of 1940, which provided for an age range of 21 to 36 in the matter of military liability. For a short time we authorized a reduction from 36 down to 28, but, of course, it is apparent that we are repairing that immediately.

The bill as reported by the Military Affairs Committee therefore makes but one change, as contrasted with the law which we passed in September of 1940, only one, and that change is reflected in the raising of the military age from 36 to 45. That is all this legislation means in the way of increasing the available military manpower of the United States; and the testimony shows, as has already been said to you, that of all the men between 36 and 45, inclusive, only 400,000 can be counted upon as fit for military duty.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that there is another very material change in that under this law every boy becoming 21, after he had registered at 18, becomes immediately available for draft, which would give us 100,000 additional available every month?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The present law does that. Every boy becoming 21 years of age, under existing law, is subject to the draft.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; he has to register once a year, while this makes him available immediately.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the total number is not changed. The net increase under this bill is 400,000, and it cannot be figured in any other way.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would like to remind the Members of the House that when the bill passed the House it was 21 to 45, but it was lowered to 36 in conference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; in any event the net gain in the available military manpower of the United States as represented by this bill is only 400,000 men, and all of them over 36. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an inadequate performance in view of what we are facing—an inadequate performance.

If we are to raise an army of the size variously estimated here from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 or 6,000,000, true, we can do it from the men between 21 and 45, but we will have to take hundreds and hundreds of thousands of men with dependents and we will go through exactly the same experience we had in the World

War and make the same error. I am hoping we will not make that error, and the way to avoid it is to sprinkle among the older men—we will say between 21 and 28 and 28 and 30, and, indeed, between 36 and 45—a little mixture of younger men, twenty and a half, 20 years, nineteen and a half, if you please, and down to 19. In doing so we will spread the burden more evenly and justly over the whole military population, and we will have a more effective army—far more effective.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. It is my opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to follow the estimable gentleman from New York, who has made a very learned presentation of the one real controversial matter in this bill. The gentleman from New York is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, but he has had occasion to sit with our committee many times, and I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] will join with me in what I have to say in reference to the serious consideration which this committee has given this legislation and has given the entire defense program over a period of a year and a half. I attended every meeting of this committee which considered the present bill. I sat there long hours with the other members of the committee and I talked with them, and I have yet to hear, Mr. Chairman, one word other than that of serious and conscientious and honest consideration of the merits of the bill that we are considering here today. I think that every member of that committee did his honest and conscientious duty as he saw it in reporting the bill, and did his level best as a patriotic Member of Congress to give what he thought was the very best bill obtainable at the present time.

There are two features of the bill that I desire to mention. The first feature is the one in reference to the registration of all male persons from 18 to 65. I consider that feature, the registration of every male person in the United States between 18 and 65 years of age, a most important part of the bill. Something was said in the course of the discussions before the committee about the matter of registering those above 45, and I thought that this is a very essential part of the bill—that those people above 45 should be registered. I think it is a fine thing for our citizens above 45 years of age, up into the higher age brackets, to 65 years, to register, so that they may receive the idea that they have their part in this program of whipping the Axis Powers in the present war. I think it is a fine thing to register those people and to make them realize that they have a personal responsibility to the United States Government toward the successful completion of this war, and that the registration of those people up to that age will have a very salutary effect.

As to the controversial feature of the bill, the induction into service of those between the ages of 21 and 45, I have in my hand a copy of the hearings which presents the actual testimony given to this committee in the consideration of this bill. The outstanding witness used at those hearings was Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service. He was the person upon whom we were told we should rely as to the facts in reference to this measure, and he was the one we were told represented truly the attitude of the Selective Service Commission and the attitude of the War Department with reference to the measure. We listened to his testimony. We gave it conscientious and careful consideration. After he had completed his testimony I read a copy of the Washington Post the following morning, a paper published in the city of Washington, and I tore out of it this little excerpt quoting General Hershey, and I read to you as he was quoted:

> Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, warning against any hysteria in connection with the draft extension, said there was no way of telling when it might be necessary to tap the reservoir of men outside the 21-35 group.

Further, he said, and I quote him:

> We can meet the situation today and tomorrow with the present draft age limits of 21 to 35.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this legislation. I shall support it as it has been written by the Committee on Military Affairs. As a member of this committee I heard all of the testimony presented by representatives of the War Department and I am convinced that this bill meets every requirement for present circumstances.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] stated that officials of the War Department have voiced concern because the committee has refused to permit the induction into military service of boys under the age of 21. That decision, Mr. Chairman, was based on the testimony before the committee, and certainly, nowhere in the hearings can be found any evidence that boys under 21 are now needed, or will be needed in the immediate future. We have not arms to equip those already in service, or housing facilities adequate to care for those who will be inducted in the age grades now provided for. If and when the time comes that the services of boys below 21 are needed, this Congress will be in session and this act can be amended on an hour's notice.

It is difficult for me to reconcile the attitude of the War Department with the statements of General Hershey, statements that were made during the hearings and in newspaper interviews following the hearings. In the Washington Post of December 13 General Hershey said:

> We can meet the situation today and tomorrow with the present draft age limits of 21 to 35.

The story in which this quotation by General Hershey appeared led with this statement:

> War Department officials made clear yesterday that it would be a long time—perhaps never—before any man outside of the 21 to 35 age group are drafted for the army despite the proposal to require all aged 18 to 64, inclusive, to register.

Now, if that is the case, why should we get all excited and disrupt the lives of students and others below the age of 21? That question was asked by various members of the committee during the hearings and was not satisfactorily answered. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the War Department failed to make a case before the committee.

One reason given by General Hershey during the hearings, was to the effect that the War Department had merely decided to order the full meal rather than order it course by course. Members of the committee were not convinced by such an argument, especially in view of the fact that more men are already available for induction into service than can be equipped and trained. If more are necessary they can be had through a reclassification of the deferred lists.

Politics and sentiment played no part in the decision of our committee to place the draft age from 21 to 45. Every member of our committee weighed the testimony of the War Department officials carefully before reaching this important decision. We do not want to do one single thing to obstruct the War Department. We are all out to win this war. We will be the first to recommend the drafting of boys under 21 years if the War Department justifies such a demand. This has not yet been done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what happened last week in the Philippines and Hawaii, there is no disposition on the part of anyone in this House to set himself up as a military expert. On the other hand, there is no reason why we should put aside our common sense and our judgment. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], made that appeal to us today, to use our common sense and good judgment.

Let me give you two homely illustrations. This morning a group in the House was told by Mr. Henderson that if all the priority orders which had been issued by the Army and Navy were granted there would not be enough steel to keep the rolling stock of the railroads going, to repair the boilers or the fireboxes of the locomotives. Now, what is the sense and what do we gain by giving priority to the Army and Navy for all that steel if you cripple transportation so that they cannot get it—so that it cannot be delivered to the shipyards?

I want to call the attention of my farmer friends to this fact, which you all know. Some farmers used to send veal calves to market regardless of their age. I use that comparison with all respect and only to illustrate my contention that boys of less than 21 are immature—not ready for the slaughter. Finally, along came the State and Federal authorities and said, "You cannot send your veal calves until they are so old." Let us protect these young men until they can give their best. It does

not require very much courage on the part of some of us who are 66, as I am, or who are younger but over the draft age, to send these young men off to war and to slaughter. It does require some courage to ask that some other men, politically powerful, and I will not name them, be required to do their bit—serve here at home in safety and at a high wage. The courage to do that seems to be lacking. But what is the sense, and where is the good judgment, in taking these boys, many of whom are farmer boys, many of whom today, regardless of the fact that they have not reached the age of 21, are doing a large part of the work on the farms before and after school hours—taking them from their training and homes, and placing them in the Army? Why not leave those boys at home until they develop and are worth something in the market, which in this case happens to be the war market, where they are going to be sent to slaughter like a bunch of sheep—another Pearl Harbor—unless we here in Congress insist they be kept here at nome until properly trained and equipped and until we are able to keep open lines of supply and support?

Those are two illustrations I want to call to your attention. To my mind the argument advanced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] was all decisive, or should be. That argument was, Why should these boys now be taken from their homes, away from the farms, before they have had technical training, when we all know, as was admitted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] that we do not have the equipment with which to train them; when we do not have the ships to transport them; when we do not have the bombers to protect them?

I received wires asking me to vote for an A. E. F., and I sent back this message to each of them:

I assume, of course, that you mean an American expeditionary force should go only after the boys are trained; after we have furnished to them the equipment, and after we have gained supremacy in the air or are ready to gain it, and have the bombers with which to do it, and after we have lines of communication and supplies to support them when we get them across.

Is that not a common-sense view, and is that not what we should do? Any other course means another Dunkirk, another Pearl Harbor.

Here is another thought: Not one single day has passed since we sustained this loss across the ocean but that there has come to my office not one but many, many letters from men who are physically and mentally able to serve, not in the armed forces, because they are not physically fit to render that kind of service, but who are equipped mentally and physically to do much of the detail clerical office work, to which the young men who could serve actively are now detailed.

Let us use these older men and so release from desk and clerical work the younger, more physically fit young men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, too little is realized of the great amount of national-defense work that has been done by the younger boys in the Civilian Conservation Corps. I believe that even more can be done, and to that end, I would suggest that the C. C. C. be placed at the disposition of the Corps of Engineers, to complete important projects now under way and to take on an even larger load of essential national-defense jobs.

It seems to me that the country has, thus far, overlooked the tremendous aid the Civilian Conservation Corps can offer in our war effort. In saying this I do not belittle what has previously been done or is now being done by the Corps to aid national defense—but more can and should be done.

Right now I know that C. C. C. companies are at work on close to 70 military reservations. These C. C. C. boys have constructed parachute-training landing fields, tank courses, artillery and rifle ranges, access roads, obstacle courses, and many other badly needed military facilities. I know the record of the corps in protecting and conserving critical natural resource areas such as forests, grazing districts, reclamation and irrigation areas, and high-value agricultural lands. I am aware of the tremendous work which has been done in physically reconditioning more than two and a half million young men.

Because of these very things I feel that the corps offers very large additional national-defense potentialities. It is a very mobile organization. It is well equipped with machinery. It has a self-sufficient supply organization. It has a large number of skilled supervisors and engineers.

This corps is perhaps the best-equipped organization in the country for the large-scale construction of military landing fields, military roads, and the construction of a number of other military facilities. The experience and training also makes it an ideal aid in carrying on disaster relief and rehabilitation which might become necessary in case of enemy attack. I see by the papers that the corps has just concluded an agreement with the American Red Cross to participate in such work if the need arises. This is a step in the right direction.

In addition to using its great resources for military construction a fuller use should be made of the corps in training and rehabilitating men who are now physically unfit for military service due to remediable physical defects and in giving practical work experience and training to young men in order that they can swiftly take their proper places either in the armed forces or in defense industries.

Past medical history of the corps shows conclusively that thousands and thousands of young men who are not acceptable for military service can be brought up to these standards through supervised medical attention, regular living, and hard work in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Best of all is the fact that while being physically rehabilitated such young men could make a distinct contribution to the defense of the Nation while working on military projects as I have outlined.

Every facility of this tremendous organization originally created for peaceful pursuits should now be checked to see if it is being used to prosecute our war effort most effectively. It will be in the best interest of this Nation to establish the closest possible relationship between the Civilian Conservation Corps and the armed forces of the United States for the duration of the war. We have in the corps a fully fashioned presently operating tool which can be of immediate and powerful benefit in constructing many types of military facilities which are needed at once. There is no other existing organization so well fitted to tackle this job. I hope there will be immediate action in applying every possible facility of the corps to the successful prosecution of our war effort.

For convenient reference in considering the matter I give these statistics on the present status of the corps:

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS BRIEF FIGURES

First. Camps now operating, 900.

Second. Field supervisory, technical, and administrative force at camp, 12 to 15 men per camp.

Third. Total enrollees, 150,000 men.

Fourth. Number of pieces of automotive equipment in immediate operating condition in excess of 35,000.

Fifth. Number of central automotive repair shops now in operation, 50.

Sixth. Trained specialists among enrollees, including cooks, bakers, radiomen, machine operators, mechanics, 110,000.

Seventh. Camps now on military reservations, 67.

Eighth. Many shops now doing Army motor repair work as well as Civilian Conservation Corps work.

These figures suggest the strength of the corps that could be applied to the war effort. They also suggest what the corps is doing and can do in producing trained radiomen, machine operators, cooks, bakers, and so forth. Let us use the corps to the best advantage in winning this war.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr Chairman, it is not very often that I take this floor to voice my opinions on a subject with which I am not very familiar. I do not hold myself out to this House as a military expert.

Three times last week this House went on record in presenting to an embattled world, the aggressors, and our enemies unity, determination, and a resolute will to win this war.

There is no division of opinion in the House this afternoon except on one subject, namely, whether or not we should force the youth of this land below the age of 21 to be inducted into the military service of this Nation. I desire to point out that: Before the laws of the United States and most all the States boys below the age of 21 are not recognized as competent and mature people. They are considered children under well-established standards and rules. They stand before the law as children. They cannot vote,

they cannot sign a legal contract, they cannot collect their own wages in many of the States of the Union, they cannot even appear in court without a guardian, they cannot hold public office, they cannot convey property, they cannot do many other things. By law they are denied the rights of men; yet this afternoon we propose to impose upon them the duties and responsibilities of men and induct them into the armed services of this country. When necessity requires, Congress will be in session and ready to comply with the request of those charged with the responsibility of defending this country, that the young men below the age of 21 are needed for such defense. The Military Affairs Committee of this House has said that it is not necessary; and certainly we ought to follow the advice of the committee.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the legislation proposed by the chairman of the committee is such, by reason of the fact that boys of 18 will be registered under this proposed act, that when it becomes apparent the services of these young boys are necessary to the success of our arms, Congress can make them available by simply passing a resolution, which can be done in 10 minutes?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

One more thought has occurred to me: Are we not presenting to the enemies of this country some evidence of weakness by extending the strong arm of this Government into every high school and college of the Nation and take out of them the youth of this land below the age of 21 years? Surely the United States Government is not in extremis. The war has just begun and it is a war that ought to be, can be, and will be, fought by mature men of the Nation. When it becomes necessary to reach below the age of 21 Congress will be ready to listen and do the thing the War Department requires.

I hope the amendment which would induct boys below the age of 21 years is defeated. I am in favor of registering them from 18 to 21.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the obvious purposes of this bill which are to locate the manpower and determine its eligibility for military service, there are two other purposes which are not obvious but are, I believe, of profound importance. These are (1) national morale; and (2) a contribution to the war of nerves when applied to the enemy.

I believe we can best aid in insuring the defeat of our enemies if we take a complete inventory of the womanpower of the Nation by registration, as well as the manpower. If we are to win this war we will have to call upon every man and woman. The enemy knows how ineffectual voluntary cooperation for morale purposes can be since it so often resolves itself into tea parties and other social activities. The bulk of the population has no time or energy to indulge in this.

The British learned only after severe bombing that voluntary response, excellent as the intentions of the individual might be, is totally inadequate to meet the fire, famine, and other hazards which attend a bombing attack. If each individual knew that he was subject to call for his specific services at specific times, either for training or to learn new but needed skills, he could then adjust his affairs to be prepared for any eventuality.

We should amend this bill to include registration of man and woman power and to make each adult individual in the United States liable for training and service in the civilian, as well as the land or naval forces.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, to say who shall be called to man the guns, planes, tanks, and ships of a nation at war is a grim and disagreeable task. Yet that is the duty of this Congress today. We will not shirk our responsibility.

Whether we should legislate that the minimum age at which liability for combat service shall be 19 or 21 is difficult for the layman to decide. Naturally, we are hopeful that the flower of our manhood will not be sacrificed unnecessarily. We had hoped all along that we would not have to use our manpower in the bloody conflict that is now spread all over the world, but now that we have been attacked, the people of America, through their duly elected representatives, the Congress of the United States, have declared to the world that America will fight. America will fight to the finish, and because our cause is right, because we are fighting a just war to defend our rights, victory will be ours.

The question of age has been seriously considered by President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and by the experts in the War and Navy Departments. It is the considered opinion of these men, whose business and duty it is to defend this country, that the age limits for military service should be 19 to 44 years.

I accept their judgment as superior to my own in this matter and will support their recommendation, but while doing so, Mr. Speaker, I offer the suggestion, and I hope it will receive favorable consideration, that every effort will be made to expedite the training of recruits so that none will be called upon to participate in active fighting until he has had sufficient training.

I base this suggestion upon our experience in the war of 1917–18, when thousands of our boys were sent into battle overseas without proper training. Because of the urgent need for troops in that war many young men like myself were sent to France and, in many cases, into action, before they knew one end of a gun from the other. Because of this misfortune many lives were sacrificed that perhaps would not have been lost had these boys been given proper training before they were rushed to face the enemy.

I trust that the War Department will so arrange its program that men who have had training will be assigned to combat positions while recruits are learning to fight; that as far as possible these recruits will be trained as units and that individuals will not be used as replacements to fill the ranks of outfits who have been fully trained or are now in advanced training.

More than 2 years ago, while addressing a group of veterans in my district, I advocated at least 1 year of compulsory service in the National Guard for every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 21, and I was bitterly criticized for it by the newspapers and by many citizens.

It was my opinion then, and it still is today, that if such a program were followed it would provide a reservoir of partially trained men upon which our Government could draw to defend our country when attacked. It would also be a sort of insurance for the men who would be called into service, because their training and experience would enable them to be better equipped to meet the enemy.

This is, as President Roosevelt has told us, and as Congress has declared, an all-out war. We are all in it—all the way. No one can foretell how long the war will last. We must be prepared not only to produce the implements of war, but also to face all kinds of sacrifices. We must be prepared to pay heavier and heavier taxes, to see property destroyed by the enemy, to see the blood of our dear ones spilled, and even their lives snuffed out in the defense of our country.

This is not a local war. It is world wide. It will require every ounce of energy of everyone in the Nation. Let us put everything we have in it so it may be brought to an end at the earliest possible date. That is the American spirit. That is the spirit that will bring victory.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice the same sentiment that has been expressed so frequently this afternoon to the effect that there is no division in this House or in the Committee on Military Affairs or in the country as to the determination of doing whatever becomes necessary to win this war. It is simply a question of what is necessary. I have listened with much interest to all of the arguments on this bill, particularly those advanced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Right along that line, what would the gentleman say in response to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that this bill would raise only 400,000? I

would like to hear the gentleman discuss that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from New York was, of course, talking literally and exclusively when he made the statement that the age group from 36 to 45 would yield 400,000 available men with class 1–A designation. He was overlooking the fact that we have heretofore dropped the age group 28 to 35 and that the testimony showed this group would yield at least 1,000,000 men. Then, of course, there is the 21-year-old group that comes in every year of 1,200,000. Under the terms of this bill, as I pointed out in my question to the gentleman from New York, we do not have to wait until a July registration or an October registration, or whenever the registration may be held, to bring these 21-year-olds in. They become available the very day they become 21 years of age and can be drafted. No additional legislation will be needed; no additional machinery whatsoever. There will be nothing to do except simply to send out the call for these men to report; and, remember, they are becoming 21 at the rate of 100,000 a month.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to get up here and make general statements or to put up good arguments based on generalities; but I want to say to you that the only thing we have to go by, the only thing upon which to base our argument, is the evidence that was presented to our committee based upon which our report was made.

I challenge any person to take this report, look at the figures that are given in it by General Hershey and the statements that are made by General Haislip, as well as the statistics shown in the various tables, and get up here and say it is necessary now to drop this age down to catch the high-school and college boys below the age of 21, and young boys who perhaps have not had the opportunity to go to high school and college.

Let us see what the figures show. I call your attention to the testimony of General Hershey on page 7 of the hearings. In answer to questions by the ranking democratic member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], General Hershey said that in the registration between 18 and 45 we could hope to get seven and one-half million men physically able and not subject to deferment; in other words, that number of class 1–A men available for the draft. That includes 18 to 45. He told us that of each class 18, 19, and 20 we could count on getting 600,000, which gives a total of 1,800,000. The seven and one-half million includes the 1,800,000 already in. So subtract the total of 1,800,000 already in and the 1,800,000 in the three classes 18 to 21, 3,600,000, from 7,500,000 and you have left 3,900,000. I think that is a pretty fair estimate.

At one time in the hearings I propounded the question to him, "You think we have available in that age group from 21 to 45 about 3,200,000?" He said, "That is a conservative estimate." At one time he used the figures three and one-half million. I quote those three different figures to show that certainly somewhere between the two extremes lies the correct figure, according to General Hershey's estimate. It probably would be near three and one-half million.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Take that three and one-half million, which excludes those already in the Army, which is 1,800,000. Taking the two together you would have an army of more than 5,000,000 men?

Mr. SPARKMAN. You would have an army of 5,700,000. We propounded questions to him and to General Haislip as to how fast they could take them in. Now, I believe we ought to be practical about this thing.

Let us see what happened during the World War The greatest number taken in in any one month was approximately 300,000. If you have 3,500,000 men available for draft, and you are able to take them in at the highest rate of induction that was attained during the time we were in the World War, you would still have a reservoir that would take you 12 months to consume. In the meantime, your boys are becoming 21 at the rate of 100,000 a month, to be added to that. The greatest number that we have taken in during the time the present Selective Service Act has been in existence was about 150,000. So you see we are far from attaining the World War peak even yet.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. That does not take into consideration the enlistments that are being made?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all, and I am glad the gentleman mentioned that, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] made some reference to it. If you will look at page 64 of the hearings you will see there a table giving the number of voluntary enlistments during the World War, and it shows them according to age. You can see that there was a relatively small number under 21 who volunteered. I do not believe that at any time during the World War did we experience so great a rush to enlist as we are having today throughout this entire country. We know it is common report in the news items of the day that the recruiting stations absolutely cannot handle the young men who are rushing there to volunteer their services to the country.

We have a real problem, one of supplying these boys, one of giving them clothes, weapons, proper medical attention, hospitalization, and a thousand and one other things, including the necessary training in order that they may not be sent to the battlefield to die on account of lack of training as many boys did during the World War. That all takes time.

We should keep the minimum draft age at 21 until the present, great reservoir of available manpower is used up, or at least until we are shown the necessity of going to a lower-age level. When that time comes, I dare say, no one will oppose such action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I find myself again filled with timidity and fear. I did request these few moments, however, to present to you my thoughts in regard to what I consider one of the most important pieces of legislation we have approached up to now. I do not conceive myself to be able to tell you anything or to give you any new features, but I come here to undertake to have us reason together for a little while in respect to the matter that now engages our attention.

In the first place, I have become afraid that we are about to realize that we have approached—indeed, have entered upon—the most awful war the world has even seen, and that the United States must take the most important part in. Upon us in the largest measure, no doubt, rests the responsibility to deliver the world from tyranny and oppression. Do we realize the state we are in? Are we mindful of how important it is that we be not so careful about seeing whether our boys shall go to school or not, but to be careful, to be sure if we may, that in the years that are to come we shall have schools and colleges and homes?

I am compelled from every consideration to vote for the amendment which I understand will be presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

In doing this, Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of a certain obligation that I owe to any committee that presents to this House with its recommendations any bill that may affect the country. I do not discount the loyalty, the patriotism, or even the wisdom of the committee in arriving at its conclusions in this matter, but I apprehend from an intimation made on the floor of the House that the committee perhaps did not have all the information before it that we have now when it acted upon this bill. There is also a division in the committee, but we are not voting for the committee or against the committee

I suggest to the Members of the House today that the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of a nation that is now engaged in war. While I think right smart of my ability sometimes, and at other times become dissatisfied with it, I am not willing to put my judgment against that of those who are charged with carrying out the declaration of war that we made a few days ago against three awfully strong, powerful, warlike people who would destroy our institutions and our country.

I cannot find it in myself to presume to take a position that is contrary to the desires of such men as Franklin D. Roosevelt, particularly as President of the United States, of Gen. George C. Marshall, of Secretary Frank Knox, and of Secretary Stimson. They say we have a plan that we are setting on foot to accomplish victory, and I am going to follow that plan in my vote.

On December 8, there was presented to the House of Representatives a resolution reading as follows:

Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That a state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan, which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

On the 11th day of December, there was presented to the House of Representatives, following the declaration of war by the Government of Germany against the United States, a resolution declaring that

A state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany, which has been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Germany; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Following the declaration of war by Italy against the United States, came a similar declaration that a state of war exists between the Government of Italy and the United States and the people of the United States, the resolution, as in the other two cases, pledging all of the resources of the country to a successful prosecution of the war.

Section 2, article II, of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

The House of Representatives, on the 8th day of December, voted unanimously, except one vote, declaring that a state of war exists with the Imperial Government of Japan and authorized the President of the United States to employ all the resources of the country to bring the war to a successful conclusion. Similar resolutions were likewise adopted on the 11th day of December with respect to the Governments of Germany and Italy. Under the Constitution, the President is Commander in Chief of the armed forces. By the near unanimous vote in the House of Representatives, and by unanimous vote in the Senate, we pledged ourselves to yield to the President and his advisers every resource of the country for the successful prosecution of the war; which is a war to save our country and to save liberty and freedom.

It is surely recognized that this is a war of great proportions. Particularly the Governments of Germany and Japan have for their purpose domination of and dominion over all the countries of the world. Italy is aiding in this unholy purpose. The reasons underlying or furnishing cause for this war are so far reaching that the Government of the United States and the people of the United States have thrust upon them the necessity of a long, hard war. We must win the war. To lose it would be to lose all we have. This means that we must summon to our aid in actuality every resource of the country. Young men and older men will have to fight.

Considering the far-reaching purposes of the Axis Powers, a young man 19 years of age stands a 2-to-1 chance, at least, that he will have to enter actual combat by the time he is 21 years of age. Is it wise to wait until about 3 months before he is to be inducted into the service to begin his training? We are fighting two nations particularly who make a specialty of military efficiency. Their men are without doubt the best trained and the most efficiently equipped fighters, on sea, on land, and in the air, that the world has ever known. Is it wise to wait and wait and find ourselves from time to time compelled to thrust our young people and our older people into this war wholly unprepared or half-way prepared? Surely, this must be folly. For the protection of the young man, say 19 years of age, and considering that he will in all probability have to engage in actual combat in this war, is it not more humane to him that he be efficiently prepared and equipped to take his place? Are we to say to him that we will risk the time when we may, and probably will, have to send him into the war with 2 or 3 months' preparation? Hardly could he be expected to possess an efficiency that would protect him from the ruthlessness and the dangers attendant upon combat with highly and almost completely trained and equipped forces.

And, too, when we are called upon by the President, advised by the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff, that the plan laid out for the successful prosecution of this war comprises a thorough training and preparation of our men, involves the summoning of every resource and every equipment possible, shall we, after having made our resolutions, run counter to the Commander in Chief and those immediately chargeable with the successful prosecution of this war? It does not seem logical; indeed, it is hardly possible that we could take such a position. We do not yield our several opinions or the pride of our mental attainment by following the judgment and advice of those to whom we have committed this important task. I think we but show a greater judgment in that we see the logic of yielding to those in authority and chargeable with this great undertaking both common sense and humanity, believing that they will do what is wise and what is right. I think they will take care of the boys the very best possible. I think the positions of President, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of War, Chief of Staff, and others comprising what we may refer to as our armed forces, are filled with men of good sense, vision, and all proper considerations of care for our soldiers, as well as all other humanitarian requirements. I think this should be the policy of every Member of the Congress, both the House and the Senate, and that it is a wiser course than to undertake to insist that we ourselves must substitute ourselves and our opinions for the collective judgment of those to whom we have committed this important work.

Is it not our province to authorize and empower, leaving to the President and those immediately responsible for successful execution the matter of building up our Army and Navy and air forces? Cannot we trust the men in these positions as to humanitarianism, as well as genius and judgment? I believe they are worthy of our confidence; that they have love, sympathy, and concern for our men and our boys. They surely do not wish them to face awful duties and responsibilities unprepared. In this I trust them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 302), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every male alien and every noncitizen national of the United States residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 65, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act every male citizen of the United States, and every male alien and every noncitizen national of the United States residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 21 and 45 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 21 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That any citizen or subject of a neutral country shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this act if, prior to his induction into the land or naval forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That no citizen or subject of any country who has been or who may hereafter be proclaimed by the President to be an alien enemy of the United States shall be inducted for training and service under this act unless he is acceptable to the land or naval forces."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. This is the amendment which I discussed on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as also offered to section 7. This is the amendment changing the age limit from 21 to 19.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS to the committee amendment:

Page 6, line 5, page 6, line 6, and page 8, line 8, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "19."

Page 8, lines 9 and 10, strike out "twenty-first" and insert in lieu thereof "nineteenth."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 6, line 5, page 6, line 6, and page 8, line 8, strike out "21" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

Page 8, lines 9 and 10, strike out "twenty-first" and insert in lieu thereof "twentieth."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I accept the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important bills that has been considered by this House in many a day. Like you, I am one of those who understands and appreciates the serious obligation that every man feels to himself and his country in this fateful hour. I do not offer this amendment in an effort to be controversial or argumentative. I am willing to accept any reasonable and fair compromise. I simply want to do honestly and sincerely what I know you want to do; that is, the best and wisest thing to save our beloved country. I do not know what is the best age limit, whether 21, 20, or 19. I just know that the world is on fire, and, as has been said here repeatedly, neither this Nation nor civilization itself has ever faced a more serious problem than that which decent, civilized, liberty-loving people face today.

I am not a military expert. I do not profess to be one. I just try to be a good, patriotic citizen like you. But I think that when tragedy and danger comes, you want the best advice and leadership you can get. You send for the best doctor available when illness strikes at your loved ones. When war comes I am following the heads of our War and Navy Departments. That is their profession. That has been their life work. They know war first-hand. They have studied and planned and I have confidence in them.

I think I am a pretty good judge of the pulse of an audience. I feel that from what has been said here perhaps this House is not ready to accept the 19-year age limit amendment. I have no quarrel with you. That is the reason I have offered this amendment as a substitute and compromise. I want the best bill we can get.

I plead with you, I implore you in the name of our country, that when the President, who is Commander in Chief, sends a personal letter here, when the War Department, through Secretary Stimson, General Marshall, General Haislip, Chief of Personnel, and when the officials of the Navy Department and of the Air Corps, and everybody else who is going to do the fighting say, "Please help us to arrange a long-range over-all program," I think we should follow their advice.

Please do not get excited. If you will read the testimony before the House Committee on Military Affairs you will find there is no effort, there is not even a threat, there is not even the slightest intention of putting all these young men into the Army at once. The men will not even begin registering until next July. Everybody knows that the Army does not have the equipment, the housing, and the clothing to care for all these young men immediately, and the War Department has not even contemplated such action. This is a preparedness program.

If we are face to face with a World War that is likely to take 4 or 5 or 6 or 8 or 10 years, it is going to be an all-out affair. We have pledged all our resources and it is now a question of fight or surrender. It means all our fighting forces and all our material wealth, if necessary.

This is a serious and a tragic hour. I beg and I plead with you that if we mean what we say when we pledge all our resources, our men, and our material, and when the Commander in Chief and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy say "Let us register these men, let us induct them as we need them and in the proportions we need them over the days, months, and perhaps years that are to come," I think the least we can do is to follow their leadership. We must lodge authority somewhere and since they have the primary responsibility for winning the war, I think we should take their advice.

As has already been said, if you do not take in more young men, you may just as well be prepared to take in later the more mature men, perhaps those with wives and two or three children, because you cannot fight this war without men. Young men are the best soldiers and have less responsibilities.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Knowing what he does about the Army and Army training, would the gentleman not consider it safe to assert that if men of 20 are inducted into the service, in view of the kind of training they would be compelled to take they would be 21 before they were ever called to combat service?

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the distinguished Speaker for that contribution, because it must not be forgotten that under the present practice when a young man enlists in the service, it is 5 months before he is even attached to a unit. He first goes to his reception center and then he goes into a replacement center, where it is determined the place he will fit best. The speaker is exactly right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. He goes into one of these replacement centers and it is determined where he can render the best service. A lot of people seem to have the mistaken idea that these young and inexperienced boys will be up in the air flying before you know it. Of course, they make the best aviators, and it is going to take these young men to run this modern machinery, these planes, and these tanks. It requires youth, health, energy, and ingenuity. It is going to take young men to do all this parachute jumping. Yes; they are daring and they are better men physically, but we must not forget in connection with the Air Corps that a man has to develop and has to be trained before he can go up in the air. They are not going to force these young men into such service. That is voluntary service. These people in the War and Navy Departments are patriotic officers and know their business and will do the right and best thing. It is their profession, and they have been making a study of this for months, and even years. General Hershey came up through the ranks, from a country boy in Indiana, to be the outstanding expert on selective military service, and he testified before the committee—

Yes; when I was before the committee last year I said that I thought 21 years was low enough to go, but I have changed my mind about a lot of things in the last week.

So has this House; so have the American people. I know how a lot of fathers and mothers feel. I know how I feel myself, but what good is this country if Hitler or the Japs get over here? Of what value are our colleges and universities if we are slaves to a foreign dictator? We have a job to do. We can take no chances. We are going to remain a free people, but it is no time to count the cost. We have to win first.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the evidence before the gentleman's committee indicate that the Army is now prepared to fully equip an army such as contemplated by the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course not; and no such claim has been made. As a farmer you know you must prepare your ground before you plant your crop.

Mr. COOLEY. Then why should there be such a rush to induct these young men into the service?

Mr. THOMASON. There is no rush to induct these young men into the service at all, but the Army says that if we are about to be engaged in a war for 6 or 8 or 10 years, with Germany having 8,000,000 trained men and other countries having the same percentage of men, why should we wait a year or two to make all our plans or before we have an over-all plan for the men to fight the war? They will be inducted and trained only as fast as conditions will permit.

Mr. COOLEY. Why should we induct a large number of men into the Army and after they are inducted we can only drill them with wooden guns?

Mr. THOMASON. I hope the gentleman will not go into that. That is an unfair and exploded story that has gone all over the country.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that on the recent maneuvers in the Carolinas they had wooden guns down there?

Mr. THOMASON. There is a rifle in the War Department for every man in the American Army. They may not all be Garands, but nevertheless the guns are available. It is true we have been sending a good many to brave, old Britain, and to fighting Russia, to hold the line until we could get prepared, but all

the War Department wants to do now is to arrange and plan for an all-out program for an all-out war. There is no thought of inducting these men into the service before we are prepared to receive and train them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman state that we have neither the housing nor the equipment for these men?

Mr. THOMASON. No; they do not have the housing for another two or three million immediately, but the War Department says housing will not be a problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. There is no contention, not the slightest, that they have the housing or the equipment for two or three or four million more men at once. This, I repeat, is a long-range plan to win this war, and I do not see how anybody is hurt by it. It is the best life-insurance policy we can buy. But rather than have a repudiation, in effect, of what the President, who is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy want, if you say that you will not reduce it to 19, I beg and plead with you at least to put it at 20, because there will not be 10 percent of those boys who will not be 21 by the time they are called. This is the time not only to fight but to sacrifice. We must lay aside sentiment. War is a grim, cruel business, but we did not fire the first shot, although we will fire the last one if we do our full duty. Down in Texas our slogan is "Remember the Alamo." I implore this Congress to make our slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I would like to see if there are any gentlemen who want to debate this particular amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; I want to say something about it.

Mr. MAY. I want to get the time settled, if I may. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock and that I be permitted to use the last 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I thought that some things had happened which caused the Nation to be more united than we had been for some time previous. I regret very much that now there seems to be a tendency to again get into a controversial proposition and to disregard the request of those who have been charged with the responsibility of carrying forward our war program. I believe that the American people are able ultimately to win this conflict because of the ultimate ability and capacity which we have to utilize our facilities and natural resources, and those things which are so necessary to carry on a successful conflict; but I feel at the same time that it is folly for us to attempt to do it with our hands tied behind our backs. I have had enough experience myself with military affairs to know that men 18 to 21 make the best soldiers. I know that we need the best men. I know that the fathers and mothers are willing to make the kind of sacrifices that they are called upon to make, and I know that these young men who are mentioned here today are just as willing to make whatever sacrifices they may be called upon to make. I know that when you go above 20 years you take more who have families, more who are married, and that it is more expensive to the Government to draft these men. I do not mean to infer that cost is the only item, but certainly it is one item, and I know that these young men are just as willing as other men to do their part. I think this is a reasonable suggestion, that at least we give some consideration to the request made in lowering the age limit. I think the least we can do is to adopt the substitute amendment and agree to a proposition of 20 years. I would hate to see this amendment rejected, and I would hate to see this Congress refuse to do the thing that we have been asked to do.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is a most unfortunate situation which we confront in the House today and we confront a very serious situation in America which this sort of controversy will not help. We must try to avoid this in the future if we can. I have been trying for a long time to arouse our people to the consciousness of our danger and to bring to us the solidifying influence of that consciousness. I have watched popular reaction and observed the trends and developments of public opinion and of public attitude during these dangerous, stressful times. I have observed the perfectly ridiculous, self-satisfied attitude of persons in positions of leadership as we have moved unaware and unprepared into direct conflict with the greatest fighting machine of all time. Now we have arrived. At last the people are becoming aroused and solidified, and here we have this proposition, this request to override the almost unanimous judgment of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and far in advance of any practical necessity to decide the matter when the country is in the process of being solidified.

It is even admitted that if this reduction in age limit were made now the registration of these draftees could not begin until next July. It does not make sense. I have listened attentively to this debate and I am convinced that to put this unnecessary and profitless strain upon the morale of the country, and this unnecessary strain upon the accord between the House and the executive branch now, does not make sense. The question at the moment is not whether this age limit may have to be reduced when these younger men can be utilized, but whether at this time when our solidarity is young and not fixed, and a remarkable harmony is developing among all the departments of the Government, that we should adopt this amendment when it is admitted we cannot begin to operate under its provisions for half a year. The question is whether or not we should at this time put this unnecessary strain upon the morale of America. That is a serious practical question for any people situated as we are. It does not make any difference what your view is with regard to this proposition as a thing which must be done in due time, done as fast as we can induct men and equip them for training.

I remember that in the last war it was suggested by the military authorities to begin drafting men at 17 years of age. I was one of whose who thought that was a dangerous thing from the standpoint of the morale of the Nation, aside from all other considerations, to make the first draft largely upon these boys, practically none of whom could claim a recognized exemption. We did not make any noise about it, but we went to those preparing the plans for the draft and had some conversation with them; we told them we could not support the plan and persuaded them that that was not a wise thing to do then, although it might become necessary later on. I wish that had been the procedure here. That ought to be the character of procedure in the future and I hope it will be. It would be a serious mistake if our policy in this great struggle, the struggle of life and death, shall not have in it as its basic, component elements, the best contribution which can be made by our military experts and the best contribution which an earnest, patriotic, self-effacing, wholly dedicated Congress and a great people can make. Let us do together now of the things now needed to be done upon which we can persuade ourselves to an agreed judgment, and if we will, we will be in better condition, better understanding, better teamwork long before next July, the earliest time at which we could begin doing even the first material thing with reference to these young draftees.

I listened to the statement of my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who said that we will not be registering these men until July anyway. We cannot afford to crowd this thing now. I am fully convinced of that fact.

There are too many things connected with our preparedness which we can do which will bring us closer together, for us to turn aside from them and undertake to force this amendment over the almost unanimous protest of our Committee on Military Affairs, and force it on the country before the country is ready to receive it, even though we should feel that by next July, the earliest day we could begin even registering these boys, we might have to lower the age limit. We can pass a bill in 2 days. As we get nearer to July, we will know more clearly what we ought to do, and if we have to do it then, the country will be better prepared to have us do it.

We will be here from now until July. The point I make, and it is the thing that is determining me—of course, we want to go along with the Commander in Chief,

but the Commander in Chief wants to go along with us, too. I mean that with all respect. It is essential that the House, the Senate, the President, and the country pull together.

Now, here is a duly authorized committee of the House which has reported out a bill with 21 years' limit for draftees. The opponents of that minimum-age limit admit, even if the limit is reduced, that the registering of those in the lowered age limits could not begin until next July.

What is the horse-sense thing to do? The common-sense thing to do is to wait until nearer July, until the country gets a little more solid and a little more used to this war, and then we can put the age at anywhere that is necessary, and the country will be ready to receive it, if it is necessary to put the limit down. If that is not the sound, practical, common-sense thing from the standpoint of the people who want to win this war, who want to preserve the solidarity of the Nation and accord among the departments, then I cannot figure out anything. That is how I am going to vote. As I see it, it is a dangerous, reckless, unnecessary thing to pass this amendment now, when, if adopted, we could not begin to use the provision of the amendment until next July. It just does not make sense. As I see it, I am doing a better service for the Commander in Chief and for the country than those who are promoting this controversy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am against this hip, hip, hurrah, and go-along spirit as compared with two sound letters I am about to read. I have a letter from a very able chairman of a draft board, Mr. Walt Zoellner, of Tonganoxie, Kans.:

> I want to take this opportunity to acquaint you with some facts about our present selective service as it affects Leavenworth County, No. 2 district. The board honored me with the chairmanship, and as I am the only member in Tonganoxie, where our office is located, am very familiar with selective-service operation. Noting the publicity concerning changes to be made in selective service, some real facts should be known to you who are in Congress. Our district has some 940 registrants at this time, and we have so far sent 38 men to the Army. We now have 50 men in class 1–A, physically examined, and 70 men who have not been examined. We have 60 men in class 1–H (over 28 years) who will probably become class 1–A in the near future. That makes a total of 218 men class 1–A out of a total of 940 registrants, or almost 25 percent. Possibly another 50 men who now have class 2–A deferment could be put into class 1–A without serious harm to necessary industry.
>
> Now, the above is a picture of a country district, and I imagine it is probably an average district. With the above percentage of men available, why all the worry about so much more registration? Military training for boys over 18 years of age would be fine and is justified, but why scare and worry every mother or wife in the country just now? Let these present forces get proper training and then mix in the younger lads.

I also have a letter from a leading citizen and the chairman of the Board of Education of Topeka, Mr. Kelsey H. Petro, from which I will read a portion:

> No sacrifice is too great to eliminate our enemies, but we give plenty of thought to actions that affect our school-age youth. This war will not be won by children in diapers nor by old men in their dotage. The paper is mentioning lowering draft age to 18 years, which will catch untold thousands of boys, many of them not out of high school, which, at the present state of this world conflict, is not justified. Let these children finish their school and become adjusted, as they will in the next 3 years, to an adult view of the world and war. Then it is proper, if they are needed, to draft them, but not at the age of 18, unless men from 21 and upward have all been taken, which at present is not the case

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, if this substitute is adopted we might as well vote now for 19. You do not have a thing in the world to trade on with the conference committee of the Senate. One of these great bodies has to give way to the other, with only 1 year between. I would prefer, of course, 20, if we cannot get 21, but you know and I know that the Senate with 19 and the House with 20, you have divested yourself of everything with which to strike a bargain in conference.

Now, there is some one age that is the right age. Do not tell us that the military authorities have some infallible rule, some absolute cure-all prescription. There are just as many minds among the brass hats on this question as among Members of the House. The only difference is that when an officer who is above the other speaks, they have to hush, and we talk to each other and just talk on. That is the only difference. But, under cover, there is the same difference of opinion.

I know what is the best age for an Army horse. Four to seven years. Anything above or below, you are getting an inferior piece of material. There is some one age best for military age, and when you get above or below you are not taking the best.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] says "Sprinkle them all along from 18 all the way up." I know how the sprinkling will go. Every fellow who is 18 will get sprinkled into the service, and the other fellow goes home. That is the very thing I am objecting to. There is some one best age. Do not let the mill run empty for a minute for men, and when the best age has been exhausted, then take the next best and the next best, whether it be higher or lower. Every time you take an 18-year-old youth into the service, if a 29-year-old man is better you have not only done the individual an injustice, but you have done the country a disservice, because you have let out one that was better. I have no sons or any near relatives that the lower age would affect, but I speak only for the program as to what is best for all.

Stand pat on the 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I can be classified as an isolationist, and certainly not as an interventionist. I have tried to view as realistically as possible each problem as it has been presented to this House. I have listened with interest to this debate. When it is frankly admitted on the floor of this House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] that the Army does not have at the present time the necessary equipment or the necessary housing facilities to train and to house and care for the army which is contemplated by this amendment, it seems to me that it would be very unwise to lower the age for the draft at this time below 21 years.

I have never heard a more desperate appeal than the gentleman made in behalf of his amendment. He begged us to follow the great President, our Commander in Chief, and yet he admitted that his amendment was not the amendment that was advocated by the Commander in Chief or the Chief of Staff. It is only a compromise. He is apparently engaging in horse trading. We are here dealing with the lives of the youth of America and it ought not to be put on the basis of horse trading. The young men of this country are patriotic, of course. The young men of this country have fought all the wars in the past and are willing to fight this one; but to take the position now that we are going to take them from their vocations and avocations of private life and bring them into the Army and equip them with only wooden guns seems to me to be the height of absurdity. When we have the equipment, when we have the facilities, when we have a Medical Corps sufficient to take care of these young men, and when the hour comes that their services are needed to defend the institutions of this country you will find them flocking into the armed forces of the Nation and to the defense of their country.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Has the gentleman any idea of the percentage of volunteers that are under 21?

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry; I do not.

Mr. HEALEY. I wish some member of the committee would give us that information.

Mr. COOLEY. I assume that the Military Affairs Committee of the House has given this matter careful consideration, and I am going to vote to stand by the committee and keep the age at 21.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] this afternoon in holding up the scare-headline proposition that married men and men with, one, two, or three dependents would be drafted if we did not watch out. I was also interested in noting that the gentleman completely overlooked mentioning

the fact that we have had some increase in population since 1917 to draw on. That point has not been mentioned at any time very audibly by those advocating taking in the 18-year olds.

There is one other point I should like to call to your attention. It has been mentioned several times here today, but it is worth rechecking and reemphasizing. That is that the number of volunteers entering our armed forces exceeds anything in the country's experience in bygone years, because the attack upon us has drawn the Nation together as we have never been united before.

Another matter has been mentioned here many times today, and I think I can speak of this point better than many others; that is the matter of equipment and ammunition. I know the War Department does not want me nor any member of this committee, nor any member of the War Department, to tell you exactly how much ammunition we have on hand, and I will not tell you. But I do know from actual experience how long it takes to train a marksman. I have spent several years in that business myself and think I know what it takes to train a good marksman. I will say that the American soldier is the best natural marksman in the world, but he cannot be made such on his per capita share of the present ammunition on hand and leave anything in reserve.

If and when War Department officials come up here and tell us they have adequate equipment to train all the older boys as rapidly as they indicate may be necessary and that they also can offer adequate training and rifle practice to the boys under 21, I think I can go a long way toward helping them out by lowering the age limit. I am not opposed to a boy under 21 getting training. My own son joined the C. M. T. C. with my consent when he was 17, joined the National Guard with my consent when he was 18, and today at age 20 he is down in Texas in service in the cavalry. It is not that I am opposed to training these youngsters, it is that I am everlastingly opposed to drawing them in there to mark time until we wake up and get them enough equipment, and I am opposed to sending them into combat so young and so untrained.

I hardly need call your attention to some water that has gone over the dam. Our Committee on Military Affairs was not permitted to meet once all during the special session of Congress 2 years ago this fall. The President and Congress woke up to an augmentation program if you please only when the Lowlands were invaded in 1940. Then everybody started getting excited and reaching for the gun that was not there, reaching for ammunition that was not there.

Now, let us just keep our shirts on in this matter. Let us give them what they need, but let us not have our heads turned by false arguments. We should not become hysterical about the matter and draw the 18-year-olds and the 19-year-olds and the 20-year-olds into active military combat service when we cannot offer them a decent training program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I got here the day the Neutrality Act was voted on. As some folks said, I picked a mighty bad time to come to Congress. May I say, in regard to this amendment, that I do not want to send the high-school boys of this country to the Army or to the war. At the same time I do not want to say to our President that those boys are not available in case they are needed. I have sent to the desk an amendment, which will be offered shortly, which I think takes care of the opinion of every Member of the House. The amendment leaves the 21 age in. This Congress is not going to send boys under 21 years of age to war. My amendment provides further, however, that if the President of the United States finds it necessary to the end of defending this country and believes that the limit should be reduced to 19, he is given that authority. I think that takes care of what each of you Members want to do.

You do not want to say that you will send the boys of this country to the Army when they are not old enough to be out of high school. At the same time you do not want to say to the Commander in Chief of our Army, "Mr. President, they are not available to you." I say that that gives ample authority to our Commander in Chief to call out those boys if and when they are needed, whenever we have the ammunition, as the gentleman suggests; at the same time it makes our President pass on that in an official capacity. It says, "By Presidential order he shall do those things," and not, Mr. Chairman, by letter to the majority leader of this House.

The bill that we are now considering provides that the President may eliminate the boys under 21. You should vote against the pending amendment, leaving the age at 21; then I certainly shall present and try to get you to adopt the amendment which is on the Clerk's desk providing that the President may reduce that age limit in case the emergency warrants it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why should we make these young boys available to the Army when we emphatically state that they are not prepared to house and train them?

Mr. WHITTEN. The point of the gentleman is well taken. In addition to that, you know these boys who are under 21 cannot vote against us Members of Congress. They have not anything to say about whether we come back here or not and there are other disabilities which these boys have. At the same time, I want to say to the President, to our Commander in Chief, "They are available, this Congress says they are available, but we ask you in the consideration that you give to these matters to determine that based on the emergency. Do not ask us to do it by letters to the majority leader."

I am sure the members of the Military Affairs Committee gave this matter due consideration and they did act in an official capacity. The pending amendment should be defeated; then in turn we can take care of the true thought of the Members, that is, make the youth available to our Commander in Chief, and at the same time we will not say they must be put in the Army when we are not equipped to take care of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes you had better keep the boys at their mothers' apron strings just as long as you can in times like this. This is not the same old type of warfare that we knew 25 years ago. It is a whole lot harder. It is harder on the nerves, it is harder on the morale, especially of those boys who are subjected to the terrific overhead bombing that we did not have in the World War. I would be willing on a long-range program to start the training of the youth of America at the end of their high-school education, whenever that might be, but certainly not to send them into combat, because they are not ready.

They are not ready for three reasons. Physically they are not capable, they do not have the stamina, and, while a few might develop at the age of 14, 15, or 16, the great number do not until they are very close to the age of 21. That was our experience in the last World War. Certainly the youth of today are not supermen over those of 25 years ago. That is the first reason.

The second reason is the mental attitude of the boys. The mind cannot stand up under this modern barrage. Do you know that we have more men in the hospitals today who have brain and mind diseases than for any other reason as the result of service in the World War? And that cannot hold a candle to what we will witness henceforth. I say the brain cannot stand it when the brain is immature. Let us give them all the years we can.

Then there is the third reason, the moral stamina of the youth of today. Do not throw them in with the older men until you have to. I am not going to say any more about that. You know what I mean. Keep them tied to their mothers' apron strings as long as you can.

Here is another thing. The Navy is getting volunteers and it has been getting them right along under the age of 21. The Navy looks them over. They accept only one out of every six who apply. If you blanket them all in, you cannot pick and choose. I do not want the little fellow who is just growing. I want the big, stalwart fellow, even if he is only 18, 19, or 20. The Navy will take him if he is physically and mentally mature. He will volunteer. You do not have to draft him. To blanket all above a certain age, you get the little and the big, the undeveloped as well as the developed.

One other thing. If you accept the 21-year age limit, as the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] said, you can go to conference and iron it out by compromising on 20, and God knows that is young enough; but if you set 20 here today, you will have 19½ or 19, and do not forget that is the best you will be able to get. For combat service do not send immature boys into the kind of combat that we have in modern warfare.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the State constitution of Arizona places a liability for military service in my State on all able-bodied male citizens between the ages of 18 and 45, which fact does have some influence upon my thinking in this matter, I agree with the gentleman from California who just preceded me, and with several other gentlemen, that we ought not at this time go below the age of 21 in drafting men into military service. I shall, therefore, oppose the amendment before us now and stand by the committee proposal in that respect. It seems quite likely in the final outcome of this legislation that there will be a compromise between the two bodies and an age limit lower than 21 reached, if we today maintain the present lower limit of 21 in passing the bill.

As a schoolman, I feel it to be very important that we keep our young men in high school until they have been graduated. As a college man, I should like to say as much for complete college training for all young men, but of course that is impossible. A few young men get out of high school at 18 and more at 19. As the gentleman from California has just said, I believe the country will be far safer if we make the very minimum age limit 20, and I would prefer it to be 21. If they are needed in our armed forces after graduation, be assured their years in high school will not be void of essential military training.

The Congress will be in continuous session here. If we later find it imperatively necessary to take into training those under the age of 21, the law can be changed at any time.

Let me stress this particularly: We ought to distinguish between registering men and inducting them into military training, and certainly into service. I would be far more ready to vote to register men under 21 in order that they might be ultimately called to training when needed, or on reaching a proper age, than I would be to throw them into a hodgepodge mixture now for immediate military training and possibly combat service. We are told that men below the age of 21 are enlisting now in great numbers and that is as it should be. It may be that as many will enlist as can be taken care of with our facilities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to hear suggestions made in this Committee that anyone is going to vote for this, that, or the other age limit in order that we may have a ground for compromise with another body. After all, right is right. We do not want to work for a compromise, we want to work for what we believe to be right.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that no claim has been made, even by the most enthusiastic supporters of this amendment, that we shall within the next year or year and a half or perhaps 2 years be able properly to receive, train, arm, and equip the men we can yet draw from the brackets in which we are now working. That fact is very significant in connection with this debate.

It has been only a very short time since the Selective Service Board itself asked this body to allow them to reduce the age limit from 36 to 28, so as to be allowed to take the men they were selecting into the service between the ages of 21 and 28. At that time I told them, "This is nothing but an entering wedge. You will come back here within a short time and ask to be allowed to take the boys below the age of 21." I firmly believe this request would have been made, perhaps not this early, but certainly within no long period of time, whether or not we had actually become engaged in hostilities.

I say again that if I believed we would be able to receive, train, arm, and equip the boys below 21 in addition to those in the higher-age brackets, I would not be here opposing this amendment, but I do not believe there is a single man on the Committee on Military Affairs who believes that within at least the next year and a half we shall be able properly to take care of all of the eligibles in the age brackets in which we are now working.

As we go further into this program, as we know better what we shall have to do, as our industrial system functions more efficiently, and our production meets the demands which will be made on it we will be in much better position to judge how severely we shall have to draw upon the manpower of this Nation. Until we have to do that, until we know that in order to furnish the forces we shall have to furnish, until we know that we shall be taking care of them as they should be taken care of, let us not reach down into the lower age brackets to get these men. They will be coming of age at the rate of 1,200,000 each year, and they will be a reservoir and a reserve we can draw on in the future.

One thing we do not want to do in the contest into which we are entering is to commit all of our resources early in the game. That is not good strategy at any time. All the contests throughout history have gone in the final analysis to those nations which at the proper time had a proper reserve to put into the conflict. Therefore, let us not be stampeded at this time by any demands of this kind. Let us not be influenced at this time by any arguments that we must follow blindly any requests sent up to us by any department of this Government. Now, of all times, the House of Representatives should prove to this Nation that although we are willing to go along with the Commander in Chief in everything necessary to win this war, we are still going to preserve as far as possible the equality between our three branches of Government. Therefore, let us make up our minds as Members of the House of Representatives what we believe we should do. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that by dropping the age limit to 20 you do not create any larger reserve in the long run, you simply make 600,000 men available at an earlier date, and that is all.

May I say also that General Hershey has repeatedly said that it is not their intention to draft this younger group of men until the other age group is exhausted. Two members of the committee have read newspaper articles to the Members here this afternoon quoting his exact words. I call your attention to a similar article taken from the Christian Science Monitor quoting him on December 15 as giving the number of men he could get from the various age groups and saying this:

> The present program of induction contemplates the drawing first of remaining men immediately available in the 21 to 27 age bracket. Next to be called would be those from 28 to 35, and then those reaching the age of 21.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If this amendment is adopted, how long will it be before they can begin to register these men between 18 and 21?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is planned to register all between 18 and 65 about July 1, but, of course, if what he states here is correct, not a single one of these men would be drafted for at least 2 years, because we cannot possibly use up the age groups above that within a shorter time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You cannot even begin to register them until July; is that the gentleman's statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is planned to register them July 1.

Mr SUMNERS of Texas. That is, to begin then?

Mr. SPARKMAN. To register them; and I assume they will register the whole group, but I do not know about that. However, the point I want to make is that even if this amendment were adopted, not a one of these men could reasonably be expected to be drafted, under this statement, for at least 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, this problem of calling men into service, getting them to camp, putting clothes on them and arms in their hands, and giving them food and shelter is no small problem within itself. Just so many of them can be taken in every month, and no more; and our testimony is to the effect that the very most that were taken in during the World War were approximately 300,000 a month.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. This is one thing I do not believe the gentleman will dispute. The gentleman must admit that the War

Department solely is charged with the planning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and I am glad the gentleman has mentioned that. There is no reason under the sun why every plan cannot be made because these men will be registered, we will know everything about them, they can be classified and the day they become 21 they can be drafted, and if it ever becomes necessary to drop the age below 21, a simple amendment of one word contained in a joint resolution of the two Houses can do it. This would simply be changing the figure "21" to "19" or "18" or whatever age you want to make it, and it can go through the two Houses of Congress just as quickly as the declaration of war went through, and the Congress will be in session.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can the War Department make such plans today unless we make it certain?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly, they can plan and they say they are not going to draft them until the others are used.

Mr. ANDREWS. They cannot plan it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They can lay their plans on the assumption that they will be available when they become 21 years of age. I just want to appeal to you to hold this to the age that the committee has decided it ought to be held to and let these boys under 21 know that they are not to be drafted unless it becomes absolutely necessary for the adequate defense of this country.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to apologize for the vote I am going to cast, because I am going to vote against this amendment, and someone is going to say that I offered the very same amendment in the committee. That is true. However, I am most sincere when I say that I want it to be at the age of 20. Perhaps my strategy is bad, but I think many Members of this House are also using the same strategy that I am, and that is to vote down this amendment, stay with the committee at 21, and when they do go to conference, after the Senate has passed its bill at 19, we will be able to bring out this bill at 20.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can the gentleman tell us what the Senate is going to do?

Mr. MERRITT. I do not think anybody has any doubt about what they are going to do. I am sure if we do let this get by at 20 at this time, as someone who preceded me has said, and the Senate does pass a bill for 19, we will probably compromise at 19½ or 19.

I was very much impressed by what the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] said, because of the long experience he has had in the Navy and because of the distinguished record he has made, having been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. I am sure the very point he brought out of keeping these boys at their mothers' apron strings is a good one if for no other reason than because of morals. I say that in itself is one of the finest things we can think of in making these boys stay home until at least they are 20, and I hope it does remain at 21.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman from New York ask the gentleman from California, in view of his observation, why it is the Navy is so glad today to get men between 18 and 21?

Mr. MERRITT. I think I can answer that. I think it is because of the daring attitude of boys when they reach an age between 18 and 21.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a little earlier in the afternoon, as a result of some of the statements made by some of my friends, I felt a little bit concerned because of their statements that something I said had constituted a criticism. I have looked over my remarks, and instead of being concerned I am rather amused at the fact that they were so thin skinned, if I might in an off-handed and friendly way, say so with reference to their little mental discomfort. I said at that time that "I cannot accept their judgment," and that means the Committee on Military Affairs, "in preference to the judgment of the President and his military advisers." I would never consider that to be a criticism. That is the expression of an opinion that I am entitled to entertain. I further said:

> In this crisis we must all be good soldiers. That applies particularly to the membership of the House Military Affairs Committee, who challenged the statement of the President and General Marshall in this matter.

Of course, that means the majority of the committee. That is a statement of a fact. There is nothing uncommon about that. If stating a fact constitutes a criticism, of course, it is a criticism; but I never felt that stating a fact was a criticism. I do not retract a word I said.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. EDMISTON. There certainly has never been any statement made on the part of General Marshall, about this age limit, to the committee, or by the President or anybody else.

Mr. McCORMACK. I read a letter to the Committee this afternoon which I received from the President of the United States and which others received.

Mr. EDMISTON. But that is the President of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it is fair to assume that on military matters the President acts on the advice of General Marshall.

Mr. EDMISTON. That, again, is an assumption.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Secretary of War, representing the General Staff, himself addressed the committee as the initial process in the hearings, over his own signature.

Mr. McCORMACK. When I referred to the Military Affairs Committee I was talking extemporaneously, because the bill before the House comes from that committee. I just want to disabuse from the minds of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members any feeling on their part of criticism, and convey to them the fact that I was stating a few facts. Certainly the record shows that any Member who disagrees with the majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee is justified in entertaining that opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the age 19, but I recognize ir the present situation that the same cannot be obtained. The compromise amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas seems to be one that the House should accept. It seems to me a happy solution. We have one question in controversy, and the acceptance of that amendment should be an agreeable one. The Speaker asked a question of one of the Members who had the floor, indicating that that amendment was acceptable to him. It seems to me, in the light of that situation, that at the end of this debate happiness and pleasantness of mind can exist, if the Committee of the Whole and the House adopts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I do not think we should be influenced by a statement that Congress is in continuous session, and that by changing one word we can bring about a certain result later on. You know as well as I do when that time comes we will have this fight over again. The change of one word later on, as advanced by some Members, is not an answer to the amendment pending before the House. It should not be brushed aside by an observation of that nature. Furthermore, it has been said that General Hershey has stated that it is not the intention to draft these young men until others have been drafted. It seems to me that that is an argument in favor of this amendment rather than against it. We are in the war. We have been in the war a little over a week. Unanimity exists throughout the country. Whatever differences existed prior to December 7 were removed by the dastardly and vicious attack made by the Japanese. This House has shown to date that it reflects the unanimity of the country by the action of last week. Let us adopt this compromise amendment. It is satisfactory to the leadership and it should be satisfactory to all Members of the House. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for the remaining time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not conscious of anything I could add to the debate, but I do want to call the attention of the Committee to one or two statements I have seen in the press recently. First, one from Winston Churchill a few days ago, in which he told the British Parliament that if England won the war she would do it with American munitions and supplies and American foodstuffs.

The Secretary of Ariculture, last week, issued a statement to the effect that there was going to be a vast shortage of farm labor in this country for the coming crop season. I have always believed since I was a boy 18 to 21 years of age, on the farm, that there was a pretty good place for boys.

I ask that both the original and the substitute amendments be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement all time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PRIEST. If I understand the situation now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] accepted the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas, and that is the only amendment now before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. There are two amendments pending, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], as a substitute.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were ayes 102 and noes 152.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. THOMASON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported there were ayes 113 and noes 173.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, may we again have that amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FADDIS and Mr. LAMBERTSON objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAMBERTSON and Mr. FADDIS) there were ayes 53 and noes 175.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMISTON: Page 6, line 5, after the word "and", strike out "45" and insert "35."

Page 8, line 9, strike out "45" and insert "35."

Page 9, strike out section 9.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to offer this amendment without much idea of its success, but I do think you should give this matter some thought.

It seems to me that in such times as we are facing the least we disturb our country in an economic way the better off our country will be.

We will get so few men in the classification of 35 to 45 under this bill that they will add nothing to the armed strength. Most of them have dependents. Most of them are experts or technicians in some line. A great many more of them cannot pass the physical qualifications. We will get so few of those men that it is not worth the effort to get them.

Another thought I want to leave with you is that most men over 35 years of age, whether they have dependents or not, are more or less settled. They are on a small farm, in a small store, or filling station. Most likely they are going to do what they are now doing for the rest of their lives. To take them out of whatever they may be doing for a year or two is not going to add anything to the armed forces of our country, and greatly disrupt their lives.

Another thought I want to impress upon you is that they are going to be the most expensive soldiers that you will have in this army, because when their service is over they will come out with a physical disability and you will be paying them pensions as long as they live, and they will be worth very little to you while they are in the service. Let us be sensible about this army we are raising this afternoon.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman believe there is a little fight still left in some men at 45?

Mr. EDMISTON. I am trying to reduce it to 35.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I ask the gentleman if he does not believe that some men over 35 still have a pretty good fight left in them?

Mr. EDMISTON. I say we do not need them now under present conditions to start this war. I hope we do not have to come to them at any time. I think we shall never need them. We raised 4,500,000 between 21 and 31 in the first World War and I am trying to reduce it not to 31 but to 35.

We have no use for a large army at the present time. We will have 2,000,000 men in the Army by January 1. It will take us 6 months to equip them properly. Let us see where this war is in 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 9, after the colon, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the President may upon finding that it is necessary in the national interest lower the minimum age fixed in section 3, subsection (a) from 21 years to 19 years."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the President has sent a letter to Congress saying he needs them today.

Mr. WHITTEN. Did the gentleman from New York receive the note?

Mr. ANDREWS. It was read by the majority leader on the floor.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered with the thought in my mind that it meets the desires of members of this committee. This committee has just voted to fix the minimum limit at 21 years. I think the House never intended to say that no man from 19 to 21 could be called by the Commander in Chief in case of necessity, nor do I believe that the mothers of this country are not willing in the interest of necessity and in the interest of public defense that the young men from 19 to 21 be called out.

The committee having voted to fix the minimum limit at 21 years, my amendment provides that the Commander in Chief may have them available when he determines that they are needed. I do not feel that any mother in this country could find fault with that. I do not think any man in this House could find fault with saying that, if the public interest demands it and public defense requires it, the Commander in Chief of the Army could call out young men from 19 to 21. Let us see where these young men are. Under the provisions of this bill, the young men from 19 to 21 are registered. They are not going anywhere; they will be in this country going to school, many of them to technical schools, learning things that will be helpful. They are going to be here. The committee, having refused to fix the minimum limit at 19, but raising it to 21, should say to the Commander in Chief of our Army that when he determines that these young men must be called in the interest of defending this country we will let him call them. The distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, has quoted the President as saying he needs them today. If this be true, if the letter he wrote is decisive of his official judgment in the matter, then, if this amendment is adopted, the President can, the very day the bill becomes law, call these men up for training.

Let us consider this thing a little further. The original draft of the present bill provides that the President, by Executive order, can eliminate certain age groups. This amendment changes that and provides that, although we have eliminated men from 19 to 21, yet he may include men of those ages in case the public interest requires it or public defense necessitates it.

As I stated a while ago, I have been here since the Neutrality Act amendments were passed on. I know a whole lot more about defense back home than I do about running the Congress of the United States. I am frank to admit that. It has been said, however, that although

the age limit is lowered there is no intention of calling the men in the lower brackets. I do not know about that, but I do know that when orders come to the selective service board back home they say they want so many men. They do not say they want so many men 21 years of age, 22 years of age, or 23; they say within the limitations, between the ages fixed last year, the lower limit being fixed at 21. We have passed an act here that fixes the limit at 21, but we say to the head of the Army, the Commander in Chief of our Nation, if my amendment is agreed to, "Mr. President, as head of the Army if you think we need these young men, you determine it in an official way, and if you so determine it, you may call them." I believe the mothers of this Nation would be glad to have them called into the Army if the Commander in Chief determines it to be necessary for national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in rising in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the only thing I desire to say is that the House has just gone on record by an overwhelming majority fixing the age of the military personnel of this country. The Congress is the body which, under the Constitution, is required to say who shall be soldiers and, having fixed it, the object, the purpose, and the effect of the amendment which has just been offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] would be to take back what we said and leave it to the President to call those boys down to the age of 19 whenever he got ready.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MAY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Page 6, line 21, after the word "forces", insert: "*Provided further*, That no person shall be barred or prevented from entering or serving in the land or naval forces of the United States because of having been previously dishonorably discharged therefrom on the ground of misconduct in the nature of a misdemeanor, provided at least 5 years shall have elapsed since such discharge and the person so discharged has not been charged with, or convicted of, any crime in such period of time: *Provided further*, That no person shall be barred or prevented from entering or serving in the land or naval forces of the United States because of having been committed or convicted of a felony, if such person has been pardoned by the President, or by the Governor of a State for such felony."

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has nothing whatever to do with the matter of age limitations. That is all water under the bridge now. We have decided that issue. This amendment I have offered is of vital importance, in my judgment, to every Member of the House because the problems it will solve, and the inequities it will rectify, are common to every congressional district. Speaking subjectively, at least a half dozen relevant cases have come to me from my district, and I feel sure that all of my colleagues here have also been asked questions like, "How are we going to get back into the Army or Navy? We fervently want to serve our country, but many, many years ago when we were just lads in our teens we committed some indiscretion. It is called misconduct, but it sprung from boyish exuberance. We happened to be caught. Others were not caught. As a consequence we were dishonorably discharged from the Army or the Navy."

I am really very much surprised and keenly disappointed that this amendment has not been readily agreed to by the Committee on Military Affairs. I judge from the fact that the distinguished chairman of that committee has reserved a point of order to my amendment that he is perhaps going to raise the question as to its germaneness. Let me point out that no amendment could be more germane, nor could any amendment be more appropriate for marshaling our manpower against the foes of our country.

Mr. NICHOLS. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs did not make a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. No. He reserved a point of order against it.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; not on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to hear that the chairman did not reserve a point of order.

The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that we have these lads, many of whom have developed into stalwart and capable men, who want to get back into the Army and the Navy and in many instances the Army and the Navy want them back because they are excellent timber. In most instances they have atoned for any misconduct of which they may have been guilty, but under military law there is no distinction between a felony and a misdemeanor. All dishonorable discharges look the same and all dishonorable discharges are indelible stains on the records of the recipients and, as such, they are insurmountable hurdles to reentry into the armed forces of the United States. I call your attention to a case which is the subject of current newspaper comment and which strikingly illustrates the situation. You will recall that last January four of our young sailors climbed up the side of a building in San Francisco and cut down the swastika flag of the German consulate. Young Harold Sturtevant, who was the bellwether of that group of impetuous, but courageous lads attempted to reenlist in the Navy last week after the treacherous attack on our shores by Japan. In order for him to reenlist it was necessary to obtain a special ruling from the Navy Department at Washington, which required about 1 week's time. At first, it seemed doubtful that he would be able to reenlist because he was discharged from the Navy as a result of the swastika escapade.

Now, in this bill we have the positive wording that every male citizen, and I labor the word "every"—that means every man between the ages of 21 and 45—shall be liable for training and service. It occurs to me that it is patently inconsistent to make such a provision in this draft act when we are confronted by a condition, not a theory, which prevents the Army and the Navy from accepting certain of these very men who can so well serve, and are so eager to serve, their country. Certainly there is no disposition on my part to open the doors of the Army and the Navy to jail birds and hardened criminals. I am simply trying to give absolution to those former soldiers and sailors who, as the result of the committing of misdemeanors only while serving their enlistments are now barred from reenlisting. Why, the offenses of some of them were of such minor nature as would have subjected them only to trial in a magistrate's court, or a police court, had they been civilians. A great many of these men have amply proved their worth in civilian pursuits. Many of them have become highly skilled in mechanical trades and as technicians. They can, and they will, if given the opportunity, be of invaluable service to our armed forces in the grim, total warfare in which we are now engaged. In justice to these men, and in justice to the Nation, we should make it possible for them to again take up arms in defense of their country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How many persons would this amendment affect?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am unable to give that information to the gentlemen, but merely as an estimate I would say they run into the thousands, just judging from the inquiries I have had from my own district.

Mr. Chairman, that portion of my amendment which seeks to take down the bars with respect to those men who, under civil law, have been convicted of a felony but who have been pardoned by the President, or by the Governor of a State, closely parallels the provisions of S. 1989 recently introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I cannot conceive of any valid objection being offered to that portion of my amendment, or to the amendment as a whole, in these crucial days when no man should be prevented by mere technicalities from standing in the front rank of the Nation's defenders and, if need be, offering his life on the altar of his country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from saying that it is my impression—I should like to be corrected if I am incorrect—that the President of the United States has vetoed every private bill that has been passed pertaining to the correction of the military record of a soldier. I am in perfect accord on this with the President of the United States; you may be surprised that I am for once. I think it would be a bad thing for the discipline of the Army to agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 4 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That in the classification of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations."

SEC. 4. Section 5 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "foreign countries" a comma and the following: "and persons in other categories to be specified by the President."

SEC. 5. The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "(1)" and after "(2)" the words "of any or all".

SEC. 6. Paragraph (2) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the men so deferred."

SEC. 7. Section 15 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The term 'between the ages of 21 and 45' shall refer to men who have attained the twenty-first anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.

SEC. 8. Persons inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 who are inducted into or assigned to the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, shall be members of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be; and in time of war their periods of service or training and service may be extended by the President for such additional time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided*, That the periods of service or training and service under section 3 (b) of such act of men who are detained under this section shall be terminated not later than 6 months after the termination of the war which authorized their detention, unless such men voluntarily extend their periods of service or training and service.

SEC. 9. The first proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the word "forty-five" in lieu of the word "thirty-six."

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding the limitation in section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 upon the time within which applications for national service life insurance may be made, all personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be granted insurance under such section without further medical examination if application therefor is filed prior to the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That after the expiration of this 120-day period such personnel may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute for the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 390, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules on the bill H. R. 6250.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6250.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON] may be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1941, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, a column written by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, said in part:

Interesting inside fact apropos of the Chicago Tribune's exposé of the "secret war plan of 10,000,000 men" was that Congressman PHILIP A. BENNETT, of Missouri, paid $400 for similar information, which he used in a speech exposing the Army's giant plan. Congressman BENNETT's source, presumably inside the War Department, is reported also to have spilled similar information to the Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I want it recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the article I have just referred to is a bare-faced falsehood. I have never paid or bribed anyone to steal from or betray his country. The Members of this House know me better than that. This attempted smear by the two character assassins, Pearson and Allen, would reach the level of crime, did it emanate from the source of truth. I hesitate to take time of the House in this critical period, but on the other hand, silence upon my part might be interpreted by political demagogs as giving them license to repeat libelous words.

On November 19, 1941, I presented to this House the results of a study conducted by me and the secretaries in my office working under my personal supervision, disclosing either waste and extravagance in purchase of certain items of personal military equipment or administration plans for an army many

times greater than necessary just to defend the Western Hemisphere. This latter alternative was not and could not be denied. It has, in fact, been confirmed by subsequent events. At that time our Nation was not at war. The information I revealed had no military value. However, it cast much light on the course we are now following but concerning which, until November 19, 1941, we were much in the dark.

As soon as the libel by Pearson and Allen was called to my attention, I at once wrote the Secretary of War a letter, which reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1941.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STIMSON: I was greatly surprised and disappointed yesterday when a newspaper clipping entitled, "Secret Army News," was called to my attention. The article in question was written by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen. I am informed that the article appeared in several daily newspapers on December 9, 1941. The article, which is a pure fabrication, casts reflections upon my integrity and that of the officers and employees of the War Department.

I am calling your attention to the article because of the phrase, "Congressman BENNETT'S source, presumably inside the War Department," might lead someone to believe that among your employees there is a disloyal one. Further, this phrase would indicate that I made a deal with a disloyal employee. If I knew of any disloyal Government worker, I would lose no time in turning in such information to the proper officials. I think that every person in the War Department, as well as myself, has just grounds for resenting this untruthful statement by Pearson and Allen.

Pearson and Allen had reference, I suppose, to an address I made in the House of Representatives November 19, 1941. The essential facts and conclusions presented in that speech have not been denied but rather confirmed by subsequent events. The facts in question were not bought from anyone. They were compiled by me and by the clerks in my office under my personal supervision. Information presented was obtained only from official sources available to all Members of Congress, viz: Official War Department press releases, the weekly bulletin, Defense, released by the Office of Emergency Management; Contract Award Listings, as compiled by the Office of Government Reports, and those compiled by the Office of Production Management. All of these reports are still in my possession.

If, as a result of the remarks I made, more care and economy is practiced in the future with respect to purchases of certain items for the Army, I will have served the taxpayers well. It was through the desire to render such service that I was prompted to deliver the speech in question.

Insofar as Pearson and Allen are concerned, Mr. Secretary, I am giving them opportunity to retract their libelous statement. If they fail to do so, I shall then determine what steps to take.

It is to be regretted that irresponsible sources often attempt to smear those trying to perform worth-while public service. As the owner and editor of a newspaper for many years, I realize that editors are sometimes imposed upon. If Pearson and Allen have any honor, they will make a retraction of their libelous article. 's for myself, I have confidence to believe that no person who is familiar with my record will be influenced in any way by this fabrication. So far as others are concerned, the article is libelous and damaging to me.

If I have failed in any way to do all in my power for the defense of our own country and to keep out of foreign wars, I do not know wherein I have been amiss. Now that we are at war, I am pleading for unity and will do everything in my power to make victory complete, speedy, and with minimum expenditure of life and treasure.

Respectfully yours,
PHIL A. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on the same date that I wrote to the Secretary of War I wrote to Pearson and Allen, advising them of the facts, and giving them opportunity to correct their error. That letter reads as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1941.

DREW PEARSON AND ROBERT S. ALLEN,
Care of the Washington Times-Herald,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am sending you a copy of letter just mailed to Secretary Stimson of the War Department. I am giving you opportunity to retract your libelous statements. What will you do about it?

Respectfully yours,
PHIL A. BENNETT.

Mr. Speaker, Pearson and Allen have not answered that letter, although given many days in which to do so. They do not have the manhood or honor to admit their mistake. I have ascertained that they are execution proof and that a libel suit against them would be a waste of time and money, a judgment as worthless as their word. These two calumnists, have prevaricated about many other Members of Congress. They are well known in informed circles because of their utter lack of regard for the truth and for being two of the most dishonest, unreliable, and vicious character assassins in America. They are a disgrace to the great newspaper profession. They apparently seldom take the trouble to ascertain their facts or to commend a public official for doing a good job. They make their living in the half light of minds diseased by the filth they alone can imagine. The people of my congressional district will not be influenced by their perverted activities.

Only yesterday these smear artists, in their column, misrepresented facts about my honored colleagues the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. A statement of the true facts in answer to these latest untruths was put in the RECORD today by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The people of the United States know how they attacked that outstanding statesman, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland. Their attempts to defeat him with distortions of the truth were not effective. Members of this House know how once Pearson and Allen fled to Europe to escape the wrath of a respectable citizen outraged by their fabrications. My honored Democratic colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] was also prevaricated about by these same writers. I am advised he has obtained many judgments against newspapers, which, not knowing of the true character of these men, carry their articles, thinking they are giving their readers accurate and inside information about activities in the Nation's Capital. Former President Hoover was persecuted by their disregard for the truth. Mr. Allen was discharged from the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Pearson was discharged from the Baltimore Sun. Yes; there is a great deal I might reveal about these characters. But the record is made. I know that by this statement, Mr. Speaker, these low characters will hound me without end in their column. But I am willing to stand on my record. I have nothing to conceal. Let those who print, or repeat in any fashion, the untruths of Pearson and Allen about the the gentleman from Missouri, PHIL BENNETT, beware of the legal consequences.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Hon. David W. Harris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, and in one to include a portion of the correspondence I have had in regard to the bill passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Wayne Coy. The address exceeded the limit. I have an estimate from the Public Printer and I ask permission to have the address inserted in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CODE FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5822) to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky just what this bill does with respect to the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] to explain the measure, because he knows more about it than I do.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as indicated by its title, is a bill to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska. There is no similar legislation on the subject at the present time passed either by the Congress or the Territorial

legislature. It is impossible to now secure the legislation from the Territorial legislature, because that body will not meet in regular session until January of 1943. The bill was written in the War Department and it is favored by the Secretary of War and is urgently asked for by the Governor of Alaska, as well as by myself.

The bill sets up a short, simple, military code for the Territory of Alaska, covering the militia and the National Guard. Incidentally, I pause here to say that all of the Alaska National Guard has now been brought into active service. The most important feature of the measure is contained in the last section which will authorize the establishment of a Territorial Guard. Alaska, as you know, is one of our frontiers and may be attacked any day, and the establishment of a Territorial Guard immediately is vital to our safety, because such a guard can aid in the protection of public utilities and public and private property, and in other ways defend the Territory and thus help to defend the United States.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. I yield.

Mr. MAY. In other words, the Territory of Alaska is in exactly the same position now that the States were in after we called out the National Guard, and the States were permitted to set up a home guard.

Mr. DIMOND. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Have you a National Guard in Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. We have a National Guard in Alaska, but it has already been brought into active Federal service and it is not available for local use and therefore we want this bill passed. The most important feature of the bill is to establish a Territorial Guard, and while some units of such a Guard have already been organized, at the present time they have not the protection of any such legislation. The immediate passage of this bill is of high importance to the safety and more adequate protection of the citizens of Alaska. The bill is more completely explained in the House report thereon which I ask to have here inserted in the RECORD.

REPORT [TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 5822]

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5822) to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass without amendment.

The purpose of the bill, as expressed in the title, is to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska. Nothing of the nature has heretofore been enacted either by Congress or by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, except for the provision contained in the act of June 6, 1900 (title 48, sec. 61, U. S. Code), with respect to the power and authority of the Governor of Alaska, reading as follows:

"He [the Governor] shall be ex officio commander in chief of the militia of the Territory, and shall have power to call out the same when necessary to the due execution of the laws and to preserve the peace, and to cause all able-bodied citizens of the United States in the Territory to enroll and serve as such when the public exigency demands; * * *."

The first six sections of the bill make provision with respect to the militia of the Territory of Alaska and the Alaska National Guard.

Section 1, which defines the militia of the Territory, is in complete harmony with similar provisions of Federal law (title 32, sec. 1, U. S. Code) defining the militia of the United States.

Section 2 exempts from militia service all persons exempted by the laws of the United States (see title 32, sec. 3, U. S. Code) and in addition thereto "judges of the several courts of the Territory and members and officers of the Alaska Territorial Legislature."

Section 3 defines the Alaska National Guard, a definition in complete harmony with Federal law (title 32, sec. 4, U. S. Code).

Section 4 makes the Governor of the Territory of Alaska as ex officio commander of the militia of the Territory, like commander of the Alaska National Guard when not in active Federal service, and provides that the Alaska National Guard and its members shall be subject to all Federal laws and regulations relating to the National Guard of the several States and Territories and of the United States.

Section 5 authorizes the President to appoint an adjutant general of the Territory who must be a citizen of the Territory.

Section 6 ratifies and confirms the organization of the existing Alaska National Guard in the Territory which has heretofore been inducted into active Federal service.

Section 7 is of special importance at this time because it authorizes the organization of a Territorial Guard in Alaska under such regulations as to discipline as the Secretary of War may prescribe; and further authorizes the Secretary of War to issue for the use of such Territorial Guard upon requisition of the Governor of the Territory such arms and equipment as can be spared by the War Department.

There is no existing legislation authorizing the organization of a Territorial Guard. It is of vital importance that such authority should be given at the earliest practicable moment. In fact, units of such a Territorial Guard have already been organized in the several cities of Alaska to be prepared in case of emergency to aid in the protection of the public utilities, in policing the cities, to act as auxiliary fire wardens and firemen, and, generally, to take whatever emergency action may be necessary in case of attack or sabotage to protect the local inhabitants and property.

The Territorial Guard should be furnished whatever arms and equipment can readily be spared by the War Department in order to more effectively perform its duties.

While it is possible that most, if not all, the provisions of the bill could be validly enacted by the Alaska Territorial Legislature, that legislature will not meet again in regular session until January 1943. To call the legislature into extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting such legislation would involve delay and very considerable expense to the Federal Government, because all legislative expenses are paid out of the United States Treasury. Hence it is advisable that Congress should take prompt action on the subject.

No objection to the bill from any source has been brought to the attention of the committee. Its enactment is urgently requested by the Delegate from Alaska and by the Governor of Alaska and favored by the Secretary of War, with clearance from the Bureau of the Budget.

The original legislation on the subject was H. R. 5050 of the same title, which, upon introduction, was referred to the Secretary of War for an expression of his views in relation thereto. The Secretary replied by letter dated October 11, 1941, addressed to the chairman of the committee, reporting adversely upon H. R. 5050, but recommending the enactment of legislation on the subject and submitting a draft of such recommended legislation. The bill, H. R. 5822, now under consideration is an exact copy of the draft so submitted by the Secretary of War when reporting upon H. R. 5050.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the militia of the Territory of Alaska shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens of the United States and all other able-bodied males who shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, residing within the Territory, who shall be more than 18 years of age and, except as hereinafter provided, not more than 45 years of age, and said militia shall be divided into two classes: The Organized Militia, to be known as the Alaska National Guard, and the Unorganized Militia.

SEC. 2. The following persons shall be exempt from militia service: Persons exempted by the laws of the United States, judges of the several courts of the Territory, and members and officers of the Alaska Territorial Legislature.

SEC. 3. The Alaska National Guard shall consist of members of the militia voluntarily enlisted therein, who, upon original enlistment, shall be not less than 18 nor more than 45 years of age, or who, in subsequent enlistment, shall be not more than 64 years of age, organized, armed, equipped, and federally recognized according to the laws of the United States, and of commissioned officers and warrant officers who are citizens of the United States between the ages of 21 and 64 years and who shall be appointed and commissioned or warranted by the Governor of the Territory: *Provided*, That former members of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps under 64 years of age may enlist in said Alaska National Guard.

SEC. 4. The Governor of the Territory of Alaska, as ex officio commander of the militia of the Territory, shall have like command of the Alaska National Guard while not in active Federal service, and is empowered to promulgate all necessary regulations therefor not inconsistent with this act. Except as otherwise prescribed by this act, the Alaska National Guard and its members shall be subject to all Federal laws and regulations relating to the National Guard of the several States and Territories, and of the United States.

SEC. 5. The Adjutant General of the Territory of Alaska shall be appointed by the President with such rank and qualifications as he may prescribe. He shall be a citizen of the Territory and shall make such returns and reports to the Secretary of War and to the Governor of the Territory of Alaska or to such officers as each of them may designate, at such times and in such form as may be prescribed.

SEC. 6. The terms and provisions of this act pertaining to the Alaska National Guard are hereby made applicable to the existing units and individuals of the military forces in the Territory of Alaska, heretofore organized and known as the Alaska National Guard, and such organization is hereby ratified and confirmed.

SEC. 7. During such time as the Alaska National Guard, or any part thereof, is in active Federal service, the Governor of Alaska, through voluntary enlistments, may organize a Territorial Guard under such regulations as to discipline in training as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to issue for the use of such Territorial Guard, upon requisition of the Governor of the Territory, such arms and equipment as may be in possession of and can be spared by the War Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXPEDITE THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6233, to expedite the prosecution of the war effort, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to H. R. 6233 and especially with regard to paragraph (1) of section 301 of title III, Trading With the Enemy, in view of the discussion on the floor of the House during the consideration of H. R. 6233 on yesterday, I would like to make it clear that there was no intention on my part and so far as I know there was no intention on the part of any member of the Committee on the Judiciary to propose or support any legislation reducing the powers of the President under existing law, nor to reduce in any degree existing law relative to domestic transactions.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I—COORDINATION OF EXECUTIVE BUREAUS IN THE INTEREST OF THE MORE EFFICIENT CONCENTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

"SECTION 1. That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be published in accordance with the Federal Register Act of 1935: *Provided*, That the termination of this title shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this title and during the time that this title is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war: *Provided further*, That no redistribution of functions shall provide for the transfer, consolidation, or abolition of the whole or any part of the General Accounting Office or of all or any part of its functions.

"SEC. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this title the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, governmental corporations, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

"SEC 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said functions, except to the extent hereafter authorized by the Congress in appropriation acts or otherwise.

"SEC. 4. That should the President, in redistributing the functions among the executive agencies as provided in this title, conclude that any bureau should be abolished and it or their duties and functions conferred upon some other department or bureau or eliminated entirely, he shall report his conclusions to Congress with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

"SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this title are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this title is in force.

"Upon the termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this title to the contrary notwithstanding.

"TITLE II—CONTRACTS

"SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize the use of the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to authorize any contracts in violation of existing law relating to limitation of profits: *Provided further*, That all acts under the authority of this section shall be made a matter of public record under regulations prescribed by the President and when deemed by him not to be incompatible with the public interest.

"TITLE III—TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

"SEC. 301. The first sentence of subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise—

"'(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and

"'(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest, by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof shall vest, when, as, and upon the terms, directed by the President, in such agency or person as may be designated from time to time by the President, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, and such designated agency or person may perform any and all acts incident to the accomplishment or furtherance of these purposes; and the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision either before, during, or after the completion thereof, or relative to any interest in foreign property, or relative to any property in which any foreign country or any national thereof has or has had any interest, or as may be otherwise necessary to enforce the provisions of this subdivision, and in any case in which a report could be required, the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require the production, or if necessary to the national security or defense, the seizure, of any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memoranda, or other papers, in the custody or control of such person; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, take other and further measures not inconsistent herewith for the enforcement of this subdivision.

"'(2) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder.

"'(3) As used in this subdivision the term "United States" means the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, arising under this subdivision in the Philippine Islands and concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts of the United States of all cases, civil or criminal, arising upon the high seas: *Provided, however*, That the foregoing shall not be construed as a limitation upon the power of the President, which is hereby conferred, to prescribe from time to time, definitions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this subdivision, for any or all of the terms used in this subdivision.'

"SEC. 302. All acts, actions, regulations, rules, orders, and proclamations heretofore taken, promulgated, made, or issued by, or pursuant to the direction of, the President or the Secretary of the Treasury under the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, which would have been authorized if the provisions of this act and the amendments made by it had been in effect, are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

"SEC. 303. Whenever, during the presnt war, the President shall deem that the public safety demands it, he may cause to be censored under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time establish, communications by mail, cable, radio, or other means of transmission passing between the United States and any foreign country he may from time to time specify, or which may be carried by any vessel or other means of trans-

portation touching at any port, place, or Territory of the United States and bound to or from any foreign country. Any person who willfully evades or attempts to evade the submission of any such communication to such censorship or willfully uses or attempts to use any code or other device for the purpose of concealing from such censorship the intended meaning of such communication shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

"TITLE IV—TIME LIMIT AND SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 401. Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

"SEC. 402. This act may be cited as the 'First War Powers Act, 1941'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have looked over the amendment, and the committee is unanimously in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

The bill S. 2129 was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of obtaining information from the majority leader in respect to the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider H. R. 6250, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940. That bill comes out of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and, I understand, is recommended by the State Department and the Department of Justice.

Mr. SABATH. And it was reported out by unanimous vote of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all for tomorrow that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all, except whatever can be taken up by unanimous consent, and I know of nothing now. Friday, we will have the supplemental appropriation bill, and then, if a rule comes out of the Committee on Rules, which I expect, making in order a bill that was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, similar to a bill which I introduced some years ago, known as the McCormack bill, compelling agents of foreign countries and agencies engaged in propaganda to register, it will be considered. That bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on the Judiciary. I doubt if there will be any opposition to it, although it should be debated and will be. That will be brought up on Friday, if the rule comes in.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And then we have the deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are there any plans for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing I know of for Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not want to press the gentleman now if he is not ready to tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as I know, that concludes any legislation upon which action would be required for the following week. I know of nothing that is coming up the following week.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman will be able, will he not, before we adjourn on Friday, to make some quite definite statement about next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is hopeful to make it tomorrow, because the gentleman is hoping to be away himself on Friday.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course, we are going to complete the legislation that was passed today and, as far as I understand it, the report from the Senate committee is in disagreement with the legislation passed here. If the Senate passes the bill as reported by the Senate committee, it naturally will have to go to conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. COCHRAN. That bill is important and Members should not leave here until we have finished with it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is hoped that that bill will be disposed of even in conference before Friday. We hope it will.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Columbus Ledger.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made today on the bill H. R. 5822 and to include therein the report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement with regard to some features of the bill H. R. 6233, just disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

DECEMBER 14, 1941.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the following committees of the House: Mines and Mining, Claims, and Enrolled Bills.

Respectfully yours,

IVOR D. FENTON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 392) and ask for its immediate adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WILSON D. GILLETTE, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the following committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Claims, Committee on Indian Affairs, and Committee on Enrolled Bills.

The resolution was agreed to.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1544. An act to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the Government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River;

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 4853. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 4905. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926;

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in extra-hazardous service or while the United States is engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite coal producing regions of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 18, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1171. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a reexamination of Oakland Harbor and San Leandro Bay, Calif., to determine if the existing project should be modified in any way, and particularly with a view to providing improvements in San Leandro Bay, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 6, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 466); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1942, as well as for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 461); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1173. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 22, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a reexamination of Calcasieu River, La., with a view to providing deep water to the industrial plants and terminals at and near the Port of Lake Charles, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 28, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1174. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report from the joint board to investigate the need for constructing a bridge between Hunters Point and Bay Farm Island, Calif., as requested in House Resolution 158; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1175. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of $150,000,000 for community facilities (H. Doc. No. 462); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1176. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an emergency supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, to remain available until expended, for the War Department, making available, for public relief and civilian defense in the Philippine Islands, the moneys authorized to be appropriated in accordance with section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937 (H. Doc. No. 463); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1177. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $15,000,000, for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 464); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1178. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for performance of the duties of chiefs of bureau and the Judge Advocate General in the Navy Department, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to adjust certain obligations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on the Territories. S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 1514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1515. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Navy Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1516. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Navy Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1517. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Treasury Department. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1518. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1519. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1520. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1521. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of War. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1522. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1523. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1524. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1525. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1526. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1527. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Agriculture. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1528. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of Commerce. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1529. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the United States Board of Tax Appeals. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1530. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the United States Civil Service Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1531. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the United States Civil Service Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1532. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1533. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Federal Security Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1534. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1535. Report on the disposition of executive papers by Work Projects Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1536. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Public Roads Administration, Federal Works Agency. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1537. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of the Treasury. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1538. Report on the disposition

of executive papers by the Office of Production Management, executive office of the President. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1539. Report on the disposition of executive papers by the Department of the Navy. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 6220. A bill to amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R 6251. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Neutralization. H. R. 6250. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 393. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6250, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 6256. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6257. A bill to amend section 826 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 6258. A bill to require certain persons within the United States and its territories and insular possessions to carry identification cards and to be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 6259. A bill making an appropriation to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to begin construction of the Douglas Dam on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 6260. A bill suspending collections of certain seed and feed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6261. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 6262. A bill to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 6263. A bill to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war, or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6269. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code to simplify the procedure in connection with amortization of certain facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H R 6264. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Hugh Boyd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr BARRY:

H R 6265 A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CREAL:

H R 6266. A bill for the relief of Mack Skaggs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H R 6267 A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah C Kimble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H R 6268. A bill for the relief of Arthur Seaver, Jr., D. F. Broderick, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2184. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Resolution of the common council of the city of Niles, Mich., pledging the whole-hearted cooperation and support of the citizens of Niles to their Government and its duly elected and appointed representatives to the end that our form of government shall not perish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2185. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Brooklyn Concourse Association of Homing Pigeon Flyers, favoring the Pfeifer bill, safeguarding of the valuable homing pigeons, signed by 120 members of the association; to the Committee on Agriculture

2186. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Los Angeles County District Council of Carpenters in meeting, most vigorously opposing any further taxes on pay rolls or otherwise, feeling that they would lower the standard of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2187. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the first district conference, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, assembled in the city of Kenosha, Wis., pledging their support whether it be physical, moral, or financial, to the Congress and to the President as Commander in Chief of the armed forces of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 16, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom we spring and to whom we tend, help us this day that we may endeavor to be that which Thou wouldst have us to be, and to do that which Thou commandest, for Thou, O God, art the way, the motive, the guide, the beginning and end of all conduct. And so we ask Thee to bring us into Thine eternal and abiding order where right is right because it is Thy nature, the secret and method of the universe, where righteousness becomes imperative as it lays hold of our inmost nature and binds us to duty by every law of our being.

And, as we dedicate ourselves and our country which Thou hast given us to this solemn task which now is ours, may we leave no unrepented fault, no uncleansed spot, sparing least of all that sin which doth so easily beset us, that, as we offer Thee a pure life, a more unselfish patriotism, and a deeper loyalty to the Kingship of Thy Son, we may never cast a backward glance, nor lean on mortal man but only on the Rock of Ages who standeth fast forever and will make all things work together for good, for the everlasting good of all the children of men, who trust in Thee as their Lord, their Father, and their God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the calendar day Wednesday, December 17, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 17, 1941, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Julia Neville.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6233) to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1544. A bill to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Bunker	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tobey
Carawny	McCarran	Truman
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Murray	Wheeler
Doxey	Norris	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DECLARATION BY EL SALVADOR OF WAR ON GERMANY AND ITALY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram dated at San Salvador the 13th instant, from Hon. Francisco A. Reys, President of the Congress of El Salvador, stating that [translation] "Our congressional body is faithful to its promises. Yesterday we declared war on Germany and Italy," which was ordered to lie on the table.

PAYMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 1 of the House engrossed amendments strike out "1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco" and insert "1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 crops of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts"; and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
W. J. BULOW,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will make a brief statement as to the final effect of the action of the conferees on the part of the two Houses.

The Senate enacted a bill to extend the Soil Conservation Act, making it a permanent statute. The House amended the bill by limiting the operation of the Soil Conservation Act to 5 years and further amended the bill by providing for an extension for a period of 3 years of the 85-percent commodity loan, which was in effect for only 1 year under existing law. In the conference it was agreed that both those statutes should be extended for the same period of time. The report, therefore, provides that the Soil Conservation Act and the Commodity Loan Act, providing for loans of 85 percent of parity on the basic commodities, shall be extended for a period of 5 years. The conferees further added peanuts which are to be sold for edible purposes to the commodities to which the 85-percent loan applies. This was done because of the fact that edible peanuts are covered by statute and are under a quota, as are the basic commodities. Nonquota or oil peanuts are not covered and do not receive the benefits of the loan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

Two letters from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT ON PALISADES DAM PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Reclamation report on the Palisades Dam project on the South Fork of the Snake River near Idaho Falls, Idaho (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

BIBIANO L. MEER

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of legislation for the relief of Bibiano L. Meer (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940, approved May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

REPORT ON CODORUS CREEK WATERSHED, PENNSYLVANIA AND MARYLAND

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a survey on the watershed of Codorus Creek (Pennsylvania and Maryland), a tributary of the Susquehanna River (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

A letter from the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel for the period July 1, 1941, to October 31, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram from Foster Parmelee, of Wilmington, Del., stating "that many of us of the last war prefer minimum of 21 years for unlimited war service and raising the upper limit to include us. Compulsory training at 19 and 20 recommended"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from S. W. Rogers, of Westwego, La., praying for the enactment of legislation to mobilize the manpower of the Nation from 19 to 64 years of age; to the table.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey; to the Committee on Commerce.

Joint Resolution 3, Laws of 1941

Joint resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Federal Loan Administrator to designate the Delaware River tunnel heretofore authorized as a project for immediate construction through the medium of a Federal loan under the national-defense program

Whereas the Legislatures of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have heretofore authorized the construction of a tunnel under the Delaware River between opposite points in the county of Gloucester, in the State of New Jersey, and the county of Delaware, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and created proper authorities or commissions in each of said States to construct, operate, and maintain the same; and

Whereas formal application has been made by the Gloucester County Tunnel Commission and the Delaware County Authority, acting as a joint authority or commission, to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to

finance the cost thereof through the purchase of tunnel revenue bonds of the county of Gloucester, in the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas plans for constructing, financing, operating, and maintaining said tunnel have had the approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator under the Government of the United States, and said project has been included among a number of other important projects in the Nation which are contemplated by the President as a part of a post emergency-works program; and

Whereas the great need for additional facilities to connect the main arteries of travel running through the great industrial areas of the Middle and North Atlantic States, in which a major portion of the Nation's defense material is being produced, makes it essential that the construction of the proposed Delaware River tunnel proceed immediately as a part of the national-defense program to supplement the present inadequate transportation facilities between strategic points on opposite banks of the Delaware River, thereby affording additional safeguards both to the Nation's civilian population as well as to its armed forces; and

Whereas the defense importance of said tunnel in this hour of national and world crisis is best evidenced by the fact that each succeeding Chief of Staff of the United States Army since 1935 has referred to said tunnel as a "military necessity": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring)—

1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey does memorialize the President of the United States and the Federal Loan Administrator forthwith to recognize the vital importance of including the Delaware River tunnel aforesaid as a project for immediate construction as a part of the national-defense program and to make available the funds to meet and pay the cost thereof.

2. That certified copies of this resolution, when adopted and approved by the Governor, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Federal Loan Administrator, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Members of the Senate of the United States representing the State of New Jersey, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States representing the State of New Jersey, in order that all persons in the Government of the United States may be duly impressed with both the commercial and military advantages which are to be gained from the immediate construction of this vital and strategic defense facility.

Approved, December 10, 1941.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution adopted by the Associated Industries of Nebraska pledging its services to do everything to speed and promote victory in the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore County, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A petition of sundry citizens of Wayland and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, praying that the 49-cent penalty on the 1941 wheat crop be removed from the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A memorial of sundry citizens of Grand Rapids, Mich., remonstrating against the licensing and penalty provisions of House bill 5990, the price-control bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Michigan Secondary School Association, convened at Lansing, Mich., protesting against reduction of the funds available for the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions of the Councils of the Villages of Inkster and Ecorse, and the City Council of Wyandotte, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the development of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Commerce.

Memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase social-security taxes from 1 percent to 5 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions by members of Local Union No. 6814, United Mine Workers of America, of Bay City; the mayor and Common Council of the City of Niles; and the Jackson County Board of Supervisors, all in the State of Michigan, pledging full support to the Government in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, at Washington, D. C., protesting against certain provisions of House bill 6128, amending the so-called Lanham Defense Housing Act relating to the distribution of funds allocated for defense housing, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

TELEGRAM FROM WELLINGTON (KANS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram which I have received from Mr. D. D. DeWeese, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Wellington, Kans., in which he assures me of that city's solid support behind our Government in this emergency.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELLINGTON, KANS., *December 8, 1941.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We want you to know that this city and this community are solidly behind our Government in this emergency. Any action has our support. Call on us if needed.

WELLINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By D. D. DEWEESE, *President,*
Wellington, Kans.

WAR WITH JAPAN—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. RADCLIFFE presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution pledging the support and loyalty of the members of the City Council of Baltimore to the Government of the United States in its action against Japan and urging the people of Baltimore to give the utmost support to the Government in every way possible

Whereas the people in Baltimore and throughout the country were startled and shocked by the premeditated attack by Japan against the United States early yesterday morning; and

Whereas negotiations for the settlement of problems confronting the two countries were still in process; and

Whereas this unjustified and dastardly attack against the United States calls for condemnation by every citizen of the United States and for the loyal support of all its citizens; and

Whereas our country now needs the unified action of everyone and calls for the utmost support in every demand made by our Government in whatever way may best serve the cause of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That the action of the President and the Congress of the United States, in declaring war against Japan, be, and it is hereby, approved and endorsed in every particular, and the members of the city council hereby pledge their loyal support, not only as the legislative body of the city but as individuals, to do everything possible to aid the Government in its efforts to defeat Japan and its allies and for the aid to all countries fighting for democracy; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby call upon the people of Baltimore to unite solidly in rendering every aid possible to the Government of the United States in the struggle which lies ahead for the protection of our own freedom, and that this aid be given without delay, without stint, and with every means at their disposal; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the city council be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our military and naval forces, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress, to the Governor of Maryland, and to the mayor of Baltimore City.

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW LONDON (N. H.) FORUM—SUPPORT OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by members of the New London (N. H.) Forum.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of New London, N. H., in public meeting assembled on the evening of December 15, 1941—the one hundred and fiftieth birthday of the American Bill of Rights—do unanimously resolve

(1) That they wholeheartedly pledge their support to the Government and national leadership of the United States in the present war;

(2) That they stand ready to cooperate in every way in the national war effort;

(3) That they send a copy of these resolutions to the senior United States Senator from New Hampshire to be presented to the Senate as indicative of their feelings.

J. DUANE SQUIRES,
Chairman of the meeting.

RESOLUTION OF RENO (NEV.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT IN WAR EFFORT

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Reno (Nev.) Chamber of Commerce. It so typically represents the unity and patriotism existing in Nevada that I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be incorporated in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of directors of the Reno Chamber of Commerce recognizes the extremely serious situation confronting the people of the United States through the sudden attack upon our Nation by Japan. Undoubtedly we must look forward to a long, hard war.

We do, therefore, pledge that the activities of this organization will be directed to meet the conditions which war imposes upon us and that the war effort will take priority over all other chamber of commerce work, whether the demands upon us come from the National, State, or local governments.

We note with pleasure the spirit of unity that has evidenced itself between business, labor, and every group of citizens in the first critical days of conflict, and it will be our purpose to foster this spirit in the future.

We do further pledge that, when necessary, we will curtail all dispensable organization activities in order to be better able to serve our country and carry out our responsibilities in this time of need. The facilities of the chamber of commerce are accordingly offered to serve as a coordinating and clearing agency for various defense activities in order to facilitate the work of patriotic citizens during the period of the war.

Our directors feel that the present need in the community is the creation of a central agency which will be in a position to cooperate with all existing defense organizations and furnish authentic information to the hundreds of patriotic citizens desiring to volunteer their services in specific defense activities. If the chamber of commerce can assist in supplying that need, it will gladly do so

RESOLUTION OF FIRST DISTRICT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION OF MISSISSIPPI—SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT IN WAR EFFORT

Mr. BILBO presented a resolution adopted by the first district of the American Legion of Mississippi, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

The first district of the American Legion of Mississippi assembled in solemn convention in the city of Tupelo, Miss., on the 14th day of December 1941, salutes in honor, loyalty, and love the President, the Congress, and the Government of the United States.

Assembled in the presence of our God, and with Old Glory smiling down upon us, we solemnly vow to stand by our President and our Government during the present war, to demonstrate our loyalty in deeds of service and sacrifice, to pray for the success of our arms in all lands, to fight the good fight until victory is ours, and to defend our motherland whenever and wherever we may be called to serve.

Standing in the presence of the challenge of godless and pagan might, we dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our material means to victory and triumph in every theater of conflict.

Done by unanimous standing vote.

R. A. DEEN,
District Commander.
HERBERT V. IJAMS,
Northern Vice Commander.
Rev. G. C. SCHWARTZ,
Chaplain.

RESOLUTIONS OF FIRST DISTRICT CONFERENCE, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR, AND CATHOLIC KNIGHTS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY presented resolutions adopted by the first district conference, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and the board of directors of the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF FIRST DISTRICT CONFERENCE, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE WORLD WAR

Whereas the President of the United States has announced this 7th day of December, 1941, that at 8 o'clock a. m., standard time, the Japanese Government, through its armed force, attacked the Philippine Islands and our naval base at Pearl Harbor, and

Whereas such conduct on the part of Japan constitutes not only an act of aggression but also an act against the peace and dignity of this, our Nation: Be it

Resolved, That we, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War assembled in the city of Kenosha at our first district conference of the Department of Wisconsin, do hereby declare and pledge as veterans of the first World War our humble support, whether it be physical, moral, or financial, to the Congress of the United States of America, our President as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, in the same manner and spirit of loyalty and devotion to this, the only free country in this world, as has been exemplified by us as soldiers in the days of 1917 and 1918; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, our Congressmen, and Senators.

Unanimously adopted by the first district conference of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War at Kenosha, Wis., this 7th day of December, 1941.

F. A. SINGER,
District Commander.

The Catholic Knights of Wisconsin, at its board of directors meeting held December 9 and 10, 1941, passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, December 7, 1941, will ever remain in the minds of the American people a black and fateful day. Without provocation, without justification, in the middle of peace while their envoys were still deliberating in Washington with our President, the Empire of Japan struck us, killing our people, sinking our ships. We deeply deplore such tragedy, but at the same time we wholeheartedly approve the action of our President and Congress in declaring war upon a government which could be guilty of such treachery and perfidy.

"We, many thousands of members of the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin, consisting of men, women, and children from our beloved State, Wisconsin, at this critical time proclaim our loyalty and patriotism. We pledge to our country our lives and our fortunes. We pray that God may grant a speedy victory to our arms and finally a just and lasting peace to our country and to all peace-loving nations of the world."

JOSEPH J. FIEDLER,
State Secretary,
The Catholic Knights of Wisconsin.

LAND FOR AMMUNITION DEPOT IN FRANKLIN COUNTY, PA.—MEMORIAL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, a memorial signed by some 334 farmers in Letterkenny and Green Townships in Franklin County, Pa., protesting against the establishment of an ammunition depot and plant by the Government which will compel the sale of their land and equipment, and require them to vacate the land, thus prohibiting them from reaping benefits from their long-established and fertile farm land.

Mr. President, the proposed action by the Government means that the Government will take over 200 farms, of some 21,000 acres, all improved and producing, valued at $1,500,000. It will mean the wiping out of Letterkenny Township in Franklin County, Pa. It seems to me the War Department should go very slowly in the matter.

This territory was settled by persons who came to the United States prior to the Declaration of Independence, and their descendants have continued to hold title to this property. They are thrifty, honest, faithful, and law-abiding people. The taking of this land will also mean that the property will then be exempt from taxation, because it will be Government property. It will mean a great increase in taxes in that small, prosperous county in the Cumberland Valley, in the southeastern section of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I hope the Military Affairs Committee will take up this matter with the War Department, discuss it with the Department, and ask the Department to proceed very slowly, and see if there is not other property in the neighborhood which is less productive than the property proposed to be taken in Franklin County.

I may add that a memorial containing the signatures of 334 persons owning the particular farms was presented to the War Department today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned landowners, residents and citizens of Letterkenny and Green Townships and vicinity, do hereby protest against the establishment of an ammunition depot, as planned, that will compel us to sell our land and equipment and vacate, thus prohibiting us from earning the benefits of our long-established and fertile farm lands.

AMBROSE B. KARPER,
G. W. RICE,
(And sundry other citizens).

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Military Affairs Committee will be very glad to give consideration to the memorial and will ascertain the attitude of the War Department with respect to it.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS—REPORTS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 25 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 199, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, Senate Resolution 199, submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WHITE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. BYRD) on December 4, 1941.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, in line 2, after the words "directed by", to strike out "S. Res. 277, agreed to July 11, 1940" and insert "S. Res. 246, agreed to April 17, 1930."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee authorized and directed by Senate Resolution 246, agreed to April 17, 1930, to investigate the conservation of wild animal life, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, in furtherance of such purposes, $7,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purposes; and the said committee is hereby directed to file with the Senate as soon as practicable its report and recommendations.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO THE ATTACK ON HAWAII—JOINT RESOLUTION REPORTED

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 121) to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BYRD introduced a bill (S. 2143) for the relief of Mrs. C. M. W. Hull, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5622) to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS TO NATIONAL MINE RESCUE ASSOCIATION OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to the National Mine Rescue Association of Pennsylvania, at Pittsburgh, Pa., December 10, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEES FOR OBTAINING DEFENSE CONTRACTS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of December 18, 1941, relative to fees paid for services in helping to obtain defense contracts, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOST ESSENTIAL FREEDOM—SERMON BY DR. PETER MARSHALL

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered by Dr. Peter Marshall, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, December 14, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. COLIN P. KELLY, JR.

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by the President of the United States by way of tribute to Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF THE LATE SENATOR PITTMAN ON JAPAN—ARTICLE FROM CARSON CITY (NEV.) CHRONICLE

[Mr. BUNKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the views of the late Senator Pittman on Japan published in the Carson City Chronicle, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE CONTROL—OILS AND FATS

Mr. REYNOLDS obtained the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the able Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I now renew my request for unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which was submitted by me yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama for the present consideration of Senate resolution 209?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, having objected yesterday, I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I hope it will not be necessary for me to object—I desire to make a short statement with respect to the situation created by the action of the Price Administrator in fixing the price of cottonseed oil at 11¼ cents.

Undoubtedly the reason why the Price Administrator acted as he did was because of the very sharp increases which took place in the prices of many varieties of oils which are used largely in the manufacture of soap and other commodities. I am informed by the Price Administrator that immediately after the outbreak of hostilities in Hawaii the probability of getting foreign oils was greatly reduced; and, due to that factor and to others, there continued a very sharp increase in the price of oils. The situation became so alarming that the Price Administrator felt that he ought to take some action. He feels that if he had not taken action we might have had a very marked rise in prices generally and a start toward inflation.

We in the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency which has been considering this matter have arrived at the point where we are in agreement with the House of Representatives on a very important limitation which is contained in the House price-control bill, and which would have an effect upon this situation. In the House bill, as it passed that body and came to the Senate, is a provision that the Price Administrator, in cases in which he undertakes jurisdiction, may not fix any price which is below the price of the commodity on October 1, 1941. The subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee which has been considering this matter this morning agreed with the House bill in that particular. That does not necessarily mean that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will agree with us, or that the Senate will agree with us; but I think it will. It was my feeling and the feeling of others with whom I discussed this question that since that limitation had been provided by the House, and since it had been agreed to in the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ought so to state, and indicate what the effect would be upon the Administrator if that provision were the law today.

The price he has fixed for cottonseed oil is 11¼ cents a pound. If the limitation has been adopted by the House and agreed to by the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate were in effect, the price would be approximately 12¾ cents a pound.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Those figures are arrived at on information furnished by Mr. Henderson, I understand.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct. The majority leader and I discussed the question with Mr. Henderson this morning. I can give the Senate no assurance that it is Mr. Henderson's intention to make that readjustment in the price, but I can say that he appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture this morning, and as he left us he had in his mind a reconsideration of the question.

I felt that I should state that it would seem to me to be proper for Mr. Henderson to give consideration to the limitation which would be established if the bill which passed the House and which has been approved by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency were the law. I think he should give consideration to that as the view of the House and the view of our subcommittee which is charged with responsibility in the matter.

Therefore I say to the Senator from Alabama, who is on the subcommittee, and who, with many other Senators, is keenly interested in the subject matter, that it is my belief, as chairman of the subcommittee, that the Price Administrator will give consideration to the price which would be fixed under his authority, as a floor below which he may not go in fixing the value of various agricultural products.

In view of this statement, and of the fact that Mr. Henderson, as I can assure the Senator, is now giving consideration to this subject matter, I hope the Senator will not insist upon consideration of his resolution this morning.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator does not object, there are two points which I should like to have developed. First, as he knows, I am not asking for action on the resolution in my individual capacity. I am representing the other Senators who are sponsoring the resolution with me. Of course, naturally they wish to have all the information the Senator from

Michigan can supply, if I am to agree to withhold action on the resolution.

Personally I know nothing about the Senator's discussions with Mr. Henderson, but I do know about the other things he mentioned, that is, the attitude of the subcommittee this morning in fixing the price as of October 1, 1941. It is my understanding that the price for cottonseed oil as stated by Mr. Henderson to the Senator was approximately correct. I did not have any accurate recollection, but that appeared to me to be satisfactory.

I know the Senator's attitude. He favors the recommendation. But I should like to know his opinion as to Mr. Henderson's attitude on this issue. I know he cannot bind Mr. Henderson, but he has talked with him, and as a number of us are leaving the city to be gone for the holidays, I and others would like to know the Senator's opinion about the position Mr. Henderson is likely to take. I know the Senator cannot bind him.

Mr. BROWN. It is my judgment that when the Price Administrator learns that the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has agreed to what is contained in the bill as it passed the House—that is, that a floor should be fixed below which Mr. Henderson may not go—it will be a very potent factor in his reconsideration of the subject matter. I hope I make it plain that if the House bill and the recommendation of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency were now the law of the land, the lowest price which Mr. Henderson could fix for cottonseed oil would be 12¾ cents a pound. I may say that in his testimony the Administrator substantially approved this provision in the House bill to which the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee agreed this morning; and, inasmuch as the provision of the House bill and the recommendation of our subcommittee are likely to become the law, I think that would be a very potent factor in Mr. Henderson's reconsideration. I know he will consider it, because he so assured me this morning. Whether he would go so far as to reach 12¾ cents, I cannot give the Senator any assurance; but I think that our action would be a very important factor in his determination of that question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When does the Senator think Mr. Henderson is likely to reach a decision? The markets have closed, and the trade has been all paralyzed.

Mr. BROWN. In reply, I may say that I know the matter is now under reconsideration. As to when Mr. Henderson will reach a decision, I cannot give the Senator a certain answer, but I should think it would be in the very near future.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Presdent, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In a very brief statement, I wish to supplement and confirm what the Senator from Michigan has stated. The Senator from Michigan and Mr. Henderson and I conferred at some length this morning in my office before the meeting of the subcommittee which was called to consider the price-control bill. Mr. Henderson took the action which has led to the present debate because of various conditions which had resulted because of the outbreak of the war on the 7th of December. For instance, the Maritime Commission could give no assurance as to the quantity of the oils in question which might be brought in from the outside from across the Pacific. It was stated that such a situation might be created as would make it necessary to take action, and as a precaution Mr. Henderson took the step which we are now discussing.

Eleven and a quarter cents for cottonseed oil represents about $50 or $51 a ton for cottonseed. The Senator from Michigan, Mr. Henderson, and I discussed the matter in every possible detail. Mr. Henderson was very amenable to reason and assured us that he was willing to go just as far as possible in readjusting the price so that no injustice would be done to those interested, especially the growers of cotton and those who now have cottonseed on their hands.

He went from my office over to the House to confer with Representative FULMER and other members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House on the subject, and, as the Senator from Michigan has stated, the matter is now under reconsideraton. Just when Mr. Henderson will make any pronouncement, of course, it is impossible to state, but I have every reason to believe that he will be prompt. I may also say that a price of 12¾ cents a pound for cottonseed oil means about $62 a ton for cottonseed, and I understand that is a satisfactory level for the price of this product.

I, therefore, join with the Senator from Michigan in expressing the hope, in view of the situation, that the Senator from Alabama, who is, of course, always alert and interested in the welfare of the farmers, not only of his section but of all sections, will withdraw his request to have the resolution considered at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In view of the statements by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency and by our leader, it seems to me that perhaps the course suggested would be the best to adopt, because 12¾ cents would be satisfactory, I believe, from my knowledge of the facts. But the subject has been under reconsideration for several days already. It was 3 or 4 days ago that Mr. Henderson was before the committee of southern Senators who are interested particularly in the subject. I believe they are all Senators from cotton-producing States. It seems to me that since he has previously looked into the questions involved, he should be able to give us a decision right away.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit, at the time to which the Senator from Tennessee refers the hearings had not been concluded in the Committee on Banking and Currency on the proposed price-control legislation, probably the subcommittee had not been appointed, and, as members of the subcommittee, we had not gone into the question with Mr. Henderson. While, as the Senator from Michigan has stated, there is no guaranty that the full committee will accept the views of the subcommittee, I think they will be very persuasive, and I have every reason to believe that the full committee will accept them. Of course, it will then be for the Senate to determine whether it will agree with the committee's report on that subject. I have every reason to believe that the committee will accept the views of the subcommittee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think we can quite safely tell the Senate that the committee will accept the limitation recommended by the subcommittee, because it was fixed by the House, and Mr. Henderson proposed no change in it. The subcommittee this morning unanimously agreed to it. I think the full committee will agree to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as one of the authors of the resolution, I will say that if that is done it will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The resolution now being discussed carries my name as one of the joint authors, and I had very definite reasons for joining the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the other Senators in presenting the resolution. I shall use just a moment to state why I joined in introducing the resolution.

On July 5, 1938, the President, in a letter addressed to the members of the Conference on Economic Conditions in the South, said:

> It is my conviction that the South presents right now the Nation's No. 1 economic problem—the Nation's problem; not merely the South's.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that the reason why the South at that time presented, and still does present, this serious economic problem is due very largely to the low price of cotton.

At this point I desire to offer for the record a statement in the nature of a formula which shows that if cotton sells for 10 cents a pound, the man who raises the cotton gets approximately 10 cents an hour for his labor; that if cotton sells for 15 cents a pound, the return to the producer is approximately 15 cents an hour for his labor; that if cotton sells for 20 cents a pound, the producer receives approximately 20 cents an hour for his labor; and the same ratio exists if cotton sells for 25 cents, 30 cents, 40 cents, or for as much as 44 cents, the price at which cotton sold just after the first World War, and at that time the cotton producer received only approximately 44 cents an hour for his labor in producing the commodity.

At the present time wage earners of the country generally—and I am not complaining about the facts—are receiving from $4 a day for common labor, $8 for skilled and semiskilled, and $12, $16, $20, and even $24 a day for skilled labor. The higher wages are for overtime, of course. Now, it seems that some agents of our Government are seeking to sen-

tence the cotton producers of the South to an eternal wage scale of from 15 to 20 cents an hour for their work.

Yesterday, December cotton futures sold on the market at 16.50 which means 16½ cents per pound, which means, according to this formula—and the formula is verified in the main by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics—that the man who produces the cotton is receiving approximately 16½ cents an hour for his work. On this basis of returns he has to work 10 hours a day to get the sum of $1.65.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the suggested formula incorporated in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The formula is as follows:

COTTON PRICE PER POUND IS COTTON LABOR PRICE PER HOUR

When cotton sells for 10 cents per pound, the laborer receives approximately 10 cents per hour for his work in producing the cotton.

If cotton should sell for 20 cents per pound, the producer would receive approximately 20 cents per hour for his labor.

At the present price of cotton—16 cents per pound—the grower receives approximately 16.12 cents per hour for his labor.

The following analysis of receipts and expenses demonstrates the stated facts:

(1) Average yield of lint cotton per acre: 10-year period (1919–28); authority, Agricultural Statistics 1940, page 109, 162 pounds.

(2) Average yield cottonseed per acre: Note: Double the weight of lint cotton, 324 pounds.

(3) Average number hours of human labor necessary to produce 1 acre of cotton, 85 hours.

(4) If it takes 85 hours of human labor to prepare the soil, plant, cultivate, pick, and market 1 acre of cotton, then we secure the following results:

(5) By dividing the average amount of lint cotton produced per acre (162 pounds) by the total number of hours (85), we find that each hour produces lint cotton to the amount of 1.9 pounds.

(6) By dividing the average amount of cottonseed produced per acre (324 pounds) by the total number of hours (85), we find that each hour produces cottonseed to the amount of 3.81 pounds.

(7) The average price of spot cotton at the 10 designated markets on October 20, 1941, was 16 cents per pound.

(8) The price of cottonseed on October 20, 1941, was $50 per ton.

RECAPITULATION

	Cents
Returns	
1 hour human labor produces 1.9 pounds of cotton lint at 16 cents per pound (see 5 and 7 above)	30.40
1 hour human labor produces 3.81 pounds of cottonseed at $50 per ton, or 2.5 cents per pound	9.52
Total returns for 1 hour human labor	39.92
Expenses	
Expense, ginning at $7 per bale (500 pounds), or 1.4 cents per pound: 1.9 pounds at 1.4 cents per pound	2.66
Expense, fertilizer at average cost of 1 cent per pound of lint: 1.9 pounds at 1 cent per pound	1.90
Expense, poison at average cost 1.64 cents per pound of lint: 1.9 pounds at 1.64 cents	3.11
Total expense	7.67
Total return per hour of labor	39.92
Total expense	7.67
Net return	32.25
Landlord's share, one-half of 32.25, or	16.12
Labor's share (per hour), one-half of 32.25, or	16.12

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, at a later time, when this matter comes up again, I shall present a comparison of the prices fixed in this formula and the prices fixed in the formula approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The facts and figures vary only in few particulars. The Bureau reports that farmers may have their cotton ginned for a slightly less cost per bale than the figure just given. In my State of Oklahoma a farmer must pay about $7 per bale to have his cotton ginned. In order to substantiate that statement I read from a telegram sent to me on November 28, 1941, by J. B. Pope, of Dallas, Tex., as follows:

The average cost for ginning and wrapping cotton in west Texas is $8 per bale, and the average for the remainder of the State $6.50 per bale.

That is more than the cost reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. By adding the higher prices for ginning as shown in this telegram to the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, their figures are practically in harmony with those shown in the formula I have presented for the RECORD.

Mr. President, if the Senate desires to sentence two or three million cotton farmers in the South to economic slavery and if the Senate and the House desire to give to some price administrator the power to sentence these cotton farmers to accept a wage scale of 15 to 20 cents an hour for their labor, then I fear that some of us will have no power to prevent such an act. However, it shall not be done with my consent.

At this point I ask that the telegram from Mr. Pope be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DALLAS, TEX., *November 28, 1941.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

Reference conversation your office last Saturday with Governor Holloway and me regarding earnings of sharecroppers and tenants producing cotton, the average cost for ginning and wrapping cotton in west Texas is $8 per bale, and the average for the remainder of the State six fifty per bale. After discussing the matter with several of our directors today who reside in various sections of the State and all of whom are cotton producers it is the general opinion that sharecroppers and tenants realized this year from $1 to possibly as high as a dollar fifty per day for their labor in the production of cotton crops. It is also our opinion that the per hour earnings of these farmers is in direct relation to the price of cotton per pound. Here is a concrete example: A sharecropper in Ellis County, a family of 6, 5 of whom worked to produce the crop of 25 acres of cotton, had gross earnings of $508. This is an average of $102 per person for 1 year's work and this sharecropper family made 11 bales which is above average for the State.

J. B. POPE.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have noticed that all the Senators from the cotton States, when a situation of this nature arises, make the mistake of creating the impression in the mind of the Senate that this order of Mr. Henderson's affects only cotton and cottonseed. I know there are many Members of the Senate who are not from the Cotton Belt who feel that the Senators from the cotton States occupy a great deal of the time of the Senate, particularly in dealing with agricultural questions. Senators from other sections of the country have said in my presence that the cotton Senators were continually demanding something at the hands of the Congress. For that reason, and on account of that impression, I wish to make it clear again, because I do not believe that anything except cottonseed has been mentioned today, that this order of Mr. Henderson's applies to all fats and oils. It is just as important to the producer of soybeans or the producer of animal fats anywhere in the United States as it is to the producer of cottonseed.

Mr. President, it is true that those of us who are primarily concerned in cottonseed have been more active in presenting this matter to the Senate, but I want Senators to understand when they go to checking up and charging to the Senators from the cotton States the time of the Senate that is occupied in dealing with agricultural questions, that this is not a matter which affects only the cotton producer. It is just as vital and important to the producer of animal fats and to producers of other vegetable oils as it is to the cotton producer.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. He probably possesses the information which I do not possess. I understand that since the order was issued with respect to cottonseed oil, Mr. Henderson has issued another order or is about to issue another order with respect to cotton goods, which would have the effect of making it impossible for cotton ever to sell for more than 17.1 cents a pound. Does the Senator from Georgia know anything about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not heard anything about it, and I certainly hope the Senator from Texas is misinformed about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was informed of it by a long-distance message from Dallas. I am just now told that Mr. Henderson threatens to issue the order, and to threaten to issue the order is just about as bad as to issue it. He has no legal authority to do it. The mere statement that he is about to do it is bad enough.

I wish to read a statement appearing in the Washington Post of today, Thursday, December 18, if I shall not be trespassing on the time of the Senator from Georgia in doing so. I know he is fully advised about the textile situation, which touches his State very largely. The statement published in today's Washington Post is as follows:

Temporary price ceilings on a wide variety of textiles, including blankets, towels, table cloths, sheets, and pillow cases will be issued

shortly by the Office of Price Administration, it was learned yesterday.

Price Administrator Leon Henderson said maximums for such items would be set at levels prevailing prior to December 6 and would apply to all stages of production and distribution except retail sales.

Purpose of the action is to halt steady price increases and effect a stabilization pending issuance of permanent schedules, Henderson added.

He usually subtracts. He is adding this time.

It will mark Office of Price Administration's first exercise of control over prices of finished textile products.

Meanwhile, Office of Price Administration announced it would permit—

Senators, note the word "permit"—

producers of carbon black used in automobile tires, ink, paints, and plastics, to raise prices approximately 5 percent beginning January 1. Officials said the advance was allowed because cost increases in the industry had passed the point where they could be absorbed and because of reduced revenue from export sales.

Carbon black is produced from natural gas by some 17 companies. Approximately 85 percent of the output goes into automobile tires.

Probably the Senator from Georgia would be able to figure out what the result would be on raw cotton. Unless the cotton goods can be sold, of course, it is not possible to pay for the raw cotton. So the order would affect raw cotton.

Apparently an open season has been declared by Mr. Henderson on the cotton farmer. This is the season for game—ducks, geese, and deer—and Mr. Henderson is out gunning for the southern cotton farmer, for whom we are supposed to be legislating to help raise the price. Mr. Henderson says that the cotton farmer shall not receive anything further by reason of the operation of the law of supply and demand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have not read the article to which the Senator refers, and I should not like to undertake to comment on it before having an opportunity to examine the effect of it. However, I wish to point out the unprecedented action of Mr. Henderson in making his order retroactive—not merely stopping a rising market, but going back to a date which he has picked out of thin air, without any particular reason for that date having been selected. His action would adversely affect every producer of fats and oils in the United States.

I think the price mentioned by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is not as high as the market has been in normal times in the past. It is a reasonable and fair price. No one who produces agricultural commodities is trying to encourage run-away prices. God knows, if there is any class of people who would be justified in encouraging a run-away market, or in being the recipients of benefits from it, it would be the farmers. During all these years, and particularly during the past 4 or 5 years, the farmer, generally speaking, has sold his commodities for about half of parity. In all justice he might be permitted to have the benefit of a little run-away market to recoup some of his losses. The farmers are patriotic, and do not take that position; but certainly they should not have the Price Administrator or anyone else issue a retroactive order which goes into the past.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the other day when we had our conference with Mr. Henderson and two gentlemen in his department, they said that they had the approval of the Department of Agriculture in this matter. Today I talked with the Secretary of Agriculture, and he told me that Mr. Henderson did not have his approval or the approval of his Department.

I think Mr. Henderson ought to act immediately on the proposal which has been submitted by the Senator from Michigan. I think that proposal is satisfactory if it is acted upon. There is no reason why this question should be held in abeyance. The situation should be corrected immediately, and I hope that will be done.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I took up with the Price Administrator this morning the contention which has been made, that his action was retroactive. He handed me the release in connection with it; and if I clearly understand the language I do not believe that it is retroactive, because it contains this provision:

Contracts made to and including the close of business December 12, may be carried out at the contract prices, even though such prices may be higher than the established maximums.

I do not know much about the cotton business. As the Senator from Georgia well recalls, I got into the middle of the cotton question once before, and it seems to be my fate to participate in it again today.

I wish to make plain to the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators who are interested in the question that my only reason for rising is that we have had some discussion with Mr. Henderson, and he has assured us that the matter will receive reconsideration. I felt that it would be healthy, desirable, and beneficial not only to the cotton-producing areas of the South, but to the soybean areas and other areas interested in oil, if we should call attention to the fact that it is almost certain that a limitation will be placed upon the Price Administrator with respect to the power which he may exercise under the price-control bill. If that limitation were in effect today the lowest ceiling he could place on the price of cottonseed oil—and that applies necessarily to all the other oils—would be 12¾ cents a pound, 1½ cents above the price fixed. It seemed to me to be desirable to call that circumstance to the attention of the Senate and of the Price Administrator in this manner, and let it be a factor in the consideration of this intricate and disturbing question.

In view of the existing situation, it seems to me that the Senator from Alabama ought not to insist upon his request for immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I appreciate the motive and spirit and the helpful attitude of the Senator from Michigan in this matter. I think he has rendered a helpful service to farmers all over the United States, to Senators representing agricultural areas, and to Mr. Henderson, in the long run. I appreciate it, as I am sure my associates do.

Mr. BROWN. Such action probably would aid very much in the passage of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope that the situation may be adjusted. I think this sort of conduct should not be permitted to go unchallenged.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that I was not in error in stating that the order was retroactive. If I correctly understood the paragraph read by the Senator from Michigan, it could only have the effect of protecting the larger refiner who had bought crude cottonseed oil which had been crushed by the little crusher. It would afford absolutely no protection to the small independent ginner who had purchased the seed at $60 a ton and held it in the form of seed. It undoubtedly would have the effect of fixing the price of cottonseed at $51 and a fraction, even though it might not affect a contract actually made for the sale of crude oil.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator will recall, in confirmation of what he said, that in the conference with Mr. Henderson I charged, in rather vigorous language, that the order was retroactive, and in effect an ex post facto law. Mr. Henderson defended the order rather than denying the charge.

Mr. RUSSELL. He conceded that it was retroactive.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Alabama how much more time he desires to consume.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am ready to act now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. Would the proposed relief apply to the small grinder of cottonseed?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. Henderson has not yet revised his order. If he revises it as indicated by the Senator from Michigan, the small independent crusher, or the man who happened to have seed on hand, whether he be a ginner or a farmer, could at least escape with a whole hide. He could get out with about what he had invested in his seed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what I wished to know.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Georgia says, I feel that a statement which the Price Administrator has prepared should be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, so that his views upon this subject may be known to the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that is proper.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. HENDERSON

Excluding mineral, essential, and chemical oils there are about 1,800 fats and oils used industrially and domestically in the United States. Their annual consumption, or "disappearance," exceeds 9,000,000,000 pounds. There is scarcely an industry which does not make use of one or more fats and oils, either in raw or processed form.

Every housewife is familiar with butter and lard and with the various vegetable

shortenings, salad oils, and salad dressings that are made from cottonseed and related oils. All soaps used in the home or by industry derive their body and effective cleansing properties from fats, tallows, coconut oil, palm oil, olive oil, and other members of the fats and oils family. No other group of commodities is more widely used or plays a more important part in the domestic and industrial life of our country.

A few common things in which fats and oils are used: Salad oil, shortening, cooking oils, oleomargarine, soap, soap powder, cosmetics, paints, varnishes, printing inks, linoleum, compounds of calking boats—there are many, many more.

During the last war the Nation paid a heavy penalty because of sharp speculative increases in the price of fats and oils. Price developments in fats and oils over the last year demonstrate conclusively that, until just the other day, we were well on our way to repeating the same experience in this war. Here on October 1940 (chart) the index price of 27 fats and oils, which make up more than 96 percent of the total of all fats and oils consumed in the United States, was at 63. Here—a little more than a year later—following this nearly perpendicular line we arrive at an index price of 93. This means that the prices of these essential materials, the most important of which are foodstuff items, have increased by more than 50 percent in 13 months and were well on their way to doubling

We have had literally stacks of letters and telegrams sent in by consumers in all walks of life protesting vigorously against the high costs inflicted upon them by this inflationary upsurge In fact about 10 percent of all consumer complaints received by my office over the past few months have applied specifically to fats and oils.

Most of you gentlemen are familiar with the history of the action I have taken. Early last summer the evident speculation in fats and oils caused me to issue a statement to the effect that maximum prices were in contemplation for cottonseed oil at levels considerably below those prevailing at that time. This had a temporary corrective effect, but further study made it clear that because of the interchangeability of these products any action to be effective would have to cover the entire field of fats and oils.

Accordingly, after extensive investigation which brought us into first-hand contact with every factor in the industry, we issued on August 29 a schedule designed to eliminate speculative and inflationary price practices. There were, nevertheless, further substantial increases in the price of cottonseed oil and sympathetically increases in the prices of all other fats and oils. This in turn induced growers to withhold from selling their seed at a time when the Army was desperately in need of cotton linters, a basic raw material in the manufacture of high explosives

But that is not all. The crushing mills began to speculate on still higher prices for cottonseed oil. They went out and bought cottonseed at prices of $50 to $62 per ton. On the basis of prices for cottonseed oil, meal, linters, and hulls then prevailing, they could not have recovered the minimum cost of the seed, let alone show a mill profit. Obviously, then, seed purchased at these levels was in anticipation of a further speculative bulge in the price of cottonseed oil.

The unstable character of these high seed prices was dramatically exemplified early in October. At that time, on the announcement of a new trade agreement with Argentina, the prices of cottonseed and cottonseed oil broke sharply. In less than 6 days of trading cottonseed oil broke from 13.45 cents a pound to 11.45 cents a pound. In this speculative boom, I may point out, the Office of Price Administration was merely an observer.

Now, while I have been talking these past few minutes about cottonseed and cottonseed oil, I want to emphasize that the same general price pattern prevailed during this period throughout the entire fats and oils field. This is because of the close interconnections in the prices of fats and oils.

Soon thereafter prices recovered somewhat, and then, under the stabilizing influence of the Office of Price Administration, restrictions on speculative trade practices leveled off. This desirable stability continued until the last few days in November, when the situation in the Far East began to show indications of reaching a crisis. A manifestation of the market's alarm over the threats of war in the Pacific came quickly. Offerings of certain oils of foreign origin were completely withdrawn, and general price levels began to show all the signs of a complete run-away. The price relationships between the various individual oils were sharply distorted, and because of the lack of offerings it became impossible to determine any tangible relationship between domestic and imported oils.

Prices of selected fats and oils on Nov. 26 and Dec. 12, 1941

[Cents per pound]

Type	Nov. 26	Dec. 12
Domestic:		
Cottonseed oil, bleachable, prime summer yellow (New York)	12.50	13.65
Linseed oil, raw, tank cars (New York)	9.10	10.30
Soybean oil, crude, tank cars (Decatur)	9.75	11.50
Corn oil, crude, tank cars (west)	11.00	12.00
Foreign:		
Coconut oil, crude, tank cars, nearby (New York)	7.50	10.75
Oiticica oil, liquid, carload	20.00	23.75
Palm oil:		
Niger, drums, spot	[1] 9.00	([3])
Sumatra, tank cars, nearby	7.60	([3])
Rapeseed oil, drums, tax included	15.00	16.00
Tung oil, spot, tank cars	35.00	([3])

[1] Nominal.
[2] Not quoted.
[3] Under control of Office of Production Management.

Upon the outbreak of actual hostilities, the situation changed rapidly for the worse. The price spurts came faster, and the trading in futures contracts became feverish. It was apparent that immediate and drastic action was necessary if I were to faithfully discharge the duties assigned to me by the President, to prevent price inflation. Any other course not only would have been dereliction of duty but would have merited whatever criticism the consuming public might have seen fit to direct against this administration.

On December 10, 3 days after the attack on Pearl Harbor, I issued the following statement: "The Office of Price Administration is taking steps to stabilize the markets for imported food commodities, for fats and oils, and for certain related dairy products at or about the levels prevailing at the beginning of this week." This was intended to warn those individuals who were bidding up prices without regard for the public welfare and to cushion the effect of our contemplated action on the sellers and buyers of the commodities named.

On December 13 I imposed ceiling prices over all fats and oils except butter at the levels prevailing on November 26, 1941. Under the provisions of this schedule, which is strictly of an emergency nature, no sales, either spot or futures, of raw, crude, or refined fats and oils can be made at prices above the November 26 levels. The ceiling applies to sales at all stages of distribution except retail. All contracts outstanding up to the close of business December 12 may be carried out at the contract prices, even though such prices may be higher than the maximums established. This special exemption as to outstanding contracts was made so as not to upset any outstanding hedges by those members of the trade who were intending to avoid speculation.

I stated at the time the ceiling schedule was issued, and I reiterated a few days later, that our action was taken under conditions of extreme emergency; that the schedule itself is temporary; and that it is subject to revision. I have also pointed out that, since imported fats and oils are interchangeable to a great extent with domestic fats and oils, it was impracticable under these emergency conditions to confine ceiling action to the imported group. We are already hard at work on special studies to determine the extent of hardship cases.

Let me tell you why we selected November 26 as the ceiling date for the fats and oils schedule. If you will recall, I had explained that the period just prior to November 26 was the only period of relative stability on which an emergency price schedule could be based. During this period of relative stability prices of all the fats and oils were more nearly in their normal relationship than in any other recent period we might have chosen. For example, had we frozen prices as of December 12 instead of November 26, the price of linseed oils in relation to other fats and oils prices was such that a demand actually developed for linseed oil for the manufacture of soap rather than for paints and varnishes where it is urgently needed for defense purposes.

Most of the criticism directed against the Office of Price Administration following the issuance of our ceiling has come from the cottonseed crushing mills and their spokesmen. Indeed, I might say that complaints have been almost exclusively from those sources. The fact that the scope of this schedule embraces tallow, lard, soybean oil, linseed oil, and grease, all of which are of domestic origin, and that little or no complaint has come in from any of the producers of these items, has caused us to examine very carefully the reasons back of the complaints from the cottonseed crushers. Speaking frankly, the underlying cause goes back to the latter part of August when public statements appeared which resulted in the speculative purchase of cottonseed at prices all out of proportion to what the mills had any reason to believe they would obtain from cottonseed oil; unless, of course, they thought that prices would be permitted to go to levels that would yield them comfortable profits at the expense of the consuming public.

I do not believe, gentlemen, that any public-spirited member of this administration will want to see the consuming public compelled to pay exorbitant prices for a basic foodstuff simply to prevent a small segment of the fats-and-oils industry from suffering a loss on a speculative venture. Moreover, the fact should not be lost sight of that to have permitted this increase in cottonseed-oil prices would have lifted, correspondingly, the whole level of all fats and oils.

A further point: In our schedule issued last August, aiming at the speculative trade practices in fats and oils, we specifically exempted from the general provisions any restriction against forward deliveries in crude cottonseed oil. This left the way open for crushing-mill operators to sell oil as they purchased seed. In other words, forward contracts for crude oil could be entered into when each lot of seed was purchased. We did nothing to hinder trading in futures contracts on the New York Produce Exchange. Therefore, it is obvious that, unless a crushing-mill operator deliberately undertook the risk of assuming a speculative position, he had every opportunity to hedge against the possibility of serious loss in the event that cottonseed-oil prices should decline or be brought down by the Government.

A final word on the matter of the November 26 price level: As this chart will show, prices were near the peak on that date. The relatively slight reduction imposed by the Office of Production Administration emergency ceiling is very small when compared with the staggering increase depicted by this long line. [Indicating with pointer.] Excepting for the comparatively small amount of cottonseed still in growers' hands, our ceiling action on fats and oils has had no effect on cotton farmers. The current market price of cottonseed is about $45 a ton as compared with a parity price of $32 a ton. The bulk of this year's crop of cottonseed has been sold at levels substantially above those of any recent year.

Some 9 or 10 months will pass before our cotton farmers again will come to market with their seed in volume. In the meantime America will be fighting for its very existence. Our armed forces will be fighting on land, sea, and in the air; while on the home front we hope to continue to wage war against disastrous inflation. If we lose in the economic battle, we cannot win the peace.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in view of the statements which have been made on this subject by the Senator from Michigan, who is chairman of the subcommittee on the price-control bill, and by the majority leader, and in view of the request made by the Senator from Michigan and the attitude of my associates, I withdraw my request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, and ask that it may continue to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The request for consideration being withdrawn, the resolution will lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2087) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. DIRKSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) relative to the reenrollment of the bill (H. R. 6208) to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1047. An act to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385);

H. R. 5726. An act to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 5800. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5925. An act to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936;

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6223. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6233. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

INVESTIGATION OF PRO-AXIS ACTIVITIES

Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, after which I shall yield to the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have asked the eminent junior Senator from North Carolina to yield to me so that I may make a very brief statement.

On the 2d day of last October the distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON, and I submitted a resolution asking for the investigation of certain pro-Axis activities. On the floor at that time I made a rather concise statement with reference to certain societies which were alleged to be engaged in such activities. Two days after the submission of the resolution an order emanated from Tokyo closing some 14 of the societies' offices within the continental limits of the United States. That action may have been coincidental with the submission of the resolution, but it followed 2 days thereafter.

At that time I called attention to an organization known as the Imperial Comradeship Society which was operating with headquarters at Los Angeles, and had some 4,800 members scattered over California, Arizona, and Texas; and I called particular attention to their destructive and subversive activities, hostile to the interests of the United States.

I have just come from the telephone, where I was informed that the president of this society, a Mr. Honda, committed suicide day before yesterday, and the F. B. I. has taken over the papers and official records; and the investigations made up to the present time show that the subversive activities have been treble and quadruple what was anticipated, to the detriment of the interests of the United States.

I call attention to the matter, feeling that Senators will be interested in it, and also as proof of the fact that the Senator from Colorado, and the Senator from Iowa were not seeking publicity at that time but were very much interested in stopping the activities to which I have referred.

AVOIDING BLACK-OUT CASUALTIES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks upon the pending measure I should like to have the clerk read a telegram which I received this morning from the president of the chamber of commerce in San Francisco [Mr. HAAS], which telegram I believe develops a matter of national interest which should immediately be called to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
December 17, 1941.

Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In order to meet what we are convinced is one of the most critical problems affecting public safety, particularly in all coast States, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce respectfully urges that legislation be introduced immediately setting all clocks ahead 1 hour for at least a period of 90 days, thereby minimizing night traffic and permitting the public, including office and store employees to be off the streets and in their homes before nightfall. We urged LaGuardia to take action as National Chairman, Civilian Defense. He recommends congressional action. We believe immediate consideration imperative and that new time schedule be made Nation-wide rather than State or sectional in order to obviate confusion in interstate transportation and communication systems and that its national importance more than offsets any temporary inconvenience it may cause some areas least affected. Would appreciate your enlisting support of all representatives of coast States.

WALTER A. HAAS,
President, San Francisco
Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before I proceed to a discussion of the question now pending before the Senate, I desire to state in reference to the telegram just read that I am informed from California, upon what I believe is authentic evidence, that during the first night of the black-out in Los Angeles County we had five times as many automobile accidents as we have on an average night; and I think that fact should bring home to us the need for utilizing at its full value every resource in the United States, including the sunlight that comes to us without costing us anything.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wonder whether he has any information such as that—apparently authentic—which I received last night, that in England the number of persons killed during black-outs and as a result of the activities of the Home Guards has been greater than the number killed by all the bombing of England.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President, I have not heard such a statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is the statement I received from a gentleman who has just returned from England.

Mr. DOWNEY. But I may state to the Senator that every year in the United

States far more people are killed by automobile accidents than have been killed by bombing in England in all the time since the war began. So the statement made to the Senator may well be true.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr President, lest some Members of the Senate may be disturbed because I am rising to delay the vote upon the pending measure for perhaps 30 minutes or an hour, let me assure them that we now have in the Army of the United States, including the selectees, 1,800,000 men; and, according to the Army's own declaration, it is probable that that body of men cannot be properly equipped, housed, and officered until around July 1. But if some persons believe that by some miracle the 1,800,000 men will be off our hands and ready 30 days from now, let me say that excluding our boys from 18 to 21, we have in the age limits left in the House bill at least 1,600,000 available men without dependents and without exemptions; and I say to you, Mr President, no one can produce the declaration of a single military authority that our Army can, by any energy or any possibility, utilize that reservoir of 1,600,000 men in the next 12 months, 18 months, or 2 years. As a matter of fact, while our authorities are very doubtful that we should select a million men and train them during the next year, I think all the authorities in Washington believe that because of shortage of matériel, housing, equipment, and officers we cannot handle over a million men; and meanwhile, Mr. President, "out of the cradle, endlessly rocking," 100,000 American boys are every month becoming 21 years of age. So, lest anyone fear that I am standing in the way of the Army's selecting a greater number of men, let me say that if we should draft beyond a million next year they will certainly train with broomsticks, sleep on the ground, and lack any officers or leaders whatever, because we have not enough now for our present Army.

Let me say, Mr. President, that there is something, however, of vital importance in this measure. I do not say that democracy is at stake because of the way in which this measure has been handled; it may be we must lose democracy and freedom in this emergency; but I do say that rational, efficient, honest, sensible government is at stake. If we are going to have a military dictatorship or some other kind of dictatorship, let us at least make it a rational, honest, and efficient dictatorship. These may be thought to be extreme words. They are; I recognize them as such, and I will attempt to convince any Senator who will do me the honor to listen to me for a few moments that they are justified.

Mr. President, in the first portion of the pending bill we have laid the foundation for an industrial census for the determination of the occupational skills of men from 18 to 25. Every expert in Washington, it is my firm opinion, after having talked to several of them, will say that the census method set up by this bill is costly, slow, and absolutely worthless.

The Military Affairs Committee did not call before it one expert from the Census Bureau or from the Department of Labor or from the Social Security Board to discuss with us the question of an occupational census which is of transcendent difficulty and extreme magnitude. I have talked to several experts who, if called to appear before the Military Affairs Committee, would tell its members, I am sure, that what the Army proposes to do is useless, wasteful, and expensive.

Mr. President, we debate here about one clerk for ourselves ad infinitum, and the press of the Nation condemn us because we want sufficient help to do our office work in order to serve our people, and yet here is a bill that would require some 25,000 to 50,000 clerks, typists, and experts to make an occupational census, which could not be completed, under the method proposed, probably short of 3 years, which never could be of any benefit in this war. Not one witness was called to testify upon it, not one hour of consideration was given to it.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of War and the Selective Service System say we should have an occupational census. Of course, we should. In Detroit, let me say to the distinguished and learned Senator from Michigan, we had better have an occupational census ready for February, March, and April. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator yet knows it, but, under the orders of O. P. M., on January 1 automobile manufacture, save for military purposes, will be one quarter of what it was a year ago, and on February 1 all automobile manufacture, except for military purposes, will be stopped and hundreds of thousands of men in the automobile industry will be disemployed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator suggests that I may not be advised of the approach of this disaster. I can assure him I am; that the figures contemplate at least 300,000 displaced and unemployed men, and that it is a serious and major crisis in the life of the Commonwealth.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then, let me say to the distinguished Senator that he should take intense interest in this occupational census, under which 2 years from now the Army will disclose what happened in Detroit during the coming January and February. Likewise, Mr. President, in the industries using rubber the same results are going to follow. Japan has now, apparently, taken the island of Penang, and Sarawak in the island of Borneo. Hongkong may fall, and possibly Singapore, and any boat loads of tin or rubber that may come through, after that, will be providential, for Japan will have gained the balance of power in the Asiatic Pacific Ocean.

Of course, Mr. President, 3 years ago everyone should have known that this is almost certainly what would happen if the war we have been talking about for years with Japan should come. We would not do anything about it then, but we are farsighted in the occupational census the Army wants to take, because 2½ or 3 years from now we will know what was the labor situation in the United States on January 1, 1942; we will know, in retrospect, what it was, let me say—if we are still interested.

Mr. President, let me state the facts about our census. We have recently taken a great occupational and population census. That census was taken in the last week of March, as I recall, before April 1, 1940. Do you know, Mr. President, how long the Census Bureau had been preparing for that. They were concentrating on it for 2 years, under men who had been engaged in statistical work all their lives. They now say that, due to the difficulties of occupational analysis, they should have started the work 3 years before they ever took the census. What did they do? They first collected in Washington 60 or 70 of the statistical census experts of the United States. Those men, during the period of a year, laid out the entire plan. They secured 400 or 500 executive assistants. Then, as will be recalled, there were appointed 140 area managers, who began to go to school here in the fall of 1939. They, in turn, selected supervisors, the supervisors were trained for months; then the supervisors selected and trained 120,000 enumerators who were given schedules carefuly worked out, and that great body of men, whose training was the result of years of planning, went out and took a population and occupational census beginning 1 week before April 1, 1940, and ending on that date.

Mr. President, when did we know what was the occupational and labor picture of the United States as of April 1, 1940? Able and diligent as our census takers have been, they have not yet completed the analysis of that picture and have not yet given the final results.

The census authorities, men who are experts in this line of work, say that it will not be possible to take an occupational census as this bill would have us do. I want to make it clear to the Senators who honor me with their presence that I am not objecting to the registration of men who may be called for military purposes. Of course, the Army is entitled to, and should have, as definite and accurate a list as possible of men in the potential reservoir that may be called to arms. I am now only objecting to the phase of the bill relating to the registration of all males from 18 to 65 to determine their labor and occupational characteristics. I am not now talking about registration for military purposes.

The pending bill merely provides that the Army shall have power to call upon all males from 18 to 65 to register as often as required. We have to go to the main act for additional power to take the census. The act itself—the Selective Service Act—gives to the Army power to send out questionnaires to these men. Now, let me show the Senate how expensive and perfectly worthless will be the results of the Army plan.

It probably will take from 3 to 6 months to register the males between 18 and 65. Tens of thousands of typists, stenographers, file clerks, and experts will be required who are vitally needed elsewhere.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. DOWNEY. I do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying. He has given more study to this phase of the matter than I have; but it occurs to me that in taking the census the public was apathetic. The Federal Government took the census. The enumerators had to go around and find people. The people themselves were only mildly interested in the census.

This registration will not be made by the Federal Government under our draft act, but will be made by the State governments and by local draft boards appointed by the State governments. So, therefore, the people being interested and being required to go to the enumerator rather than have the enumerator come to them as in the case of the census, there is not an exact parallel between the time element in taking a Federal census by the Federal Government and the time element in taking a census through the media of the State governments.

Some time ago we passed a draft act which required persons to register, and the Senator knows, as I know, that no great amount of time was taken for that registration. In this draft we would have the same boards that are already constituted, and we would have persons skilled in taking the registrants that we did not have in the first draft operation. I cannot follow the Senator in the statement that it would take 2½ years or 2 years or 1 year to take this census, in view of the first draft which we have had, which equipped and qualified those on the local boards to proceed with this work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that, inadvertently, the distinguished Senator from Maryland is in error in one respect. It is not contemplated that the men of the Nation shall appear before the draft board to tell about their occupational skills. If that were the fact, it would take hundreds of thousands of trained statisticians to interview and talk to the men. What the Army intends to do is this——

Mr. TYDINGS rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the Senator that if he will let me trace this matter through, I shall show exactly what is going to happen, according to the Army and the statistical experts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator again; but let me set before the Senator the facts in one particular. As I read the bill, the men who are between the ages of 19 and 45——

Mr. DOWNEY. I am not talking about that part of the bill at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to consider that part first. The men between the ages mentioned will be subject to the military draft.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That leaves men from 45 to 65 who will be in the classification that will not be included in military requirements. It seems to me, if I may leave this thought with the Senator, that if the men between 45 and 65 have to register with the draft boards just as the military personnel will have to register a great deal of the delay occasioned by taking a Federal census will be avoided; and certainly it seems to me that no great additional amount of time should be required to register and reasonably classify those between 45 and 65.

I may be in error, but that is the way it appears to me as I read the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. First, let me say to the Senator from Maryland that it is a comparatively simple matter to register a man for military service, taking his age, his occupation, and his dependents, if any. I may say to the distinguished Senator that if the Military Affairs Committee had cared to inquire they would have found that the present Selective Service Act up to date has made tremendous mistakes in the way in which it has functioned, and has no statistical data on occupations that are worth anything. I will admit that we could easily enough, over a few months, register all males from 18 to 65; and if the Army intends to follow this bill with a military conscription bill, so that it wants to know what men it may conscript for industrial purposes, that is one thing; but I may say to the Senator that the Army denies that. It wants to have a picture of the manpower of the Nation that will help us to win the war. On the Army's own statement, that will take at least 2 years, and the Census believes it will take 3 years.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will let me make my statement——

Mr. TYDINGS. I will; but I am asking these questions so that I may follow the Senator and not interrupt him.

If the Army intends to take an industrial census, apart from the military census, for the purpose of conscripting industrial workers, I do not so understand the bill. My idea of that part of the measure is that it is desired to find out whether, in some particular labor and industrial lines, there may not be some men who are more valuable to the total defense effort and to victory than they would be if they were mere privates, for example, in the Army.

The idea is not that the private is less important than the industrial worker, because he is not; but there are some men who are highly skilled and particularly equipped to provide weapons which we do not now have; and if we were helter-skelter to reach into that reservoir of equipped men and put them into the Army, it would mean that the condition against which the Senator has inveighed would prevail; namely, that we would have these men and would not have the weapons. Obviously, the two things must be considered side by side; and my understanding is that the industrial census is to be taken primarily for that purpose under such rules as may be promulgated by the President.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I assume his statement to be correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know that it is.

Mr. DOWNEY. I assume that it is. I think the President and the Secretary of War have stated that this registering and analyzing of our labor supply does not indicate the right to make military conscription of our labor; and I assume that is correct, although I want to state that when I categorically queried some of the generals who appeared before us they were not sure, as they spoke to me, that this was not possibly a military conscription bill.

The questions and answers, I might say to the Senator, went like this:

> Does this mean in any way the possibility of a military conscription of labor?
>
> No; probably not—at least not at this time.

Thus, I, at least, was left with a feeling of uncertainty as to what was in the minds of the military regarding this proposal.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that in making my argument I am assuming that this is an honest bill, by which our military, and our O. P. M., and Congress may learn something about our labor supply, so as to assist us in winning the war. And that it is meant to be the first step in a plan of military labor conscription.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator one more question, for he is a member of the committee and I am not. If this were a measure to conscript labor and compel laborers to work in civilian battalions and regiments, so to speak, I rather think the labor organizations very properly would protest the whole bill. So far as I have heard, not a single labor organization has protested the mere taking of an industrial census for the purpose of ascertaining how the total defense effort of the country can be best husbanded and projected.

Mr. DOWNEY. I again wish to go back to some of the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, and I do deeply appreciate his intelligent questions and comments.

It is not expected that any of these men will go before the draft boards and testify about their occupation or their labor skill. What will happen will be this: These men will first be registered. The Army and the experts estimate that that may take from 3 to 6 months. It might take far longer than that, but we will assume that the registration of all the males from 18 to 65 takes place, we will say, even in 90 days, which is almost an impossibility.

Under the law, thereafter the draft boards will send out questionnaires designed to elicit the information which is desired. Many statistical experts with whom I have talked declare that the results will be wholly inconclusive and largely worthless and cannot be stated until the passage of at least a year's time. In the State of Mississippi, for instance, in which half the population is Negro, great portions of them cannot

read or write. Everywhere hundreds of thousands of letters will be misdirected, questionnaires will be answered in such a way that they will be perfectly worthless, and I say to the distinguished Senator that while he states that this can be done much faster than the census did it, I point out to him that the census did the job in 1 week of enumeration. Yes, in 1 week, the census reached every home, hotel, and apartment house in the United States with 120,000 skilled enumerators, but the complete analysis of their labor has not yet been made.

I looked over some of the census schedules, and I say to the Senator that while I may not have the intelligence of many of the other United States Senators, I am at least of average ability, and it would have bothered me as a citizen to have made out a schedule showing my occupational ability under the questions asked by the census.

The census says—and these men are experts, I can assure the Senator—that it cannot be done successfully by mail.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not seen any of the intended questionnaires which I imagine the Army would send out to those between 18 and 65 years of age, but when they come to register I imagine the questionnaire would read something like this:

State your name, age, race, color, education.

There would be some blanks—

Grammar school? High school? College? Trade school? Address. Do you have dependents? Who are they? How many? To what extent are they dependent on you? What has been your occupation for the last year, the last 5 years, the last 10 years?

I cannot go on with the questionnaire; it would be rather long. This is the point, however. If that is boiled down to the irreducible minimum, to eliminate all surplusage, and to elicit information as to all the mechanical qualifications, then the Army would be in a position to defer welders, if there were a shortage of welders in the country, from being in the next draft.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me interrupt the Senator right there.

Mr. TYDINGS. Permit me to finish.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Army can do that very thing now. If there is a shortage of welders, all the Army has to do is to send out to the draft boards word to defer welders. If it wants welders in the Army, all it has to do is to give that notice to the draft boards.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for that concession. All they are going to do, therefore, is to continue the present system in effect, with perhaps a few additional questions, so that they can defer or take men, or do what they require with them for the national effort.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator please yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. As soon as I make one further statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is talking to cross-purposes with me. I am not talking at all about the men who are to be called into the Army, the additional troops.

Mr. TYDINGS. Nor am I.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is what the Senator was speaking of.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was merely using that as an illustration. When the men register all that information is available. In my opinion, that can be done in 60 days after the enactment of the pending measure. They can then wire in to headquarters at any time as to how many welders they need, or farmers, or oil workers, or what not, in the State of Arizona, or Oklahoma, or Maryland, or any other State, and any shortage of labor can be provided for.

Mr. DOWNEY. Provided for where?

Mr. TYDINGS. Wherever it is required. Let me give the Senator one more thought.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement, I believe I can take these things up categorically and discuss them, and I assure the distinguished Senator that I am merely expressing the ideas of men who have been in this census work for many years.

I say to the Senator, in the first place, that I think the Army will admit, and the census authorities will proclaim, that even though we use a tremendous amount of clerical help, we could not get the registration completed in less than 90 days or 6 months. Of course, if we put on several hundred thousand typists and stenographers and a great many file clerks to handle forty or fifty million names and address envelopes, it can be done sooner.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me complete my statement, please. I wish to repeat to the Senator that the Army itself fixed 2 years as the time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. What we have to do from now on is not to find ways in which we cannot do things, but ways in which we can do things. In my opinion, a complete registration can be made in 60 days. There is no reason I have heard stated why it cannot be done. There may be some assemblying afterward, but I cannot conceive why, if we enact the pending measure, the work cannot be completely done in 60 days.

Mr. DOWNEY. The experts, including the Army, all say it will take about 90 days to 6 months before twenty-five to fifty million men can be registered. It is a very large task.

After the registration takes place, and not until then, the questionnaires are sent out. The men from 18 to 65 will first have to come in and register. A tremendous organization will have to be set up to handle that. Their names will have to be arranged alphabetically, tremendous files will have to be set up, tens of thousands of clerks and stenographers will have to be hired to handle that work.

When those things are completed and all the information is in the hands of the local draft boards, it is contemplated that the local draft boards will secure questionnaires from the Army here in Washington. Those questionnaires would then flow out to about 40,000,000 men, I suppose, or somewhere about that number. Millions of them would have probably changed their addresses between the time they registered and the time the letters arrived at their homes.

I say millions, because our people are in a dynamic, fluid, condition in which great bodies of labor will move from Flint, or Detroit, or Cleveland, or St. Louis, or from or to California, or to or from Pennsylvania, or some other State. Tremendous numbers of these questionnaires, by reason of clerical mistakes, will go astray. People will die, people will get sick. The Army itself admits that the questionnaires probably could not be returned and be in final form until the end of 8 or 9 months. At the end of those 8 or 9 months the local draft boards in the United States would have in their possession forty or fifty million schedules showing the circumstances of the individuals who registered, and who filed the questionnaires. It is then contemplated that the local draft boards will make an analysis of their registrants, separating them by skills and alphabetically, and having accomplished that, will forward their results to the State boards.

Mr. President, unless a tremendous number of skilled experts are employed, the local draft boards cannot do that work in less than 2 or 3 months. After the State draft board has received the results from all over the State it will make an analysis of the situation, and at the end of that time the 40,000,000 cards, showing the occupational skills of all the workers of America, will be forwarded to the military here in Washington, probably a year after the work was begun.

Thereafter it will take the Army probably a year to analyze the national picture. As I have said, the Bureau of the Census has been working for 2 years on the analysis of its occupational statistics, and it is not yet ready to announce the final results.

What good will it do for our Army to send out registration cards and questionnaires to the automobile workers in Michigan now so that 2 years from now, or even 1 year from now we will know the condition that existed on January 1 of this year? We are in desperate, critical need to understand our labor problems right now. We are going to have tremendous labor difficulties in the United States over the next year. We do not want to know present conditions a year or 2 years from now. We want to know what conditions are this day, this week, this month.

Mr. President, I know something about the city of Los Angeles. I know our complicated, dynamic, fluid, labor problem. As an attempt to solve those problems this bill is stupid and asinine. It will not help us any. What is the condition? I gave one example before the Military Affairs Committee. Here is a plant which employed 1,000 men in assembling automobiles. Most of the workers were past middle age, and belonged to the C. I. O. The plant was taken over by an aircraft

company. All those men went out, and boys 18 or 19 or 20 years of age came in, largely from the Southwest. Thirty days after a census is taken of those farmer boys in Oklahoma or Arkansas, or of the former workers in the Willys plant, such a census would be invalid and worthless.

We in Los Angeles have at least 10 efficient, adaptable, powerful organizations keeping track of our labor supply. We have the P. W. A., the chamber of commerce, the shipbuilders, the airplane manufacturers, the Department of Labor, and agencies of the State of California. Every week we can find out about the labor problem of Los Angeles. We know whether we have enough shipbuilders there, or whether we have enough airplane workers there. We know whether we have enough farmers there. I see sitting in the Senate Chamber now two distinguished Senator from farm States of the Middle West. Either one of them could go to Wisconsin or Ohio and in 1 week, after talking with farm leaders, with county farm advisers, with State representatives, and with local farmers, could tell us all we need to know about the farm labor situation in Wisconsin or Ohio right now—today.

We do not want to know about present conditions a year or 2 years from now. We want to know what is going to happen in January, February, and March, in 1942.

We are reaching a critical situation in this war. Why are we? Up to date we have been increasing our production through unused capacity, and that has meant a very slight inflation or disturbance of our lives. From now on almost every pound of material, every worker and machine that is used in defense, will come from civilian production.

Mr. President, I questioned military witnesses who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee. If they had anticipated and understood these problems, they certainly gave no evidence of it. Let us take just one problem. Under the priorities of O. P. M., house building in 1942 will be less than 50 percent of what it was in the present year 1941, and it may be only 25 percent, and in those figures I am including defense housing. What does that mean? That means that in 1942, day by day, week by week, month by month, millions of workers everywhere in the United States will stop working for their accustomed contractors, in their own home locality, at their accustomed jobs. Does that mean that millions of them will be disemployed? Probably not. It may mean that, if bureaucrats do not begin to cut red tape and get busy, but it does not necessarily mean that. Why? Because the O. P. M. is endeavoring to strike a balance, and as those workers come away from building homes they will be shifted into defense jobs. But millions of men will have to leave their towns, their homes, where they have been locally engaged, to go to factories where the defense products are being manufactured. That is also true, as I have said, of automobiles, of tires, of radios, of furniture, of Frigidaires, and a multitude of other things. What does that mean? That means that tens of millions of men, from day to day, week to week, month to month, in 1942 will be changing their addresses, changing their jobs, becoming employed, and unemployed, and this Army of ours is going to start the leisurely registration of all the males in the United States, the sending out of questionnaires, the patient assembling of them, and then finally a year or two from now the analysis of the results. As I recall, the only witness who seemed to have any idea of the time element thought their census would take 2 years; but that it might not be done that soon. If I had the opportunity, I could present to the Military Affairs Committee the best experts in Washington, who say that the Army probably could not do it in 3 years, and that when it got through the records would not be worth the paper on which they were written.

Let me inform my distinguished friend the chairman of the committee, for whom I have high admiration and deep affection, that for years the Census Bureau has been working on this very problem. The Census Bureau officials know so much more about it than I do that I do not even like to talk about it. They have experts in that field who have studied the question for years. For a long time they have laid their plans for the very kind of a census now needed. They are now prepared to make what they would call the blitzkrieg annual occupational census, in which they will build upon the present census and prepare annual and monthly results. Not only that, but they have plans worked out so that at the request of the Army or Navy 25 or 50 of them who know all the records and know how to keep statistics could go to Butte, Mont.; Cleveland, Ohio; St. Louis, Mo.; or Los Angeles, Calif.; and have on the desk of any general or O. P. M. official a full weekly or daily statement of labor conditions in any particular city or area.

We vitally need that service. We ought to have it. The idea that we should start to duplicate, by a long and laborious process, all the work of our Census Bureau, the result to become available to us at the end of 2 or 3 years, is to me the sheerest kind of nonsense.

Mr. President, there is something sadder about this proceeding than the Army starting out to do a totally useless thing, and that is that on this particular issue the Military Affairs Committee is abdicating its jurisdiction and judgment. We did not give 1 hour before the Military Affairs Committee to the consideration of the complications and difficulties of an occupational census. The granting of the request of the Army was a wholly routine affair. Some gentlemen who knew nothing about the difficulties of census taking came before us and said they wanted the power, a tremendous clerical force, and millions of dollars to start this occupational census; and they promised us that if we allowed them to go ahead, 2 or 3 years from now they would tell us what was the labor condition on February 1, 1942. Millions of men will live and die on the Chinese and Russian fronts in the next 2 or 3 years, but their identities will change no more than our labor statistics from the time we start to take them until we finally analyze the results.

I do not think I made myself entirely clear to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Let me say that if the Army needs more chefs, bakers, mechanics, or farmers than it has, all it has to do is to tell the draft boards not to make so many exemptions in those classes until the Army has enough of the particular kind of skills that it requires. If on the other hand the Department of Agriculture should say to the Army, "We have not enough farmers in California to grow guayule for rubber," all the Army would have to do would be to send out to its draft boards instructions to increase the exemptions of farmers. That must be done week by week and month by month. Any longtime census is utterly worthless.

Mr. President, I offer a challenge to the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, who is so courteously and attentively listening to me, and who has been so fair to me throughout the hearings. If he will reconvene his committee to listen for 6 hours to men from the Social Security Board, the Bureau of the Census, the Labor Department, the Federal Reserve System, and labor leaders, they will convince him that what the Army seeks to do would not only be expensive and long drawn out, but worthless at the end.

On this tremendously important and transcendentally difficult question of a census on our labor conditions we did not even take the testimony of one single witness. The Army merely expressed its desire to start upon this long and laborious task of appraising the occupational assets of this Nation; and the committee, without discussion, without hearing witnesses, and without consideration, decided to give the Army the "green light."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNKER in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have heard all the remarks of the distinguished Senator. In view of what he has said, does he intend to move to recommit the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I do. I think that if any considerable number of Senators were listening such a motion would be agreed to; but under our unfortunate procedure, when great issues are being debated if a Senator is not on the side of the Senator who is speaking he is likely to leave the Chamber. We do not give fair consideration to these great issues.

Mr. President, I hope and pray that when the present war is over it will be the end of wars. I hope and pray that when this war is over we may proceed safely and rapidly to prosperity and stability. But I doubt if either of those things will happen.

I was discussing with one of the ablest economists in the O. P. M. the transcendentally difficult questions which are now before the country relating to matériel, men, priorities, and business. We reviewed the complicated repercussions and changes which are taking place in our

financial, economic, and industrial life. I said to him, "Suppose that right now the decisive battle were being fought on the Russian front, and that in April or March the German military machine should break and the German military power should be destroyed in vast revolutionary movements in Europe. What do you think would then happen in the United States, when we should have scaled a mountain peak of defense production?" He looked at me with absolute fear in his eyes and said to me something which he did not mean, of course, but which was meaningful nevertheless. He said, "Senator, I almost hope that does not happen."

He knew that 24 hours after our Government and our people know that Hitler is no longer a menace all this vast edifice we have been building for 2 years will begin to crumble and break. What disasters may then descend upon us no human mind can foretell. But whether we continue in this war, whether it is soon over or lasts long, or whether out of its dying embers another war will blaze—whatever happens, we should have worked out some method by which we can know from day to day what is our labor problem, what is our labor supply, what are our labor needs.

Take for example a State in which sugar is grown, such as the State represented by one of the distinguished Senators near me, what an uncertain thing the labor needs in the sugar-producing industry of today! In studying the labor supply and labor needs of Louisiana or Kentucky I would prefer to have from 1 week of investigation the advice and judgment of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who sits before me, or of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who has been a distinguished Governor of his State, than to have, after 2 or 3 years of delay, the information which would be furnished as a result of the operation of the labor-census provision of the bill.

If it should happen that this war should end next year or the year after next, then, indeed, we shall want to know from week to week what is happening with labor in New York City, what is happening with labor in St. Louis, or Cleveland, or Los Angeles, or Louisville, or New Orleans, or in the coal mines of West Virginia. Why, we cannot wait even weeks for that information. Out in Los Angeles, as I have already stated, we have several organizations which can keep track of our labor problem from day to day.

Mr. President, again I repeat, this procedure is most unhappy. The War Department has told us we need an occupational survey. Well, we do need it; we need it terribly. I do not say we shall face any disaster in Detroit when hundreds of thousands of workers lose their jobs in January and February if we do not have it. No; I do not say that; but I do say that we should be armed with every weapon of fact and knowledge in order to meet the problems that will be raised by what is going to happen in Detroit in January and February and March. We should know what is going to happen to the garages throughout the Nation, to the superservice stations, to the people who deal in rubber, and to the people who sell automobiles. It is sheer nonsense to take a census in January, and to find a certain man is working for Ford, in an automobile company, and then proudly announce that fact 18 months or 2 or 3 years later, when perhaps by that time the man has been in California or in Kentucky for a year working in some industry there. But, Mr. President, that will happen in millions upon millions of cases.

If our Committee on Military Affairs, our Finance Committee, our Commerce Committee, our Banking and Currency Committee, and our other committees henceforth are going to take the ipse dixit of men in the Army or of the Executive, if our committees are going to yield to them their right to have inspections made and testimony taken, if our committees are to become mere rubber stamps, then let us pray that the gentlemen who appeared before us are experts in almost every line. We had before us able representatives from the Army, but they were not in any way experienced statisticians, and we failed to call before us a single expert to ask, "How long do you think this census will take? What do you think it will cost? How many people will be employed? What shall we have of value at the end?" We did not even ask the Army how it expected to use or how it could use such information. We asked absolutely nothing about such matters; but at this time, when labor is so vitally needed, our committee recommended in effect that 25,000 or 50,000 of our clerks, experts, and typists be turned over to the Army for this purpose of working for 18 months or 2 or 3 years, assembling and analyzing statistics that would show what was the labor condition in the United States of America in January A. D. 1942.

As I have said, Mr. President, I have little thought that my voice will be heard here except to bring down upon me the anathema of certain persons who may disagree with me, and who want to give the green light to our military. Nevertheless, it is my solemn duty, when I see a serious mistake being made, to rise on the floor of the Senate and to speak my mind; and I want to say to the Army and to those gentlemen supporting the pending proposal that on Monday I shall offer a resolution asking the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to investigate the problem of an occupational census of all males from 18 to 65 years of age. We have in the Committee on Military Affairs some brilliant intellects, but I say to them that it will take them 2 weeks, listening to the experts, before they will be able to know how the problem should be worked out. When we do I am certain that we shall say that the Army is not a statistical agency, that it should not handle the statistics of labor. We have here in Washington the greatest Census Bureau the world has ever known, in which are found men who have worked in this specific field for years. They are able and are waiting to perform this function for the military.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask if the Senator from California has at hand a copy of Senate bill 2126?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I have.

Mr. DANAHER. I will ask the Senator to turn to the bottom of page 4, and I invite his attention specifically to section 9, reading in part as follows:

Section 9. Persons inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 who are inducted into or assigned to the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, shall be members of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be—

And that is followed by a semicolon. I ask the Senator from California to take special note of the language which follows:

and in time of war their periods of service or training and service may be extended by the President for such additional time as he may deem necessary—

And so forth. The significance of the interposition of the word "service" ahead of the phrase "or training and service," appearing here as it does, and nowhere else in the Selective Service Act, cannot have been purposeless. Legislative draftsmen do not use language without intending that it should have a meaning.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I inquire of the Senator what was the language he just read; I did not understand the quotation?

Mr. DANAHER. I invited attention to page 5, line 4—and notice, please, the words:

and in time of war their periods of service or training and service may be extended by the President—

And so forth. Let me say to the Senator from California the new word "service" has there been interpolated for the first time; it appears nowhere else in the Selective Service Act; and I wonder if, in the light of the splendid argument made by the Senator from California, he has previously had an opportunity to give consideration to this curious interposition of the word "service" in that section?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I have not; and I must, unfortunately and ashamedly, admit to the Senator from Connecticut that I do not know what it means.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from California that I have compared this language with that in the bill as passed by the House yesterday, and I notice that the word referred to is also in the House bill; it appears in section 8 in the House bill. It is perfectly apparent, it would seem to me, that if the United States is going to induct men into the Navy or the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard under this section and by a classification of their skills it shall be determined that a given number of craftsmen of any type or ability are needed, then those men will be ordered, pronto, to adopt the vernacular, into the service; not into any training and service, but into service in whatever field their skills may require.

That is the interpretation I place upon the strange new interposition in the legal phraseology of the bill; it is more or less pertinent to the speech of the Senator

from California, and I thought he might have some comment to make on the point.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, I have not; but I appreciate my attention being called to it. I can easily see its importance in connection with the argument I am making, but I have not thought about it sufficiently to be in a position to make any comment.

Mr. President, what I should like to see in Washington is a high-powered, energetic commission, a body of, say, 50 census experts, taken, as they should be, from the Census Bureau, the Social Security System, and the Labor Department, and let them undertake to secure for the Army, day by day and week by week and month by month, reports of labor conditions from everywhere in the United States.

I certainly agree with the President of the United States and the Secretary of War that we should have an analysis and understanding of exactly what our labor resources are. I go a step further and say we will more definitely need such an analysis and understanding in 1942 than we ever will thereafter. I am not so unhappy that we have done what we have done; I am unhappy that we in the Senate Military Affairs Committee have done it the way we have done it; and I trust and hope and pray that when other important issues come before us we will make it our duty and our obligation to scrutinize and understand proposed legislation and the problems that flow from it.

Mr. President, I speak my own opinion only when I express the view—and I am open to contradiction—that the members of the Military Affairs Committee generally, and in the majority, when they decided it was necessary to draft boys under 21 were merely declaring their acquiescence in what the Army and President Roosevelt wanted. I shall not criticize any committee member or any Senator for it. I suppose one may logically believe that, since we are in a war, we should go along, let the Army run the war, and do whatever the Army wants, and if the Army wants to constitute its personnel from boys of 18 to 21—if that is what they really desire—then I can understand Senators who say, "Well, it is not up to us to deny the Army, even though our judgment would be different." I cannot agree with that attitude. Assuming that we have, for years ahead, sufficient manpower in the classes above 21 years of age, I think it then becomes a social question for Congress to pass upon and to say whether that is what shall be faced by our boys and by our older men.

Mr. President, upon this same issue, I was made unhappy, for I do not think the Army was honest or frank with us. I listened to the testimony for 2 or 3 days, and at the end of that time I was unable to form any opinion from what was said; whether our Army merely wanted the boys under 21 as a reservoir, to be called on only after the list of older men had been exhausted, whether they would draw them out on a parity with the older men, or whether they intended to constitute the Army, so far as possible, from the boys of the Nation. I hate to say it, but the Army, by its evasion and ambiguity, has at least led me to believe that, in their desire to get this bill through, they are evading a clear statement of their position to the people of the United States and to the Congress, and that it is their intention, as rapidly as possible, to build the Army from boys under 21 years of age, who, they have testified, make the bravest soldiers and are more amenable to discipline.

Mr. President, I would not object if any general or official made that statement to the Congress, saying to us that our condition is so desperate that we have to sacrifice our boys because they make better soldiers than do older men; I would not object to the military authorities doing that; but I do object to witnesses who come before our committee who evade and quibble and change and confuse and contradict until—when they are through—not a single Senator can say, with any degree of assurance, what the Army intends to do if they are given the right to take boys under 21. I say that does not augur very well for the future.

Mr. President, it is my very fixed opinion that we have a more than ample supply of men above 21 years of age, and that we do not have to go down into the groups lower than that. I also say to you, from a social standpoint, God forbid that the Congress of the United States should unnecessarily disrupt the lives of three or four or five million young boys, many of them still adolescent and unseasoned in life!

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a telegram I have just received from Mr. John W. Mahan. Mr. Mahan was the adjutant general of my State for a great many years. He says:

> I trust that Senate sustains House provisions limiting drafting of men for military service to 21 years instead of 19 as recommended by departments. As national commander of the Disabled American Veterans in 1925 and 1926, I had occasion to and did observe tremendous effect of modern warfare on the men in their teens who participated, and I never knew of one who came through without irreparable damage to his nervous system. After maturity, seemingly, they can take it much better; and I believe it unfair to our youngsters not to give them a chance to mature. Men over 20 should be exhausted first.

I may say that Mr. Mahan is one of those who have been absolutely in favor of the President's program, in favor of the draft act and everything else. This is the first time Mr. Mahan has ever sent me a telegram saying that he was opposed to any part or portion of what the administration or the armed forces wanted with reference to military service of men.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I very much appreciate the reading of that telegram. Coming from such an authority, I should say that it is very persuasive and conclusive.

The newspapers in California announced my opposition to drafting boys under 21. Before I left my office we received stacks of telegrams, and it was reported to me that there was not a single criticism of my stand. Those telegrams came generally not from the pacifists or the isolationists, but from the American Legion and others who themselves had been following the President in his program.

I am happy, however this legislation comes out, that the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, under the distinguished and courageous leadership of Mr. MAY, and the House of Representatives itself, have had the courage to stand up against the barrage of newspaper editorials and the demands of persons here in Washington for the immediate passage of this bill. At least we can be happy that one of the great bodies of Congress has had the courage to do what its Members believed to be the right thing.

I now desire to call attention to another thing relevant to the telegram which has just been read by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I could almost have wept as our generals read to us the cruel and tragic statistics of our Civil War, showing that an overwhelming proportion of our boys were under 20, 18—yes; even 16 years of age. I thought of the ruined farms and homesteads in the South, where the barefoot boys of the South, 14, 15, and 16—the only males left in their homes—went out with unbroken courage to die on the field of battle against overwhelming odds. I could have wept as I thought of that story; and yet apparently our generals wanted us to take that as a reason why we should again send out the boys of America. I thought of the story of the Federal army of men with money who paid bounties to the hundreds of thousands of immigrant boys, two or three hundred dollars a piece, so that those Germans or Swedes or Irish would take their places in the Army. I thought of the desertions of those men, and the sickness, and the deaths; and then, Mr. President, I thought of exactly what is expressed by the telegram read by the distinguished Senator from Montana, of the psycopaths, the criminals, and the moral break-downs that followed the terrible Civil War. I was born at the tail end of the pioneer age in Wyoming, and I still saw the results of the Civil War upon the character of the men who had fought in it as boys—oh, not all of them; I do not mean that. There are boys of 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 who have the morale and the courage and the character to endure the misery, the horror, and the fear of war, and their association in mass lots with other men. There are many boys—perhaps half, perhaps a quarter of them—who can do that; but there is many and many a boy who, at 18 or 19 or 20, is not ready for war, and he becomes a worse citizen if he survives the war.

Mr. President, distinguished members of the Military Affairs Committee will corroborate me, I am sure, when I say

that one of the generals who appeared before the committee upon this very subject admitted that a large proportion of boys under 21 are not yet seasoned for war. He said some of them are. I think, perhaps, he expressed the opinion that half of them are. I have forgotten the proportion. He said that some are and some are not. The general went on to say:

> If I could personally talk to them, I could tell which boys are ready for the brutal, bloody business of war and which boys are not.

Unfortunately, neither that general nor anybody else can interview all boys in that respect. Here on one side of the street is Mike, a tough, hardy young Irish boy of 19, seasoned for war. His father is a poor man. Across the street is another boy of the same age, the son of a wealthy man, who is not yet seasoned for life or for war. Would any draft board dare to say, "We have interviewed these two boys. One, by character and development, is ready for war, and the other boy is not?" We cannot do that.

The Army said they felt so solicitous toward the men above 21, the 1,600,000 who have been declared ready for military service, that they did not want to draw upon any one age, but wanted to make parity everything from 19 up. Mr. President, let me say that the generals are now getting their wish, because all over America the recruiting stations cannot handle the floods of recruits for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard. In 1 week alone in New York City the Red Cross fed 15,000 men waiting to register, and the account said that a substantial portion of them were under 19 and 20 years of age. So the Army is going to have its fill of young boys, because I have no doubt that at least three or four hundred thousand of them, courageous, seeking adventure, will be inspired by patriotism, and will bravely go forth to enlist.

Mr. President, one of our most distinguished committeemen stated the proposition exactly as I have stated it, then said how unfair it would be to allow these young men to volunteer and not subject all the other boys to the draft. Let us analyze that proposition.

I am free to admit that some of our young men under 21 are eager for war, and I am willing to admit that as a class they will make the very finest soldiers. I venture to say, from what I personally know, that there is a marked correlation between those boys who are fit to go and those who volunteer. No general and no psychologist can segregate the group who should go from the group who should not go better than by the desire and the wish and the will of the boys themselves. I say that because I have talked to boys under 21, who are enlisting, and I find them almost uniformly fine physical specimens, well matured for their age, seasoned, and ready to take on the burdens of army life. But I know so many boys 17 and 18 and 19 and 20 who are not ready for the brutalities, and the discipline, and the danger of war, who cannot endure it without destruction to their characters and nervous systems.

Mr. President, the common law was a rather wise Solomon. The common law fixed 21 as the age of adulthood, because it recognized that under that age the male sex were generally still boys, and over it they generally had become seasoned men.

What will be the effect upon the boys under 21 if we enact the proposed law? There are 2,500,000 boys and girls in the United States now reaching majority each year. Half of them are girls, roughly, and half are boys. So there are in the age group from 18 to 21 a million two hundred and fifty thousand boys coming of age each year. The Army experts testify that at least one-half of those would be without dependents, and would be fine war material. In the age group from 18 to 21, then, we would have almost 4,000,000 boys, scattered everywhere in the United States, in 4,000,000 homes. As I have already said, I have no doubt that the Army will get three or four hundred thousand of that group, the cream of the group, the cream of the Nation, by voluntary enlistments. But that does not satisfy them, although they admit it is true.

Let us now consider the balance of the group. We not only need military power; we more vitally need industrial power. Let us assume a man, a farmer, in Iowa, let us say, and that the Department of Agriculture has called for more corn to help feed more chickens, or more hogs, or the people in Europe. Here is a farmer with a 19-year-old son. He has an additional 60 acres of land which he can plant if he can utilize the labor of his son. If he should lose the labor of that son he would lose his seed and his crop, and he would not plant it. What kind of uncertainty is to be thrown upon that farm? How are we to cultivate national morale or national production by saying to that farmer, "You plant that corn at your own risk. We want that boy of yours. The Army is going to take him." The farmer will reply, "I want to plant this corn, but I cannot do it unless I have my son." They will say, "Plant it at your own risk."

I know a father with an 18-year-old son in one of the chicken districts in California, who had planned to raise 1,500 additional chickens, at the request of the Department of Agriculture. He has now given up the idea, because he had to rely upon the labor of his 18-year-old son, and just as soon as he saw the possibility that that boy might be made subject to the draft and taken from the chicken farm, he would not go ahead with his plan.

What are boys in high school going to do? Does anyone think they are going to enter, or that they are going to continue and work as they should, with all that uncertainty hanging over them? I say that it would be better for the Army to take them outright than to make their lives so uncertain. What about the boys who might become apprentices, or go into some business in which the Government needed them, but who dare not do it if this uncertainty is cast upon their lives?

I contend we do not need to take these boys. Voluntary enlistments will give us all we need in that age group, and to subject three or four million homes to the uncertainty of this proposal will not help the Nation, but will profoundly demoralize and help to ruin it.

Mr. President, with the material we have above 21 years of age, in the next 2 or 3 years, if we include youths reaching 21, we could build an Army of 4,000,000 men. If we do what the President says he is going to do, we cannot build such an Army. Every selectee who is drawn into service requires back of him the labor of 4 men in civilian and defense industries. If we take a million selectees and train them next year, that will be an abstraction from the manpower of the Nation equivalent to 5,000,000 men. If we should try to handle 2,000,000 additional, it would mean an abstraction of 10,000,000 more. We already have plans for the equivalent of twelve or thirteen million men. We will soon be up to a requirement of 20,000,000.

If we are to make good on our lend-lease policies, if we are to provide arms and equipment to the Chinese and Russian fronts, we will have difficulty doing it and providing for another million men. Even if we had an Army of two or three million men, we do not have the ships available to move them to Europe or to the Orient. What is the good of planning for a great army which we simply would not be able to use, the building of which would prevent us from helping to arm the Chinese and the Russians?

No Senator dare rise here and say that we do not have ample military men available for the next 1 or 2 years. I say that the only sensible thing to do is to wait and to pass a measure of this kind at a time when we know we shall need it.

Mr. President, it is my intention at some later time to call up a motion, which I now make, to recommit the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States, under its authority, has declared the existence of a state of war. The Congress, however, cannot conduct the war. That must be done by the President of the United States and the officers and men of the Army and Navy and Marine Corps of the United States.

I am a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I was present during all the time this very important legislation was under consideration by the committee. I desire sincerely to compliment my friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who has made a most excellent presentation of his side of this question. No one questions his earnestness and his sincerity. He has suggested, however, that we wait, and that suggestion frightens me. I am very much afraid that there are some of us who do not yet realize how important it is that we act promptly.

If this bill is enacted into law, every man in the United States between the ages of 18 and 65 will be registered, and the country will know where those men are and will find out in a reasonable time what they can do to help the country win the war. No one should object to that. If the bill is enacted into law, every young man who is 19 years of age

and not past his forty-fifth birthday will be eligible for service and training in the Army of the United States.

I wish I could envision a situation in which Japan or Germany would blow up, and all our enemies would suddenly collapse, and that we would be victorious and could start over again; but again, I say, I am afraid to take chances. That may happen or it may not happen, and if it does not happen, we may be in for a very long war.

I assume all Senators know that perhaps it takes a year to train a man to become a good soldier. With respect to some men it takes longer, but to teach a man to use the terrific instruments of destruction now employed it takes at least a year, or perhaps longer. It takes that long or longer to train a man to fly an airplane, or to use a tank, or properly to use a machine gun, or to understand the mechanism of the various instruments of war of which the countries at war make use today.

If a young man 19 years of age is taken for service, the chances are that he will not be ready to fight until he is 20. The testimony given before the Committee on Military Affairs was conclusive that after 24 years of age a young man is no longer able to operate a dive bomber, or to fly the other terrific instruments of destruction, some of which fly 440 or 500 miles an hour.

Mr. President, when you ask me to delay you ask me to take chances again, and to speculate on the safety and security of the people of my country. My answer today, as it has been all along is "No"; I cannot afford to do that.

It may be, as my friend the Senator from California says, that we will not need these men. It may be that thousands of them will be called and that thousands of them will be killed. But if the war should be a long one, it would be a tragedy if we did not go all-out in making adequate preparations for it.

The Army now says it needs a million young Americans at the Nation's airports.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the air force, up to date, especially the combat air force, has been made up entirely of volunteers?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think that is true. There is, however, no assurance that it will be made up entirely of volunteers in the future. I shall have no objection to it being made up entirely of volunteers, if we can obtain a sufficient number of volunteers, for if it is made up of volunteers, we will not need to take these young men into the air force. They will not be placed in the air force. Consequently, they will be in practically no danger at all, because this war will be fought by air power, it will be won or lost by air power, and the Nation that can put the greatest number of planes in the sky and provide the men to fly them will win the war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The air force is not only made up of volunteers, but is made up of young men, just as the Navy is made up of young men. The average age of the men now volunteering in the Navy—and as we know, the Navy at this time is constituted entirely of volunteers—is 19. We have young men in the Navy. We have young men in the air force.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is entirely correct. And if we call young men and train them, and if we shall reach a speedy decision in this war, which is the wish and hope of every father and mother and of every other citizen of the country, then, Mr. President, we may save thousands—yes, millions, of our citizens from the possibility of total destruction. I wish my friends would not ask me to wait. Every delay gives opportunity for disaster.

Mr. President, it grieves me, and it grieves every other Senator and Representative, to think that he must vote to take the young son of some father and mother and place him in a position where he may be killed. Thousands of our boys may be killed. Thousands of our mothers and fathers may be distressed. Already young Kentuckians have given their lives in the defense of their country in the first 2 weeks of the war. Others will bravely give their lives on the battlefield in defense of this country.

I pray God that we may realize that we have sustained losses, and that those who are dead speak at this hour to those who live. It is barely possible that only those who are willing to die are fit to earn for themselves the right to live. Homes may be distressed and sons may be sacrificed. There may be tears all over the land. But if we have sufficient courage to face the situation as we ought to face it we will let the President and the Army have a free hand. If they cannot conduct this war successfully we are not going to win it. We might as well make up our minds to that. Congress cannot run this war.

I hate to cast a vote which would send any of my fellow citizens to die anywhere; but it must be remembered that we are at war. We have been attacked. At the request of the President of the United States we have declared that a state of war exists between our country and Germany, Italy, and Japan. We will either win the war or we will lose it. We will not win it by faltering or by failing to follow in this critical hour the leadership which will give us an opportunity to produce and to fight, or by failing to stay wide awake and do everything that is humanly possible to bring the war to a swift and successful conclusion.

I agree with my friend from California [Mr. DOWNEY] that we ought to study the prospects and possibilities of the future. But the future is not certain now, and will not be certain unless we are willing to make it so.

The members of the Committee on Military Affairs heard the testimony. I do not believe that the Army officers failed to give us as true a picture of the situation as they were able to give us. Every member of the Military Affairs Committee who voted on the bill presented by my friend from North Carolina voted for the bill as we reported it to the Senate. There was not a single vote in that committee against favorably reporting the bill. We had statements from the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps, and a letter from the President of the United States.

In defense of my fellow countryman, the distinguished chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, I wish to say that he had no such letter from the President of the United States when his committee considered the subject. I do not say that it would have affected or changed the result, but it might have. I think we shall make a mistake if we do not vote to send this question to conference. Nobody wants arbitrarily to set the age for a man to go to war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has brought out the point that at the time it voted the Senate Committee on Military Affairs had a letter from the President which the House committee did not have.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, acting a day later than did the House committee, had other evidence which was not available to the House Committee on Military Affairs and which was not presented to the House Committee on Military Affairs.

Most of the evidence we had on that last day, which evidence was not presented to the House committee, was evidence showing the necessity for including the younger men. Is not that true?

Mr. CHANDLER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. President, I am asked to delay. I am asked to wait. I am asked to take chances. If every American understands the issues which are involved in the present tragic situation in which the world finds itself, he will not ask for delay. He will ask us to make up for the delays of which we have been guilty in the past, and of which we should not have been guilty. But that is past. The time for delay is past.

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to refer to a very important matter. Everyone should know by now that the German, Italian, and Japanese Governments are masters of lying propaganda. Everyone should know by now that the Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo radio broadcasts and so-called news announcements are filled with untruths and inaccuracies designed to frighten the people of the democratic countries, to confuse the people of the conquered countries, and to allay the fears of their own people. From sober thought we all know this; but I wish to take this occasion to urge the citizens of this country to keep this thought in mind at all times in evaluating the reports of our enemies on the progress of the war.

German, Italian, and Japanese announcements cannot be believed and ought not to be believed by the people

of this country for the simple reason that they are designed in advance to bolster up the cause of the Axis and to destroy the United States and her allies.

I have asked Government sources to report to me on recent radio broadcasts emanating from Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo concerning the progress of the war. The report clearly reveals the complete untruthfulness of the announcements made by the Axis Powers. In summary, the report shows that the Axis Powers have been feeding the world an abundance of fiction, principally about internal conditions in our own country. The Germans, Italians, and Japanese are broadcasting over the radio and putting in their controlled press for the benefit of their own shut-in people and the neutral and democratic countries lie after lie about the United States and its condition.

According to these announcements, the condition of the United States is portrayed by the Axis Powers—and I now quote from the summary of a Berlin-Rome-Tokyo radio broadcast—as follows:

The United States is in despair. Its people are terrorized. Barricades have been hastily thrown up in the streets of Washington.

I believe there is one picket fence down by the White House. That is probably to keep children from straying off the sidewalks into the place where dirt is being moved by a dirt scraper.

President Roosevelt is panic-stricken. The Congress is in secret session. Food is being rationed.

The people of the Axis countries know that their food is being rationed, so if they believe that ours is being rationed it may encourage them. I have not seen any evidence of food rationing in the places I have visited in this country.

Millions have fled from New York for safety, and the entire Pacific coast has been evacuated for exactly 1,100 yards from the shore.

Eleven hundred yards from the shore would be a safe distance if we were throwing stones at somebody. We probably would miss him at 1,100 yards from the shore.

Every American citizen knows that none of those statements is true. We all know that they are deliberate falsehoods circulated to help the Axis Powers in their fight. Their people do not know any better because they do not hear anything except what their governments want them to hear. In this country we are still permitted to read the newspapers and listen to the radio.

Again, according to the propaganda of the Axis radios, "The majority of the people of the United States are hostile to the Government." That statement is made notwithstanding the fact that there were unanimous votes in the Senate and in the House on two declarations of war.

According to Axis propaganda, "The American people have gone pale because of the war." The Axis propagandists claim they have some reason to think that that has happened, to think that we do not have sufficient courage to do what the President and the Army say is necessary to be done in order to assure the winning of this war. But our people do not debate whether they would go out and win it.

The other day a Senator said that certain action should be taken only during a declared war. If my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, remembers it, I said then that it was my opinion that a man could be killed just as dead in an undeclared war as in a declared war.

The Axis propagandists also say that, "Most Congressmen are opposed to the war." Well, every Representative and every Senator is opposed to war; all Members of Congress would have avoided war if there had been any way to avoid it. But the Axis propagandists do not understand how the people of this country feel if they think that any American is opposed to defending himself or to fighting back when he is attacked.

We all know, and will correctly estimate, the value of the statements made over Axis-controlled radios. They are not true; they are not worthy of belief; and the American people should know exactly what kind of statements are being made to the people across the seas. We all know that those statements are lies, perpetrated to help the Axis cause.

I now quote a few excerpts from the German, Italian, and Japanese radio broadcasts as examples:

Berlin radio to Latin America, December 8: The German radio reports that the United States has "blackmailed" some Latin American nations into declaring war on Japan.

Berlin radio to Germany, December 9: In commenting upon the war in the Pacific the newscaster says that Wang Ching-Wei, the head of the Nanking regime, promises fulfillment of its treaty with Tokyo and that Chinese people make a U-stand at the side of Japan.

Rome radio, in French, to North America, December 9: The Italian radio says that President Roosevelt in his speech to Congress, admitted losses in the first phase of the war. This, the Rome radio says, has created great anxiety in Congress, where the legislators are "mostly opposed to war."

Rome radio, in English and Spanish, December 10: The Italian radio claims a "regular war panic" exists in the whole of the United States, asserting that barricades have appeared in the streets of Washington.

Rome radio to Latin America, in Spanish, December 10: The majority of the United States people, notoriously hostile to their Government's policies, now see themselves facing the grim prospect of suffering the disastrous consequences.

Rome radio, in English, December 10: The Italian radio reports that "President Roosevelt, for the first time in his life, is panic-stricken. He vents his fury on the Japanese, for fear of the sudden discovery of his mistake."

Tokyo radio, in Japanese, December 11: The Japanese radio reports that "The United States Pacific Fleet had 250 ships 5 days ago, but now has only 7 of any value."

Tokyo radio, in English, December 11: The Japanese radio says that the "Governor and Vice Governor of Guam have been made prisoner; most of Guam has been occupied. The Japanese forces suffered no casualties. American prisoners admitted there is no reason for fighting Japan, except that the warmongers ordered them to do so."

Tokyo radio, December 11: United States officials are busy with propaganda, trying to overcome the fears of their people "who have gone pale" over the war.

Berlin radio, in English, December 12: The German radio reports Congress will hold a secret session to determine responsibility for the "debacle" of the war.

Berlin radio, in German, to North America, December 12: The German radio reports "from Washington" that Congress will be called for a "secret session" in order to demand that the "persons responsible for the defeat should give an account of themselves."

Rome radio, in English, to North America, December 12: The Italian radio asserts that "rationing of food" has already begun in the United States. Rome comments: "This must be a shock for Americans." The Italian radio adds that Americans have never had to deprive themselves of anything, and that now freedom is a thing of the past.

Tokyo radio, in English, December 12: The Japanese radio says that in light of past history it is evident that Burma and the East Indies will follow Thailand and Indochina into the Axis camp. The Japanese add that "the declaration of war by South American countries is a rare piece of nonsense. These countries are poisoned by gold."

Rome radio, in Italian, to Central and North America, December 12: The Italian radio reports that "it is learned from Santa Cruz, Calif., that a black-out has been ordered for all of Santa Cruz County. American authorities have ordered the evacuation of the population along the Pacific coast for the depth of 1 kilometer."

Holland, German-controlled radio, in English, December 12: The Dutch radio says that "it is reported from New York that the stock exchange has suspended operations because of the war situation."

Holland, German-controlled radio, in English, December 13: The Dutch radio says that "according to a Domei report from Tokyo, the spokesman of the Japanese board of information, addressing the foreign correspondents this morning, stated that in spite of the reports of a pan-American solidarity behind the United States war efforts, so far the Japanese Government has not received one single formal notice of a declaration of war from any of the South American countries."

Holland, German-controlled radio, in English, December 13: "According to a report reaching Stockholm from Washington, the nervousness of the population of California is steadily increasing owing to numerous measures taken by the Government. In accordance with the latest instructions given by the military authorities, all persons have to be evacuated within a radius of 1,000 yards from the Pacific coast."

Germany, Italy, and Japan, by faking newspaper and radio announcements, are using the old technique of trying to confuse and divide the democratic countries. They shall not succeed in that mission. As the war goes against the Axis countries—and it will go against them—the number and variety of the Axis lies will increase. President Roosevelt said last week that the United States would announce the facts on the progress of the war as the facts are confirmed and when they do not give aid and comfort to the enemy. The people of America do not want any more than that. They want to know the facts; they are entitled to know the facts. The President said they are going to have the facts on every occasion except when, by giving the facts, the enemy might get information which would give aid and comfort to him. In that event the facts will not be given until such time as they can be given without giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

We are a democratic country, and, unlike our enemies, we can afford to tell

the people the truth. I urge every citizen of this country to rely for his information on the war not on rumor or fiction as propagandized by the German, Italian, and Japanese Governments, but on the statements given out by the President of the United States and the official statements given out by the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps of the United States.

DISTRICT MOTOR-VEHICLE-FUEL TAX

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. BURTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2126) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, initially I desire to thank the distinguished and able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] for having at this hour registered his opposition to the motion of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the effect that the bill be recommitted for the purpose of providing further consideration; and I am glad that the Senator from Kentucky has taken this opportunity to register his protest against the proposed recommittal of the bill. I am particularly glad that the Senator from Kentucky has made protest, in view of the fact that the able junior Senator from Kentucky is a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; and, as chairman of that committee, I recall with much appreciation and gratification that he was present at every minute of every hour during the many hours the committee sat from day to day in consideration of the bill.

Let me say further that I have a great deal of affection, and have always evidenced admiration, for the able and distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. Unquestionably he is one of the most able speakers in this body. I always listen to him with a great deal of interest. I do not always agree with him; but I listen to him, because I know he is absolutely honest and sincere in the convictions expressed by him from time to time. I listened to him today; I listened to him with much interest. I always like to hear him. The Senator from California, with whom I disagree at this hour, has convinced me beyond question of a doubt that he is against this bill.

Now I desire briefly to refer to several statements he made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Would the adoption by the Senate of the motion made by the Senator from California to send the bill back to the committee, bring about, in the Senator's opinion, any different result, if the committee continued to discuss it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. None whatever.

Mr. CHANDLER. Was not the vote unanimous in the committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was unanimous, by every member of the committee present; and in reference to the suggestion of further contributions in the way of testimony which might have been introduced or would be introduced, let me say that I do not recall that a single member of our committee—and it is composed of a membership of 18 Senators—requested the chairman or made request of the committee that anyone from the Social Security Administration or the Census Bureau be called before the committee; and it is my recollection that the distinguished junior Senator from California did not publicly request in open committee that any such persons be summoned.

The junior Senator from California has told us that it will be absolutely impossible to take the census which is desired in the form of registration, whereas on the other hand General Hershey tells us that he can make the registration, that he can make it within a very few months, and that he can do so with the same framework he has set up now, and with but little more expense.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. And the truth of the matter is that neither the Social Security Administration nor the Census Bureau has now in existence any organization similar to that possessed by the Selective Service Administration. The Selective Service Administration has its local boards in every town, city, and almost hamlet throughout the United States. Those boards have their employees and clerks available every day and are ready to do this job. Is not that true?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is quite true, and that was the statement made by the general himself.

Mr. HILL. Of course. The Census Bureau has no such organization, and the Social Security Board has no such organization.

So far as my distinguished friend from California is concerned, as a member of the committee it was his right, and he had the opportunity to offer any amendment he saw fit. He could have offered any amendment dealing with social security; he could have offered any amendment dealing with the census or any amendment of any other character, kind, or description he wanted to offer; but he did not offer any amendment. The truth is, as the distinguished chairman of the committee knows, that when we met on Tuesday morning the distinguished Senator from California was not present—I imagine he must have been engaged in some other very important or urgent matter—but he telephoned and asked the committee if it would not let the vote go over until 2 o'clock that afternoon. It will be recalled that the committee acquiesced at once in the request of the distinguished Senator from California, and he was advised that we would be happy and would agree to let the vote go over until 2 o'clock that afternoon.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And we did.

Mr. HILL. We did let it go over until 2 o'clock. At 2 o'clock the distinguished Senator from California could have been there when the bill was under consideration, and he could have offered an amendment to any line, phrase, word, or paragraph in the bill, but he did not offer a single amendment. If my memory serves me, he was not even there when the final vote was taken on the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In order that the record may be kept clear I appeal to the Senator to corroborate that, as vehemently and logically as I could, I stated my position against this method of industrial census on the floor of the Senate this morning. I spoke only for a few minutes, of course, but I challenged the committee and the Army to produce one expert on statistics or on the taking of censuses who would endorse what the Army wanted to do. I declared that practically every expert with whom I talked would state that the plan of the Army would be ineffective, costly, and unnecessary, and I suggested that witnesses be called by the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that the Senator from California is correct; he did make quite an extended statement; he made a speech to the committee, but following his speech he offered nothing. It is easy for a Member on this floor to stand up and criticize; it is easy to say that the committee did not do this or somebody else did not do that; but if a Member of this body or a member of the committee believes that something ought to be done, it is up to him to offer something himself. The distinguished Senator from California did make a speech in the committee, and the committee sat there very patiently and listened to the Senator's speech. As I recall, he spoke for 40 minutes or 45 minutes. Perhaps his speech was not so long; but I know I listened to every word the Senator uttered. However, when the time came to consider the bill—and the committee considered the bill paragraph by paragraph—the Senator from California had no amendment to offer; he offered nothing constructive; he had nothing in writing; he had nothing he intended to offer, so far as the language of any of the provisions of the bill was concerned.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, inadvertently, my very dear friend, the brilliant Senator from Alabama, has misstated himself. I did move the substitution of the House bill for the Senate bill, which would have fixed the age at 21, and the committee very unanimously and promptly voted it down. Does not the Senator recall that?

Mr. HILL. Yes; but let me say to the Senate that, even though the Senator did offer the House bill for the Senate bill, the provisions of the House bill with reference to registration, over which the Senator has thrown up his hands in horror, were exactly verbatim et literatim what they were in the Senate bill, and as they are in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, I admit very frankly that I was not prepared, and I am not prepared now, to offer any amendment to this bill providing for an industrial or labor or occupational census. I will go further than that, Mr. President, and say there is no Senator of sufficient experience and intellect to know the kind of a law that ought to be passed for an occupational census without putting in about 2 weeks' work. I have spent several days interviewing the statistical experts in Washington, and, while I think a very fine and excellent piece of legislation could be worked out by the Military Affairs Committee, they could not hope to understand the problem and present a finished piece of legislation unless they were to sit patiently for a week or 2 weeks and listen to men who have made statistical investigation a life work.

Of course, I have not any amendment; of course, I did not have any amendment; I am merely asking that on this tremendously vital question we take sufficient time to consider it; and, Mr. President, I want to be on record as saying that in 6 months' time we will know that what the Army will have done under this bill will have been a futile and worthless work. Time will prove it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. In view of the statement of my friend from California that he has no amendment, will he not agree that no good could be accomplished by sending this bill back to the committee? I agree that my friend voted for a provision that would have placed the minimum age at 21 years—I recall that very well—but there was nothing before the Committee on Military Affairs that was not acted upon during the sessions of the committee; I know from my friend's statement if the bill were sent back there would still be nothing before the committee. So I plead with him not to make us wait 2 weeks. I will agree to help him get his experts, help him to make his study, and help him get a bill, if we can get a bill which will place this country in a position to carry on again when the emergency shall have passed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I dislike to intrude upon the good nature of the Senator, but I do not think that the last remark, if it is intended as an implication from my argument, is a just one. I am saying that what we need is an industrial census right now from day to day, from week to week, and month to month. I am not suggesting any industrial census for post-war collapse, important as that may be. I am saying that if we want to provide war material and utilize labor to the fullest extent we will never learn the way to do it by this Army method, which, by their own statement—their own statement, Mr. President—will take 2 years. That is their statement, not mine.

Now, let me say that if I can be assured that, on the introduction of a resolution on Monday for an investigation as to the best method for setting up an industrial and labor census to determine how best to develop our military supplies, our industry, and our defense, there will be a hearing at which the experts on that subject in Washington will be allowed to testify, I will immediately withdraw my motion to recommit.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend knows that no suggestion of mine was intended to be unjust to him. What I want to say to him now is that I pledge him my support to his resolution for an investigation and to having a hearing that will satisfy him, but as yet I do not know why he is trying to do that. I am like an old Governor who once presided over my State, and who said, "If it is good and the people are for it, I will support it; but if it is bad and they are against it, I will be against it." I promise, however, to give earnest consideration and enthusiastic help in trying to bring about what the Senator wants, although I confess I do not completely understand it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I do not want to delay this body in registering its decision in reference to the Senator's motion, if the Senator persists in having his motion voted upon. Does he?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. I am sure the best policy for the Senate and for orderly procedure will be for me to rely upon the fairness and courtesy of the chairman of our committee, as I have been able uniformly to do, and to serve notice upon the committee that I shall submit a resolution asking the Military Affairs Committee to investigate the best way to set up an occupational census. Upon the assurance of my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] that he will assist me in furthering that resolution, I intend to withdraw my motion to recommit this bill to the committee and stand upon a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is very considerate of the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I desire to say to my friend from California that I will join the Senator from Kentucky in doing anything I can to expedite not only the adoption of the resolution but an investigation by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and action by that committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to the matter before the Senate—and then I shall have finished what I have to say in support of the bill's passage at this hour—prior to the taking of the vote, whenever it is taken, I wish to read two communications. One communication is in the form of a memorandum from General Hershey.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly; I am always happy to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I very greatly appreciate the continued courtesy of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment which would strike out the word "nineteen" and restore the words "twenty-one," to conform the pending bill to the form in which it passed the House. I respectfully ask the Senator from North Carolina to allow me to offer that amendment now, and let it become the pending question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There is no objection to that.

Mr. DANAHER. I therefore offer the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the word "nineteen" and insert the words "twenty-one."

In line 11 it is proposed to strike out the word "nineteen" and insert the words "twenty-one."

On page 4, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the word "nineteen" and insert the words "twenty-one."

In lines 18 and 19 it is proposed to strike out the word "nineteenth" and insert the words "twenty-first."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator from Connecticut is very welcome. I am always happy to yield to him.

Mr. President, in particular reference to the matter just referred to in the form of an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I wish at this time to read a letter from General Marshall. This letter is over his signature, under date of December 17, 1941.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICES OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: Urgent military demands render it impossible for me to present personally to your committee certain recommendations which I consider it my duty to submit regarding the age limits for liability for military service provided in pending

legislation to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

I earnestly request that the Senate fix these ages at 19 to 44 years, inclusive.

To win this war will require a maximum national effort, and it is important that we recognize from the beginning that able-bodied men of all ages must bear proper proportions of the load in the capacity for which best suited. The traditional age for liability for military service in our country is 18 to 45. The War Department, sensing the reluctance of the Congress to fix the lower age limit at 18 years, recommended 19 years originally. The Department feels that it would be unwise to make further concession in this regard. The Army needs men between the ages of 19 and 44 to insure a proper balance in our effort. This is in line with the experience of the other principal nations engaged in this war, and we should profit by their experience.

Highly skilled technicians can be obtained only from those in the upper age brackets who have had years of experience. Young men possess the vitality, enthusiasm, and physical stamina necessary to the successful performance of certain types of duty.

The selection of men for military service from the very beginning of this war must be accomplished in a manner that will insure a continuous maximum effort in both military and industrial fields. There is sufficient manpower available to do this, but in order that it may be accomplished fairly and without waste, all men between the ages of 19 and 44 years should be notified now that they are liable for military service if and when needed.

Already a greater percentage of our people is employed in industry than was the case at the peak of production during the first World War, and this percentage is steadily increasing. Certainly, it can be assumed that our industrial effort will continue to increase at a rapid rate for some time to come, and all of our available manpower will be required in the defense of this country, either in uniform or in industry.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

That, Mr. President, is in particular reference to the amendment offered by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

In reference to registration, and utilization of manpower under the proposed registration, and in opposition to the motion made by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], I now wish to read for the RECORD and the information of those who are here a memorandum from General Hershey, who heads and directs the selective-service organization, to Capt. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., under date of December 18, 1941, reading as follows:

You are instructed to inform Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that, after conferring with the War Department, my plans have been modified as herein set forth

I have this date directed my staff to make all necessary preparations immediately for the registration of the men between the ages of 19 to 21, inclusive, and between the ages of 36 to 44, inclusive, and for their classification and addition to the respective classes of present registrants at the earliest practicable time consistent with proper administration.

Necessarily, there will be some lapse of time before this can be accomplished, and consequently current requisitions and calls for men by the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps must be filled during such time from among the men who have already been, or are now being, registered, classified, and placed into class 1-A. Under these plans it is contemplated that the first of the new registrants will be added to classes of old registrants in approximately 90 days.

Simultaneous with the above action, present plans contemplate careful rechecking of the present deferred classes, from which it is believed additional men will be obtained.

The contemplated increase in the size of the armed forces and the type of men desired by them make the foregoing action essential in the light of the World War experience as set forth commencing at page 166 of the second report of the Provost Marshal General.

This memorandum is signed by Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System. It is my understanding that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is now present in the Chamber, has a copy of the report to which I have referred; and I therefore yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator wish to finish reading the letter?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have a copy of the Second Report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War on the operations of the Selective Service System. The report is dated December 20, 1918.

Senators will recall that at the time of the World War the first draft law provided for the drafting of men from 21 to 31 years of age. That was found insufficient. Congress then had to take a second bite at the cherry, amend and change the law, go back to 18 years of age, and forward to 45 years of age.

This report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War tells the story of what happened in 1918. I read from page 176 of the report. The paragraph is headed "Exhaustion of class 1," and reads:

At the outset of the year 1918, when the announced military program looked only to the completion of the first call of the President for 687,000 men, and when class I promised to hold about two and a half million nominal numbers and some 2,000,000 effectives, the prospect of the exhaustion of class I seemed too remote for practical contemplation at the time. But as the fortunes of the battlefield progressed and the military program was enlarged, and especially when the large shipments overseas marked the months of May and June and correspondingly increased requisitions were made upon the selective draft for deliveries to camp, it became apparent that class I under the first registration was certain to be exhausted before long. Congress, by the act of May 20, 1918, had authorized the President to include for registration the new age-21 men—and the President had authorized their registration on June 5, 1918; but even this accession did not suffice to fill the camp needs then announced in the plans of the General Staff. It therefore became necessary either to consider the organization of an additional class I or to call upon the deferred classes 2, 3, or 4 in the sequence of their liability. The result of this situation viz, the congressional legislation enlarging the ages for registration, and thus enabling a new class I, estimated at nearly two and a half million effectives, to be made available, has already been set forth in chapter II.

The date of the passage of the enabling act of August 31, 1918—

Which was the act the Congress then had to pass to supplement the original act, because the original act had not provided sufficient manpower, as the report has just stated.

The date of the passage of the enabling act of August 31, 1918, extending the draft ages, left scanty time for the processes necessary to the replenishment of the almost exhausted class 1. Yet the enlarged military program made it absolutely necessary that a substantial portion of the new class 1 should be ready at the earliest feasible date. There never had been a moment when the requisitions from the General Staff were not able to be filled by the Selective Service Administration, and such a moment must not be allowed to arrive or even to impend.

The responsibility for carrying the heavy labors now necessary would fall largely upon the local and district boards, the State executives, and the other field forces of the system. A letter was therefore addressed to the Governors of all States on September 10, pointing out that the situation imposed an inevitable condition of promptness and celerity in disposing of the huge new task, and announcing that the entirety of the operation must be compressed into the space of 100 days.

Immediately after the registration day, September 12, the boards began the first stages of the operation of classification. By direction of the President on September 10, the new registrants were to be taken in two series, the first series including registrants between 19 and 36 years of age, inclusive, and the second series including the remainder—

That is those from 36 to 45—

and the boards were directed to proceed first with the classification of the first group. In order to enable the several States and boards to proceed at a pace consistent with their powers, a system of telegraphic and mail communication was installed by which each State and board together with this office were informed by daily bulletins of the progress of the classification work in all other States and boards. The loyal and devoted spirit of all of the officials without exception and the boards was exhibited by the zealous manner in which they proceeded to the dispatch of their task.

Mr. President, this report shows that during the World War we did exactly what it is suggested we do now, to wit, not enough, that we not go far enough, that we make a mistake which will compel us to return and do the job as it should be done, when perhaps we will not have the time in which to do it.

During the World War, in the first act Congress did not provide for the drafting of any men under 21 years of age. Congress had to return subsequently and put on a "blitzkrieg" program, so to speak, in an effort to get the men not covered under the original act, when it looked as if they were going to be so badly needed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have perhaps missed the statement already made by the Senator which would answer my question.

Mr. HILL. I may say for the information of the Senator that I was reading from the second report of the Provost Marshal General in 1918. As the Senator will recall, the administration of the selective service at the time of the World War was under the Provost Marshal General, who was the administrator of the system. I have been reading from his report to the Secretary of War on the operations of the selective service sys-

tem, the report being dated December 20, 1918. Of course, that covers the whole period of the selective service, because the armistice came on November 11, 1918.

Mr. PEPPER. I remember that very well, because that was the registration in which I registered.

I was about to ask the able Senator, about what is the period of training the War Department prefers to have for the men who come into the service afresh?

Mr. HILL. A minimum of a year. It is better if they can have a year and a half or 2 years.

Mr. PEPPER. I suppose that if the War Department had an opportunity to have 2 years, they would prefer to have that length of time.

Mr. HILL. They would much prefer to have 2 years. While we are considering this question today, let us think in terms of the men who may be sent into battle. There is not a soldier on earth who will not testify that for every day of training he has his chances for coming out of battle with his life are just that much enhanced. The great tragedy of the World War, in many respects, was that the United States had to send its soldiers into battle in France when the men had not been properly trained, and prepared, and made ready for battle. Many of them went to their deaths, many of them were sacrificed because, under the compulsion of the situation, they had to be sent into battle without being given the fullest possible training and the fullest possible opportunity to protect themselves and to save their lives.

I have often said, Mr. President, that as great a tragedy as war is, there is one tragedy even greater than war; that is the tragedy of being forced into war, and we of the United States are now forced into war, and then being forced to send our young men into battle without their being properly trained and prepared—made ready for battle. Many a cross over an American grave today marks the resting place of some gallant young American shot down in battle because we were forced to send him into battle without the proper training or preparation.

I will say to the Senator that from my observations as a soldier in the World War, from my observations as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, from my observations for many years as a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, from all the observations I have been able to make, I should say that if I had a boy who was 19 years of age I should want him to go into the Army now in order that he might have the best possible chance for preparation. No man knows what tomorrow may bring, or what 6 months from now may bring, or what 1 year from now may bring.

Mr. President, I heard one gentleman in particular in the Committee on Military Affairs mention the fact that our associates in this war have unlimited manpower. As I said on the Senate floor yesterday, I want to see the United States give all possible aid to our associates. I want to see the United States carry out the lend-lease program to the fullest measure possible consistent with the dangers which confront us. This great United States of America cannot rely upon some other nation to win the war for it. The only way we can proceed with common sense, the only way we can proceed according to all the dictates of reason, is to go forward and to be prepared to win the war with our own manpower, with our own strong right arm.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. From what the Senator has said, we are entitled to assume, I believe, that one of the considerations moving the Department and the President to make this recommendation is so as to be able to furnish a longer and more effective period of training to this category of our manpower?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have been out of the Senate Chamber for a few moments, but while I was present during the debate I heard the very eloquent Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] discuss the bill, and I gleaned from what he said, or, at least, I think it is a fair implication to be drawn from what he said, that men would be taken into the Army under the provisions of this bill, and under the preparations which are now being made by the War Department without being given the proper opportunity for the training of which the Senator is now speaking. In other words the Senator from California would lead me to believe that under the provisions of the bill men are once again going into the Army as they did in 1917 and 1918, that we shall find in camps men training with broomsticks, men not properly clothed, men not properly housed, and, as I recall, the Senator even said men would find themselves sleeping on the ground if the bill is passed.

Mr. President, I do not quite understand that to be the purport of the bill. I may be wrong in my interpretation of what the able Senator from California said, but I believe it is a fair implication to be drawn from what he said, and that he left the impression with the country that that is exactly what would happen if the bill were passed. If that point has not been explained, I hope the able Senator from Alabama, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, will explain it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I had no intention to convey to the Nation the impression or meaning he says he has gained from my statement. What I intended to say, and what I still mean, is that, if we should attempt to take into the selective service in the calendar year 1942, more than 1,000,000 additional selectees, in addition to the 1,800,000 now in our Army, we would not be able to officer them, to provide housing for them, or to provide equipment for them. That is what I meant to say. Then, of course, I added that we have a reservoir far beyond the 1,000,000 men. Consequently it would be useless to add to the reservoir.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. Let me answer the Senator's question first.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad if the Senator will do so.

Mr. HILL. With reference to the question asked by the Senator from Illinois, I wish to say that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs catechised the representative of the War Department very closely about the very question raised by the Senator from Illinois as to whether there would be any effort made by the War Department or any action taken by the War Department to take men into the Army when the Army was not prepared properly to house and properly to care for them. The representative of the War Department, General Haislip, in reply used the very term the Senator from Illinois used and said:

> I can assure you gentlemen that we are not going to have any "broomstick" army; we are not going to take these men in except as we are ready to take care of them, and take care of them properly.

The general said further that in order to take care of the men properly he did not consider that they all ought to be in houses made of wood or some other kind of permanent construction. Some of the men would be housed in tents.

In addition to the assurance we had from the War Department that no men would be inducted until the War Department was properly prepared to train and house and take care of them, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that there is a specific provision in the basic act—and the bill we are now considering is only an amendment to that act and does not affect all its provisions—that men shall be inducted into service only as the Secretary of War finds that he has adequate facilities to house and care for them.

There is in the basic act another provision which will apply just the same under this amendment as it has heretofore applied. No man can be inducted into the service until and unless Congress shall appropriate the money for bringing him in and providing for his care and training.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy the Senator has made that explanation, and I am also thankful for the explanation made by the able Senator from California. It may be that because my mind was turned to some other matter while the Senator from California was discussing the bill, I received a wrong impression. But I distinctly remember the speech the Senator made, and I was a little fearful that some of our citizens might obtain the impression, as the result of the passage of this bill, that once again the men from every section of the country would be sent to camps and cantonments when in reality there were no camps and cantonments prepared for them, and that again they would find themselves drilling with inadequate military equipment.

I am glad the Senator said what he has said. I am glad that the basic provisions of the bill contain what they do. I am also happy to know that those who testified before the committee have given the country the assurance that what happened in 1917 and 1918 will not happen in this war.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the intention of the Senator from California to ask that his motion to recommit be withdrawn?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is not a pleasant task to oppose the recommendations of the President or a general of the Army in time of war. I have seriously questioned what our proper function is as Members of Congress in dealing with the questions and proposals that are set before us. So far as I am concerned, on military and naval matters, I should be inclined to accept whatever the Army and Navy experts may recommend. If the Army says that it needs an army of 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 men to go over to Europe, I may or may not disapprove of that general policy; but if the Army says that is necessary, I am inclined to accept that judgment. After all, this is an all-out war, a war which may ultimately threaten the very security of this country. I believe that the recommendations of the Army or Navy on such matters ought to be followed. If more battleships are recommended, I will vote for more battleships, even though I personally may feel that battleships are no longer of any value.

But when we go outside the strictly military questions and come to questions of national policy I believe that it is not only our right but our duty to criticize measures which are proposed. I do not believe that we are obliged to accept every recommendation the President may make. I think we must examine his recommendations in the light of our own opinions. I believe that every authority that has been cited is to the effect that in a democracy the right of criticism prevails even in time of war. Certainly nothing distinguishes England from the totalitarian nations today more than the free right of criticism which has remained in the House of Commons and throughout England.

So, if a measure is presented, I think we may properly question whether the method proposed is right. Certainly in all fiscal matters we must exercise our own judgment. I believe that on the question of psychological and moral values our opinion is just as good as that of the President or the Army. In this case we have the fact that the House of Representatives and its committee have both voted in favor of the age of 21, so the criticism does not begin in this body.

We cannot hope to keep business as usual. On the other hand, we have created in this country a great field of moral and educational values, of better standards of living, and of all kinds of things which we want to retain; and it seems to me that until it is necessary for military or naval purposes to make changes in those values and in those economic relationships, we should not do so. I believe we should make the change as gradually as possible.

If it is not necessary to draft men of 19 and 20 today and if it is not going to be necessary for another year or 2 years, then I see no reason why such a draft should not be put off. In fact, I think it ought to be put off until it becomes necessary for military purposes.

We can analyze figures as well as can the Army or the President of the United States. Those figures show that of the 17,000,000 men who are registered, only about 800,000 have been drafted. About 1,000,000 more can be obtained from that group in the A–1 class. That would leave 15,000,000 still untouched, because they have dependents or for some other reason are not being accepted in the draft. I refer to the men below the age of 28. In the age group from 28 to 35 it is estimated, according to the hearings, that 365,000 more would be available; and from the 10,000,000 in the class from 35 to 45 400,000 more could be drawn.

Furthermore, every year 1,200,000 boys become of age. The last registration was the 1st of July. So if we look ahead for the year 1942—and I think we should look ahead for the year—we find that in a period of 18 months 1,800,000 boys who have not yet registered will have become of age. The estimate is that half of them would be liable for service. I should say that that is a very low estimate. In any event, 900,000 more are coming in this year and there will be 600,000 in every year thereafter, making a total of 2,750,000 men who may be said to fall in the A–1 classification, without any reduction of the age limit during the year 1942.

So far as I can judge, the Army simply says that it does not know how many men it is going to take this year. It does not think it will require more than 1,000,000, because it is not going to draft anybody until it has the equipment and the proper method of maintaining him. So out of the 2,750,000 we have an ample supply to meet all requirements during the year 1942. Why should we reduce the age limit and pick up another 1,200,000 subject to the draft, and in another year another 1,200,000?

If the boys of 19 and 20 years of age are taken, and drafted on a proportional basis, nearly half the total draft will be boys of 19 and 20.

It seems to me that the argument based on the plea of necessity completely falls down. There is no need to draft boys of 19 and 20 today to raise the army which the Army itself says it wants during the next 12 months and during the year 1942.

It is suggested that young men are needed for balance. Nearly all the volunteers, or a very large proportion of them, are boys under the age of 21. The Army has plenty of young men, men who probably are abler and stronger than those who have not gone into the service.

In the 20-year-old group we find a great variation among boys. Some are mere boys, and some are men. It cannot be said that those men are all perfectly capable of making good soldiers at that age.

Such a draft would tremendously upset all the relationships in this country. It would deprive the colleges of practically half their student bodies. It would cut their revenues down to one-third. Those are secondary considerations, but they are considerations to be taken into account before we go ahead and extend the draft to obtain men whom we do not need for the biggest army anybody says we can possibly have during the year 1942.

I cannot help feeling that the real reason for this request is not a military reason. If we read the statement of the Secretary of War in his letter to the House committee, which was endorsed by the President, I think we will find the reason which is really urged for the proposed lowering of the draft age. The Secretary says:

> I desire to emphasize the psychological or moral effects of the passage of a great measure along these lines. It will make clear to the American people the character of the effort that will be required to defeat the vast forces arrayed against us. To the outside world it will be a symbol that we are providing the means to make good our declared policy to accept no result save victory, final and complete.

I think I am just as good a judge of moral and psychological results as is the Secretary of War. In my opinion the way to achieve the proper psychological result in this war is to do the things we say we will do, create an army and a navy, and give them the powers and the money necessary to a military success.

It seems to me that we have had enough of taking action for psychological effect, for the effect it would have on the morale in England, Germany, or Russia. As a matter of fact, the statements introduced by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] show that, so far as Germany is concerned, it does not make any difference what we do, because the Axis Powers will lie anyway. They do not tell the people what is going on. They can picture any kind of a situation, whether it exists or not. The moral effect on Germany would be nil.

The way to create a moral effect is to make our plans and say what we are going to do, and then go ahead and do it, and not announce broad programs that do not mean anything, or announce a great registration of men between the ages of 45 and 65, when the chance of ever taking a single man in that age group is practically nonexistent. The way to help morale is not to promise lease-lend aid unless we are ready to give such aid, and to impress on everyone that we will keep our promises; for otherwise, if we simply talk for effect and then do not keep our promises and fail to carry out our plans, the eventual effect on anyone's morale will be much worse than the effect would have been if we had never made such promises.

The real purpose of this bill is its psychological and moral effect on the American people. However, the American people know what they are up against; they are determined to win this war. We do not need to spur them on. Any American called upon today to perform any task will voluntarily do the task to the best of

his ability. We shall not have any trouble getting men for any industrial work; and if we have all the questionnaires available and resting in the back office of some draft board, a man who wants new men to work in a new airplane factory will not go to a draft board to find out what machinists are available; he will advertise for them, and in 2 days he will get better machinists than those he could get from the draft board in 2 months, and he would have his new machinists working before the draft board could furnish him with any information.

I think some boys 19 and 20 years of age are perfectly capable of serving, but others are not capable of serving. In some cases I think that, as a result of being thrown in with a group of men of all classes, men who are a bit toughened and hardened older men who are familiar with conditions which exist around all military camps, the character and future of boys of 19 and 20 years of age will be seriously and permanently affected. Boys of that age who leave school for 2 or 3 years will never go back to finish their education; their schooling will be over.

I think there are many considerations to be kept in mind regarding these men, and it seems to me that we should not disturb them in their relationships until it is necessary to do so for a military reason.

I do not understand that there is any need to register all men from 45 to 65 years of age except for a psychological reason. Statistics regarding the men from 45 to 65 years of age will never be used. Such statistics will rest in some back office. They will not be of any value along the lines the President has in mind when he says that he considers such registration an essential instrument for the orderly planning of our national effort.

When we consider the kind of treatment that census reports, Senate committee reports, and various other reports have received in the past, I should be very much surprised to find anyone planning our national effort ever looking at the questionnaires. The questionnaires will remain in the back office of some library, and that will be the end of them.

So, Mr. President, when we balance the various considerations I think we find there is no military necessity of any kind to draft men from 19 to 20 years of age. Of course, it may become necessary to do so. If Hitler does not collapse, and if we have to set up an army of 7,000,000 men, I think it will be necessary to draft men from 19 to 20 years of age. But certainly we do not need to look further ahead than 1 year. If a year from today it appears evident that we must have a still larger army, that the addition of 600,000 men every year is not enough, after we have exhausted the two and one-half million men already available, then personally I shall be perfectly willing to vote to draft men 20 years of age, and then to draft those 19 years of age. But, Mr. President, I see no present military need for such action.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long. I have always desired military legislation which would precisely meet the needs of the situation. I think Senators will remember that a year ago, when we had the selective training and service bill under discussion, I had a bill which was more limited in its scope, and I was the author of an amendment to restrict the ages to the group from 21 to 25. At that time I hoped that we would concentrate on developing the most efficient striking force that we could have, which would be ready at all times, and which, together with our Navy, would be a deterrent to any nation which might want to assail us. Of course, that was in time of peace.

Now we are at war; and the whole military problem is not only much bigger but it is also much more acute. Military service, instead of being an inconvenience and a hardship, becomes a matter of life and death. The number of men that we have to raise is much larger, with consequently much greater impact on the whole of our civilian civilization.

For that reason, therefore, it is essential as a matter of justice to spread the burden more broadly so that no one age group will feel that that particular group must carry the whole load. The burden should be spread for the sake of efficiency, so that in building up our Army we shall not destroy the industries which maintain the Army. It should be spread for the sake of humanity, because if this war continues for a long time we may find the whole burden of the war coming down on the very young men, in the way it so often has done in wars in the past—unless we adopt a broad plan.

I think it is true that in the latter days of the Confederacy the burden was borne by boys in their teens. I have read, as have many others, about the young students at Virginia Military Institute. That is not an isolated case in military history. It is generally true that a war is begun with the men in the age group of 21 to 35; then those in their forties are taken; as the war goes on it is found that the fighting is done by boys in their teens.

We can admit certain things. Much of what the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] have said is true. We can admit that the Army does not know the future any more than we do. The Army today does not know where it is going to fight. The Army today does not know the precise kind of training it is going to give these troops. We cannot know these things unless we know exactly whether we are going to fight in the sand, in the snow, in the heat, or in the cold.

We can also admit that the Army is asking for all the necessary power. It is making a complete demand for authority—that is, complete except for the control which we always maintain over appropriations, which control is real and continuous. I think we can admit that so far as we now know, many of the powers requested will not be used. We have been assured that for the next year the added number of soldiers will probably be taken between the ages of 21 and 35, for the very simple and practical reason that the men from 21 to 35 years of age have been registered and classified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. How would that result be brought about under the terms of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. How would the draft be made in those age groups?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The draft boards will have no choice as between men between 19 and 21 years of age; will it? Today the draft boards have no choice as between men of 21 and 22 years of age, for instance.

Mr. LODGE. In section 6, on page 4 of the bill, the President is given the right to provide for the deferment by age group or groups.

Mr. TAFT. So that, although we draft the boys of 19 and 20 years of age, the President can come back and say, "I find that is not necessary." But if it is not necessary, why does he not say so to us now?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the Senator from Ohio has put his finger on the crux of the whole thing. When the President and the War Department, supported by the studies which the General Staff has made, believe that they may have to use the power, how can we stand here and say that they are wrong? They may not be able to prove that they are right; they are not clairvoyants; they cannot foresee the future. But how can we stand here and say that they are wrong?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Have they indicated whether, if the bill is passed, the President intends to defer boys of 19 and 20 years of age? He may have to decide that question tomorrow, when the conditions will be the same as they are today.

Mr. LODGE. All I can tell the Senator is what General Hershey said. My recollection is—I have not the hearings before me—that he said that as of the day he spoke, which was yesterday or the day before—and he warned that he might have to modify his statement in 2 weeks—they did not intend to make an invasion into the class of those 19 years old. He was very frank and honest about it, and said that the situation was changing so fast he might have to revise that judgment later.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yesterday I believe the Senator from Michigan asked a question with reference to the ages of men in the armies of other countries. I think an answer to the question is pertinent at this time. In Canada for single men the age limits are 19 to 45; in Australia for single men from 18 to 45 and for married men from 18 to 35; in New Zealand, for territorial or home service, from 18 to 45, and for other service 21 to 45; and there was passed today by the House of Commons in England a bill requiring military service of all men between the ages of 18 and 51.

As to Germany there is no accurate information, which is in keeping with the Senator's statement; but in Japan the age limits are 17 to 45.

I will say, if it will help answer the question of the Senator from Ohio, the President indicated in his letter, and the Army Staff has also indicated, it was not their purpose to call in the younger men if it could be avoided.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me again at that point?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am perfectly willing to register men from 18 up so that the registration will take place, but so far as the Army is concerned, apparently we can pass through the Congress a bill to call men of 20 whenever they are needed within less than a week, surely as fast as the President could act, or if he should find it necessary to call them. So I do not quite see why we should not retain that power ourselves finally to cancel the deferment instead of granting the power to the President.

Mr. LODGE. That is the crux of the whole matter, whether we want to take a short view and make our guess here in Congress as to what next year is going to hold, or whether we want to take the long view, recognizing the fact that we are at war and that the Commander in Chief is responsible, and give him the power to make a far-reaching plan.

I think the Senator from Kentucky made a valuable contribution when he referred to what had been done in Great Britain. I think it is of even greater interest to realize that the chances are that Germany and Japan will lay their hands on boys when they are 10, 11, or 12 years old, and tell them what they are to do from then on.

As a matter of fact, I did not think, personally, that all this power was needed. I had thought in terms of a bill which would include the ages from 21 to 44, which I think would go through the Senate unanimously, in all probability; but, as I have said, the President and the Army, who are the leaders of the country in the war effort, have concluded that they may have to use this power, and it takes a good deal of self-assurance to prove that they are wrong.

I have the same personal feelings that every other Senator has regarding this matter. To provide a minimum age of 19 is a very painful thing to do. I have two sons, one of whom is approaching what will soon be, I think, military age; but in any military situation it is essential that the commanding officer be allowed to make the most far-reaching plan possible. He may make 8 or 10 plans which he never uses, but it is essential that the limitations on his power to plan be as few as possible. We cannot now foresee the day when it will be necessary to call all these boys or when we will be impressed with the importance of having registered all men up to 65. It is very difficult to visualize those things now; but who foresaw Pearl Harbor? How can anyone tell what is going to develop from one week to the next? Who foresaw the present condition of war between Germany and Russia? Those are all imponderables. I believe that our country should be placed in such a situation as to be able to meet every eventuality. I believe that our country should not repeat the errors which have been made in history by confining military service to certain small-age groups, then having them decimated, and having to form armies consisting of only one age group. I am convinced that to have a regiment or a brigade in which some men are in their early twenties and some in their thirties and a few in their forties makes a much sounder and stronger team than when the men are all of one age. I think difference in ages gives strength. So, in the interest of allowing the Commander in Chief of the Army to make as complete and as all-embracing plans as possible, I think this measure deserves support.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there seems to be considerable misapprehension, judging from the nature of the discussion, as to the significance of the pending amendment. There is only one question involved, namely, whether we will take boys at the age of 19 or whether we will take them at the age of 21. That is all that is involved. There is no question whatever of registration; there is no question whatever of ascertaining a complete inventory of our manpower; there is no question whatever of the application of any other phase of the pending bill. In determining at what age we should take boys into the Army if there is any one thing which should be the test and yardstick to be applied, it should come after we have made the inventory of the manpower. That is the sensible, the common sense approach to the question. If we will inventory our men between the ages of 18 and 65, under the registration plan, we will then know exactly how many there are who are 18, exactly how many there are who are 19, exactly how many there are who are 20 as well as of all the other ages. When the fact has thus been established, we will not have that uncertainty which has pervaded the testimony and the argument which we have heard and listened to, as the case may be.

If, Mr. President, we have, as we do have, a law under which we take the boys for active military service when they reach the age of 21, and we know that we are getting classes at the rate of 1,200,000 men a year reaching the age of 21, and we know as of the date, when our registration is complete, how large an army will be required, then, if the registration is complete without having to disturb the minimum age provision under which all operations up to now have been and are being conducted, in a very brief space of time, at least as quickly as we are being asked to pass this bill, we can reduce the age if a reduction is then indicated to be necessary.

Mr. President, at the very least, General Hershey points out, it will take him 6 months to organize under the pending bill. Let me call to your attention, Mr. President, and to the attention of such Senators as may not have an opportunity to examine the hearings, what General Hershey says. I read from page 34 of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs:

Well, I realize the pressures that you always meet after something becomes law, but I have felt that we could keep on taking that part of this registration that we could and that perhaps we could stand the pressures to hasten through something and do it only as we could do it.

My planning has been entirely on that basis. I may be optimistic to my people, but they responded very well. I believe we could do it.

This is what is especially pertinent to the pending discussion:

As I said, I should look with a great deal of fear if we were ordered to do it even in 6 months. I would not like to have the limitation placed upon us that we must do it in 6 months, and even today I wouldn't like to have you say that we should do it in a year, which may be arguing against my support of this, but my support of this is not that we must have it tomorrow, but it seems to me we have come to a time when they must know that to the last man and the last dollar we are behind them and if the administration and the President cannot be trusted here I am afraid we get into some difficulties on who is going to dispatch the fleet, or the planes, or something else. I don't want to be argumentative at all, but that is really how I feel about it, and I may be wrong.

Mr. President, the last and concluding thought that General Hershey expressed at that point—

and I may be wrong—

was not confined simply to his observations even in that particular. It will be remembered that earlier there had been considerable discussion as to whether or not the general or the War Department had issued a release saying that boys between the ages of 21 and 35 would be sufficient.

On page 27 of the hearings General Hershey testified:

I think I was asked, first of all, did we have enough men to meet our present emergency. I am a little inclined to think that the part of my statement that had to do with the 28 to 35 years old and the coming 21 years old was probably omitted.

I think probably what I said was that counting the people we had, the people that would be made available if you did let us go back to 35, plus the individuals who would become 21 this year, would, I thought, meet any—well, getting up two and one-half or three million people, providing that is the way that you wanted to take them.

I have said that it seemed to me from the fact that we had these 17,000,000 registered that we have most all of them classified, that it would be the part of wisdom to explore rather thoroughly the 21 to 35 year olds.

Now, rather than perhaps omit to take many that we might eventually take and go back to them eventually because of the fact that I believe we will get better work out of our local boards if we drive them into classification rather thoroughly.

So I repeat, that unless our demands run above three or four million we probably could make it with those between 21 and 35 and the 21 year olds that we will either have authority to register now with about 600,000 of them, or in July with 1,200,000.

My position on this bill has been that it is merely a question of whether Congress at this time feels that they are going to serve notice to the world, to our people, and especially to our soldiers, those fellows who are on the outposts now wondering whether everyone is behind them, or some sort of a piecemeal.

That is my purpose in supporting this bill, and not because we need these people tomorrow. I would pray that whatever the bill is, that selective service be permitted to make this registration and classification orderly. I repeat, because the last thing I should want to do is to be compelled to try, either today

or a year from now, to register 10,000,000 people simultaneously. It is too big a job and cannot be done with efficiency.

That is why I have felt that perhaps it would be best for the country if we faced it now.

And he concludes:

I could easily be wrong.

Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] let me say that we would not in any way interfere with the registration or taking of the inventory of manpower under the pending bill as proposed to be amended. We would in no way interfere with the orderly processing of the men and their classification—a task which General Hershey says will take a minimum of 6 months, and he would not like to have us tell him that he would have to do it in a year. Consequently, we come squarely down to the only issue, and that is whether or not we should now, without that inventory and without that classification, say that we must lower the draft age from 21 to 19.

The House had before them every word of the arguments that we have heard here. They probably had better arguments there than we have heard here, including the present one. But the fact remains that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House—a gentleman of long experience in this field—gave it as his considered judgment that a serious mistake was being made in reducing the age from 21 to 19, and both the House and the House Committee on Military Affairs took the same position, and that is the way they voted.

I notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a magnificent argument on this point contributed by Judge HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, in which Judge SUMNERS emphasized the complete lack of "horse sense," to borrow his term, in going ahead at this time with a reduction from 21 to 19. On the facts and on the figures of the evidence before us, on the testimony here, how can anybody gainsay it? As the Senator from Massachusetts says, he does not know, but he would like to be ready—ready for what? I submit that when we are not in any way whatever interfering with the orderly flow of men into the Army at the rate of at least 700,000 annually, with a total of 1,200,000 coming of the age of 21 annually, and when we know that the classification can proceed without interruption the moment we pass this bill, we can thereupon inventory exactly what our needs are, and make our appraisals accordingly.

If it shall then become apparent that we need more men, that we have accommodations for them and are not going to put them out on the ground to sleep, if we can show that we have cars to carry them and equipment to clothe, feed, and care for them, if we are organized as against the time when we actually need them, and we know that is what we need, come back here, General Hershey, tell us what the facts are, and then we will vote for it. Without the slightest hesitancy we will vote for it. But when General Hershey himself says that this proposal is based on what he called psychological support, or when some Secretary says it is for moral and psychological reasons, and when somebody else, purportedly in charge and assumedly knowing the facts, tells you, "This is the way I see it, but I could easily be wrong," I submit that he easily could be wrong, especially in the light of the state of the record at this time.

So, Mr. President, I submit that the fairest, sanest, and most sensible view for the Senate to take in the present dilemma is to support the action of the House on the pending bill. If there be an emergency, and if there be need for the measure, let it be passed in accordance with the action of the House on the matter. This amendment, as proposed, does no more than conform the pending Senate bill to the House bill as passed yesterday.

That is the issue before us, on which I ask for a vote.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

If we have not yet learned, Mr. President, we shall learn to our sorrow that so far as the Axis Powers are concerned, the only effect which we can now have upon them will depend upon fire power and our ability to concentrate military and naval force against them. Nor is there any necessity to impress upon the people of this country the fact that we are at war and that we have a long, hard road to hoe. If the Members of Congress do not yet know it, the American people already are aware of that fact. Therefore, I do not think we should deal with this problem on any basis of psychological effect either upon our enemies or upon the people of the United States.

Unfortunately, the people of the United States are going to suffer in many respects, and very soon, the impact of this war effort and the defense program. They are going to suffer from priorities unemployment. They are going to suffer from a shortage of farm labor. They are going to suffer under the burden of the most staggering per capita taxes ever carried by any people. So let me plead with my colleagues not to approach this problem from the standpoint of psychology.

Furthermore, let us not display any tendency to come down with the jitters. It will do no good so far as our enemies are concerned, and it will do no good so far as our people are concerned.

In the third place, in view of all that has happened within recent days, let us not approach this problem from the standpoint of attempting to strip Congress of power, unless it becomes absolutely necessary to do so in order to effect an efficient conduct of the war effort.

I submit that any person who will read the House hearings, the debate upon the floor of the House of Representatives yesterday, and the transcript of the Senate committee hearings cannot escape the conclusion that no evidence of a substantial character has been submitted in either of the places I have mentioned to justify the Congress reaching down at this time into the age group of those under 21 years of age for active military service.

Perhaps others may come to a different conclusion, but it is my deliberate and considered judgment that there is not sufficient evidence in the record to take the action proposed by the Committee on Military Affairs in its recommendation, so far as this particular issue is concerned.

As stated by other Senators who have taken part in the debate, there is no desire on my part to interfere with the registration, the so-called inventory of manpower, although I share in some degree the apprehensions expressed by the able junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] in his remarks this afternoon that, insofar as the older age group is concerned, the particular survey which will be taken in connection with this registration will not prove to be so useful as some may now believe.

I hope no one will misunderstand me when I say that the fact of the matter is that we made mistakes insofar as the application of the original draft act was concerned. Men were brought into the service for training despite a lack of matériel and adequately constructed and completed camps. It is my opinion, from conversations with many of those who were called into the service—and I have found that my colleagues have come to the same conclusion from similar contacts that the lack of equipment, and the type of work which the men had to be given in lieu of training with modern equipment, was one of the reasons for the low state of morale which was indicated on every hand in the training program.

I should be the first to concede that the declaration of war has given an overall objective and purpose to this training which may not have been present formerly in the minds of those who were called, but I do say that on the basis of our past experience we should now proceed with great caution in subjecting individuals to the call for training before matériel and equipment and proper housing are available.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the Senator think of the proposal to proceed to register all the men from 18 to 21 years of age, and to put those from 18 to 21 in a deferred class, not to be called for service until the rolls of those above the age of 21 shall be exhausted?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should much prefer that to the proposal made by the Committee on Military Affairs; but I believe Congress still has the right to exercise its judgment in a matter of this kind. I differentiate it entirely from the question of military strategy, or the conduct of operations. I think that if a majority of us are convinced, as the Members of the House of Representatives were, that the younger group should not be subjected to induction into the military and naval service of the United States at this time, we could very well provide, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, that they should not be eligible for such service until further action by Congress. But if that amendment should be defeated, I say to the Senator from Texas that I

should much prefer to have his suggestion adopted than the one recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs, with all due respect to the Senators who are members of that committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am willing to vote to draft men of 18, or even those under 18, if it shall be necessary——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am, too, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. However, I see no reason to leave it up in the air and say, "until Congress acts." Of course, that is implied. Congress can act at any time, and I am not impinging on the power of Congress, but I would put into the pending bill a provision that the War Department should proceed to register all the manpower of the country, with instructions that men under 21 should not be called for service until the list of eligibles above 21 had been exhausted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think that would be a very great improvement over the bill as it was reported, and if the opportunity shall be afforded to vote for such an amendment, I shall certainly be happy to support it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator very correctly dwelt on the importance of not having a supply of men out of all proportion to the supply of equipment. That is a question which I myself pressed in the committee, and on page 4 of the hearing appears the testimony of General Haislip. With the Senator's permission I should like to read what he said.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should be very happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LODGE. General Haislip said:

> We feel that there are definite limitations on the expansion of our armed forces. The first, of course, is matériel. We have embarked on a vast industrial effort, and to date production has been more or less a flat curve, but that curve will begin to ascend rapidly in a reasonable time. We plan on expanding our Army in a methodical, rapid way, depending on the procurement of matériel, which takes a long time to manufacture. We have no idea of trying to organize as rapidly as possible a great mass of manpower to have what we might call a broomstick army which would not be worth anything if we got it. So, consistent with being able to obtain matériel, we expect to begin the expansion of our armed forces without any set number as a goal.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That may give comfort to the Senator from Massachusetts, but it does not give very much comfort to the Senator from Wisconsin, for the very reason I outlined just prior to the time when I was interrupted; namely, that we gave the Army the power to call these men under the original act, and although my testimony may not be valuable because I have had with the men who had the training and experience only the limited contact that comes to any Senator not a member of the committee, I found the reports so universal and so widespread that I could not come to any other conclusion than that a great mistake had been made in inducting into the service men for whom there was not sufficient modern equipment to enable them to be trained for modern war, so that after they had been through the school of the soldier and had learned all the close-order drill, there were long periods of time when they had to be put to work shoveling sand, or manicuring the general's lawn, or completing a job which some of the profiteering contractors and wasteful contractors in the cantonments had left unfinished. I say that was destructive of morale. There was nothing wrong with the young men of this country, in the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Likewise let us not forget that the American youth is the most intelligent youth in the world, and he cannot be fooled. It is impossible to set him to work hauling sand and filling up a marsh that swallows all the sand which the whole outfit can throw into it, and have him listen over the radio to broadcasts about how the modern "blitz" is operated, and yet convince that American youth that he is being trained for modern war.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I subscribe heartily to what the Senator has just said. No one has been more critical than I of what the Senator has described. The Senator is entirely correct in his statement. There were a great many cases of men being inducted into the Army when there were not the proper facilities for training them. The men were bored to death; their morale naturally suffered, and they were forced to do work which was not the work of a soldier or work which they should have been required to do. I think the Senator is entirely correct in that statement. But I believe the Army has realized that situation, and I have high hope that the Army will not repeat that mistake in the future.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator wants the Congress to repeat the same mistake it made before, and I say it should not make that mistake. Especially we should not make it, Mr. President, when there is ample evidence upon the record that all the manpower that can be absorbed by the Army in the next year or longer—a year at the minimum—is available in the age group of 21 and above.

Mr. President, perhaps I do not need to elaborate; it has been discussed before; but I have before me the testimony, and I ask unanimous consent that I may insert several excerpts to substantiate the point I have just made. To me it is clear from the record that all the manpower the Army can train and properly equip for the next year or more is available in the age groups above 21 years of age.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> General HERSHEY. I believe, of course, you can meet the situation tomorrow and the next day with our present age group. (House hearings, p. 9.)
>
> Mr. EDMISTON. General, you have not convinced me yet that this age limit should be lowered—I believe it is 19 now instead of 18—should be lowered below 21.
>
> General HERSHEY. Yes.
>
> Mr. EDMISTON. It seems to me that you have to win peace as well as war; and if it would not disrupt, particularly that age group that is now being trained, it would be of more service to the country, either for war or for peace. And it seems to me also that with the limitation on the housing and on equipment and on personnel to train these men, you really do not need them at the present time.
>
> General HERSHEY. Well, I have nothing to say to that. It is a very difficult question of whether we want to provide now to meet any emergency that might come or whether we might come back after the emergency is under way. And I have no disposition to argue it; that is a decision which the Congress must make, and I do not have any argument one way or the other. I think we can provide for a large portion of them, and we are presenting this bill here as one that is an all-out measure, one that will provide the manpower for the struggle we are facing, and if there is not in the executive branch of the Government enough intelligence to use that one way or the other, I think it is just going to be unfortunate, whichever way it is provided. (House hearings, p. 16.)
>
> Mr. SPARKMAN. That gives you a total of 3,200,000 that would be available from 21 to 45.
>
> General HERSHEY. I think that is reasonably conservative.
>
> Mr. SPARKMAN. Assuming that the Army could take that many in, clothe them, equip them, and house them, and train them, how long would it take you to take in that number?
>
> General HERSHEY. Of course, the 600,000 or 800,000 would be a guess after the 1st of July, because not all of those would be eligible under present regulations. So far we have taken in not more than 150,000 in any 1 month. In the World War there were several months when they took in over 300,000. On the basis of 300,000, that means about 3,500,000 in 12 months.
>
> Mr. KILDAY. And at the end of that time you would have another class of 1,200,000?
>
> General HERSHEY. That is right. (House hearings, p. 25.)

The committee, in the consideration of this legislation, heard the testimony of representatives of the War Department, the Director of the Selective Service System and his assistants, and, after very careful consideration of all the evidence, struck out all the provisions of H. R. 6215, following the enacting clause, and inserted provisions which provided:

That the minimum and maximum ages for military training and service shall be all able-bodied male citizens and male aliens between the ages of 21 and 44, inclusive, which differs from the bill as requested by the War Department, and which provided for the selection, training, and service of all able-bodied men and all male aliens, between the ages of 19 and 44, inclusive, the difference being that the minimum age for draft and service of men is 21 to 44, inclusive. This provision, according to the evidence before the committee, will authorize the Army to select and induct into the service from that age group, approximately three and one-half million men, classified as 1–A in the following brackets; 600,000 between 21 and 28; 315,000 between 28 and 36; 400,000 between 36 and 45; 300,000 of whom have reached 21 years of age within the last 6 months. In addition to this, there will be available, according to the proof, 135,000 between 28 and 36 who have been sent back to the Reserves after induction and training for one reason or another, but who are yet subject to recall as reservists.

The present armed forces in the Army of the United States is approximately 1,800,000, and with those forces and the ones that may be inducted under the provisions of this legislation, the Army can easily have approxi-

mately 4,000,000 men available within the age limits fixed by this legislation. (House report, p. 3.)

Senator DOWNEY. Of course, General, we have 1,000,000 ready for you that you have not been able to use, last year.

General HAISLIP. For the next year we can get plenty of men. (Senate hearings, p. 9.)

General HERSHEY. I didn't happen to see the Herald, but I imagine that statement was copied from some of my testimony on Saturday.

I think I was asked first of all, did we have enough men to meet our present emergency. I am a little inclined to think that the part of my statement that had to do with the 28 to 35 years old and the coming 21 years old was probably omitted.

I think probably what I said was that counting the people we had, the people that would be made available if you did let us go back to 35, plus the individuals who would become 21 this year, would, I thought meet any—well, getting up 2½ or 3 million people, providing that is the way that you wanted to take them.

I have said that it seemed to me from the fact that we had these 17,000,000 registered that we have most all of them classified, that it would be the part of wisdom to explore rather thoroughly the 21- to 35-year-olds.

Now, rather than perhaps omit to take many that we might eventually take and go back to them eventually because of the fact that I believe we will get better work out of our local boards if we drive them into classification rather thoroughly.

So I repeat, that unless our demands run above three or four million we probably could make it with those between 21 and 35 and the 21-year-olds that we will either have authority to register now with about 600,000 of them, or in July with 1,200,000.

My position on this bill has been that it is merely a question of whether Congress at this time feels that they are going to serve notice to the world, to our people, and especially to our soldiers, those fellows who are on the outposts now wondering whether everyone is behind them, or some sort of a piecemeal.

That is my purpose in supporting this bill, and not because we need these people tomorrow. (Senate hearings, p. 27.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In this connection, since the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has read from General Haislip, I wish to cite one very significant quotation, at least it was significant to me. I read from the House hearings on page 41:

Mr. EDMISTON. General, under your plan as the representative of the War Department, how fast do you want, and how many more men do you want? How fast do you want them? It seems to me that with the impetus that the declaration of war has made on volunteers, that by January 1, 1942, we will have 2,000,000 men in the service.

Now, beyond that 2,000,000, how fast do you want any more men? How fast can you equip them? What would you do if you had 10,000,000 men?

General EAISLIP. Those are decisions which are in the process of being made now. There are many far-reaching decisions about the use of the equipment which is being manufactured in this country today, as to whether there should be a new reallotment of that so that we will get more of it, or perhaps all of it, and those decisions will determine the rate at which we will build our Army.

Now mark this:

In other words, if we continue to send all of our equipment that we manufacture abroad, certainly it will be a very slow process. If we stop shipping anything abroad, we can go very much faster, and the decision will have to be made which will determine the rate at which we will increase the forces.

Mr. President, the Congress is being asked to reach down into this group, which has not reached its majority, a move which every country in all the history of the world has hesitated to make until it was necessary for defense, and we are asked to make that move now and to grant that power now, when the essential decisions as to how rapidly the Army can be increased have not yet been made by the Army and by the administration.

I know from past experience that Congress always shrinks into comparative insignificance in the face of war, but I say that upon these questions which affect broad general public policy, it should not be necessary to ask Congress to make decisions upon a state of facts which have not yet been determined by the administrative branch of the Government itself.

If the proposed legislation is passed, it will be of little comfort and of no use to quote the testimony that has been quoted here by the supporters of the recommendation of the Military Affairs Committee, that there is no immediate intention of drafting men under 21 for active service in the Army. You will have created just as much confusion, just as much damage to the future of these young men by that action as if you had actually drafted them into the Army, and perhaps more so.

Action such as recommended by the committee will result in uprooting and disturbing the life of every able-bodied young man in the United States of America between the ages of 18 and 21 years. I have received numerous communications from parents with sons in that age group and others who are opposed to this action, and I hasten to assure my colleagues that there is no indication in those communications that they are not ready to make any sacrifice necessary for the defense of this country. The mere announcement that this proposal was under consideration has caused young men all over the United States to want to stop the jobs they were on, to want to stop their school, if they were in school, and to obtain permission from their parents, if you please, to enlist as volunteers in the United States armed forces.

Mr. President, if we disrupt this whole age group, where are we going to turn for technicians, where are we going to turn for professional men, where are we going to turn for skilled tradesmen and mechanics, if we unsettle this whole group which at this time is under some kind of training for future use to society? If the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] prevails, they will all be there; they will all be registered; but they will not have their lives disturbed, and they should not have their lives disturbed, I submit, for the best interests of national defense, until it becomes necessary that they enter the armed services of the Nation to defend it in a military sense.

I repeat that in the months which lie ahead the fabric of the economic and social life of the United States is going to be ripped and torn beyond the imagination of anyone within the sound of my voice by the impact, as I have said, of priorities, unemployment, by the impact of the scarcity of farm labor, by the impact of the various war efforts. Why contribute further to that condition? Why make it worse than is necessary? Why endanger the successful functioning of society in this country any more than we absolutely have to do in the light of military and naval necessity?

Mr. President, there is another unpleasant aspect of this problem of which I wish to speak. This group is probably at its most formative period. It is just coming out of the adolescent period, provided it is not delayed in the individual case. They are, for the most part, to some extent under parental or educational guidance and supervision. They should not be called into the armed services; they should not be drawn into the situation that now surrounds too many of our Army camps unless it becomes necessary from the standpoint of national defense.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to quote briefly from the book, Plain Words About Venereal Disease, by Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and Dr. R. A. Vonderlehr, the Assistant Surgeon General. I am quoting excerpts from page 79:

From the first 1,000,000 examined up to April 15, 1941, almost 60,000 men were rejected because of venereal disease. Reports from the States indicate that not quite half of them are under treatment at present.

With a dilution of 7 men uninfected, for each man in an Army population of which 14 in every thousand already were reported infected with syphilis and slightly more than 27 per thousand with gonorrhea, one would have expected a swift and permanent flattening of the Army rates of infection. What has happened?

In reports now at hand from the several corps areas, a reduction in venereal disease rates was noticeable for a few weeks after each detachment of fresh men poured into the ranks. Then steadily, inevitably, in regiment by regiment the rates crept up. By March 1940, for example, the over-all syphilis rates were back to 11.3 per thousand; the 1939 mark was exceeded by the rate of 35.9 for gonorrhea. With a new influx of men, the June 1941 syphilis rates were down again to 8.1 per thousand. Either the devices for detecting gonorrhea in selectees were not effective or new infections occur swiftly and in large numbers immediately after inclusion of the volunteers and selectees, for there has been practically no decline in the gonorrhea rate of the Army during the periods when the largest numbers of presumably uninfected men were added. The trend has been steadily higher through 1940 and to the end of June 1941, when 40.3 gonorrhea infections per thousand mean strength were admitted to medical treatment.

Let me read another excerpt, from page 104:

The traffic in vice is vicious in many of the Central States, especially through the highly industrialized areas. In the Eastern States, and as far north as Newfoundland, a spreader of disease is the street-walker who solicits her patrons and takes them to a cheap rooming house. Like the modern army, however, the prostitute army has taken to wheels—mechanized, organized, and mobilized by professionals—following the men and the money wherever they go. There are many recent reports of well-dressed women in smart automobiles who frequent the roads about the Army camps and offer to give soldiers a lift. If the soldiers are willing, the destination is a house of ill fame of good appearance and in a good neighborhood. Other women specialize on truck drivers, picking them up at

roadside diners and sometimes riding with them to the next town for the next pick-up. The trailer frequently is a house of prostitution on wheels. Near Fort Knox, for example, trailer camps are populated with elderly "parents," each with a surprisingly large family of "daughters."

I quote another excerpt, from page 108:

Our present methods of dealing with it seem about as bad as can be imagined. The whole prostitution racket has become so vast, so complex, so richly lucrative, so weighted with local influence, sprawling across the lines of city, county, and State governments, that only united action will abate it—just as it was proved that only united national action could abate the venereal diseases.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not catch the title of the book from which the Senator is quoting.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The book is entitled "Plain Words About Venereal Disease" and is by Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and Dr. Vonderlehr, the Assistant Surgeon General.

Mr. President, I do not wish to overemphasize this aspect of the problem. I realize that war is not a pleasant business. But I do say that before the Congress of the United States passes a statute which would reach down into the age group below 21 and disrupt their lives, whether they be drafted or not, it ought to have overwhelming evidence of the national military necessity for such action; and, above all, those responsible in the Army and Navy should have utilized the legislation passed months and months ago, which gives them authority to clean up the situation exposed by the courageous Surgeon General.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, although I opposed the administration's foreign policy step by step, as I thought it was leading to war, and although I still believe that the alternative policy which I advocated was a sounder and wiser policy and would have kept this country out of war, we are now in war, and so far as I am concerned, my colleagues in this Chamber will find it difficult to keep abreast of me in supporting measures needed to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. But I am unalterably opposed to Congress stripping itself of any more power than is essential for the conduct of the war, and I am opposed to Congress stripping itself of its power before there is evidence that such a course is necessary. The entire course proposed would only contribute to the difficulties of the survival of representative government in this country and in the world.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of my colleague, the able Senator from Wisconsin. I am indeed sorry to have to disagree with him.

Before taking a vote on the bill, I wish again to call the attention of the Members of the Senate who have not been present, some of whom have been absent from the Chamber because of committee meetings, to the fact that the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, wrote a letter, which I read into the RECORD today, in which he advises that he desires for military service men between the ages of 19 and 44.

I repeat that there is on my desk a letter from the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, in which he urges the inclusion of men between 19 and 44.

A moment ago I listened to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] state his arguments in favor of the inclusion of men between the ages of 19 and 44, as defined in the bill. At this time, before taking a vote, I wish to take the opportunity, as chairman of the committee, to thank the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution and aid to us in ironing out the bill and questioning witnesses before the Military Affairs Committee.

I hope we have now reached the point where we may take a vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have long felt that unless there is an absolute necessity for it it is unwise for us to draft men below the age of 21 years. I know that the date to be fixed must be arbitrary, and that whatever time we do fix, whatever age we decide upon, we shall find that many have been left out who ought to be in, and many are in who ought to be out. We cannot fix a definite time which will apply equally to all; but for centuries, ever since the dawn of civilization, the same question has always been present, not only in military affairs, but in all social and economic proposals of law.

Mr. President, I do not believe this is a question on which we are called upon to follow blindly the suggestions of men who have been engaged during all their mature lives in military matters. It seems to me that a civilian of ordinary judgment and education ought to be able to decide what the age should be, and that he is just as well qualified to decide that question as is one who is at the head of the Army or the Navy.

During all this time, and, so far as I know, during the ages, without exception, human beings have gradually reached the conclusion that the age at which boyhood passes into manhood, when men have reached the time when their judgment is sufficient to guide them in the important affairs of life, is 21 years. That is the limit that is fixed in civil life; and I do not see any reason why it should be different in this instance unless the country's salvation demands a change. I admit that if such a time should come, or if that time be here, we should disregard the universal opinion of mankind that 21 years of age is the dividing line between boyhood, let us say, and manhood.

I do not think anyone claims that that time has arrived or is presented to us now in the development of events or in the questions which are before the American people and the Congress for decision. Those who favor the registration of young men 18 years of age still say, and I think they are correct in so saying, that the probabilities are that men between the ages of 18 and 21 years will not be drafted into service. I can see that if we change that rule now, under conditions which it seems to me, at least, do not warrant our taking such a step, we shall be doing a great injury to hundreds of thousands of the young men of our country, especially young men who are now on the farm. It is especially true that most of them between the ages of 18 and 20 years have not completed their education. Hundreds of thousands of those on the farm are in school during the winter months, the only time they have to go to school. Suppose we take them out of school before they have completed even an ordinary eighth-grade education and put them in the Army and keep them there for 3 years, or perhaps even longer, where will they be after that?

It may be said that they can go back to school, can commence again where they left off, and can complete their education at least to the extent to which every one concedes that every American citizen should have an education. Will that work? In my judgment it will be a failure. When a young man 18 years of age who has come from the farm, has, let us say, devoted 3 years of his life to service in the Army, and when, after completing service in the Army, he goes back to school, if he attempts to do so, where will he find himself? He will find himself in the same classes and grades with youths of both sexes 3 years younger than he is. Will he stay there? Will he complete his education? Will he be satisfied with continuing his education under such conditions? We all know he will not.

Some young men will continue their education under such circumstances, it is true; but the great bulk of them will be embarrassed to continue going to school under those conditions, and for many other reasons will decide that it is best for them to go into the ordinary avenues of life. The education thus denied them will remain uncompleted during all their lives; and they will be handicapped from the time they return at, let us say, the age of 21 years, until they die of old age, at 65 or 70 years. Throughout their lives they will suffer under that handicap; and it will be a severe handicap, not only for them but for our country and for the advancement of civilization generally.

I realize that the time might come when it would be necessary for us, in order to save the life of our country, to abolish even our public schools, in order that the moneys normally used to keep them up might be used for something vital to the very life of the country. That time has not come. No one believes it will come; but if it should come we would be justified in taking such action.

It is conceded now by everyone, I think, that the probabilities are, so far as any man can see at the present time, that these young men will not be needed. When we take into consideration the conditions now existing, when we con-

sider the fact that the difficulty of sending an army across the Atlantic or the Pacific is almost insurmountable, and that, as a general rule, it is not contemplated to do such a thing, at least so far as concerns having a great movement of troops, certainly it is not necessary that these young men should have taken out of their lives the 3 years which, in an intellectual sense, are more productive than any other 3 years of their lives.

So it seems to me that we shall make a mistake if we take these men from the ordinary avenues of life. What will it mean in that respect to the young farmers who are going to school in the wintertime, 3 or 4 months in every year? All their time is given, outside of that short school year, to the production of the things that are necessary to keep our armies in the field and to keep them active. We shall have to produce through the efforts of these young men the food which perhaps will sustain us in a bitter trial. During the remainder of the year, aside from the school months, we shall have their full-time labor to produce the crops necessary to sustain an Army at the front. From any standpoint from which we may look at the matter it seems to me that if we take the action recommended by the military authorities we shall be doing an injury to those young men. After all, the time is coming when they will have to replace us and others in official life. We shall be depriving them of the right properly to qualify themselves for the life that is coming in the future.

Mr. President, I should be one of the last to handicap the administration in carrying out any program which would enable our country to achieve victory in the war in which we are now engaged. I am not one of those who have not followed the President in the main in his foreign policy. I believe it was right, and I followed it for that reason; and I would not now, under any consideration, discontinue following it if I thought that any course recommended by the generals of our Army and the admirals of our Navy for carrying on this war is essential. I would not in any way handicap them at any sacrifice that it is necessary for the country to make.

In the case of the officials of our Navy, particularly, we have seen a difference of opinion as to the relative value of airplanes and battleships. All of us who have had conversations with expert Navy men have recognized the derision in which the airplane was held by those who believed we could best serve our country in time of war by devoting all our money to building battleships. We have been in the present war for only a little over a week, and in that time we have seen some of our best ships go down to the bottom of the sea. We have seen two vessels which were the pride of the British Navy go down to the bottom of the sea. We have sunk some of the vessels of the enemy, and they are now down at the bottom of the sea. Yet in every case, without exception, those ships have been sunk—ours, and those of our enemy—by men manipulating airplanes. There has not been an instance in which a battleship or a cruiser on our side has come in contact with a battleship or a cruiser of the enemy. Yet we have seen both our Navy and the navy of the enemy seriously crippled, showing, it seems to me, that even experts may be wrong, and that in that particular case our naval experts have been wrong.

I am not one who believes that our Navy is inefficient. I believe I have as high an admiration for the opinions of our Navy and Army men as has anyone. Yet even in matters pertaining strictly to military affairs we have seen that they have been wrong. No one now will discount the advisability of having more airplanes, even if it means less battleships.

This matter, as I see it, is not primarily a military matter. In reaching a decision on it, consideration must be given to civil effects as well as military ones. I cannot now see my way clear to vote in favor of sending our boys from 18 to 21 into the Army. We have more men above that age than we are able to utilize at the present time, more than we are able to train at the present time.

It is a mistake to think that we have only to consider the welfare of the young men themselves. I want us to consider the welfare of our country when the war is over. I do not want hundreds of thousands of our citizens to be deprived of the education and the experience that is absolutely necessary to fit them for the battle of life, even without giving any consideration to military affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Gillette	O'Daniel
Bailey	Green	O'Mahoney
Ball	Guffey	Overton
Barkley	Gurney	Pepper
Bilbo	Hatch	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hayden	Reed
Brooks	Herring	Reynolds
Brown	Hill	Rosier
Bulow	Holman	Russell
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Burton	Kilgore	Spencer
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lodge	Tobey
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maloney	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
George	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The amendment presented by the Senator from Connecticut occurs four times in the bill, changing the figures from "19" to "21." Is there objection to voting on the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be voted on en bloc.

Mr. TYDINGS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Are we to understand that a vote "yea" is a vote to make the lower age limit 21, and a vote "nay" is a vote to leave it 19?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOWNEY (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], who has just been called to the White House on important public business. If I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea" on the pending amendments, and if the senior Senator from Indiana were present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], which I transfer to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and will vote. I vote "nay." The Senator from New Jersey is unavoidably absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PEPPER. My colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], is unable to be present at this time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness. He has a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and if the Senator from New Jersey were present and voting he would vote "nay."

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Virginia if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in the labor conference and is therefore unable to be present. He has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay" on the pending amendments.

My colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. If present and voting, my colleague would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] is attending a conference at the White House and is unable to be present.

If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Herring	Reed
Bailey	Johnson, Calif.	Rosier
Brooks	Kilgore	Stewart
Bulow	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Norris	Wheeler
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	Radcliffe	Willis

NAYS—49

Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Ball	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Gurney	Overton
Bilbo	Hatch	Pepper
Brewster	Hayden	Reynolds
Brown	Hill	Russell
Bunker	Holman	Schwartz
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	McNary	Wallgren
Doxey	Mead	White
Ellender	Murdock	
Gillette	Murray	

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Downey	Smith
Bankhead	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Barbour	Hughes	Van Nuys
Bone	Shipstead	
Bridges	Smathers	

So Mr. DANAHER's amendments were rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 14, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That persons under the age of 21 within the jurisdiction of any local board, except persons who volunteer for induction, shall be deferred from training and service under this act until those persons in other age groups within the jurisdiction of such local board, who are liable for such training and service have been classified, and those persons in such other age groups within the jurisdiction of such local board, who are not deferred or exempted have been inducted for such training and service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this amendment simply provides that the local board shall not induct anyone under 21, though they shall be registered and classified, until it has inducted those in the higher age groups who are liable for service. Let me read the amendment:

Provided further, That persons under the age of 21 within the jurisdiction of any local board except persons who volunteer for induction, shall be deferred from training and service under this act until those persons in other age groups within the jurisdiction of such local board, who are liable for such training and service have been classified, and those persons in such other age groups within the jurisdiction of such local board, who are not deferred or exempted have been inducted for such training and service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, if I understand his amendment correctly, it provides for the registration of all those persons between the ages of 18 and 65, as provided in the pending bill, but it further provides that the local boards shall classify those 21 and older, and shall call into service for induction men from that group, and then when those age groups have been exhausted and, when necessary, it would be within the power of the boards to draw upon those from 19 to 21 years of age?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I will say that the amendment was very hastily drawn, but the draftsman assures me that it has the effect that I have explained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If it does not do so, it can be perfected in conference?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; it can be perfected in conference. I am sure there will be some grammarians and rhetoricians among the conferees who can do that.

I do not care to make any further remarks, Mr. President, except to say that I am perfectly willing to call on the boys from 18 to 21 to win this war if it is necessary to do do so, but I am not in favor of calling on the boys to do the first fighting and the worst fighting. According to my mail, many men above 21, men from 35 to 40, are eligible for service. I am in favor of giving them an opportunity to get into the war before we go down and snatch boys from 18 to 21.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On the pending amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator a question. I gather from the reading of the Senator's amendment that it provides that boys from 19 to 21——

Mr. CONNALLY. No; from 18 to 21.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nineteen to twenty-one is the age.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, but 19 to 21 is in the bill. My purpose by this amendment was to make it 18 to 21.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as boys who are 18 years of age are not subject to the proposal at all, that is a matter which is irrelevant, it seems to me. But that is aside from my point. I desire to ask the Senator if it is his purpose to forbid the training of boys from 19 to 21. If the Senator's amendment were to provide that young men of this age should not be subject to service, instead of to training and service, I would be more inclined to look with favor upon his amendment. But as it has been read, it provides clearly that boys from 19 to 21 may not even be trained, and that I think is very bad policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I do not care to direct the Army, but after a man is inducted he is in the Army. Whenever we induct one of these boys we cannot tell the Army then where it is going to send him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator please wait until I can answer the question he asked me? I do not want to keep the Army from training those boys. All I am asking is that the Army train the older ones first. After the older men have been inducted for training, or for fighting, or whatever they are going to do, then the Army can reach down and train all of them, or draft all of them, from 18 years of age up. I am simply postponing the calling of the men between 18 and 21 until after the older men, men of 25, 30, and 35, have been called. I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is that, if the Senator from Texas would modify his amendment by striking out the words "training and" where they first appear, he would, in my opinion, strengthen his amendment. It would then provide that boys between 19 and 21 might be called for training, but not for service.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that leaving out the words "training and" and letting the word "service" remain would in nowise weaken the amendment. It would mean the same thing. So if I can obtain a vote for two words, I will delete them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator withdraw the words?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not done so as yet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr President, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment, to strike out the words "training and" where they first appear in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will accept the modification. I do not see any difference. A man cannot be trained unless he is in the service. I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified as requested.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The whole theory of the program has been that a man cannot be trained unless he is integrated into a military organization. In many instances trainees, Regulars, and National Guard men are mingled together in the same organization. A man may be put into a military organization for training purposes, but if that organization were ordered into the service he would be in the service. Remember that we are already at war. When an organization is ordered into the service the authorities cannot go through the organization and pick out one man from a gun crew, another man from a cavalry organization, and another man from a tank corps, and say, "These boys will have to be taken out. We will have to break up this organization and take them out." So if we are to adopt the principle of inducting men into the service for training, it seems to me that we must induct them for service as well as for training.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I am doing. I am eliminating the words "training and." If a man is inducted for service he is inducted for all purposes—training, fighting, or anything else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Texas have convinced me that I was mistaken.

Inasmuch as the persons who would be affected by the act would be taken into the service, they should be taken into the service, and therefore I withdraw my suggestion to the Senator. I shall feel free to vote against his amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I stand on my last agreement.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. If I correctly understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, it is that we are to exhaust every last man in the older age group, from 21 years up, before we bring into the service those under the age of 21.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Those who are classified and eligible must be exhausted.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest to the Senator from Texas that he abandon the "last of the Mohicans" idea and say two-thirds, three-fourths, or something like that, so that every single man in the higher age group would not have to be exhausted.

Mr. CONNALLY. The conferees can work out that problem. I am willing to trust the conferees. It is late, and Senators wish to vote. I think we can safely send it to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Frankly, I am opposed to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I judge from what the Senator says that he is opposed to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the vote, and I shall not do so. However, I wish to say that the effect of the amendment would be the same as that of the amendment upon which we have just voted. Under the terms of this amendment the men in the age group specified could not be called into service for either service or training. Of course, it is inconceivable that they could be called for service until they had been trained.

Assuming that a period of a year is required to train men, if this amendment were adopted they could not be called for training until they had reached the age of 21; and they could not actually be put into service until they had reached the age of 22. Under the program of the present law it is estimated that about 600,000 men a year may be called. We do not know how many men will be required to win this war. At that rate, under the terms of the pending amendment, 4 years would be required to raise an army of two and a half million men. I do not believe it is wise to stretch out over that length of time the raising of an Army.

Much as I regret to disagree with my friend from Texas, because I know he is sincere, I hope that his amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk wil call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I am not advised how he would vote on this question. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness. He is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if he were present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and that if the Senator from New Jersey were present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in a labor conference and unable to be present. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

My colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] is necessarily absent at the White House. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would note "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

Mrs. CARAWAY. My colleague, Mr. SPENCER, is necessarily absent. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." On this question he is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], who would vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I have voted. Therefore I allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hayden	Rosier
Brooks	Herring	Russell
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Tobey
Byrd	La Follette	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Norris	Wiley
Downey	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	

NAYS—42

Austin	Burton	Green
Ball	Caraway	Guffey
Barkley	Chandler	Gurney
Bilbo	Chavez	Hatch
Brewster	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Bridges	Doxey	Holman
Brown	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bunker	Gillette	Lee
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Idaho
Lucas	Overton	Thomas, Okla.
McKellar	Pepper	Truman
Mead	Reed	Wagner
Murdock	Reynolds	Wallgren
Murray	Schwartz	White

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews	Hughes	Smith
Bankhead	Langer	Spencer
Barbour	McNary	Taft
Bone	Shipstead	Thomas, Utah
Glass	Smathers	Van Nuys

So Mr. CONNALLY'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, in section 2, on page 1, in line 8, after the word "every", to insert "other."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, in line 8, after the word "male", to strike out "alien" and insert "person."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, in line 8, to insert the word "other" before the word "male" the second time it occurs in said line.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 9, at the beginning of the line, to strike out "alien" and insert "person."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 3, in line 7, at the end of the line, to strike out "classified" and insert "classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 14, after the word "be", to strike out "selected" and insert "selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, on page 5, in line 8, after the word "service", to insert "under section 3 (b) of such act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, at the end of line 10, to strike out "condition" and insert "war."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, in line 11, after the word "which", to strike out "originally."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding the limitation in section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 upon the time within which applications for national service life insurance may be made, all personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be granted insurance under such section without further medical examination if application therefor is filed prior to the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That after the expiration of this 120-day period such personnel may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment, which I have offered as a substitute for the committee amendment just read, and which is at the desk, be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment beginning after line 17 on page 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 11. Section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Any person in the active service, and while in such active service, shall be granted such insurance without medical examination upon application therefor in writing (made within 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act), and upon payment of premiums: *Provided*, That after the expiration of such 120-day period any such person may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

"(2) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, dies or has died in line of duty (including death resulting from disease or injury incurred in line of duty), without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance as of the date of entry into active service or October 8, 1940, whichever is later, in the sum of $5,000 payable as provided in section 602 (h), except that payments hereunder shall be made only to the following beneficiaries and in the order named—

"(A) to the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried;

"(B) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

"(C) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

"(3) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, suffers in line of duty total disability continuously for 6 months or more without having in force at the time of such disability insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance in the aggregate sum of $5,000 effective as of the date such disability was so suffered but not prior to October 8, 1940. Such premiums shall be waived during the continuation of such total disability. The Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from the national service life insurance appropriation to the national service life insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

"(4) The benefits and privileges extended by this section are hereby so extended by the Congress because many of the personnel of our armed forces (1) were unable to comply with the prerequisites necessary to the granting of insurance by reason of extended duty in the North Atlantic, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other outlying bases; (2) had failed or neglected to apply for such insurance in the expectation that their service would be peacetime service only; and (3) by reason of the suddenness with which war was thrust upon us, had not sufficient time to apply for such insurance prior to engaging in combat. The Congress hereby declares that no further relief of such character will be granted."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, section 11 of the committee amendment——

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have talked to the Senator from Missouri and some other Senators in regard to the insurance feature in the form of the amendment he has just offered, and we are perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. I did not understand what the chairman of the committee said.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The chairman of the committee said that the Military Affairs Committee would accept the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by me.

Mr. LEE. It is a substitute for what?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For section 11 of the committee amendment.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator explain to us the high points of the proposed substitute?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be very glad indeed to do so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Without going into the details of the amendment, if the Senator from Missouri will make it clear that the Senator's subcommittee of the Finance Committee has reported a bill dealing with this subject which is now on the Senate calendar, as I understand, I think it will furnish the information desired by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is precisely what I was about to do.

Mr. President, the committee amendment as it appears on page 5, section 11, represents the bill passed by the House 3 days ago under the number H. R. 6219. That bill was referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate for consideration, and by the Finance Committee was referred to a subcommittee on veterans' legislation. The subcommittee held hearings at which the Veterans' Bureau, representatives of the Army and Navy, and veterans' organizations appeared. The veterans' subcommittee reported to the full committee, as a substitute for the text of H. R. 6219, the amendment I have just sent to the desk and had read. That substitute was adopted without a dissenting vote by the full Finance Committee.

Mr. President, the essential difference between the House text and the substitute may be very briefly stated. The House text provides for extending for an additional period of 120 days the period within which men already in the service may take advantage of the insurance features of the National Service Life Insurance Act which expired by limitation at midnight of night before last. The Senate substitute embodies everything that is in the House text, but, in addition, grants automatic insurance on a presumptive basis to men who have died in the service in line of duty, or who have been totally disabled in line of duty, since the effective date of the National Service Life Insurance Act in October 1940. We felt that the men who perhaps have neglected to take out insurance, or who, by reason of being assigned to some outlying station, have suffered death or total disability in line of duty during this period, are entitled to the presumption that they had taken out a life-insurance policy. In that regard we are following precisely the pattern which was followed in the first World War. When the first insurance act was passed in the middle of October 1917, it was not only extended back to April 6, which was the date of the declaration of war, but it was also extended to include the members of the crew of the *Cyclops*, a Navy collier which left port and was never again seen.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the ground on which that was done was that we presumed that the men had taken out insurance.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The presumption was that they had done so?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct and that is the form which has been followed in this case.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I think the substitute is a good one. I am glad that it is being offered, and that the chairman of the committee has accepted it. If the Senator will allow me a word further, I wish to say that yesterday I introduced a bill, which I did not want to offer as an amendment to this bill, which is intended to provide a $10,000 insurance policy to each man in the armed force, with the Government paying the premiums; in other words, providing a free $10,000 policy for each man in the service. During the World War the average premium was $6.60 a month.

Later, I hope that bill may be considered, because I fear that in this war not so many boys will avail themselves of the life-insurance policy as did before, because we thought it was mandatory. Thank goodness, the authorities merely said, "Sign here and move on." The result was that most of us took out the insurance. This time I have already learned that many boys are not taking out the insurance. Some are taking out insurance for $1,000, and others for smaller amounts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Approximately 50 percent of the men now in the service have taken insurance, the average policy being for some $3,500.

Mr. LEE. But this is a good amendment, and I hope all of us can agree to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can assure the Senator that his bill will receive early and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee, I merely wish to observe, that, in view of the fact that the conferees perhaps will not be as familiar with this matter as are those

who have dealt with the subject, it might be well to have incorporated in the RECORD in connection with the Senator's remarks the report which the Senator from Missouri filed, and which is a more amplified statement of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report filed by me yesterday from the Committee on Finance on House bill 6219, which is essentially the amendment which has just been offered except that the amendment does not contain certain preambles which are in the committee substitute, be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (S. Rept. No. 917) is as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6219) to extend the provisions of section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The House bill, for which the committee amendment is substituted, extended for 120 days the time within which personnel on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard could file applications for national service life insurance without further medical examination.

Paragraph (1) of the committee amendment contains a similar provision and, in addition thereto, provides that after the expiration of such 120-day period any of such personnel may be granted such insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

Paragraph (2) of the committee amendment grants automatic insurance of at least $5,000 to any person who was in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, and who dies or has died in line of duty (including death resulting from disease or injury incurred in line of duty) during such period. The benefits so extended will be applicable only to those persons who did not have in force at the time of their death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, the World War Veterans' Act, or the National Service Life Insurance Act in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000. This means that if any such person died in line of duty during that period without having been granted any of such insurance, automatic insurance in the sum of $5,000 immediately issues upon the date of enactment of this act. If he had taken out $1,000 of insurance under any of the above-named acts, an additional amount of insurance in the sum of $4,000 would immediately issue upon such date of enactment. This paragraph also provides that such insurance shall be payable in the same manner as insurance is payable under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, but an exception is made with respect to the beneficiaries and the order in which they are to take. The only beneficiaries who will take under such automatic insurance and the order in which they shall take are as follows:

(1) To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried;

(2) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

(3) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

Paragraph (3) of the committee substitute grants automatic insurance up to $5,000 for any person in the active service who suffers total disability in line of duty during the same period specified in paragraph (2). Such insurance shall immediately issue on the date of enactment of this act and shall be effective as of the date such disability was so suffered but in no case shall it take effect prior to October 8, 1940. This paragraph also provides that premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuation of such total disability and, in order that the national service life insurance fund will not be depleted, the Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from the national service life insurance appropriation to such fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under paragraphs (2) and (3) of the substitute. The committee has also amended the title to the bill so that it will be more descriptive of the matter contained in the substitute.

The committee would like to stress the point that many of the men (estimated to be about 50 percent) who have been killed or totally disabled during the period specified in the committee substitute have been granted no insurance at all. This is due to a number of factors, one of which was that many of the men expected to serve for a training period comprising peacetime service only. Other men were on extended duty in the North Atlantic, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other outlying bases and were unable to comply with the prerequisites necessary to the granting of such insurance. If we had been at war when the insurance act was originally enacted, there is no doubt that many men would have taken out such insurance who did not do so. The gravity of the situation was not any more apparent to them than it was to us, and the committee feel that such men and their dependents and loved ones should not be denied relief because of the suddenness with which war was thrust upon us. Your committee, therefore, recommend the passage of the substitute but, at the same time, strongly urge the Congress that no further relief of this character be granted. We are now at war, and the right to apply for such insurance is extended by this bill for 120 days. Everyone is now cognizant of the gravity of the situation, and no valid excuses will hereafter lie for failure to make timely application.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I offered the amendment which is now the committee amendment, and am somewhat interested in it. I think the substitute offered by the Senator from Missouri is a great improvement on the committee amendment. I am glad arrangements have been made so that we can have the benefit in conference of the study made in other committees on this subject.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I venture to report to the Senator from Missouri that I have discovered that in a good many respects the insurance benefits available to the soldiers of this war are not so generous and comprehensive as those available to the soldiers of the first World War; and I wonder if the Senator, feeling that way about it, will not continue his study of this subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation will give their fullest and most sympathetic consideration to all these matters connected with a determination of the policy for the present war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to insert the following:

Paragraph (1) of section 5 (c) of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "Governors" a comma and the following: "and all other State officials chosen by the voters of the entire State."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have talked over this amendment with members of the committee and the chairman, and I respectfully ask that they accept the amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, we have no objection to accepting the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. Did the Chair say that the amendment was agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was agreed to without objection.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent for reconsideration of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am willing to be displaced if I can have recognition presently. Otherwise, I shall object.

Mr. LEE. Does the Senator from Connecticut object?

Mr. DANAHER. I reserve the right to object. I want to know if the Chair will recognize me upon the conclusion of the business proffered by the Senator from Oklahoma. If I have such assurance, I will gladly yield. Otherwise, I should like to retain the floor.

Mr. President, in the absence of assurance that I will get the floor if I yield it now, I shall retain the floor and proceed. I am quite willing to assure the Senator from Oklahoma that for my part he may have recognition at the conclusion of the business I wish to present.

Mr. President, to resume where I left off before I really got started, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a consideration with respect to the bill before us which has not been offered at any time or in any phase. I ask Senators to refer to page 2, line 10, and again in line 11, where we find the age of 19 set forth. I intend to offer an amendment to strike out the word "nineteen" and insert the word "twenty." In urging consideration of the substitution of the word "twenty" I shall give an illustration showing how practical the suggestion is.

If we take boys at the age of 19 and send them into the service irrespective of the education and training they have had, we not only are depriving ourselves of a substantial background for officer material, but we are rendering it impossible for those men to qualify for officers' training schools in the service. They cannot be commissioned until they are 21 years of age. If we take them when they are 20, we can at least have grounded them thoroughly in 6 months to 9 months in the elementary training that is required before they may be designated by the divisional commanders for attendance upon officers' training schools. If we take them, on the other hand, at the age of 19, they most certainly cannot qualify. A year and a half or more must elapse before they attain the age of 21, when they may qualify for a commission. That factor has not been given consideration, either in the explanation of the bill or otherwise.

I mention it perhaps the more urgently, without having wished hitherto to inject any personal element to show exactly how the provision applies, because I have two sons, one 20 and the other 19. The elder of the two, the one who is 20, will enter the service. He will enter the service without being drafted. There is no element of draft involved so far as he is concerned, no matter what kind of a bill we pass, or what kind of an amendment we adopt this afternoon.

Being 20, he will become eligible to attend an officers' training school in due course. He has had a year and a quarter or more of Reserve Officers' Training Corps training at the university he attends. He has qualified himself, under the most capable Army instruction, as an expert marksman. He is a crack rifleman at this very moment. In order to qualify himself further, he rose early every morning and drove 15 miles to work for 12 or 14 hours in a factory making machine guns and small arms. In other words, the young man has done everything he possibly could to qualify himself elementally as against the day when he could render the best possible service.

The other young man is in the other classification, being aged 19. Let us assume we classify him. Of course, we register him, and classify him as with no aptitude for anything special, despite all the years of background of training and assistance it has been within our means to try to give to a boy of his classification. Nonetheless, he has no opportunity whatever to add himself to that group of officer material upon whom the Army normally and actually would rely.

While I can personalize this particular experience in reference to my very own case, let me say to Senators that there are 4,000,000 homes, the testimony reveals, wherein boys of just this general age classification will be affected under the amendment we have considered this afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think the point the Senator raises is a very important one, and it is one I sought to develop in the hearings. I asked General Haislip this question:

> Would you care to say anything about any changes in the procurement of officers?

General Haislip replied:

> Yes, sir; we are planning now to greatly increase the output of our officer candidate schools.
>
> Senator LODGE. Draw them from selectees?
>
> General HAISLIP. Draw them from men in uniform. We feel that is the best way, the most equitable and the most democratic way to get our officers, and we feel we will get the best officers that way.

In other words, the procurement of officers will be probably less and less from R. O. T. C. units, and more and more from officer-training schools, taking them from the selectees.

Mr. DANAHER. But we cannot take them until they are 21 and give them commissions.

Mr. LODGE. We cannot commission them, but we can train them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I call the Senator's attention to section 5 (a) of the basic act, and to the further fact that the bill we are now considering is merely an amendment to the basic act. In other words, the basic act stands unless modified or amended in some way by the pending bill. Section 5 (a) provides that men of the advanced course, senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, are deferred until they have opportunity to complete their training for commissions.

Mr. DANAHER. Before they can get into the senior classification, they must have 2 full years of the elementary R. O. T. C. work.

Mr. HILL. That is correct, and if they are in the senior division they are permitted to go ahead and get their commissions, but if they have not reached the advanced course, they are not. But all the training and service they have had in the R. O. T. C. will make them all the better soldiers, and give them all the greater opportunity to become officers after they get into the Army.

I wish to say in this connection that whereas to get a commission in the regular Army a man has to be 21 years of age, under the measure we passed not many weeks ago, providing for temporary promotions during the period of the war, a man does not have to be 21 years of age. So youngsters who are in the junior R. O. T. C. will have the advantage of the training they have had in the R. O. T. C., and if they are called into the service they will have an opportunity to go to the officers' training schools and become officers.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Alabama certainly is not telling any of his colleagues, including myself, that there is any intention of commissioning 19-year-old boys?

Mr. HILL. There certainly is such an intention. I would say that if the boy to whom the Senator has referred is inducted into the service and prepares himself to be an officer, he will be an officer; and he should be an officer, of course.

Mr. DANAHER. I usually have more respect and regard for the expressions of the Senator from Alabama than I have for the last observation he has contributed this afternoon.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to read a telegram I have received?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have received the following telegram:

> NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 18, 1941.*
>
> Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
>
> *United States Senate,*
>
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Strongly oppose drafting boys under 21; underdeveloped physically and cannot endure hardships of training and campaign. I saw many sicken and die in '98 and 1917. They became a loss, while they are potential asset in maturity. Urge you vote against such measure.
>
> C. P. SUMMERALL.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 10, after the words "ages of", and on line 11, after the words "age of", to strike out the word "nineteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty." I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and will vote. I vote "nay." I am advised that the Senator from New Jersey, if present, would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I have voted. Therefore I shall let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness. He has a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is unavoidably detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in the labor conference and is unable to be present. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

My colleague the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. If present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] is necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. PEPPER. I announce that my colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Gerry	Rosier
Bailey	Herring	Stewart
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Brooks	Kilgore	Tunnell
Butler	La Follette	Vandenberg
Byrd	Langer	Walsh
Capper	McCarran	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	White
Danaher	Maybank	Wiley
Davis	Norris	Willis
Downey	Nye	
George	Radcliffe	

NAYS—47

Austin	Green	Murray
Ball	Guffey	O'Daniel
Barkley	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hatch	Overton
Bridges	Hayden	Pepper
Brown	Hill	Reynolds
Bunker	Holman	Russell
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Caraway	Lee	Spencer
Chandler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Doxey	McNary	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Wallgren
Gillette	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Glass	Smith
Bankhead	Hughes	Taft
Barbour	Reed	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Shipstead	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Smathers	

So Mr. DANAHER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, if there be no further amendments to be offered, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 6215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6215.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I move to strike out from the House bill all after the enacting clause, and to substitute therefor the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina to strike from the House bill all after the enacting clause and to substitute therefor the text of the Senate bill, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present and voting he would vote as I have voted, so I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting those Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah is detained in a labor conference. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent. I am advised that, if present, those Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Bilbo	Bunker
Austin	Brewster	Burton
Bailey	Bridges	Butler
Ball	Brooks	Byrd
Barkley	Brown	Capper
Caraway	Kilgore	Reynolds
Chandler	La Follette	Rosier
Chavez	Langer	Russell
Clark, Idaho	Lee	Schwartz
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Spencer
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Danaher	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Davis	McFarland	Tobey
Doxey	McKellar	Truman
Ellender	McNary	Tunnell
George	Maloney	Tydings
Gerry	Maybank	Vandenberg
Gillette	Mead	Van Nuys
Green	Murdock	Wagner
Guffey	Murray	Wallgren
Gurney	Norris	Walsh
Hatch	Nye	Wheeler
Hayden	O'Daniel	White
Herring	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Overton	Willis
Holman	Pepper	
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	

NAYS—2

Downey	Johnson, Calif.

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Glass	Smith
Bankhead	Hughes	Taft
Barbour	Reed	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Shipstead	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Smathers	

So the bill H. R. 6215 was passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 6215) entitled "An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes," do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 2 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885; U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 302), as amended, be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and of every other male person residing in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of 18 and 65, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner and in such age group or groups, as shall be determined by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.'

"SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 19 and 45 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 19 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That any citizen or subject of a neutral country shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this act if, prior to his induction into the land or naval forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That no citizen or subject of any country who has been or who may hereafter be proclaimed by the President to be an alien enemy of the United States shall be inducted for training and service under this act unless he is acceptable to the land or naval forces.'

"SEC. 3. Section 4 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: '*Provided further*, That in the classification

of registrants within the jurisdiction of any local board, the registrants of any particular registration may be classified, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after the registrants of any prior registration or registrations; and in the selection for induction of persons within the jurisdiction of any local board and within any particular classification, persons who were registered at any particular registration may be selected, in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, before, together with, or after persons who were registered at any prior registration or registrations.'

"SEC. 4. Section 5 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words 'foreign countries' a comma and the following: 'and persons in other categories to be specified by the President.'

"Paragraph (1) of section 5 (c) of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word 'Governors' a comma and the following: 'and all other State officials chosen by the voters of the entire State.'

"SEC. 5. The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after '(1)' and after '(2)' the words 'of any or all.'

"SEC. 6. Paragraph (2) of section 5 (e) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Anything in this act to the contrary notwithstanding, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment, by age group or groups, from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States, of those men whose age or ages are such that he finds their deferment to be advisable in the national interest: *Provided*, That the President may, upon finding that it is in the national interest, terminate the deferment by age group or groups of any or all of the men so deferred.'

"SEC. 7. Section 15 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The term "between the ages of 19 and 45" shall refer to men who have attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and who have not attained the forty-fifth anniversary of the day of their birth; and other terms designating different age groups shall be construed in a similar manner.'

"SEC. 8. Section 15 (c) of such act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 9. Persons inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 who are inducted into or assigned to the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, shall be members of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be; and in time of war their periods of service or training and service may be extended by the President for such additional time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided*, That the periods of service or training and service under section 3 (b) of such act of men who are detained under this section shall be terminated not later than 6 months after the termination of the war which authorized their detention, unless such men voluntarily extend their periods of service or training and service.

"SEC. 10. The first proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the word 'forty-five' in lieu of the word 'thirty-six.'

"SEC. 11. Section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(d) (1) Any person in the active service, and while in such active service, shall be granted such insurance without medical examination upon application therefor in writing (made within 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act), and upon payment of premiums: *Provided*, That after the expiration of such 120-day period any such person may be granted national service life insurance at any time upon application, payment of premiums, and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator showing them to be in good health.

"'(2) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, dies or has died in line of duty (including death resulting from disease or injury incurred in line of duty), without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or th: act, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance as of the date of entry into active service or October 8, 1940, whichever is later, in the sum of $5,000 payable as provided in section 602 (h), except that payments hereunder shall be made only to the following beneficiaries and in the order named—

"'(A) to the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried;

"'(B) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

"'(C) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares

"'(3) Any person in the active service on or after October 8, 1940, who, while in such service and before the expiration of 120 days after the date of enactment of this amendatory act, suffers in line of duty total disability continuously for 6 months or more without having in force at the time of such disability insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance in the aggregate sum of $5,000 effective as of the date such disability was so suffered but not prior to October 8, 1940. Such premiums shall be waived during the continuation of such total disability. The Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from the national service life insurance appropriation to the national service life insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

"'(4) The benefits and privileges extended by this section are hereby so extended by the Congress because many of the personnel of our armed forces (1) were unable to comply with the prerequisites necessary to the granting of insurance by reason of extended duty in the North Atlantic, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other outlying bases; (2) had failed or neglected to apply for such insurance in the expectation that their service would be peacetime service only; and (3) by reason of the suddenness with which war was thrust upon us, had not sufficient time to apply for such insurance prior to engaging in combat. The Congress hereby declares that no further relief of such character will be granted.'"

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the amendment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2126 will be indefinitely postponed.

SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5988, Calendar No. 943.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let the bill be stated by its title. I do not know what the bill is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5988) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 513 of the Sugar Act of 1937 as amended (relating to termination of powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 513. The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1944, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1944 and previous crop years."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "in the 1937, 1938, and 1939 crops" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the 1940 and subsequent crops."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. (a) The amount of the base rate of payment shall be 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar or liquid sugar, raw value."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The total payment with respect to a farm shall be the product of the base rate specified in subsection (a) of this section multiplied by the amount of sugar and liquid sugar, raw value, with respect to which payment is to be made, except that reduction shall be made from such total payment in accordance with the following scale of reductions:

"Reduction in the base rate of payment per hundredweight of such portion	
"That portion of the quantity of sugar and liquid sugar which is included within the following intervals of short tons, raw value:	
"350 to 700	$0.05
700 to 1,000	.10
1,000 to 1,500	.20
1,500 to 3,000	.25
3,000 to 6,000	.275
6,000 to 12,000	.30
12,000 to 30,000	.325
More than 30,000	.50"

SEC. 4. (a) Section 307 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. This title shall apply to the continental United States, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to the 1942 crop and subsequent crops.

SEC. 5. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3508. Termination of taxes: No tax shall be imposed under this chapter on the manufacture, use, or importation of sugar after June 30, 1945."

SEC. 6. Section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to payments to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1942," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is not intended to proceed with the consideration of the bill at this time. We will take it up tomorrow.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 2144 (by request). A bill to amend section 321 of the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to the character of military or naval property of the United States which may be transported at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. BANKHEAD):

S. 2145. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in potatoes so as to provide an adequate and stable supply with fair prices for producers and consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Naval Affairs, I report favorably the nomination of Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 19th day of December 1941.

Mr. WALSH. I may state that yesterday Admiral Nimitz was appointed commanding officer of the naval forces at Hawaii. He expects to leave tomorrow for the performance of duty in Hawaii. He is now Chief of the Bureau of Navigation. His departure creates a vacancy in the Bureau of Navigation, and the President has nominated Admiral Randall Jacobs. If his nomination is confirmed tonight, he can take office as Chief of the Bureau of Navigation tomorrow, and Admiral Nimitz can proceed to carry out his orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination of Admiral Jacobs has just been received by the Senate and is now before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement by the able senior Senator from Massachusetts, I have no objection to waiving the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

CUSTOMS SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nan Wood Honeyman, of Portland, Oreg., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Flynn, of Pelham Manor, N. Y., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations acted upon today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of all nominations acted upon today.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 19, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. J. Waties Waring, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice Hon. Frank K. Myers, deceased.

Hon. George Bell Timmerman to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina, vice Hon. Alva M. Lumpkin, resigned.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

A. Cecil Snyder, of Maryland, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. Adolph G. Wolf, retired.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1943, vice Riley E. Elgen.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATOR FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Paul Edwards, of the District of Columbia, to be Work Projects Administrator for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, effective January 1, 1942.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE NAVY

CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 19th day of December 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

CUSTOMS SERVICE

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Nan Wood Honeyman, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 29, with headquarters at Portland, Oreg.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

John H. Flynn to be appraiser of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 19th day of December, 1941.

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be majors

Richard Phillip Klocko
Harold Bell Wright.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenants

Ralph Bassett Martin, Corps of Engineers.
Warren James Clark, Infantry.

To be first lieutenant

Robert Goodwin Rate, Medical Corps.

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel

Benjamin Almond Brackenbury, Chemical Warfare Service.

To be lieutenant colonels

Richard Kemp LeBrou, Finance Department.
Charles Wesley Sullivan, Air Corps.
William Jacob Kunzmann, Infantry.
Handy Vernon Brown, Finance Department.
×Neal Dow Franklin, Judge Advocate General's Department.
×Harold Ogier Godwin, Quartermaster Corps.
Henry Joachim Boettcher, Infantry.
Lonnie Otis Field, Field Artillery.
Melvin B. Asp, Air Corps.
×Maurice Stewart Kerr, Infantry.
×Robert Burdette Woolverton, Signal Corps.
Orley DeForest Bowman, Coast Artillery Corps.
George Clement McDonald, Air Corps.
Thomas Judson Weed, Quartermaster Corps.
Peter Emanuel Skanse, Air Corps.
Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Air Corps.
James Austin Gilruth, Quartermaster Corps.
Henry Clyde Clark, Judge Advocate General's Department.
Arthur George Liggett, Air Corps.
Jacob Herman Osterman, Quartermaster Corps.
Westside Torkel Larson, Air Corps.
Andrew Daniel Hopping, Quartermaster Corps.
Edward Herendeen, Field Artillery.

To be captain

Richard Irving Crone, Medical Corps.

To be majors

Leland Grant Meder, Dental Corps.
Samuel Rush Haven, Dental Corps.

To be captains

Willard Graham Davis, chaplain.
Earl Dwight Compton, chaplain.

APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

First Lt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., to Chemical Warfare Service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be colonel

Franklin A. Hart

To be lieutenant colonels

William S. Fellers
Ralph D. Leach

To be majors

Frank G. Dailey
Frank H. Wirsig

To be captains

Michael Sampas
William G. Robb
John H. Masters
Leonard M. Mason
Walter N. Flournoy
Kenneth A. King
Arthur B. Barrows
Marion M. Magruder
Wood B. Kyle
Russell E. Honsowetz
Russell B. Warye

To be second lieutenants

Carl M. Johnson
George D. Webster

POSTMASTERS

NEW JERSEY

Sarah V. Dickerson, Denville.
John P. Leonard, Elizabeth.
Vincent J. Tuite, Harrison.
Verna A. Cox, Magnolia.
Kemp C. Wetmore, Tuckerton.

OHIO

Mayme E. Puterbaugh, Centerville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Viola DeFino, Adah.
Walter P. Dunwoody, Bareville.
Emilie D. Hunt, Dingmans Ferry.
Violet M. Burrell, Indianola.
Jewett Shirm, Montoursville.
Margaret M. Ryan, Oreland.
Samuel F. Snyder, Paxinos.
Park C. Shank, Jr., Peach Bottom.
William A. Donovan, Sutersville.
Lewis E. Hatch, Whitemarsh.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In humble adoration and praise, our Father in heaven, we pray that we may have a vision of our duty and without hesitation or delay seek to know Thy will. We pray that even misfortune, often unseen under cloudless skies, may open our souls. Laying this truth to our hearts, do Thou put Thy hand upon us as a balm for every wound; through this ministry all may come into the healing wisdom and light which is the purpose of the divine mind. We ask for the spirit of the Master, for through it labor becomes sanctified, devotion hallowed, and every truth is the light of life. Inspire us to love Thee, O Son of Man; for Thy strength and tenderness and for all Thou hast brought us of consolation, of peace and warmth of heart, we thank Thee. Abide with us, teaching us to see the divine spark in the poor, the unfortunate, and the helpless on the highway of life and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6223. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2119. An act to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5558. An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House may have until 12 o'clock tonight in which to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6263) to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CERTIFICATION OF DRUGS CONTAINING INSULIN

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6251) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from California explain the nature of the bill?

Mr. LEA. I shall endeavor to do so. There is an emergency situation that caused our committee to act on this bill at the present time. The report before the House represents the unanimous opinion of the committee.

The patent on insulin expires on the 23d of this month. Control of the manufacture of insulin is in the hands of the University of Toronto. The patent is owned by the University of Toronto, and manufacturers in the United States act under license from the committee on insulin of that university.

Control of insulin quality by the University of Toronto has been most commendable. That control has been on a nonprofit, humane, and scientific basis. It has required that all manufacturers comply with the standards set up by the committee on insulin in order to engage in its manufacture or sale. This control was through ownership of the patent right.

On expiration of the patent, present control over the situation will cease and

manufacturers in this country would be at liberty to manufacture and place insulin on the market in disregard of that uniform standard of quality and strength that are so essential for the protection of users of insulin.

Over 1,000,000 people in the United States are now under insulin treatment. It is estimated they are spending about $15,000,000 a year for this remedy. Ordinarily, the doctor gives the patient a prescription, who after that buys from any drug store available. So far, the afflicted person has had the protection that is given by a uniform standard and strength under the restrictions imposed by the owners of the patent.

The effect of insulin is such that injury and death may result from taking too much, or too little. The peril to the public that would ensue from the lack of a uniform standard would be primarily due to the variation and uncertain quality as to strength and purity unless its standardization is assured by the Federal Government acting through the Food and Drug Administration.

Under the amendment here proposed to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, every batch of insulin would be submitted to tests to assure its freedom from infection, its purity, and strength. Each batch would be subject to approval of the Food and Drug Administration, and rejected if not of a properly standardized quality. By this means all users of insulin, suffering from diabetes, can be assured of the quality, the standard, strength, and purity of their purchases.

The procedure required in making tests, the adoption of regulations to control such tests, and the certification thereof by the Food and Drug Administration, will conform to the practice that already prevails in requiring such tests, and issuing such certificates as to certain coal-tar products.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This means that the Food and Drug Administration will have control and jurisdiction over insulin.

Mr. LEA. Yes; the Food and Drug Administration will have the power to require all necessary tests to establish its proper qualities, and assure protection to the users of insulin throughout the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 (i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting "506," before the phrase "or 604." at the end thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 502 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting a new paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"(k) If it is, or purports to be, or is represented as a drug composed wholly or partly of insulin, unless (1) it is from a batch with respect to which a certificate or release has been issued pursuant to section 506, and (2) such certificate or release is in effect with respect to such drug."

SEC. 3. Chapter V of such act, as amended, is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof, as follows:

"CERTIFICATION OF DRUGS CONTAINING INSULIN

"SEC. 506. (a) The Federal Security Administrator, pursuant to regulations promulgated by him, shall provide for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin. A batch of any such drug shall be certified if such drug has such characteristics of identity and such batch has such characteristics of strength, quality, and purity, as the Administrator prescribes in such regulations as necessary to adequately insure safety and efficacy of use, but shall not otherwise be certified. Prior to the effective date of such regulations the Administrator, in lieu of certification, shall issue a release for any batch which, in his judgment, may be released without risk as to the safety and efficacy of its use. Such release shall prescribe the date of its expiration and other conditions under which it shall cease to be effective as to such batch and as to portions thereof.

"(b) Regulations providing for such certification shall contain such provisions as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including provisions prescribing (1) standards of identity and of strength, quality, and purity; (2) tests and methods of assay to determine compliance with such standards; (3) effective periods for certificates, and other conditions under which they shall cease to be effective as to certified batches and as to portions thereof; (4) administration and procedure; and (5) such fees, specified in such regulations, as are necessary to provide, equip, and maintain an adequate certification service.

"(c) Such regulations, insofar as they prescribe tests or methods of assay to determine strength, quality, or purity of any drug, different from the tests or methods of assay set forth for such drug in an official compendium, shall be prescribed, after notice and opportunity for revision of such compendium, in the manner provided in the second sentence of section 501 (b). The provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 701 shall be applicable to such portion of any regulation as prescribes any such different test or method, but shall not be applicable to any other portion of any such regulation."

SEC. 4. Regulations initially prescribed under section 506 of such act, as amended, shall be promulgated and made effective within 45 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 6, after the word "service", add the following: "Such regulations shall prescribe no standard of identity or of strength, quality, or purity for any drug different from the standard of identity, strength, quality, or purity set forth for such drug in an official compendium."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACK-OUTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President pro tempore of the Senate in signing the enrolled bill (H. R. 6208) entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", be, and the same is hereby, rescinded; and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reenroll the said bill with the following change, namely: In the engrossed Senate amendments, at the end of amendment No. 6, strike out the word "section" and the period, and insert the following: "section, and there is hereby appropriated for this purpose $1,000,000 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the United States not otherwise appropriated."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR EXAMINATION OF MONTHLY ACCOUNTS OF DISBURSING OFFICERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2087) to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this simply extends the time for the filing of reports of audits of accounts of Marine Corps disbursing officers.

Mr. COCHRAN. In connection with disbursing officers of the Marine Corps, it is approved by the Marine Corps, Comptroller General, and Bureau of the Budget. The Paymaster General of the Marine Corps advises me it will save money. It is impossible to comply with the present law due to the emergency.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has passed the Senate, and has been approved by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. It was unanimously reported yesterday by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps after the date of actual receipt at headquarters, United States Marine Corps, and before transmitting the same to the General Accounting Office, as limited by section 12 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 209), as amended, is hereby extended from 20 to 60 days. In time of war or national emergency and for a period of 18 months after such war or emergency shall have ceased to exist, the time for examination of such monthly accounts is hereby extended from 60 to 90 days.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT]?

There was no objection.

ADEQUATE EQUIPMENT FOR POSSIBLE AIR RAIDS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have all been hearing of the preparations being made in many cities against possible air raids. The work of preparation is being pushed forward vigorously by the Office of Civilian Defense and local defense agencies. We ought to help.

All the preparations may be unavailing if the civilian population has not got the necessary equipment. Air-raid wardens need helmets. The people should have gas masks, for the fact that gas has not been used much in this war does not mean that it will not be.

Furthermore, the people need equipment to defend their homes against incendiary bombs. They need pails of sand and pails of water, shovels for the sand, and a stirrup pump and a hose with a sprinkler nozzle for the water. All this, let alone black-out material, costs money.

I have visited many homes which are "all set"—at considerable expense. But I have visited many other homes around Boston which have no equipment and there is not much money in those homes to buy the equipment. Surely home defense must not be strong or weak depending on the affluence or poverty of the householder. We are all in this thing together.

Perhaps our cities will not be attacked. There seems to be a very good chance of that, at least in the immediate future. But if we are going to be prepared we should do a thorough job, with no distinction between citizens.

I hope therefore that we can start doing our part, here in Congress, by immediately passing the civilian-protection bill, H. R. 5727, as one move in the direction of getting proper equipment distributed to all. This is a matter that will not wait. We should take this action now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes after disposition of the legislative program in order for the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 7 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any previous special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 3 OF THE SUBSISTENCE EXPENSE ACT OF 1926, AS AMENDED

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 6220, to amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended. The bill is urged by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 688), as amended by the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 405), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Civilian officers and employees of the departments and establishments, while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed, in lieu of their actual expenses for subsistence and all fees or tips to porters and stewards, a per diem allowance to be prescribed by the heads of the departments and establishments concerned at a rate not to exceed $6 within the limits of the continental United States, and not to exceed an average of $7 beyond the limits of the continental United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of what price defense and to include statements by Theodore Granik; Leon Henderson, of O. P. A.; Donald Nelson, of S. P. A. B.; Charles F. Palmer, Division of Defense Housing; Rear Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission; and Floyd B. Odlum, O. P. M. I have checked with the Government Printing Office, and I find that the cost will be $315.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

PREVIOUS ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE—A FULL-TIME JOB

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] this morning, I want to call attention to the urgent need for immediate action with respect to civilian defense. All of us know the coastal States are very much impressed with the fact that some of them may be subjected to air attack in the immediate future. We cannot continue to run a proper civilian program under part-time administration.

Mayor LaGuardia has a full-time job to do in running the city of New York. Mrs. Roosevelt certainly cannot do a full-time job of civilian defense with all the other tasks she has at hand.

I call your attention to an article written by Walter Lippmann appearing in the Washington Post a couple of days ago, which I shall include in my remarks later. Mr. Lippmann points out the absolute necessity of immediate action on our civilian-defense program.

Prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor various civilian-defense organizations were attempting to set up some sort of a defense program that would work, but the mayors and officials of the various cities found there was no turn-out for the meetings. The citizens were interested, certainly, but before the attack on Pearl Harbor very few showed up for the meetings.

Let me read you some of the progressive headlines from newspapers in my district following the attack on Pearl Harbor. In the southern part of my district, in Monterey, the headlines the day following read:

Partial black-out is ordered here.

The next day:

Officials plug holes in black-our plans.

The next day:

Monterey now has black-out ordinance.

In the northern part of my district the headlines read as follows:

Here's what to do during an air raid.
Civilian Defense Council created; air-raid instructions are released.

In the next day's paper appeared this:

Pupils told what to do.

Down in the central part of my district another paper carried headlines as follows:

Civilian defenses of city prepared for emergencies.
Everybody talks about air raids; action slow.

This is undoubtedly indicative of what is going on in many sections of the country. It appears to me that we are going too slow in taking action on our civilian defense program; this can be fatal in many instances. People are not hysterical around the country, I find. They are eager to do their part. They are meeting the tasks we have ahead of us with courage. But unless we set up a full-time civilian defense program, we are going to run into difficulties that may have very serious consequences.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. May I ask the gentleman how many antiaircraft guns are now in his district?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I cannot answer the question, I am sorry to say, but I would venture to say that there are too few, if any.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this subject should be thoroughly considered, and immediately, by the Congress of the United States. A suitable bill providing for a full-time civilian defense program is absolutely essential at the present time. We are apt to meet with very fatal consequences in certain parts of the United States in the near future if something is not done.

Various proposals providing for civilian defense are presently pending before the House Committee on Military Affairs. One of these, H. R. 3303, was introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] and myself on June 12, 1940. Our bill calls for the establishment of a home-defense organized reserve, established as a part of the reserve component of the Regular Army. Our plan was turned down by the War Department, but, nevertheless, we reintroduced our measure in February of this year. Neither of us wish to claim that our proposal is perfect, but we do feel that some sort of a plan along the lines suggested in our bill will meet the civilian-defense needs of the day. At any rate, I am of the opinion that the Military Affairs Committee should take immediate action on this, or some other similar proposal, in order that a workable civilian-defense program will not be too long delayed.

Our citizens who are meeting this emergency with courage and resourcefulness are entitled to the utmost cooperation from the Federal Government. Any workable plan, however, must be all-inclusive, so that the program in California, for instance, will coincide with the program in Maine, in Florida, and in the rest of the 48 States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article therein by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Washington Post of December 16, 1941]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

MAYOR LAGUARDIA AND MRS. ROOSEVELT

It is at once accurate and charitable to say that the Office of Civilian Defense, under the direction of Mayor LaGuardia and of Mrs. Roosevelt, is a hang-over from prewar days. It was set up in that fantastic period of our history when every effort to awaken the country to the peril ahead of it was met by a storm of opposition In those circumstances the organization of home defense could not be undertaken seriously. It would have been treated, and in fact was treated, as warmongering propaganda to frighten the people into an intervention by some five to eight million soldiers in the European war.

Thus the country had been alarmed by such nonsense as that and, on the other hand, it had been drugged by the false and deadly assurance that our own territory was invulnerable. The grim business of civilian defense has had, therefore, to be treated as a kind of make-believe, like children playing at war, and it had to be sold to the people by Mayor LaGuardia's talents for publicity and by Mrs. Roosevelt's talent for sugar-coating the matter with all manner of fads, fancies, homilies, and programs which would have been appropriate to the activities of an excited village improvement society. As a result, the realities of civilian defense have never been clearly grasped, nor has the business been organized in a way that is remotely adequate. The effect is clearly visible in the confusion which we are now experiencing and in the desk thumping, the shrill appeals, the threats, and the warnings which emanate from the Office of Civilian Defense.

A drastic change in the whole organization is immediately necessary, for it must be recognized at once that vital areas of American territory are directly threatened and measures must be taken at once. These measures must serve the fundamental purpose of protecting the threatened areas without pinning down and diverting the Navy, the Army, and the air force from their mission, which is to take the offensive against the enemy. This, above all, we must fix in mind: That the civilian population must be organized to protect itself and to protect the vital industries of the Nation within continental United States. The civilians must be prepared morally and spiritually to take what punishment they cannot protect themselves against, for the armed forces of the United States must not be called upon to look after the civilians. The armed forces must be free to think only of the enemy.

That being the case, the protective functions of civilian defense should become a home defense organized on military lines. The threatened area on the Pacific coast, first of all, and, after that, the vulnerable areas on the Atlantic coast and in the vital interior munitions centers should be placed under limited martial law. In each area there should be a commandant who, under these emergency powers, would have the control of the police, State troopers, fire departments, home guards, air-raid wardens, public utilities, the power to draft into the service of home defense the volunteer services, and the power to draft citizens otherwise exempted from the armed forces and not required for war industries.

The home defense should be placed under the jurisdiction of the War Department, and operated by an Assistant Secretary of War for Home Defense. The matter has gone far beyond the authority or the competence of Mayor LaGuardia and Mrs. Roosevelt. Even if they had the military experience needed for the task, even if they could give all their time, instead of a little of it to the task, it would still be impossible for them to do what needs to be done. They have no authority, and though Mayor LaGuardia sits with the peacetime Cabinet, he has no responsibility except vaguely and personally to the President, who is too busy to listen to him.

Therefore, the Office of Civilian Defense issues statements and appeals when it should be able to issue orders, and it pleads for cooperation when the facts of the situation and the morale of the people require lucid and authoritative commands.

Home defense will not be dealt with seriously and adequately until it is organized as a military command, subordinated to but coordinated with the Army, and directly responsible to the War Cabinet itself. We may rely with great confidence upon the demonstrated ability of Secretary Stimson to make the necessary appointments and to delegate the necessary authority.

After the military functions have been cut cleanly away from the present Office of Civilian Defense there will be a better prospect that the remaining functions of that office can be carried on effectively. But even they cannot be carried on by Mayor LaGuardia as a side line to his being mayor of New York and head of the Canadian-American Defense Board. The mayor should resign as soon as his successor can be found and installed in the office. And Mrs. Roosevelt should undertake to assist but not to direct and administer the office. The wife of the President of the United States should not confuse everybody by being a subordinate official in a subordinate department of the Government which her husband administers.

What will remain to be carried forward after the military organization of home defense has been removed are all those activities which depend upon volunteer activity, upon personal and local initiative among the mass of our people. Civilian defense should be concerned with service to the American forces and the men of the merchant fleet and the men in the war industries, with the training of nurses and nurses' aides and medical auxiliaries and with activities to keep the civilians fit. It should be concerned with the relief of those who are injured, and of those whose lives are dislocated either by enemy action or by the privations which the war will impose. It should be concerned with inspiring local self-help and personal self-reliance, so that as normal business and the normal ways of life are interrupted our people will use a Yankee ingenuity to find ways of helping themselves. It should be preparing itself to help police the rationing of goods, which will certainly be necessary, and in assisting the authorities in their watch upon the subversive and in their protection of the innocent.

There are no end of things to be done. But none of them will be done until the military task of home defense is separated from the civilian and voluntary aspects of it. How can the home front be organized properly when we find Mrs. Roosevelt talking about air raids in one breath and in the next about what kind of toys to give children for Christmas? How can Mayor LaGuardia and Mrs. Roosevelt hope to know what they are doing when they are doing so many things all over the place at the same time?

An immediate and fundamental reorganization is a matter of urgent military necessity. It is equally necessary to the morale of the people, who will be as brave and enduring as any other people if only they feel that at the top the direction and the command are lucid and firm. They cannot feel that today. And one can only hope that Mayor LaGuardia and Mrs. Roosevelt, who foresaw the peril long before most of their countrymen, will now be among the first to see that in the presence of actual war, a drastic change in their whole organization is imperative.

REGISTRATION OF PROPAGANDA AGENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it was understood that the bill H. R. 6250 was to come up for consideration today. There is a rumor around here that that bill will not be called up today, and that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold more extensive hearings before it is called up. Is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that in view of certain questions that have been raised, which I really do not feel are of any great importance, nevertheless I thought that we would withhold calling up the rule, especially in view of the fact that up to now the report has not been printed.

Mr. MICHENER. May I ask the majority leader if it is the intention, then, not to bring the bill up before further committee hearings have been held in January?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the intention to bring the bill up now, not until some time in January. What may happen in between I am unable to state, but I believe that adequately answers the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 7 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, three official acts of the administration will go far to reestablish the confidence of the Nation in the conduct of the war—a confidence which is vital to the successful conduct of the war.

The Nation was inexpressibly shocked by the debacle at Pearl Harbor. Not only were the people shocked, they were dazed. The Nation immediately became prey to all manner of rumors and speculation. As is always the case under such circumstances, the rumors of death and damage grew and grew until the most grotesque stories were floating about.

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox took an airplane to Pearl Harbor. The country did not know whether he was going to reveal or to suppress the facts. Upon his return, his frank and forthright statements went very far toward reestablishing the confidence of the country in the administration and our armed forces in Hawaii.

The second act of the administration was the appointment by President Roosevelt of a Board of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. His presence and position on the Board alone would be sufficient to assure the Nation of a thorough, searching, and honest investigation of conditions and causes of the disaster of December 7.

In addition to Mr. Justice Roberts the President appointed on the Board Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy, retired; Brig. Gen. Joseph P. McNarney, an active and able Air Corps officer; former Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral William H. Standley; and former commander in chief of the United States Fleet, Admiral Joseph M. Reeves, than whom there is no more able, courageous, or conscientious officer in the Navy now nor has there been in the past. Both of the latter officers are retired also. These officers are all able, expert, and highly respected men, and add to the confidence the Nation has in the character and purpose of this Board of Inquiry.

Third, and following closely the appointment of the Board came the startling shake-up of the Army and Navy organization in the Pacific—additional evidence that the inquiry will be one that will go to the very roots of the conditions responsible for the shocking surprise and defeat at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, if the present World War has demonstrated anything, it is that a navy acting alone is no longer the controlling factor in a war that involves the control of the seas. Through bitter experience, we and others have learned that our most powerful naval vessels can be sunk by aircraft, and with small cost to the striking force, providing always surface vessels are not properly protected by defense aircraft.

Our lines of communication in the Pacific are 7,000 miles in length. It will be most difficult indeed to keep them open, and without a large and growing air service and a constantly increasing number of submarines and other ships of the Navy it will be impossible. Our Navy there is now crippled as a result of the Pearl Harbor catastrophe. Our air service there was seriously crippled also. The latter can, and I hope will be, promptly repaired. It will take years to replace our sunken ships. It will require months to repair the damaged ones.

Our submarines, such as we have, seem to be operating efficiently. Our principal and imperative need, apparently, is up-to-the-minute equipment of every kind—aircraft carriers, and plenty of them, and submarines and more submarines, together with all the latest up-to-date scientific instruments and equipment. Success in this war depends in large part on the number and efficiency of our aircraft and submarines, make no mistake about that.

Our armed forces are entitled to have the best equipment there is—yes, and all of it they can possibly use. If in order to thus equip them it becomes necessary temporarily or permanently to cease sending the products of our national defense manufacturing plants to the armed forces of other nations under the so-called Lease-Lend Act, then let that be done. Let it not be said we have failed in our duty to the soldiers and sailors of this country by our further neglect to provide them with equipment with which they can best protect themselves in their contacts with our resourceful and well-equipped enemies. That, it seems to me, is our first and most pressing responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is still shocked by the unparalleled defeat of our arms in what was considered our strongest outpost. The people cannot understand how such a thing could happen. Notwithstanding this, there should be no disposition on the part of anybody to demand a scapegoat. It is to be hoped that facts will be developed which will show that no officer or officers were culpable or guilty of neglect in the Pearl Harbor tragedy. No one could wish on his worst enemy such a fate as the responsibility for that terrible affair.

But, on the other hand, if there was culpability, if there was lack of proper equipment, if there was neglect or indifference, if there was lack of proper alertness, which resulted in the forces at Pearl Harbor being taken by surprise by the Japanese, those facts ought to be, and undoubtedly will be, developed without fear or favor by the Board of Inquiry. If such culpability and negligence is established, the guilty officer or officers should be summarily removed from the service and subjected to such proceedings and penalties as the law provides.

Whatever the damage at Pearl Harbor may have been, however regrettable the loss of life, however unfortunate the injuries to the personnel which escaped death, an equally tragic, and perhaps a more dangerous, situation has been averted by the forthright action of the Secretary of the Navy and the President of the United States. Nothing more grave than the loss of national confidence in the armed forces could be imagined at this time.

The fact the high officers appointed to take command in the shake-up at Honolulu are made up of two outstanding Air Corps officers, and one other the greatest expert on submarines in the Naval Establishment, indicates that at last the air service in our national defense has come into its own, and that those who best understand how to most effectively use aircraft and submarines in war are to take charge of our forces in the Pacific. This will add greatly to the return of prompt and complete public confidence in our armed forces there. This action is a decidedly belated recognition of the value of the air service in modern warfare. The President is to be congratulated on the vigor and promptitude with which he has handled this alarmingly serious situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Inquiry is going to Hawaii. It is going to take testimony on the ground. There is no question but that under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Roberts the testimony will be fair and fearless and that the findings of the Board will be equally fair and fearless. Such facts as cannot, because of military necessity, be revealed, can be passed over by the people without uneasiness when they are assured by this Board that concealment of such facts is necessary.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly heartening at this time to see that the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and the General Staff have appointed a man in charge of the Hawaiian Department of the United States Army, who is an air officer, Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, who has been in command of the General Headquarters air force, our combat branch of the Air Corps. General Emmons has been chief of the air force combat command with headquarters here at Bolling Field. Unquestionably, the defense of Hawaii and the Hawaiian Islands is very largely an air problem. It is particularly pleasing to those of us who believe in air power to see the War Department is now alive to the potency of air defense and attack. The staff also recognized that the defense of the Panama Canal Zone and the Caribbean area is an air problem and appointed back in September Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews as commander of that Department. Both of them are outstanding air officers, and it is a fitting recognition of the importance of air power that our staff has appointed these officers of the air to these respective commands. That proper recognation is being given to the importance of military aviation is further attested by the fact that Gen. H. H. Arnold in com-

mand of all the air forces of the Army is also a deputy chief of staff and as such helps decide all matters of grand strategy and policy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, following the comments made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], it appears the shake-up is vital to our offense and defense in the Pacific. I, too, am gratified at the change which has been made. Too long have we neglected the proper emphasis on a hard-striking air force. Many of us have said for years that America is failing to recognize changed conditions in preparedness programs. We increasingly must give primary importance to air power in any battles which we fight. In the Pacific we have been brought to realize that Japanese, British, and American battleships have been sunk, not by other ships but from bombing planes. The most effective theater of combat today is in the air. Land and sea forces are important, but modern fighting certainly proves the need for added impetus to our defenses from the sky. I recall approximately 5 years ago when I made the assertion on the floor during debate on the naval authorization bill and later the naval appropriation bill that the next war would prove that torpedoes from aircraft would sink battleships. That statement was called absurd by opponents of an amendment, which I offered to strike out, of $141,000,000 for the construction of huge batttleships. They were successful in the committee by a teller vote of 93 to 68.

Repeatedly in battles on land and sea, in the titanic struggles now raging in all parts of the world, we find air power dominant. Certain persons in authority are reluctant to admit this fact, but events prove and reprove that huge battleships are not floating fortresses but are floating targets instead.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked when the Navy Department reported to me that Lewis Bailey Pride had been killed at Pearl Harbor. He was aboard the battleship *Oklahoma* when it was sunk.

This young man was the first boy I appointed to Annapolis. His appointment was my first official act when I came to Washington as a Member of Congress. I was proud of him then, and I am more than proud of him now. He was 6 feet and 4 inches in height and a perfect specimen of young manhood.

Bailey soon distinguished himself and was placed at the head of his class. When the King and Queen of England visited our country he was selected to represent the Naval Academy, which, of course, was a signal honor. He was elected captain of the rowing crew, and whether in the classroom or on the athletic field, Bailey Pride was always a leader. When he graduated at the head of his class, the Superintendent of the Academy wrote me a personal letter and congratulated me for appointing such an outstanding young man. Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read that letter to the Congress. It is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY,
March 5, 1941.

Hon. BEVERLY M. VINCENT,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN VINCENT: I am sure you will be glad to know that your appointee, Midshipman Lewis Bailey Pride, Jr., of the graduating class of 1941, was awarded the General Society Sons of the Revolution cup, on which is engraved the name of the midshipman most proficient in practical ordnance and gunnery.

The Naval Academy is grateful and indebted to you for the appointment of a young man of such high character and ability.

Very truly yours,
RUSSELL WILLSON,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Superintendent.

After graduation, young Pride was assigned to the battleship *Oklahoma*, and died at his post of duty in Pearl Harbor. He was gentle, kind, and brave. He was considerate and courteous at all times, and he was loved and respected by all who knew him. He was the only son of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. Pride, of Madisonville, Ky. They worshiped him, and rightly so, for he deserved it. They are now heartbroken, but not bitter. When the sad news came to them they said, through their tears, that Bailey loved the Navy, and that, although their hearts were heavy with grief, they were consoled by the fact that when this country was attacked their son was at his post of duty—that Bailey would not have had it otherwise. They said they had given all they had to their country. I know the Congress will join with me in congratulating them on their patriotic attitude. It takes great parents to rear great sons. I want these good people to know that we join with them in mourning the death of their son. His spirit and the spirit of Lieutenant Kelly will live on and inspire our men in arms to take full revenge on those who would destroy our country. Their sacrifice has not been in vain, for the Nation has been inspired by their deeds. There is nothing we can do here that will bring back Bailey to his parents. All that we can say may be expressed in the words of the poet when writing of the death of a great leader. He said:

A prince once said of a king struck down:
"Taller he seems in death."
And the word holds good, for now, as then,
It is after death that we measure men.

And another poet, in describing the death of a loved one, said:

No; I cannot and I will not say
That he is dead.
He is just away!
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand,
He has entered into that unknown land,
And left us dreaming, how very fair it
Needs must be, since he lingers there.
And you, O you, who the wildest yearn
For the old-time step and the glad return;
Think of him, passing on as fair in the love
Of there, as the love of here.
Think of him still as the same, I say,
He is not dead. He's just away.

We already have proof that others are inspired by the lives of great men, and that is true in this case. The life of Bailey Pride has inspired many of the young men at Annapolis. I hold here in my hand the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday, and here is proof of what I have been trying to say. Here is the picture of one of the boyhood chums of Bailey Pride. This young man is Samuel L. Logan, of Owensboro, Ky., who will graduate at Annapolis on tomorrow at the head of his class. He has been selected as the honor student out of a class of 564. He owes a lot to the help and inspiration of his friend Bailey Pride. He is grief-stricken but determined to grasp the sword laid down by his friend and carry on. That is what makes this country great and invincible. The youth of this country has been fired with patriotic zeal by the feats of men like Pride and Kelly. More than 5,000,000 young men have offered to enlist in the service within the past few days. If there be those among us who were callous enough to entertain the thought or fear that the youth of this generation had grown soft, let them contemplate this patriotic demonstration by the youth of this country. Nothing like it has ever happened in the history of our Nation and it is the spirit of men like Kelly and Pride that generates it. While we mourn their loss, I am certain their sacrifice has not been in vain. The brave deeds of these men will live on in the hearts of all patriotic Americans.

Their spirit will hover over our boys in battle and lead them to avenge their death. After all, I am sure their sacrifice has given this Nation renewed strength in this dark hour.

The people of Kentucky and the people of my district are justly proud of Bailey Pride. They are also proud of Sam Logan. For two succeeding classes the leading student at the Naval Academy has been a Kentuckian, and from my district.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that at some future time a more extended and elaborate memorial may be held by the Congress for our brave men who died in the defense of our country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, somewhat apropos of what has been said, I would like to say that when fate calls, all things mortal must respond. Self-determination and free will lose their validity. At this hour fate holds within the hollow of her hand the destiny of this world, and what the solution shall be is for her to determine; but if our public will be as strong, our moral stamina as great, our intelligence as high, and our men and

women as brave as those of our adversaries, then we should have no cause for worry, because we know that our cause is just.

MOTOR-VEHICLE-FUEL TAXES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to January 30, 1949, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHULTE, and Mr. DIRKSEN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1047. An act to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385);

H. R. 5726. An act to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 5800. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5925. An act to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936;

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6223. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6233. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 19, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1179. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to a limitation on the total amount to be available for obligation by the Office of Government Reports during the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 467); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1180. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $35,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 468); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1181. A letter from the Secretaries of War and Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code to simplify the procedure for tax-amortization purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1182. A letter from the Consumers' Counsel, Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel covering the period from July 1, 1940, to October 31, 1941; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6263. A bill to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6269. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 394. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6269, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6199) granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Loucresia Sanders, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6270. A bill to amend subsections (b), (d), and (e) of section 77 of the Judicial Code so as to transfer the county of Meriwether from the Columbus division of the middle district of Georgia to the Newnan division of the northern district of Georgia, and to change the terms of the district court for the Macon and Americus divisions in the middle district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 6271. A bill to appropriate funds to provide for raising the educational attainment of persons 17 years of age and over having less than a fourth-grade education for the purpose of facilitating the defense program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 6272. A bill to establish the National Inventors and Engineers Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2188. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Independent Labor Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Labor.

2189. Also, petition of the National Recovery Association, by Clarence J. Brainerd, Chesaning, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2190. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union, of Shelbyville, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their wholehearted and undivided support to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Labor.

2191. Also, petition of the State Board of General Welfare Centers, Wichita, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 16, 1941)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we commend to Thy continual care the homes in which Thy people dwell. Put far from them, we beseech Thee, every root of bitterness, the desire of vainglory, and the pride of life. Fill them with faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness; turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers, that all may be knit together in constant affection.

Let Thine especial blessings and protection be upon everyone who at this hour is in the service for the defense of the Nation, and do Thou remember in pity those who are destitute and homeless, especially those who mourn the loss of loved ones who have made the supreme sacrifice.

Bless all who are in authority over us; cheer with hope all those who are discouraged and unhappy, and by Thy grace preserve from falling those whose penury tempteth them to sin; though they be troubled on every side, suffer them not to be distressed; though they be perplexed, save them from despair.

Grant this, O Lord, for the love of Him who for our sakes became poor and died that He might bring life and immortality to light, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Thursday, December 18, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 18, 1941, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 501) for the relief of Lt. Col. Gordon Smith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6220. An act to amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; and

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Committee has received the following nominations:

A. Cecil Snyder, of Maryland, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico;

Hon. George Bell Timmerman, of South Carolina, to be judge, eastern and western districts of South Carolina; and

Hon. J. Waties Waring, of South Carolina, to be judge, eastern district of South Carolina.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider these nominations, I announce, as required by rule 1 of the committee procedure, that Saturday, December 27, at 10 a. m., has been set as the time for a hearing in the committee room on these three nominations.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chandler	Hayden
Austin	Chavez	Herring
Bailey	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Barkley	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Brewster	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Davis	Kilgore
Brooks	Downey	La Follette
Brown	Doxey	Langer
Bulow	Ellender	Lee
Bunker	George	Lodge
Burton	Gerry	Lucas
Butler	Gillette	McCarran
Byrd	Green	McFarland
Capper	Gurney	McKellar
Caraway	Hatch	McNary
Maloney	Reed	Truman
Maybank	Reynolds	Tunnell
Mead	Rosier	Tydings
Murdock	Russell	Vandenberg
Murray	Schwartz	Van Nuys
Norris	Shipstead	Wagner
Nye	Spencer	Wallgren
O'Daniel	Stewart	Walsh
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	White
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Radcliffe	Tobey	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR THE FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 150)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS PLEDGING SUPPORT IN THE WAR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by Frank Allen Wilcox Post, No. 126, the American Legion, of Fall River, Mass., and Particular Council of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, of Cleveland, Ohio, pledging full support to the Nation in the prosecution of the war, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MILITARY PROTECTION FOR PITTSBURGH, PA., AREA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on May 23, 1940, page 6686 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I introduced the expert testimony of one of Pittsburgh's most eminent engineers, Mr. Samuel Diescher, now serving as consultant for the National Inventors' Council. At that time very little attention was being given to the necessities of national defense. I called for protection for Pittsburgh because it is the very heart of industrial America. If any point in the United States requires the utmost in the way of defense and national care, Pittsburgh is the place.

Pittsburgh is the center of the steel industry. Pittsburgh is the leader in machine-tool production. Pittsburgh is the forge of the Nation.

Now the citizens of Pittsburgh have come to realize the importance of our defense efforts and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a telegram just received from Mr. John J. Kane, chairman of the Board of Allegheny County Commissioners, asking that Allegheny County airport receive the military protection it needs.

Mr. President, this is the time for this long-delayed action. I ask that this telegram be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Remember Pearl Harbor!

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *December 18, 1941.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Allegheny County airport, as well as the defense industries of this county, need additional protection. Would urge all Congressmen and Senators of this county to petition the War Department to furnish adequate military protection. Understand military protection is now being given to other airports throughout the country.

JOHN J. KANE, *Chairman,*
Board of Allegheny County Commissioners.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present several resolutions and a letter from the State of Wisconsin, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letter were received, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

Whereas it appears from statements in the press, attributed to the President of the United States and to the Federal Security Administrator, that Congress will soon be asked to liquidate local control of the employment-security program and to centralize this vast power and responsibility in Federal bureaus; and

Whereas this would mean the end of this State's unemployment-compensation system, of which labor, management, and the public are justly proud; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to any plan that would deprive the citizens of this State of the advantages inherent in our type of unemployment compensation law; and

Whereas the present joint Federal-State employment-security administration will operate satisfactorily and efficiently, providing both State and Federal authorities cooperate in a democratic manner and in good faith; and

Whereas the federalization of the program would deprive the employers, employees, and the citizens of the State of an instrumental voice in the operation of the program; and

Whereas a sound employment-security program, by reason of its relation to the lives of all affected, should be administered by officials close to and acceptable to the people; and

Whereas a sound employment-security program must necessarily reflect varying economic and social conditions in the different communities of the Nation and therefore cannot be subject to hard and rigid Federal control designed to regiment and make uniform; and

Whereas such proposed centralization of power over the lives and activities of the citizens of this Nation is undemocratic and symptomatic of the political decay and dictatorship which our defense efforts seek to combat; and

Whereas our Nation is now engaged in a tremendous effort in defense of our institutions and should wholly and unitedly apply itself to the furtherance of that effort, avoiding any matters tending to disrupt domestic tranquillity, such as this proposal would surely do, as is manifest by overwhelming reactions throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Wisconsin and the undersigned representatives of employers and workers on the official State advisory committee on unemployment compensation are completely opposed to any and all proposals to transfer authority from the States to the Federal Government in the field of employment security, whether such transfer be proposed to be made openly or through subterfuge and indirection; be it further

Resolved, That our position on this question shall be communicated by the mailing of copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, our State Senators and Representatives in Congress, to our sister States, to interested organizations in this State and elsewhere, to the Federal Security Administrator, and to the Social Security Board.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas there is perhaps no county in the United States more closely and extensively identified with dairying than Waukesha; and

Whereas, to truly represent our constituents, we must go on record as emphatically opposed to any movement that seeks by dishonest means to injure dairying, which is a major industry not only of our State but of our Nation as well; and

Whereas the Director of the Federal Security Administration has ruled that a product of various fats to which has been added substances containing vitamins and various coloring and flavoring materials manufactured to resemble butter in color, taste, and texture, but requiring the use of benzoate of soda to preserve it or to kill its odor, thus constituting a great and undeniable piece of deception constituting an injustice not only to the 3,000,000 dairy farmers but to all the people of America and the consuming public; and

Whereas such action is inconsistent with former action by both State legislatures and Congress. The attempt some years ago on the part of some cheese makers to incorporate coconut oil in cheese was knocked out by State legislatures and Congress in what is known as the filled-cheese bill. Later when some large condenseries attempted to produce evaporated milk using coconut fat instead of milk fat and calling the product Hebe, legislative action prevented all deception in labeling; and

Whereas the oleo industry is controlled by such a limited number of manufacturers as to constitute a virtual monopoly with huge sums of money to spend on propaganda through the radio and the press and whereas an effort is being made to drive a wedge between the North and the South by claiming that the North is injuring the interests of the South by opposing the oleo industry, which uses a cottonseed oil produced by cotton growers of the South, though it is a known fact the products of the South from the dairy industry greatly exceed that derived from the sale of cottonseed, this profit accruing almost exclusively to the oleo manufacturers rather than to the cotton growers; and

Whereas, as indicated in the foregoing, it has been the prevailing practice to insist on honesty and openness in buying and selling, it is manifestly out of harmony with all pure-food legislation to sell and allow to be used in hotels and restaurants a product plainly manufactured to resemble butter and so deceive the consumer. The yellow trade-mark for butter has been argued out in Congress for nearly 40 years, and the principle insisted that no substitute could claim this yellow trade-mark which belongs rightfully to butter. The natural color of oleo is white: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Waukesha County Board of Supervisors, representing the people of Waukesha County, do hereby register their disapproval of the action of the Director of the Federal Security Administration in allowing the manufacturers of oleo to produce a product for the market which is dishonest, deceptive, and injurious to the dairy industry; and be it further

Resolved, That we register our opposition to the action of Federal authorities for transferring authority which rightly belongs to the Agricultural Department of the National Government to a department of the Federal Security Administration, to the detriment of the dairy industry, and we regret that the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, we think weakly, accepted this transfer of authority from his Department without protest, thus depriving the dairy farmers of his needed and expected help at the very time they were being urged to greatly increase the volume of dairy products as their patriotic duty; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend Ralph E. Ammon, of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of Wisconsin in the Congress of the United States for their untiring efforts in the defense of the dairy interests of Wisconsin, and very earnestly request them to continue their efforts through legislative action or other means to protect the dairy industry; and further be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin, Ralph E. Ammon, Paul V. McNutt, and Hon. Claude R. Wickard.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

WISCONSIN SOCIETY,
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Milwaukee, Wis., December 11, 1941.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a meeting of the board of managers of the Wisconsin Society, Sons of the American Revolution, held at Milwaukee, Wis., December 10, 1941, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Society, Sons of the American Revolution, tender its support and services as an organization and the individual membership thereof to the local, State, and national authorities in furtherance of all projects and purposes advanced to promote the successful prosecution of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Honorable Julius P. Heil, Governor of Wisconsin, Hon. F. H. LaGuardia, Director of Civilian Defense, and to the United States Senators and Members of Congress from Wisconsin.

Respectfully,

G. N. TREMPER,
President.
A. H. WILKINSON,
Secretary.

CITY OF TWO RIVERS,
STATE OF WISCONSIN,
December 16, 1941.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Attached herewith you will find a copy of a resolution passed by the city council of Two Rivers, Wis., on Monday evening, December 15.

Rest assured that we will give every support possible to the Federal Government on any part of their program which relates to municipalities.

Yours very truly,

HARRY W. KNIGHT,
City Manager.

Whereas the United States of America now is at war with foreign powers which chose to thrust armed conflict upon us; and

Whereas the leaders of our Nation have called upon our united strength for the greatest national effort that can be made toward the goal of ultimate victory; and

Whereas the duty of every citizen now clearly lies in the full dedication of every act and word to the achievement of that goal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Two Rivers, Wis., both for themselves and for the citizens they represent, hereby pledge their intent to measure the policies and actions for which they are responsible in terms of the Nation's victory objective; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to representatives of the State of Wisconsin now in Congress, as an indication of support for any effort they may make or advocate toward the success of our national effort in the present drive for complete victory.

GASOLINE AND FUEL-OIL SHORTAGES—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 676)

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a report from the Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products, and with it a letter of transmittal signed by members of the special committee. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed and that there be printed with it the preliminary report of the committee heretofore filed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed in the manner requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 18, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1544. An act to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2146. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended;

S. 2147. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2148. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WALSH introduced Senate bill 2149, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

INCREASE IN ENLISTED STRENGTH OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, at the request of the Navy Department, a rather important bill. The present authorized strength of the Navy is 300,000. The bill seeks to increase the authorized strength of the Navy to a personnel of 500,000. The present authorized strength of the Marine Corps is 60,000. The bill seeks to increase it to 104,000.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, with an enclosure, relative to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2149) to amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, with its enclosure, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 19, 1941.

The CHAIRMAN,
Committee on Naval Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed herewith a copy of a letter with enclosures this day forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The enclosure is a copy of a proposed bill "To amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps."

Sincerely yours,
JAMES FORRESTAL, *Acting.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 19, 1941.

The SPEAKER OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to increase the authorized emergency enlisted strength of the Regular Navy from the present figure of 300,000 to a new figure of 500,000, and to authorize an emergency enlisted strength for the Regular Marine Corps of 104,000.

Based upon the contemplated shipbuilding program it is estimated that a total of slightly more than 1,000,000 enlisted men will be required upon its completion. It is considered advisable at this time to increase the emergency enlisted strength of the Navy to 500,000 men to keep pace with the progress of the building program. It is to be noted that, if the proposed bill is enacted, the permanent authorized strength of 232,000 men will undergo no change. It is upon this latter figure that the authorized officer strength of the line of the Regular Navy is computed.

With respect to the Marine Corps, the present authorized enlisted strength of 60,000 men will shortly be reached. While it is possible after the authorized strength is reached to continue to enlist men in the Marine Corps Reserve, recruiting reports indicate that applicants for enlistment at the present time prefer to enlist in the Regular Marine Corps rather than in the reserve component thereof, in a ratio of about three and a half to one. In view of this situation, and having in mind the prospective needs of the Marine Corps, it is considered advisable at this time to provide for an emergency enlisted strength, when authorized by the President, of 104,000 men.

In view of the foregoing, the Navy Department recommends enactment of the proposed legislation and considers it a matter of special urgency.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

JAMES FORRESTAL, *Acting*

OCCUPATIONAL CENSUS RELATING TO NATIONAL MANPOWER

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 210), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the best means and methods for initiating and maintaining an occupational census of all available manpower in the United States in order to determine how such manpower may be most effectively employed and utilized in military and civilian production. The committee shall report to the Senate the results of its investigation at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

DISCRIMINATION IN DEFENSE EMPLOYMENT—LETTER BY MISS PEARL S. BUCK

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Miss Pearl S. Buck to the editor of the New York Times, relative to problems confronting colored citizens, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TRUMAN ON AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE HOUSING ACT

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a rather lengthy statement which I made this morning to the Committee on Education and Labor on the pending amendments to the Defense Housing Act, House bill 6128. My reason for asking that that be done is that in all probability the committee will not have a chance to have the hearings printed in time for the Senate to read them, and I want Senators to be familiar with the attitude toward the bill of the committee which has made an investigation of the defense-housing program.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the committee, which I believe intends to take action this afternoon, I inquire whether the Senator from Missouri has suggested amendments to the subcommittee.

Mr. TRUMAN. We have suggested amendments to the Committee on Education and Labor. I was before the committee this morning, and went into the matter in detail.

Mr. WALSH. So the amendments will be available for consideration by the committee?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement of the Senator from Missouri will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

Under the defense program, it was necessary to produce in ever-increasing amounts, vast quantities of planes, tanks, vessels, munitions, and supplies. Mobilization of all our industrial resources was necessary. Labor was a major essential of this mobilization. Old plants and factories were being expanded; new plants and factories were being constructed. A great number of workers were brought into industrial defense centers from all parts of the country to construct and man these facilities. This steady flow of workers and their families to defense centers overtaxed existing community facilities and created critical housing shortages in some areas. Unless the production effort was to be impaired, adequate housing for defense workers in these critical areas had to be provided by the Government where the need was not filled by private industry.

To meet these problems under the defense program the Congress made available $792,330,987 in appropriations and authorizations. Congress thus clearly indicated its determination that the construction of ships, tanks, planes, and essential weapons of defense should not be retarded through lack of adequate housing. Without denying the magnitude of this amount, it was only a partial solution to the problem of providing shelter for defense workers, even prior to the declaration of war. Now we are engaged in a great war effort. Production must not only be doubled; it must be tripled and quadrupled. We must not be blind to the fact that now, more than ever, greater efforts must be made to insure adequate housing. Only this week the Congress appropriated an additional $300,000,000 for dormitories, trailers, and portable houses. For the present this solves the need for temporary shelter. But the need for providing additional Government funds for permanent housing still remains. The $300,000,000 authorized under the Lanham Act for permanent housing is exhausted. For this reason I come before you to urge speedy enactment of H. R. 6128, which authorizes an additional $300,000,000 expenditure for permanent defense housing. But just as speedy enactment is essential, so it is imperative that the utmost care be exercised by the Congress that the legislation will accomplish two underlying purposes: (1) Provide adequate housing in the shortest possible time. (2) Assurance that we receive 100-cent value on the dollar, for every housing unit constructed.

The Defense Investigating Committee has made an exhaustive study and conducted extensive hearings on the defense housing program. The committee has found that many mistakes have been made. The committee has found gross waste, extravagance, inefficiency, and, strange to say, petty jealousies on

the part of the administrative heads of the program. The causes of some mistakes can be corrected only by administrative action. The causes of many mistakes can be corrected by legislation.

Our committee has given careful study to the provisions of the Lanham Act and its administration. The committee has visited housing sites in several parts of the country and inspected construction. We have investigated the performance records of contractors. We have studied the methods of each of the Government agencies participating in the defense-housing program. The knowledge that we have obtained from our investigation and study convinces us that the analysis of the pending bill and the recommendations we are about to make in connection therewith will accomplish the purpose of providing the maximum necessary housing in the minimum of time, and with the minimum necessary expenditure of money and the greatest degree of efficiency.

Section 1 of the Lanham Act had for its intent the providing of housing for persons engaged in national-defense work, and their families, in those localities in which the President found (a) that an acute shortage of housing existed or impended which would impede national defense; and (b) that such housing would or could not be provided by private capital.

The Division of Defense Housing Coordination was established by Executive order on January 11, 1941, and was empowered to analyze the need for housing in critical areas and to recommend defense housing programs to the President.

A conflict arose between the Defense Housing Coordinator and the Federal Works Administrator as to whether section 1 authorized construction of dormitory units for single workers; the Coordinator taking the position that the language was broad enough to include the construction of dormitory units for single men, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency taking the position that the language was confined to family-dwelling units.

The San Diego housing project illustrated this conflict. It was stated before our committee that the Defense Housing Coordinator, by constantly prevailing on the Federal Works Administrator, under the color of authority, forced the latter to construct a 750-unit dormitory for single workers, despite the Administrator's contention that the language of section 1 precluded such construction. However, the Federal Works Administrator, in order to satisfy himself that such construction was within the purview of the act, ordered that the dormitory units be built in such a way as to be converted into family dwelling units. We had the situation of the Federal Works Administrator torturing the language of section 1 so as to make these domitories come within the provisions of the act.

In reporting this bill out, the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, taking notice of this conflict on the part of defense-housing agencies, has amended section 1 so as to permit the building of dormitories and barracks for single workers engaged in national-defense work.

Our committee recommends that this bill should allow only the construction of family dwelling units. We feel that Congress, in appropriating this week, $300,000,000 additional to the President to enable him to provide temporary shelter units, such as dormitories, trailers, and portable houses has made adequate provision for the construction of dormitories. In order to remove any further conflict, we are of the opinion that the pending bill should go one step further and specifically prohibit construction of convertible dormitory units.

Subsection B of section I allows the use of a cost-plus-fixed-fee form of contract. The alleged justification for this type of contract was the necessity for speed; the contention of defense-housing officials being that cost-plus contracts eliminated the necessity for completing detailed plans and specifications beforehand.

Our committee has found instances where defense housing departments within the Federal Works Agency differed in the types of contracts to be awarded. For example, we have found that, as of September 12, 1941, the Public Buildings Administration let 112 out of 147 projects assigned to it under the Lanham Act on a cost-plus basis. On the other hand, the United States Housing Authority has let only one project out of 96 projects on a cost-plus basis. The Division of Defense Housing of the same agency has let all contracts on a lump-sum basis, while the Mutual Ownership Defense Housing Division of the same agency has let 7 out of 10 projects on a cost-plus basis.

We have found that the United States Housing Authority in letting its contracts on a competitive-bid basis has proceeded with greater rapidity and efficiency than the Public Buildings Administration, which, to repeat, has let 112 out of 147 projects on a cost-plus basis.

At this stage in the program no intelligent reason can be advanced as to why the defense-housing agencies should not have the necessary plans and specifications to meet a long-range housing program.

Another reason cited for justification of the cost-plus type of contract is that, with rising prices in materials, contractors will not submit bids for housing construction work. We have found that construction agencies letting contracts only on a competitive basis have had no difficulty in securing a sufficient number of bidders. Especially at this time, with private construction drastically restricted, there are a great number of contractors eager to bid for defense-housing construction.

Now a word as to the vice of cost-plus-fixed fee contracts. We have found that this type of contract has caused abuses in the defense-housing program. For example, we have found that contractors have paid exorbitant rental rates for construction equipment far in excess of the valuation of the equipment, and in turn charged such rental to the Government. Recapture provisions were not included in the contract, had they been included, the Government would have benefited thereby. In this connection we found shocking instances where contractors had a recapture clause included for their own benefit.

We have also found that the contractors have charged the Government unconscionable repair charges on equipment.

Partiality and favoritism have been shown in awarding these negotiated contracts.

We recommend that this bill provide that all contracts for construction of defense-housing units be let on a competitive basis. We would, however, make an exception in the case where bids exceed preliminary estimates as to a reasonable cost and recommend that there should be discretion on the part of the contracting agency in such cases to negotiate a cost-plus contract to the lowest bidder.

The Lanham Act, as amended, places a ceiling of $3,500 on the average cost of family dwelling units, with a top ceiling for any family unit of $3,950. These cost limitations are exclusive of the cost of land, administrative expenses, public utilities, and community facilities, and apply to units located within the continental United States.

This bill, reported out by the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, raises the ceiling on the average construction cost to $3,750, and raises the ceiling on the cost of a family dwelling unit to $4,500.

We are of the opinion that this increase in cost limitations is unjustified. We believe that adequate housing within the previous cost limits has been provided. These cost limits are exclusive of the cost of land, administrative expenses, utilities, and community facilities. It should be noted that under Public, 781, appropriating $100,000,000 to the President for allocation to the War and Navy Departments for construction of defense housing units, it was provided that the average unit cost of housing projects, including acquisition of land and the installation of necessary utilities, roads, walks, accessories, and collateral expenses, should not be in excess of $3,500. Sixty-one million one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars has been allocated directly to the Navy under this act, and the Navy, working under these latter cost limits, has either completed or has under construction 17,583 units—units which are not only adequate but in many instances of better construction than Lanham Act units. I should tell you that the houses constructed by the Navy under this appropriation do not contain as many cubic feet as houses constructed under the Lanham Act. But we think this is minor. The houses constructed by the Navy under this act provide all the utilities and conveniences for the occupants that Lanham Act units provide. The Navy houses are, for the most part, single or double family units, whereas the Lanham Act units are mostly multiple units. The committee has found that prospective occupants show a decided preference for the Navy units.

If an over-all cost limitation of $3,500 has proved sufficient in the case of Navy construction, it would seem that a $3,950 limitation on the construction alone of the dwelling units, without any more, as provided at present in the Lanham Act, is amply sufficient for the purpose of erecting adequate housing. To this construction cost must be added the cost of land, administrative expenses, utilities, and community facilities, which in most instances would bring the over-all cost up to $6,000 or possibly more. Even with the present alleged rise in the cost of materials, a very adequate dwelling unit can be erected for $3,950. It must be remembered that these houses almost universally have been built without cellars or basements.

SECTION 1

Section 1 of this bill, as amended by the House, provides that in those instances where there seems to be no reasonable prospect that the houses will be needed after the emergency, temporary houses are to be constructed. We believe this should be stricken out. To repeat, the committee believes that this act should be limited to the construction of permanent housing units. We are of the opinion that the $300,000,000 provided by the Congress this past week is more than sufficient to provide temporary housing.

SECTION 2

The committee concurs with section 2 of this bill, which provides that proceedings for the recovery of possession of any property or project developed or constructed under this act must be brought by the Administrator in the courts of the States having jurisdiction of such causes, and the laws of the States are applicable thereto.

SECTION 3

The committee concurs with the additional authorization of $300,000,000. We believe that a minimum of 75,000 additional permanent housing units must be built immediately.

SECTION 4

Under the Lanham Act, at the termination of the emergency, property acquired or constructed under the act is to be disposed of as promptly as may be advantageous to the Government.

Section 4 of this bill provides that housing constructed under the provisions of the amendment may not be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income.

At the end of the emergency great care must be taken in the disposal of the houses constructed under this program so that there will be the least possible economic dislocation. The committee recommends that no limitation should be placed on the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator to dispose of these houses. However, we believe that the Federal Works Administrator should immediately make long-range plans and surveys so that these houses may be disposed of as advantageously and expeditiously as possible to the Government's interest.

SECTION 6

Section 304 of the Lanham Act provides that the Federal Works Administrator is to fix fair rentals on projects developed pursuant to the act which were to be within the financial reach of persons engaged in national defense. The pending bill provides that the Administrator shall fix fair rentals, based on the value thereof. Under the amendment rentals to be charged Army and Navy personnel are to be fixed by the War and Navy Departments.

Prior to September 27, 1941, the Federal Works Administrator charged rentals based on the income of the worker. Under this schedule, a person receiving an annual income of $700 to $800 paid a monthly shelter rent of $13. A person receiving an annual income of $800 to $1,000 paid a monthly shelter rent of $14. A person receiving an annual income of $1,000 to $1,200 paid a monthly shelter rent of $17, etc. A new rental scale was put into effect on September 27, 1941, establishing a rent scale based on value (an economic rent). For a one-bedroom dwelling, a monthly shelter rent of $27.50 is charged; for a two-bedroom dwelling, a monthly shelter rent of $30; for a three-bedroom dwelling, a monthly shelter rent of $32.50. The committee has found that the former schedule of rents, based on income, was the subject of marked dissatisfaction. Defense workers objected to occupying subsidized homes. The wages of the defense workers are sufficient to pay an economic rent. Because of this dissatisfaction with the rent schedules formerly in effect, many defense workers would not move into defense projects. We agree with the reasons set forth by the prospective occupants, and therefore concur with this provision of the House amendment.

Under this section, the Federal Works Administrator is charged with the duty of managing Lanham Act units. Management agencies have been designated for 96 projects as of September 12. The Division of Defense Housing, under the direction of the Federal Works Agency, manage 30; the Army, 8; the Tennessee Valley Authority, 1; and the Farm Security Administration, 1. The committee has found that although in a great many localities local housing authorities have an organization capable of managing Lanham Act units, the Division of Defense Housing has created a separate new staff for this purpose.

For example, at Newport, R. I., the local housing authority constructed a 262-unit and a 538-unit project to house naval enlisted personnel. The local housing authority manages the 262-unit project, but a separate staff has been employed by the Division of Defense Housing to manage the 538-unit project, although the 2 projects are in close proximity and house workers employed at the same place.

The committee believes that insofar as possible, management policies should be localized and not concentrated in Washington. The committee recommends that in such communities where local housing authorities have been established, such housing authorities in every instance should act as the managing supervisor for Government defense housing projects in that area. In this way, problems peculiar to various localities can best be solved.

SECTION 7

Section 305 of the Lanham Act provides that the Federal Works Administrator can utilize any Federal or local public agency for the construction of housing units. Under this authority, as of September 12, the following agencies have been designated as agents for Lanham Act construction by the Federal Works Administrator:

	Units	*Projects*
Public Building Administration	32,527	147
U. S. Housing Authority	24,777	96
Division of Defense Housing, Federal Works Agency	16,413	55
Mutual Ownership Defense Housing Division of Federal Works Agency	4,600	10
Navy Department	2,762	9
Farm Security Administration	1,485	6
Alley Dwelling Authority	550	2
War Department	495	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	250	1

Eleven local housing authorities act as agents for the Division of Defense Housing of the Federal Works Agency; 73 local housing authorities are engaged in defense-housing construction under the supervision of the United States Housing Authority. Thus 9 agencies, in addition to local housing authorities, have been designated as agents for the Federal Works Administrator for Lanham Act construction. Of these 9, the Public Building Administration, the United States Housing Authority, the Division of Defense Housing, and the Mutual Ownership Division of the Federal Works Agency are component agencies of the Federal Works Agency.

The committee has found that this diffusion of authority has created duplication of effort. An example is offered in the case of the Federal Works Agency itself. At the beginning of the Lanham Act program in 1940, only two of the above agencies of the Federal Works Agency, the Public Buildings Administration, and United States Housing Administration were designated for defense-housing construction. Subsequently, two additional divisions were created within the Federal Works Agency for the construction of Lanham Act units, the Division of Defense Housing and Mutual Ownership Division. Each of these four agencies acts independently of the other. Each has a separate and complete technical and construction staff. To create such a staff these new divisions have found it necessary to take personnel from the already existing construction agencies of the Federal Works Agency. Savings could be effected by combination of personnel, by one concerted and coordinated planning effort and by combination of purchasing power.

At Pittsburgh, a local housing authority was created under the direction of the United States Housing Administration; it engaged in an extensive low-cost housing program. The Federal Works Agency Administrator is making us of this local authority in the construction of Lanham Act units. But, although the United States Housing Administration has a complete organization supervising the local housing authority in this program, the Federal Works Administrator established a regional office of the Division of Defense Housing to supervise the defense work of the local housing authority. No reason is apparent for the Division of Defense Housing supervising local housing authorities in their construction work, since the United States Housing Administration has a trained staff working in close relationship with the local authorities.

The committee found that not only is there lack of coordination among the agencies of the Federal Works Agency itself but also between the Federal Works Agency and other governmental agencies engaged in Lanham Act construction. For example, the Public Buildings Administration constructed many defense-housing units to service Army enlisted personnel, yet no effort was made to use equipment previously recaptured by the Army. A substantial savings might have been effected thereby. Similarly, although component Federal Works Agency agencies constructed housing for the Navy, there was no interchange of plans and standards between construction agencies and the Navy, although the Navy, through past experience in the defense-housing field, had perfected plans and specifications for low-cost housing.

The committee recommends that housing construction under this amendment be confined to the Army, the Navy, the Public Buildings Administration, and the United States Housing Authority. The amendment proposed by the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds would eliminate the United States Housing Authority from future Lanham Act construction under the defense-housing program. The committee believes that this would be a great mistake. The United States Housing Authority has had long and valuable experience in the housing field. In its investigation of the defense-housing program the committee found that the United States Housing Authority performed its portion of the construction work rapidly, efficiently, and economically.

The committee further recommends that a greater effort be made to coordinate the activities of these agencies so that the duplication of effort will be eliminated.

The committee found that most defense housing construction under the Lanham Act has been built without sufficient consideration for local conditions and problems. Much resentment has been caused in local communities because there has not been sufficient regard by the defense housing construction agencies to site selection, planning, and architectural design. In many instances the architectural design of the housing units is foreign to anything ever erected in that community. The committee believes and recommends that in those communities where there are local housing authorities, such housing authorities should be utilized for construction of defense housing in that area. The committee recommends that such housing authorities, having been set up under the supervision of the United States Housing Authority, should work under the supervision of the United States Housing Authority for this defense housing construction.

These housing authorities are most cognizant of local problems and local needs. They have, in most instances, available personnel and are readily adaptable to supervise the construction of defense housing units.

SUGAR QUOTAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5988) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment reported by the committee, which is in the nature of a substitute.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 513 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to termination of powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 513. The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1944, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1944 and previous crop years."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out "in the 1937, 1938, and 1939 crops" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the 1940 and subsequent crops."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. (a) The amount of the base rate of payment shall be 60 cents per hundred pounds of sugar or liquid sugar, raw value."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The total payment with respect to a farm shall be the product of the base rate specified in subsection (a) of this section multiplied by the amount of sugar and liquid sugar, raw value, with respect to which payment is to be made, except that reduction shall be made from such total payment in accordance with the following scale of reductions:

Reduction in the base rate of payment per hundredweight of such portion	
"That portion of the quantity of sugar and liquid sugar which is included within the following intervals of short tons raw value:	
"350 to 700	$0.05
700 to 1,000	.10
1,000 to 1,500	.20
1,500 to 3,000	.25
3,000 to 6,000	.275
6,000 to 12,000	.30
12,000 to 30,000	.325
More than 30,000	.50"

SEC. 4. (a) Section 307 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 307. This title shall apply to the continental United States, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to the 1942 crop and subsequent crops.

SEC. 5. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3508. Termination of taxes: No tax shall be imposed under this chapter on the manufacture, use, or importation of sugar after June 30, 1945."

SEC. 6. Section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to payments to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1942," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think some statement should be made in regard to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to explain it if the Senator will give me an opportunity to do so.

It is generally recognized that legislation in a democracy is more or less of a compromise. That is especially true with respect to legislation on the subject of sugar, and specifically that is true of the pending measure.

House bill 5988, as reported by the Finance Committee, is primarily an extension of an act of Congress which is first and foremost sugar-consumer legislation, since it protects the sugar consumers of the United States against wide swings in price, recurring scarcities of supplies and uncontrolled speculation by sugar brokers and others. House bill 5988 is not in any sense special sugar refiner legislation, or foreign sugar producer legislation, or offshores-producer legislation, or sugar-beet or domestic cane-sugar legislation; rather it is legislation which seeks to establish equity among all the interested parties. It is a compromise of their conflicts and a safeguard of their existence, and, at the same time, it guarantees the sugar consumer a fair price and the sugar worker a living wage. It satisfies no one completely, yet it protects the whole industry against chaos, confusion, and utter ruin, considerations in which the consumer of sugar is tremendously interested. For these reasons House bill 5988 is not only vital legislation to the producer but it is wholesome legislation for the consumer.

I cannot overemphasize its protection to the consumer. Without its wise provisions the price of sugar would fluctuate from very low levels to extremely high levels. Without its control features, chaos and confusion would bedevil the sugar market, and sugar would move from abundant supplies to devastating scarcities.

At times domestic producers need protection against foreign and insular dumping of distressed sugar, and at other times domestic producers provide almost the only source of supply for the sugar consumer of the United States. Such a time is close at hand now. If it were not for the sugar beets of the West and the Middle West and the cane fields of Louisiana and Florida, the people of the United States today would suffer from an inadequate supply of sugar, or they would be compelled to pay such an exorbitant price for it that it would be prohibitive, and sugar would not be used except as a luxury. That recurring situation is justification for the enactment of the original Jones-Costigan Sugar Act and the extensions of it in 1937, 1940, and in this good year 1941.

Domestic-sugar production cannot be turned on and off like a spigot; it is an industry that must be planned years in advance. The cane growers of Louisiana and Florida and the beet growers of the West cannot be in and out of production. They cannot time the growing of their crops to fit a suddenly increased war demand. They cannot pick years of shortage in which to grow sugar beets and sugarcane. It takes a long time for cane sprouts to reach maximum production, and the sugar-beet farmer must practice crop rotation and prepare his fields for beets 3 or 4 years before he plants the seed. For these reasons, domestic cane and beet growers must have protection against sugar dumping in certain years so that they can answer their country's call on the day of extreme sugar shortage. World War No. 1 and its disastrous sugar shortage, followed by World War No. 2 and the threat of a repetition of sugar shortage, prove how vital it is to the consumers of the United States that the domestic cane and beet farmer be preserved.

Sugar legislation as enacted and reenacted by the Congress accomplishes the orderly processes of production through the quota system, promotes a square deal to the sugar farmer and his labor through benefit payments, and protects the consumer by adjusting the supply of sugar to the changing demand for sugar.

In order to give the Secretary of Agriculture regulatory power over production, wages, living standards, working conditions, and soil conservation in the sugar industry, the Sugar Act of 1937 provided a processing tax of 50 cents a hundred pounds of raw sugar, to be refunded in part to the growers of cane and beets. Please note that this tax is not to come out of the pockets of the consumers of sugar, but is levied on the processors in such a manner as to make it impossible for them to pass it on to the consumer. The retail price of sugar has been actually lower since the tax was imposed than before the tax was levied, which is absolute proof that the consumer does not pay it.

There is nothing mysterious about the burden of this tax. It does not violate any economic law. The Secretary of Agriculture is merely empowered by the act to adjust the supply of sugar to the demand for sugar, and the law of supply and demand, in accordance with economic law, determines the retail price. At the present time, however, Mr. Leon Henderson, in his difficult fight against inflation, has fixed the price at $3.50 a hundred pounds of raw sugar, without regard to tariffs, processing taxes, or the law of supply and demand.

All growers who conform to the Secretary's regulations under the act receive a refund payment, generally referred to as a benefit payment. Since the total amount collected in the form of taxes is greater than the total of these payments, the United States Treasury realizes a substantial favorable balance on the transaction. Sugar is the one agricultural commodity which supports a special tax to provide for its own production control, higher labor standards, and soil conservation. All other agricultural programs are supported out of the Treasury of the United States by the taxpayers.

Without refund payments, it is my opinion that small and large growers alike would be unable to remain in the sugar business. Few sugar farmers, if any, realize a profit other than a small portion of their refund payment.

At least, that is universally true of the small growers, such as we have in Colorado. I am told, and I believe, that almost every large grower would be wiped out completely if the processing taxes were continued, and if the payments were withheld. In that case the entire economy of the cane areas, especially in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, where sugar is the principal source of income, would be completely destroyed. I have visited the Hawaiian Islands and made a thorough and first-hand study of the operation of this act there, and I am convinced that sugar refunds are passed on to the workers on the sugar plantations. If they are not, the fault rests entirely with the Secretary of Agriculture. At any rate, standards of living are very much higher in all the sugar areas now than before the enactment of this legislation, so I must conclude that the Secretary of Agriculture is doing his duty.

I hold no brief for corporation farming. Generally speaking, I am vigorously opposed to it. In my State, beets are grown by small farmers who also grow

other crops, but as an American citizen concerned with the outposts of our national defense, I am interested in the prosperity of our insular possessions, which for the present cannot escape corporation farming without disrupting their whole economy.

It should be borne in mind that the benefit payment of 60 cents to American growers was paralleled by tariff reductions of 60 cents to Cuban growers when the Cuban tariff on sugar was reduced from $1.50 to 90 cents. Those who criticize the large refunds which go to growers in Hawaii and Puerto Rico remain painfully silent on the tariff-reduction refunds which go to corporation farmers in Cuba. There is this difference in the two refunds, however: Benefit payments to our insular and continental growers are conditioned upon the adoption by them of high labor standards in the sugar industry, while the tariff refunds to Cuba impose no such requirement.

I repeat, conditional payments come from the sugar industry itself, out of which the Treasury realizes a favorable balance. Small growers also realize the only profit possible for them out of the benefit payments. Consumers are affected not at all. Any further increase of the burden of large growers is neither necessary nor advisable, and would in all likelihood disrupt the economy of the sugarcane areas. In other words, no matter how large their payments may be, large growers receive less than they contribute.

On December 1 the House of Representatives passed H. R. 5988 by an overwhelming vote. It provided for the increase of continental quotas for both sugarcane and sugar beets and a reduction of insular and foreign quotas. It established a new formula for the distribution of possible Philippine deficits, and it changed the definition of liquid sugar. All these changes were equitable, desirable, and constructive.

Since the passage of this measure by the House, however, the United States has entered World War No. 2, and every phase of our economy, including economic legislation, must be merged into the war effort and made consistent with its operation. The Senate Finance Committee, therefore, deemed it expedient and sensible to delete all Western Hemispheric controversies from this measure and to enact only such provisions as appeared absolutely essential to the proper functioning of the sugar industry. The substitute bill written by the Senate Finance Committee does three things—and I shall be very glad now to have the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who a moment ago desired to know what the substitute bill proposes to do.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator has my undivided attention. I have been very much interested in his speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to tell the Senator now just what is proposed to be done by the substitute measure, about which he made inquiry a moment ago. These are the changes which appear in the substitute measure:

First. The provisions of the 1937 Sugar Act, including penalties for child-labor violations, and processing taxes, are extended and continued 3 additional years. The time within which refunds may be made of taxes collected on Philippine sugar is also extended 3 years.

Second. The conditional refund base payments are increased to small producers of sugar beets and sugarcane whose total output is less than 350 tons, from 60 cents a hundred pounds raw sugar to 80 cents. Benefit payments to larger producers are scaled downward by this measure.

Third. Benefit payments are extended to the Virgin Islands.

These are the three main changes contemplated by the substitute measure.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not desire to interfere with the reading by the Senator of his manuscript, which is most informative on the subject, but did the committee as a whole agree to the bill as now introduced?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the Senate Finance Committee agreed to the substitute bill in place of the House bill. We were able to reach an agreement as quickly as we did because of the situation which has developed in the world since we became involved in the war and since Cuba became involved in the war. We thought it best not to have any hemispheric controversy in the bill. I may say to the Senator, however, that the Finance Committee did not unanimously accept the substitute bill. I think every member of the Senate Finance Committee liked the substitute better than the original for the reasons I have given, but the vote was not unanimous. As I recall, it was 10 to 5. Five members were opposed to some provisions of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I am very happy to have that statement. The Senator has not abandoned the principle or the hope that as a matter of justice to the American producers eventually they must have an increased and expanded allocation of the sugar-beet acreage?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; we have not abandoned that hope at all.

Mr. McNARY. That is the concept and the end for which in normal times the Senator will be found working after the so-called emergency is ended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct, sir.

Mr. McNARY. After all, this is simply an emergency measure to meet a situation which has arisen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. What we propose by the bill is to meet the emergency situation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The proposed legislation is to last for 3 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Well, how long is the emergency going to last?

Mr. BYRD. I do not know. The proposed legislation is not necessarily for the emergency. Heretofore such legislation, as I understand, has been enacted for 1 year. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado why it was thought necessary to provide that the bill shall remain in effect for 3 years instead of 1 year, which heretofore has been the life of similar legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We have had sugar legislation extending over a period of 3 years. The original Jones-Costigan Act extended over 3 years, and the life of the Sugar Act of 1937 was 3 years.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator must be mistaken as to that, because this character of legislation has come up annually certainly for the last 3 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It came up in 1940.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says the proposed legislation is for the period of the emergency. Is the Senator willing to accept an amendment, as suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, that this legislation continue in effect only during the emergency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. I should be very much opposed to such an amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Then, the legislation which the Senator proposes is for a period longer than the emergency. The Senator intends it to continue for a period longer than the emergency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. "Emergency" is a rather indefinite term, and, as I have already pointed out, the growing of either sugarcane or sugar beets is something which cannot be discontinued. It is somewhat like the growing of apples.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator intends to make the proposed legislation permanent, so far as he is able to do so. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly, that is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Then it is not for the period of the emergency as the Senator said in reply to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Virginia misinterpreted the question asked by the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon wanted to know whether we were abandoning the principle of increasing quotas in the United States, so that eventually the United States would be able to provide a larger percentage of the consumptive demands of the United States. That is how I understood the Senator's question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is correct; and I also stated that I would be willing to cooperate with those interested in the expansion of the area as soon as the emergency is over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. The able Senator from Virginia has raised a point with which I was not familiar. I did not know that the proposed legislation was to be for 3 years. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill. I thought it was for 1 year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it is for 3 years.

Mr. McNARY. Well, that puts a very different aspect on the question.

Mr. BYRD. At this point I should like to read to the Senator from Oregon what Secretary Wickard wrote——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will permit, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. BYRD. What I was about to say deals directly with the particular point now under discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well; the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BYRD. The Secretary of Agriculture wrote a letter to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] dated December 9, 1941, in which he said:

> Certain transitory circumstances connected with the agricultural conditions in several of the sugar-producing localities tend to justify an increase in the basic rate of payment to small producers for the 1942 and possibly subsequent crops as a part of an emergency policy. If made permanent, however, such an increase, in view of the tax features of the bill, would establish a discrimination against California, Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, and Puerto Rico. It also would place some processors in a more advantageous position than others with respect to acquisition of raw material. I recommend, therefore, that the proposed increase in the basic rate of payment be made operative only so long as the present defense emergency continues.

That is a definite proposition, because the period of the emergency is determined by the President of the United States. I wish to ask the Senator from Colorado why he is unwilling to accept the recommendation made by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the first place, I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia whether that letter was written with respect to the substitute bill, or with respect to the bill as it originally came from the House.

Mr. BYRD. The letter was written on December the 9th to the chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, and we did not offer our substitute until after that date.

Mr. BYRD. No; but the same conditions would prevail, would they not, with respect to the emergency in connection with either one of the two proposed pieces of legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know what the Secretary of Agriculture may think of the substitute. I do not have any letter from him on the subject. Does the Senator have any word from him?

Mr. BYRD. With respect to payments and the rate of taxation there is not much difference between the substitute and the original bill, is there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; but there is a great difference between the two measures. As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, many of the growers in continental United States are very anxious to have increased quotas. During the emergency we have given up that hope.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator willing to defer the consideration of this bill until we can ascertain what the Secretary of Agriculture thinks about the substitute?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The representatives of the Agricultural Department advise the chairman of the committee that they have no objection to the substitute. I have before me a letter from the Secretary of State which I desire to put in the RECORD, in which he uses the following language:

> I am glad to inform you that the proposed substitute, unlike H. R. 5988 as originally introduced, would be unobjectionable from the point of view of our international relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *Washington, December 18, 1941.*
> The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
> *United States Senate.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Thank you very much for your letter of December 12, 1941, informing me that the Finance Committee has reported out a substitute for H. R. 5988, An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes. I am glad to inform you that the proposed substitute, unlike H. R. 5988 as originally introduced, would be unobjectionable from the point of view of our international relations.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> CORDELL HULL.

Mr. GEORGE. All the other agencies of the Government which seriously object to any legislation that would disturb the relationship existing between the United States and Cuba and other sugar-producing areas outside the United States were at first disturbed by House bill 5988, but all have expressed themselves as being satisfied with the substitute which has been reported by the committee.

Mr. BYRD. The letter from Secretary Wickard recommends that the proposed increase in the basic rate of payment be made operative only so long as the present defense emergency continues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He may have had in mind some increased quotas because of Philippine deficits, for all I know. That plan was a part of the original act passed by the House.

Mr. BYRD. The Secretary of Agriculture further says:

> I also recommend that, since the increased payments proposed in the bill are not confined by the proposed scale to the level of production typical of small farms, the committee reexamine it with a view to further limiting its application.

As a matter of fact, the bill applies to the great corporations which are receiving $600,000 or $700,000 out of the Treasury of the United States. They would receive an increase in addition to what they have been receiving.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In this bill we did scale down some of the payments to the large corporations. Let me say that the Secretary of Agriculture offered the same objections to Members of the House when they had before them the present act, and the House passed the measure by a tremendous vote. Of course, it is perfectly proper for the Secretary of Agriculture to offer his objections to and his criticism of legislation. But, after all, we must act on our own judgment.

Mr. BYRD. I made the observation only because of some question as to where the Secretary of Agriculture stands. Is the Senator willing to accept an amendment to limit the operation of the bill to 1 year, as has been the custom in the past?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado is not willing to accept such an amendment. As I pointed out to the Senator, the growing of sugar is very much like the growing of apples; it cannot be confined to 1 year; it is a long, drawn-out process.

Mr. BYRD. I hope the profit from it is better than the profit from growing apples. I think it is, when under the terms of the act corporations which grow sugar receive $500,000 or $600,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury. That is not the case with any apple growers of whom I have heard.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. The Senator from Virginia raised some question about the time involved in raising sugar. I think he is not quite familiar with the sugar-beet business, or he would not raise the question.

Around the first of January of each year we are confronted with the problem of what sugar legislation we are to have for the following year. Our sugar-beet growers, thus, in preparing the ground, have no idea what the situation is to be, and, therefore, do not know whether to grow beets. In my opinion the committee showed its wisdom in conceiving the idea of making the program a 3-year program instead of a 1-year program. In this way, the producer is able to plan ahead.

As to the increase in the payment, it is apparent that the administration has decided to reduce the tariff on sugar from Cuba about 15 cents a hundred pounds. The increased payment simply offsets that reduction. That is the argument for it. Beet growers and cane growers feel that if there is to be a reduction in the Cuban tariff it should be passed on. It does not make any difference in the price of sugar, but it does give the farmers a chance to obtain an additional price, to which they are entitled.

I think those are the reasons for the increased payment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. While we are on the subject which has been touched upon by the able Senator from Georgia I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if the proposed amendment would in any way affect the proposal in the bill as passed by the House, permitting an increase of approximately 4 percent in continental acreage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. We abandoned that principle entirely because of the international situation.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, this is a very poor time to assume a policy of nationalism in the discussion of any mat-

ter. Nevertheless, we shall need sugar, just as we shall need unity. I think it is a very poor policy to restrict the development and growth of an industry such as the sugar industry. If we should do our utmost we could not produce nearly all we need. We should not follow a policy of restricting acreage and encouraging the Nation to exist upon sugar brought in from other countries, especially at such a time as this. We do not know how many more ships may be lost. I think it would be extremely unwise to abandon the provision in the original bill which permitted a 4-percent increase in acreage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, at the present time there are in effect no restrictions of any kind on acreage.

Mr. BUTLER. I have the impression that the act, as it is proposed to be extended, would operate as it has operated in the past. It became necessary to close one sugar factory in Nebraska during the past season because of the reduction in acreage, which was not a voluntary reduction.

Mr. GEORGE and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I promised to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to respond to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will postpone my statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to address this statement particularly to the Senator from Virginia, as well as to all other Senators. As I understand, at the present time there are no restrictions on acreage or markets.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. That condition undoubtedly will continue for some time, probably throughout the life of the act.

However, if we are to increase acreage at this time, and maintain an allotment or quota system, under which the sugar industry has been stabilized, it must be done at the expense of somebody. It must be done at the expense of Cuba. The House bill proposed to reduce the Cuban quota by a net amount of approximately 50,000 tons. We are doing it on the theory also that the Philippines are out of the picture. We must do it on the theory also of upsetting the present relationships with the sugar-producing countries of Central and South America, and the off-shore producers.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not a fact that the demand for the Cuban output has greatly increased by reason of the demand from the United Kingdom and other consumers? We are not the only outlet for the disposal of Cuban sugar.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, of course. The demand for the output has increased, but the facilities for handling it have been greatly decreased. I hope there will be no disposition to limit the operation of the bill to 1 year, because the representatives from the sugar-producing States are most anxious to do precisely what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind. They have recognized, however, the situation as it now exists. There being no restrictions upon acreage or marketing, and since it is not likely that there will be restrictions upon acreage or marketing during the three years the bill will continue in force, if the House agrees to a 3-year extension, there would seem to be the strongest reasons why we should abandon any disposition to upset the relationships which exist between the United States and our own insular possessions in the Pacific, or the cordial relationship which exists between the United States and Cuba.

I wish to impress that fact upon the Members of the Senate, and particularly upon the Senator from Virginia. I have no concern about his quarrel regarding whether benefit payments should be made to the large producers. That is a different matter; but to suggest for a moment that we should simply postpone until the end of each year the reopening of a controversy which happily should end and which the proponents of this measure have recognized should end during this particular period would indeed be most unfortunate.

The bill which passed the House, which took away from Cuba a part of her quota, which redistributed the whole Philippine quota, and which otherwise changed the relationship between the sugar-producing areas outside continental United States and our off-shore neighbors, met with the stern opposition of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of State. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I was flooded with suggestions from the Secretary of Commerce and even from some of the temporary defense agencies which have been set up, not in opposition to permanent legislation but in opposition to the disorganization of existing conditions, under which the proponents of this measure—not because they approve it as a long-time proposal, not because they propose to abandon their contention, but because they recognize existing facts—together with the producers, the manufacturers who are interested, the representatives of Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and every one else actually concerned, thought that under existing circumstances this was the proper thing to do with the legislation, and that as now proposed it ought to be reasonably satisfactory. That is particularly true so far as our domestic producers are concerned, since they are not likely to have an acreage restriction or a marketing restriction during the next 2 or 3 years.

Of course, we cannot foresee how long the war will continue, but certainly it would be most unfortunate to invite a reopening of the whole issue next October, November, or December, when we should be confronted by identically the same world situation.

We had better dispose of the issue now. If the war should end during the 3-year period, Congress then could act. The very able and alert representatives of the beet-sugar and cane-sugar areas, who have been pressing for legislation much in line with that which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and his able and highly respected colleagues in this body have insisted upon, undoubtedly will be pressing for modification of this legislation as soon as the war is over and as soon as steps can be taken which will not throw out of joint our present happy relationships with our neighbors.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. I do so in the best of faith, realizing and believing that the Senator who ably presides over the committee which has these matters in charge is doing and has done the very best it is possible to do to meet this situation, which is recognized as almost impossible of settlement to the satisfaction of all persons interested.

An increased amount of sugar must come in from the fact that the importation of sugar from the Philippine Islands will be impossible during the emergency. Is not that true?

Mr. GEORGE. That is likely to be true. I think that is so.

Mr. NORRIS. That will mean that the supply of sugar, at least for the American people, will have to be obtained from some other source to the extent that we heretofore have gotten a supply from the Philippine Islands. It seems to me that logically follows.

Mr. GEORGE. Or else we shall have to produce it here; yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Or else we shall have to produce it here.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. NORRIS. This bill, as I understand it, does not give to the American producers any opportunity to increase their production in order to take care of the deficiency which we would face if the Philippine Islands should go out of the picture; but the bill provides that all the increased production shall come from the other offshore producers of sugar. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may answer the question propounded by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be very happy to have the Senator do so, if the Senator from Colorado will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the question which has just been propounded by the Senator from Nebraska reaches the very heart of the problem and presents an opportunity to explain a point that frequently is not understood.

The quotas fixed by the Sugar Act are not fixed in terms of tons. They are fixed in percentages of an estimated amount to be consumed. Therefore,

when the consumption increases the percentage of production naturally increases also.

It is not always understood, I say to the Senators from Nebraska, that the estimate of consumption changes from year to year. The Sugar Act contains within its provisions a sentence or two designed to protect the consumer from an undue increase in the price of sugar. That feature of the act has been most effectively administered. In times past the Secretary has increased his estimates of consumption to such a point that those of us who represent the sugar-producing States made representation to him that he was increasing the supply and thereby decreasing the price and, consequently, reducing the amount which the producer was able to obtain.

Under present circumstances, there are no marketing allotments. The Secretary, in the exercise of his discretion, has withdrawn them. It should also be borne in mind that although a year ago the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising his discretion reduced by about 17 percent the acreage allowed to be planted in certain beet-sugar-producing areas, his action has now been canceled, and there is no limitation.

Mr. NORRIS. What good does it do to cancel it after the time has passed when the crop can be planted and produced?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator well knows that I quite agree with him. Both he and I protested against the reduction of acreage at the time it was put into effect, believing as we did at that time that the increased demand was about to burst upon us, as it has done. However, that is water that has gone over the dam; this is legislation for the future; and so, under the pronouncement of the Secretary, and under the decision which he has made, every producer may produce and plant as large an acreage as he desires.

Mr. BUTLER. Without risking his payments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; absolutely without risking his payments. We believe that with the 3-year extension which is granted by the bill, when the beet farmers of America have rallied to the call and show they can produce, it will be then much more possible than apparently it is now to convince the rank and file who have not studied this problem that, in truth and in fact, this legislation is beneficial to the consumers, to the growers, to the refiners, and to every single element in the beet industry.

But if, Mr. President, we bear in mind that there is now no limitation upon the acreage that may be planted and no limitation upon the amount which may be marketed, then we shall realize that the quotas in the bill become effective only when the consumption has returned to normal, when there is no longer the demand which we now have, and when it will be necessary, then, to protect our producers of sugar beets and sugarcane against a world surplus.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I gladly yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. One thing ought to be taken into consideration. It will do no good whatever to throw down the bars and say, "Increase your acreage as much as you please," unless there are factories which can process the beets into sugar. Already my colleague has called attention to the fact that in the State of Nebraska this year there is an idle factory under such conditions as that thousands of farmers who are ready to plant and produce beets which would keep that sugar factory and several others like it going 24 hours a day cannot do it. We cannot expect a farmer to produce beets if he knows that nobody is going to be able to process them, even if we do throw down all the bars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. Let me finish and then I will yield.

I am not opposing this proposed legislation, Mr. President; it is probably the very best we can get; but it still does not do justice, it seems to me, to thousands upon thousands of farmers who want to produce beets and who have the facilities to produce them. In a great many cases they have started projects to put their beet acreage under irrigation, so they may produce beets every year, and they owe the Federal Government today for the money expended on those projects. One of the reasons given when the projects were first put through was that there would be sugar-beet production—not on all the land, for no farmer wants to put all his land under cultivation to sugar beets, but on a small acreage for each farmer, perhaps 10 acres or 15 acres or less. That was one of the inducements which started the projects.

The farmers borrowed money from the Federal Government; some of the projects are in operation now, and yet a beet-sugar factory in the State of Nebraska, almost in sight of beet-producing land, is standing as a symbol unable to obtain beets which cannot be produced because of the action which was taken. If that had happened in the case of a product of which we were producing a surplus, I should not be making this argument; but it has happened in the case of a product which everyone demands. If we should utilize all the potential productive capacity that exists, we would still not be able to produce sufficient for our own supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his observations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure both Senators from Nebraska will be interested to know that a representative of the Western Reclamation Association, as I recall the name of the organization, came to my office only a few nights ago and reported to me that one of the principal processing companies of the West, with offices in Salt Lake City, had given assurance that if this proposed legislation should be passed the company would build a new factory to process sugar beets in an area in Idaho which is not now able to have beets processed.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am delighted to hear the statement the Senator from Wyoming makes, but he realizes, of course, that there is, as I have indicated, a large, modern, well-equipped factory in Nebraska which is idle. We cannot expect men to invest their money in beet-sugar processing, which involves great expense, unless they are to have some continuity of operation. That would be unreasonable; we ought not to expect that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why in this bill we propose an extension of 3 years.

Mr. NORRIS. I am in favor of the extension.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that those who engage in the production of sugar beets may increase their acreage in order that we may have the sugar we need not only for the consumers' table but for the manufacture of munitions and in order that defense needs as well as normal domestic needs may not be curtailed. It seems to me that, as the Senator from Georgia so well stated, we should not think of reopening this question every year.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to reopen it every year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator does not.

Mr. NORRIS. I have always felt that in the settlements we have made we have done a great injustice to a great many worthy farmers. I say that without charging any bad motive on the part of those who wanted to curtail production; but it seems very unreasonable to me that we should curtail production of a necessity of life when we are not producing the amount we consume, and afford the opportunity for increased production to other countries.

As I suggested to the Senator from Georgia, we have been taking a large quantity of the sugar of the Philippine Islands on conditions favorable to them because we wanted to help them; that is a worthy motive; but now comes on the war; it is impossible to get sugar from the Philippine Islands to the United States, and their quota has got to be supplied somewhere else or we shall be short of sugar. We ought to let our farmers produce some of that shortage.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with everything the Senator from Nebraska says.

Mr. NORRIS. We ought not to turn it all over to foreign producers of sugar. That is what we are doing, are we not? We are not going to permit domestic sources to produce sugar to make up the shortage.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under this bill, and under the particular conditions which exist at the present time, our domestic producers will be able to produce every ton which they are capable of producing and willing to produce.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me ask the Senator a question. Is that to be for a period of 3 years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I had the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Then will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's remarks. I am interested in the thing the Senator from Nebraska has referred to; but I am wondering, and I should like to have the Senator's opinion about it, whether under this bill the American sugar producers may go ahead for 3 years and produce all the sugar they can produce or whether, say, at the end of a year or 6 months, the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to crack down and say, "You cannot produce more than so much."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, I do not think any guarantee can be made, because we do not know how long this emergency will last.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not; but that is the very reason why I agree with what the Senator from Nebraska says.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All of us agree with what the Senator from Nebraska says.

Mr. WHEELER. After all, the position we are in is that Philippine sugar will be cut off, and possibly the sugar from some of the other sugar-producing countries will be cut off. In northern Montana and in eastern Montana there are many places where men would like to produce more sugar, but they have not been able to produce it for the simple reason that they have not been able to market it. It is impossible to induce somebody to go there and build a factory if he knows that in 6 months' time or a year's time he may be compelled to suspend operations.

It seems to me we should adopt such a policy as would permit those who want to produce sugar and can produce sugar—and it is the most profitable thing they can produce—to go ahead; and we ought to say to them, "From now on we will protect the producers of sugar in the United States, because we have before us an example of how sugar may be cut off from the other countries to which we have been looking for sugar."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado permit me to make an observation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will yield in a moment. Of course, that is exactly what the Senator from Colorado would like to do; but this is a piece of legislation which became involved in the whole international situation, and we have to take the best we can get. We cannot always do what we want to do.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with what the Senator says. I appreciate what the situation is; but I also say that this is a time when we are cutting down on the production of American farm products. As was stated on the floor the other day by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], we are cutting down the production of oils in the United States, and fixing a low price on oils and other things which the American farmer produces. What appears necessary for our country at the present time is for the farmers to produce all the oils they can produce, and all the wheat they can produce, and all the flax they can produce, and all the corn they can produce, for we shall have to have the maximum production of all these commodities. I simply do not agree with the policy which is being adopted, which is giving to South American countries and other foreign countries the right to produce the things that ought to be and can be produced in the United States.

Mr. BROWN and Mr. HOLMAN addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I promised to yield to the Senator from Michigan. Then I will yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to give the Senator from Montana a little comfort along the line of his inquiry.

The head of the sugar section advised us that it probably would take from 2 to 3 years, under the ever-normal granary plan, to get a stock of sugar in the world that would bring about conditions as they were prior to this emergency. So it is more than likely, and I can say so authoritatively, that there will be no restrictions this year, or next year, or possibly in the third year. But I think, Mr. President, a word should be said in answer to what the Senator from Nebraska and others have said about the general situation.

I have been interested in sugar legislation for some time as a member of the Finance Committee, and have devoted some study to the subject. I do not think we can entirely overlook the larger aspects of this problem. In the last two sugar bills—the 1934 act and the 1937 act, and the extension which was made in 1940—we have quite generally agreed upon a policy which is an integral part of the reciprocal trade agreements. In other words, we have taken the view that there is a certain amount of this production that should be given to the producers in the United States of sugar beets and a certain amount that should be given to the producers of sugarcane, both of which to a certain extent are based upon what might be called a historical basis of fact, and a fairly substantial part of it to the territories and possessions of the United States—Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. We have also concluded that in consonance with the reciprocal trade agreements a certain part of that market ought to be given to Cuba, a small part of it to some foreign countries, such as Peru, in South and Central America.

I am usually on the other side of this controversy, but I think something should be said here for the viewpoint of those in charge of the administration of the Sugar Act in the State Department and the Department of the Interior, both of which are deeply interested in this problem, the State Department having in mind our international relationships with Cuba and other countries, and the Department of the Interior having in mind our relationships with Hawaii and Puerto Rico, because they have general charge of our relationships with those territories of the United States. All of them are involved; and, as I say, we cannot overlook the relation of this general policy to reciprocal trade.

It is the argument of the State Department that if we refuse to take any sugar from Cuba, or greatly reduce the amount of sugar that shall come in from Cuba, that will reduce the amount of corn products, lard, and other products that are bought from agricultural sections of the United States by Cuba. Therefore, there has been a compromise of a most difficult situation. Fortunately for the American domestic producer at the present time, there is no necessity for restrictions. Therefore, those restrictions have been raised.

I come from a State that is a fairly large producer of sugar, but I also come from a State that is a much larger consumer of sugar. My colleague [Mr. VANDENBERG] and I have both those interests in mind. I think it should be stated here that the bill passed the House of Representatives before the attack at Pearl Harbor. During that time the bill was up for consideration before the Finance Committee. Those of us on the committee—my colleague [Mr. VANDENBERG], myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the author of the bill, decided that perhaps there should be a reconsideration of this matter, and that the best thing to be done was to pass a continuing resolution by which the present law would be continued, with a section giving certain increases to the domestic producers, including those in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, by way of benefit payments. We considered that it was a most unfortunate time to take anything away from Cuba, to take anything away from the Hawaiian Islands, or to take anything away from Puerto Rico. The amount taken from the two American territories was so small a percentage that it is difficult to state it. Out of something like 800,000 tons of sugar on each of those two islands, slightly over 100 tons was taken away. As a matter of percentage, I should say it is infinitesimal; but it caused a tremendous protest on the part of Hawaiian interests, and a tremendous protest on the part of Puerto Rican interests. The amount taken from Cuba was a substantial amount.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to make an extended statement regarding the bill; but I feel that a few general observations on the bill should be made by myself as a representative of a sugar-producing area in the Middle West, principally in the State of Michigan.

The developments of recent months have brought into clear relief how completely the American public depends upon the domestic sugar industry for adequate supplies and for the maintenance of a fair price.

For almost a year the difficulties of importing sugar or of bringing sugar from insular possessions have been increasing. First, the freight rates and the war-risk insurance rates increased; then the ships became scarce, and space for sugar on ships became more and more limited; finally, last week, the treacherous attack of the Japanese in

the Pacific Ocean had the effect of practically cutting off all supplies of sugar from the Philippine Islands and of making very doubtful indeed the quantity of sugar which will be delivered from Hawaii.

On the Atlantic Ocean the situation is less acute, but it is still a great deal below normal. The American consumer is confronted with the fact that shipping determines the availability of sugar from offshore areas. As a daily newspaper recently stated, "Sugar cannot swim."

It is of the highest importance to national thinking that our people shall realize the security which the production of sugar in the mainland States of the United States gives to the consumer. Above all other things, sugar which is produced within the continental States does not depend upon ships for delivery. On the other hand, there are ample supplies of sugar in different parts of the world, but some of the greatest sources are so situated today that it is impossible to bring the sugar into the ports of the United States. Java and India are large producers of sugar, but the hazards of war have practically eliminated that sugar from consideration. All other islands and tropical production areas are affected to some extent by war conditions, the extent depending in each case upon the location and proximity of the area in relation to the United States. It is not only a question of distance, but often ships which are available must be used to bring strategic and critical materials like rubber, magnesium, zinc, and other materials used directly in producing ammunition or defense essentials.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives adopted a series of amendments provided in the Fulmer bill, H. R. 5988, all of which, in my opinion, are fully justified and have the merit of being based upon the experience of the 7 years of the sugar program. However, among the provisions of the sugar bill were a series of readjustments in quotas and in the distribution of deficits from the Philippine Islands and other areas, which, unfortunately, created questions of controversy affecting Cuba and other nations of the Western Hemisphere. The domestic-sugar industry has not receded from its position of advocating these adjustments; but, in a patriotic and cooperative spirit, it has recognized that, with the Congress declaring war upon the Axis nations within the past 10 days, the time is not opportune for pressing changes which may be considered controversial by the Department of State and the President. I compliment the industry upon its willingness to take this broad view and to make this contribution to national unity and Western Hemisphere solidarity.

It has always been my position that the continental sugar industry should be encouraged to expand its production, so that in times of national emergency the United States would have to depend less upon the open lanes of ocean transportation. I have also taken this view because the record shows that the price of sugar has become progressively less to the consumer as the amount of domestic sugar produced has increased in volume. The following list of retail prices covers the past 30 years and includes the years of our participation in the first World War:

Year:	*Cents*
1911	6.1
1912	6.3
1913	5.5
1914	5.9
1915	6.6
1916	8.0
1917	9.3
1918	9.7
1919	11.3
1920	19.4
1921	8.0
1922	7.3
1923	9.9
1924	9.0
1925	7.0
1926	6.8
1927	7.2
1928	6.9
1929	6.4
1930	6.1
1931	5.6
1932	5.0
1933	5.3
1934	5.5
1935	5.7
1936	5.6
1937	5.6
1938	5.3
1939	5.4
1940	5.2

During the period immediately following the first World War, when the United States sugar market was controlled by foreign producers, the average retail price was consistently above the price paid for sugar during the 1914–18 war period. In 1919 the average price paid was 11.3 cents per pound, and in 1920 the average was 19.4 cents. Even in 1923, 5 years after the armistice, the retail price of sugar averaged 9.9 cents per pound; hence a great many housewives were still paying 10 cents and over in most of the States. The total cost to consumers for the 1923 supply of sugar, when foreign areas supplied most of our consumption requirements, was $1,047,000,000 for the 5,285,000 tons of refined sugar consumed. Ten years later, in 1933, domestic production of sugar had increased to its highest total figure, and consumers paid only $652,000,000 for the 6,148,000 tons of sugar consumed. In 1938, 15 years afterward, when domestic areas were supplying more than two-thirds of our consumption requirements, our consumers paid an average price of 5.3 cents per pound, or a total of $657,000,000 for the consumption of 6,267,000 tons. If American consumers had paid 9.9 cents for sugar in 1938, as they did when foreign sugar controlled the market in 1923, the total cost would have amounted to $1,253,400,000. Thus, on the basis of price, our consumers saved practically $600,000,000 in 1938 alone. But using Government statistics of the actual cost of each year's supply, consumers actually paid almost $400,000,000 less for sugar in 1938 than they did under foreign sugar control 15 years previously, and they consumed a million tons more sugar. During the 10 years, 1919–28, while foreign sugar had control of our market, the average price paid by our consumers for sugar at retail was 9.28 cents per pound; and during the 10 years, 1929–38, when American sugar was gaining control of our market, the average price was 5.61 cents. In 1940 the retail price was 5.2 cents. That is the story as told by the figures.

As a Member of the House of Representatives in 1934, I saw that the system of tariff only for sugar would not provide the protection needed by this important national industry. The tariff rate was, in my opinion, sufficient to provide protection against foreign sugars, but the tremendous increases of production in domestic islands gradually was nullifying the tariff. The Philippines must be considered domestic, because they have enjoyed free trade with the United States up to this time. But as of 1933 the Philippine Islands had increased their production and their deliveries into the United States from a normal of 251,000 tons in prewar days before 1914 to 1,580,000 tons. The cost of production in the Philippine Islands made it possible for the Filipinos to encroach upon the United States market formerly supplied by Cuba at such a rate that gradually the price of sugar had become less than the cost of production in the United States, and less than the tariff plus cost of production in Cuba.

The Congress understood what was happening, and responded to recommendations by the administration that a quota system should be established for the stabilization of the domestic sugar industry and of the sugar market in the United States. It was also true that at that time every nation in the world was seeking to make itself self-sufficient in sugar. Home production was increasing in every country of Europe and even in tropical countries. With all this activity and expansion in sugar throughout the world, and in view of the domestic problems created by islands which came within the tariff wall of the United States, it became very apparent that quotas were the only solution to provide stabilization.

Naturally the quotas provided for in the original Sugar Act of 1934 were based upon the historical background of each area. In 1937 some adjustments were made, based upon 3 years' experience. Eventually other adjustments will have to be made to perfect the system from the standpoint of the American consumer and the domestic producer.

As a practical means of providing for the equitable distribution of industry-income among growers, laborers, and processors, a tax was established by which the United States Treasury has collected approximately $68,000,000 annually in normal years. Payments to growers out of these funds have amounted to approximately $48,000,000, so that in fact the sugar industry has financed its own program, paying the tax direct to the Government and receiving payments direct from the Government. In the meantime the wage scale of laborers on the farm has been fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, which is the only agricultural program in which wage scales of farm labor are fixed.

In a broad sense the sugar-quota system has succeeded in bringing about stabilization, although serious questions have been raised as to the administration of the sugar program and the need

for amendments to the act. For instance, I consider it most unfortunate that the beet-sugar growers should have had their acreage curtailed in 1941 on a national average of 17 percent when it was evident to informed persons in the domestic industry that an extreme national emergency was developing, and the need for sugar would seriously endanger the local supply and demand position. As late as April 1941, when there was still chance for the growers of Michigan and the Midwest to plant a full acreage, I joined with other Senators and Congressmen in presenting the plea of the industry that it be allowed to produce sugar without acreage curtailment. It now becomes very apparent that if this full acreage had been allowed the situation in the United States would have been improved to that extent, and the outlook for 1942 would be much brighter.

We have read recently of the announcement from Cuba that the Cubans, at least for the time being, are unwilling to sell their 1942 crop to the United States because of the price offered. It is well known that the much greater need for alcohol in the production of smokeless powder and other defense requirements will absorb a much greater amount of Cuban sugarcane than is normally the case. I mention these things to indicate how tremendously important it is from the standpoint of the American consumer that every encouragement and incentive be given to farmers to produce sugar in the continental United States and in the domestic islands.

The bill reported by the Finance Committee extends the quota system for a period of 3 years, which we hope will cover the period of national emergency. From the standpoint of the sugar industry it is very desirable to maintain the quota system, so that when peace is declared and the post-war adjustments are to be made we shall have already in effect and working a quota system which can be the basis and framework of the stabilization of the industry and of the United States sugar market in accordance with the immediate problems which may present themselves suddenly, and which could not be anticipated with any degree of certainty.

The encouragement to domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane growers is provided in the improvement of the payments from a base rate of 60 cents per hundredweight of sugar to 80 cents per hundredweight. The added payment will serve to guarantee the farmer, who will soon have to select his crops for 1942, that the returns on his sugar beets will be as attractive and satisfactory as the returns might be on beans, oats, corn, or any other competing crop. The Department of Agriculture has placed a minimum price on some of these competing crops—beans, for example—and therefore it is good public policy, if we want to make sure of a full supply of sugar in 1942, to place these various crops on a relative basis of equality from the standpoint of income to the farmer.

At the present time the Banking and Currency Committee has under consideration the so-called price-control bill, which passed the House several weeks ago. It is my belief and expectation that this bill will provide some protection to agriculture, based upon the principle of parity. To a certain extent this price-control bill will help to maintain equality among the growers of different crops; but in the case of sugar beets and sugarcane it is not at all difficult to see how we can protect the consumers of sugar against high prices by providing a sufficient incentive in the Sugar Act for the production of sugar beets and sugarcane.

The price control will most probably be placed upon the manufactured product. Since August 1941 the Price Administrator has established a ceiling of 3½ cents per pound on raw sugar. In order to bring about parity or any percentage of parity—whether 100 percent or 110 percent or some other percentage—the effect of the ceiling on the manufactured product will necessarily require less if we first subtract the amount of the sugar conditional payment from the total price for sugar beets or sugar cane. Thus, if a 3½-cent raw ceiling will result in the beet grower receiving, let us say, $8.50 per ton of beets, including a Sugar Act payment at the base rate of 60 cents per hundredweight, it follows that a payment at a base rate of 80 cents, or 33 percent more, will reduce the necessity for increasing the price of sugar as food prices rise, or as inflation tendencies increase, or as the parity index mounts higher. Without going into too many details, and as a member of both the Finance Committee, which considered the Sugar Act, and the Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering the price-control bill, I am convinced that the 80-cent base rate will have the doubly beneficial effect of providing an incentive for greater production of sugar, which American consumers need, and at the same time of reducing the prospect of higher prices for sugar which might otherwise result in view of emergency conditions and the general tendency of food prices to go higher.

While there are no producers of sugar beets in Michigan whose total production amounts to as much as 350 tons of sugar, I nevertheless have given considerable study to the reductions in payments to the large growers. These reductions were carefully drawn to represent treatment of relative equality among growers. I cannot accept the view that a limit or maximum flat rate should be placed upon these payments. Admitting that some of the payments appear to be very large sums of money, nevertheless a study of the fundamental set-up of the sugar program establishes the fact that most of the large producers pay more sugar taxes to the Government than they receive in conditional payments from the Government. As I stated earlier in my remarks, the effect of the tax and payment system is to bring about an adjustment in the distribution of sugar income within the industry. The sugar program is financed definitely and exclusively by payments in taxes made to the United States Treasury by the industry. In fact, the checks are not payments; they are, instead, refunds or reimbursements. The relation between tax payments and Government payments forms the foundation of the sugar program, and any attempt arbitrarily to fix a maximum has the effect of destroying the equality of treatment and compensatory provisions of the Sugar Act as a whole.

Mr. President, I voted for the declaration of a state of war because our country has been attacked, and I propose to vote for all measures which will help to bring the war to a successful conclusion. Our war effort can be successful only if we continue to be a united Nation, as we are today. It is the conclusion and decision of military experts throughout the world that the war will be won by the side which can produce the greatest amount of its defense needs. Necessarily, the first consideration will be the production of guns, tanks, and planes; but the production of foods, from the standpoint of energy and morale, is equally important in its contribution toward winning the war. Sugar is an essential food, and the rations provided for American soldiers are the highest in the world, just as the consumption of sugar in the United States is among the highest in the world. The adoption of the amendments recommended by the Finance Committee will encourage the production of sugar in the United States, and therefore will make a substantial contribution toward the morale and success of our armed forces, as well as the morale and strength of our citizens back home. The domestic industry has demonstrated its willingness to cooperate and is now awaiting the instructions and approval of the Congress of the United States. I have full confidence that the Senate will approve of the proposed amendments and will instruct the sugar producers to proceed to the greatest production of sugar in the history of our country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be through in just a moment, if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator's statement raises a question in my mind. He says the House bill was being considered——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And was passed.

Mr. MURDOCK. And was passed prior to the Pearl Harbor incident.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. After that happened the Senate committee considering the bill thought it was necessary to abandon the House bill and write a bill as nearly the same as the 1937 law as could be written.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Practically a continuing resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. The question arises in my mind. Is not the hazard to the Philippine exportation of sugar to the United States greater since the Pearl Harbor incident than it previously was?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is no question about that; the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that be true, if the Philippine exportation to the United States is to be materially decreased, why is this not a good time to give to continental United States the benefit of the anticipated decrease in the Philippine

Island exportation, instead of to some foreign country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The reason is that the international question would thereby be raised.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I must yield to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] as soon as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] concludes.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to make just a concluding statement. Let me say to the Senator from Utah, first, that the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]—I think it was last spring—and others of us anticipated the situation we now face, and we provided for an allotment of that portion of the Philippine quota which they were unable to produce pretty largely among domestic producers in the United States. As the Senator remembers, that was done by a bill which was passed last spring.

My purpose in rising is merely to say that in view of what the Senators from Nebraska and others have said, I do not want the impression left that this is a matter in which there is nothing to be said and no argument to be made on the other side; that is, in behalf of producers such as Cuba and other foreign countries. I wanted to impress upon the Senate that it is a part and parcel of our reciprocal trade agreements, and we cannot entirely eliminate that from consideration here.

I think the present situation is one in which domestic producers are in a somewhat fortunate position, and there is nothing in the proposed legislation, and no prospect of anything to occur in the immediate future, at least for 2 years, which will in any way affect the right of domestic producers to produce all the sugar they wish to produce.

Unquestionably there will be strong reasons, in view of the general situation, for somewhat increasing the percentage which domestic producers will have in the future. I did want to present a viewpoint against which I have often argued here; that is, the position of the State Department and the Department of the Interior, and the general attitude of the administration toward this question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Michigan. I yield now to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the war in which we are now engaged must be paid for by the American people, and that the obligation of paying for the war will continue for many years in the future, and if the American producer is denied the greatest possible opportunity to create revenue out of which he will be required to pay for the war, he will be placed in a very difficult and possibly an impossible situation.

As I understand the proposed legislation, it is prompted by the fact that the production of Philippine sugar will not be available for distribution in our country. I should think that that would create a void which the American producer could participate in filling. As I understand the proposal, the Philippine shortage is being distributed under the same old percentages to the insular and good-neighbor countries. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the quotas are not changed, in other words. There is merely a continuation of the quotas as set up under the 1937 act.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the quotas should be changed so that the American producer could benefit, at least in part, from this situation, without harming in any way what we call our good neighbors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Many of us feel as the Senator does.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator if the new producers and new facilities in this country are not to be called upon to produce a considerable part of the deficit which must be provided by production in this country during the period of the emergency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I understand, we want all the producers, everywhere, to produce all the sugar they can.

Mr. PEPPER. Provision is made for new producers coming into the field now, and for new mills, possibly, coming into the field?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Such provision is not made in the proposal before us.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that, but under the policy now in effect removing the restrictions of the quota system, it is now being made possible for anyone who wants to plant sugar beets or sugarcane anywhere in the United States to sell his product?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is as I understand it. There are no restrictions when there are no surpluses, and since there are no surpluses in sight, the restrictions are automatically lifted.

Mr. PEPPER. And anyone who wishes to build a sugar mill may, under existing conditions, do so in the United States, may he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume he can do it at his own risk; but he must know that after the emergency is over we will have to go back to the quotas whenever a surplus is produced.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the point to which I am coming. So the committee intends, by putting these quotas back into effect, to squeeze out everyone of the newcomers who may build a mill or put new acreage into production in this country, and retain the American market for the people who are now unable to meet that market. Is not that a fair statement?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, and documents, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUGAR QUOTAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5988) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me to make a statement, I wish to say that, as a member of the Committee on Finance, I have given some little consideration to the sugar question. I can appreciate the viewpoint of the sugar producers of Louisiana and Florida and of the beet producers, and I think there is an element of justice in the position which they have taken. But we cannot afford to take a shortsighted view of this great problem, and I should like to state the problem in the large.

If we remove the quota restrictions, we shall have a condition of instability in the sugar-producing areas, including our own, unless we can levy an unconscionable tariff to keep out of the United States sugar produced outside our borders. That is all there is to it. We might as well face the situation fairly and squarely. What is the better policy in the long run—to stabilize our markets under a quota system which has been carefully worked out, which necessarily must take into consideration the other producing areas which have usually been furnishing certain sugar for our markets, or go before the American people and ask for a tariff on sugar which will support the American producer, including the refiner, at the expense of the American people directly, with that sharp controversy over the sugar tariff coming up again and again and again?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say——

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to complete my statement, because I must leave the Senate Chamber. Mr. President, that is why we have the quota system. The Jones-Costigan Act was, in my judgment, a wise act; it was a sensible act, though it might have worked some injustice on some of our producers. I can understand the viewpoint of the distinguished Senator from Florida, coming as he does from a new area. He naturally desires the expansion of that area, and I can and do understand his viewpoint. But the Jones-Costigan Act was wisely conceived to meet a condition which actually existed, which will recur again and again.

We must meet the situation one way or the other. If we can maintain a reasonable quota system which will deal justly with Cuba, with Puerto Rico and Haiti, and with other sugar-producing areas which have been accustomed to

furnish a part of our sugar demands, my judgment is—I may be wrong, but my judgment is—that it will be infinitely better for the beet-sugar producers and for the cane-sugar producers and for the beet refineries and for the cane refineries, and for the workers in the refineries all along our Gulf and Atlantic coasts, as well as for the consumers. I say it will be infinitely better for them all if we handle the matter on a quota basis. We may admit that certain injustices exist under that system, but we must try to iron out the injustices as we gain more experience under the quota system. Again I say it is infinitely better to handle the matter on a quota basis than for those interested to be compelled to come to the Congress and say, "Here is a great industry. It is a vital industry. It ought to be fostered." All of us who understand the problem at all will agree with that statement, but if we abandon all idea of control through quota arrangement, the industry can be protected only by a tariff which will bear upon all the American people.

Have Senators forgotten the sugar debates which took place here when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was being considered and when all the previous tariff acts were being considered? Those debates will come back again to haunt us and to disturb us. Those who are being benefited by the present arrangement are the refiners, the producers, and the American consumers. On the whole it seems to me the quota arrangement is the best arrangement we can work out.

Mr. President, I grant that some increase in domestic production can be obtained in some areas which it is desired to put into the production of sugarcane and sugar beets. I grant also that that situation ought to be recognized, and thoroughly and frankly recognized here, by all of us who come from other areas which do not produce sugar. But I am frank to say that this is an unhappy time to talk about that.

If we shall write into the law a provision for more sugar acreage we must do so at the expense of others whom we do not want to hurt and disturb and upset under present conditions, and at a time when the necessity for such a provision does not exist, because we have no acreage restriction and no marketing restriction now, and I dare say we shall not have for 2 or 3 years, for the general situation cannot vastly change so far as we can foresee within the next 2 or 3 years.

So, Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to approve the solution of this question which is now proposed. There are no more intelligent leaders of the beet and sugar areas than those members of the Finance Committee who from time to time urged before the committee exactly the action which a great many other Senators, not members of the committee, desire to have taken; but when we visualize the problem as a whole, we cannot fail to realize that we shall ultimately have to rely on quotas, or there will be a constantly recurring sugar fight in the Congress, and, in my opinion, the sugar producers as well as the people of America as a whole will not fare so well—and the domestic sugar industry should be encouraged and supported so long as we can reasonably do so—nor do I believe the refiners will fare so well, or that the labor engaged in the refineries will fare so well, and, frankly, I do not believe the American consumer will fare so well.

Mr. President, I do not mean to say that the quota system can be defended exactly as it has been worked out. That is exactly what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the late distinguished Senator from Colorado, Mr. Adams, and all other Senators from the sugar-producing States, have been saying all the time. But, while we cannot defend the quota system as it is, we cannot rearrange the quota system now without upsetting the relationship which ought not to be disturbed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid my able friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], mistook the purport of what I was trying to say. I am very grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee for the courteous hearing we were given in the committee, and for what he has said today, from which I derive much comfort.

What I was going to say does not throw me upon either one of those objectionable horns of the dilemma which the able chairman of the Finance Committee has just pointed out. On the contrary, my question was a predicate for an amendment which I propose to offer a little bit later, the effect of which is that the Secretary shall have a discretion when these quotas go back into effect upon the expiration of the emergency, to take into consideration the new facilities which have come into the field during the emergency, both milling facilities and agricultural production facilities.

This is the situation we find ourselves in, for example, in my State. One company, about which I shall have something to say a little bit later, now has 85 percent of the cane acreage in the State of Florida. Now the quota, so far as acreage is concerned, is lifted and new producers may come into the field. They are invited into the field now. They come not only lawfully, but they come by invitation. They come to meet a public need, and they will be just as lawfully engaged in the production of sugarcane as the United States Sugar Corporation, which in the same vicinity perhaps shall carry on its production upon its acreage.

But under the quota system, as the law now provides, when the emergency is over and the quota system goes back into effect, every one of these new producers will be squeezed out, will be pushed out of the picture, will be prohibited from continuing to grow cane, and the sugar company, which was in the picture previously, will be retained in the enjoyment of the monopoly it previously possessed.

What I was eliciting from the able Senator from Colorado by my question was: Is it not in the public interest that new producers come into the field? If it is, and if they come lawfully into the field, is it fair and just to them unceremoniously to cut them out of the picture when the emergency is over and they have rendered the service they are now invited to render to their country?

I will say to the able Senator from Georgia that I am not advocating the removal of the law from the statute books. I favor the retention of the provisions of the law which would preserve something like orderliness in the industry. But at the same time the law should contain some provision whereby there will be a discretion at least vested in the Secretary to give consideration to the new mill operators and the new producers who have come into the picture during the emergency. If we do not do that, then we are saying to them, as one of the able Senators on the committee stated the other day:

> We give you fair warning. We need you now. We want you to come into the picture and produce; but we give you notice beforehand that when the cutting comes you will be the ones to be cut, not proportionately, but wholly out of the picture.

So every new producer in Montana, Nebraska, or Florida who comes into the picture during this emergency and builds a mill or produces sugar beets or sugarcane will be unceremoniously entirely deleted from the picture when the quota system comes back into effect.

All I am asking by the amendment which I shall offer a little later is that discretion be vested in the Secretary, so that when the day of restoration of the quotas comes the Secretary can at least give some consideration to the new producers and new facilities, to see to it that they are given a fair share of what there will then be to be divided.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have the floor, but I do not seem to be making much use of it. [Laughter.]

I wish to reply to the argument advanced by the able Senator from Florida. I presume that all the war industries, when they come in to fill the war need, would like to have the same assurance which he asks for the sugar industry. I presume that all the airplane factories, the tank factories, and munitions factories of every kind would like to have some guaranty that they may continue their industry during peace times.

Mr. PEPPER. Can they not do so? Does the Senator know of any airplane factory that will become illegal? Many new airplane factories are now coming into the picture when their production is needed. Would anyone propose that they all become unlawful as soon as the emergency is over, and be prohibited from competing for the market?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The same is true of the sugar industry. There are no restrictions placed upon sugar production except when there are surpluses. I am certain that the Senator from Florida is not advocating a policy under which producers could produce unlimited quantities of sugar, demoralize the market,

and put distress sugar on the market to such an extent that no one could sell at a reasonable price.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not saying that in any sense. I am saying that the emergency has legitimatized new producers and new facilities; and they are entitled to be treated like American citizens engaged in the enjoyment of a franchise, which right is inherent in American citizenship.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I promised to yield to the Senator from Montana. After that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Florida. No one would build a factory to process sugar if he knew that possibly at the end of a year or 2 or 3 years he might be cut off. He simply would not do it. That is common sense. Investors cannot be persuaded to invest in such enterprises.

We should say to such new producers, "If you will produce sugar at this time, later you will get your share of whatever sugar is produced." Instead of leaving the matter within the discretion of the Secretary, it seems to me that in his amendment the Senator ought to provide that the Secretary must take into consideration the new producers and facilities.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will go so far as to say——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to reply in part to what the Senator from Montana suggests?

From whom does the Senator from Montana propose to take the right to produce which is to be given to the new producer? We all understand, of course, that when the emergency is over we shall have more than enough producers to supply the full demand. If we are to give to somebody the right to produce, from whom are we to take it?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it should be taken from some of those who are now producing. If a new factory were built in Florida, we should see to it that such factory receives a certain proportion of the sugar allotment, so that it would not be completely put out of business. I think that is the only fair thing to do. When we are calling upon producers to build new factories, they will not build them and produce sugar unless they can sell it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not expect to have much to say about the pending measure because the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has thoroughly explained the bill, but I do wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Montana. As I understand the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Florida, it is to protect new producers.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Florida is talking about new processors.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator is in error. That is only incidental, however. Suppose the increase in sugar production in Florida should be 300,000 tons, and that in the beet area should be 50,000 tons. Under the terms of the amendment which the Senator from Florida proposes to submit he would take away from the producers of beet sugar in order to take care of the increase which would be made in Florida. His desire is to do away with the well-established historical background. Would the Senator want that?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator, and I do hope that the bill passes in its present form. I do believe that the basic quotas should be increased, and I look forward to the time when continental producers of sugar shall be permitted to grow 40 percent of our continental consumption requirements. As has been pointed out, the time may not be opportune to increase our quotas, and I am willing to await a brighter day.

Mr. WHEELER. If beet-sugar producers should establish new factories at the request of the Government, and as a result should produce greatly increased amounts of sugar, and such increases were not brought about in the cane-sugar industry, then I say that the beet-sugar factories ought to be able to obtain some of the business which formerly went to cane-sugar producers; or vice versa. Such an arrangement would be perfectly fair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, does the Senator want to give up the whole historic basis of the sugar industry?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I voted for the present Sugar Act, and have supported it at all times. But I must confess that when we come to consider the situation in which we now find ourselves we should consider the facts. Sugar from the Philippines is being cut off by reason of the war. What we ought to be doing is looking after the interests of the farmers and producers in the United States with a view to making our Nation self-sufficient. No other policy is wise in view of the situation facing this country today.

I am not in sympathy with those who say that manganese must be produced in some other place, at the expense of the manganese producers of this country, or that we should import copper at the expense of the copper producers of the United States, or that other materials should be imported at the expense of our own producers. The present war has demonstrated beyond all question that the United States must become self-sufficient and able to produce at home the commodities which it needs.

I was in the Senate when the sugar question was debated in connection with Smoot-Hawley bill. What are we doing today? We are taking money out of the Federal Treasury and paying it to the big refiners. I am informed that the United States Sugar Refining Co. receives more than $400,000 a year. We are paying huge sums of money to the Hawaiian refiners.

Who brought the "fifth columnists" into the Hawaiian Islands? Who created the situation which exists in Hawaii today with respect to "fifth columnists," about which Secretary Knox speaks? It was the sugar producers and refiners who imported Japanese labor, because they wanted to exploit cheap labor, and sent their sugar into the United States in competition with the workers and farmers in Montana and other places in the United States.

I must confess that I have not much sympathy for the sugar producers who have been doing that sort of thing. They have been exploiting the poor, unfortunate people in Cuba, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other places; and they are putting our own sugar producers out of business. In some places the sugar producers treat laborers like slaves.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with much that the Senator has said with regard to restrictions placed upon the domestic production of sugar. He goes into another phase of the question when he talks about the exploitation of labor in the insular possessions. One of the objectives of this bill is to raise the standards of living. That was the objective of the Jones-Costigan Act and the act of 1937; and it is the objective of the proposed extension. It has for one of its main purposes the protection of labor and raising the standards of labor under the American flag.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what I wish to say deals with what the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Montana have been saying.

As the Senator from Colorado has just said, one of the purposes of the Sugar Act has been to put an end to the exploitation of labor to which the Senator from Montana has referred. The evidence before the committee, the evidence before the Senate, is that it has done precisely that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Montana to allow me to answer him.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is not answering me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator to bear with me, please. With respect to Hawaii, the evidence before us shows that the wage rates on the plantations in Hawaii have been increased by 48.4 percent in 1941, as against 1934, when the act went into effect.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator will yield to me, let me ask what has been the increase in the Philippine Islands. I was in the Philippine Islands in 1927. Of course that was some time ago, but at that time the workers there were being paid only about one peso a day, or approximately 50 cents a day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Philippine Islands are in an entirely different status.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; that is an utterly different matter.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have before me the figures having to do with present wage rates in the Philippine Islands, but I venture the assertion that today the workers in the Philippine Islands are not being paid any more than one peso a day, or 50 cents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator from Montana knows that in the Philippine Islands no benefit payment is made.

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Philippine Islands come under a different law, and it is beyond our power to upset it.

Mr. WHEELER. What is being paid today in the Philippine Islands? What is being paid in Cuba?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In Cuba in 1934 the base rate, as reported in the figures I have before me, was $1.59 a day; and in 1941 it had been increased to $2.36 a day.

Returning to the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida, it should first be understood that all of us who have sponsored this legislation, who have introduced it in the Senate and in the House, who have argued for it before the Finance Committee, and have succeeded in bringing it out under the able leadership of the Senator from Colorado, believe in expanding our continental production of both sugar beets and sugarcane. But we are dealing with a realistic situation. If we want legislation we must deal with the facts and circumstances as we find them.

Earlier in the year the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, and I introduced in the Senate a bill for the purpose of making a reallocation of quotas in order to take care of the Philippine deficit. We believed that the condition which now actually exists was coming. I stood upon this floor and argued that shipping facilities would not be available to bring in sugar from the Philippines, and therefore that the quotas should be distributed to our continental areas which can produce the sugar. But objection was raised to my suggestion. The State Department objected to it, and took the position that we should not withdraw from Latin-American countries the possibility of benefit from participation in supplying the deficit. The State Department was able to persuade a majority of the Finance Committee that those of us who wanted a reallocation of quotas in order to supply the deficit were mistaken; and the Finance Committee filed an unfavorable report.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Montana will permit me to do so, I shall get to the point he has in mind.

The Senate, however, agreed to our point of view, and passed the bill. It went over to the House, and there it never moved.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that apparently he seems to think that I have criticized him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. WHEELER. I realize that the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Colorado, the late Senator Adams of Colorado, and other Senators have done their very best and have had in view the same objective that all other Senators from the Western States have had. However, I have been pointing out that it seems to me this war has proven the fallacy of some of the things which have been done with reference to the allocation of sugar quotas and the production of sugar in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly, that is so.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said; and no one on the floor of the Senate has worked more diligently than has the Senator from Wyoming for the benefit of the sugar-producing States; and the same statement applies to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, Mr. President, the mere fact that I raise my voice and wave my arms a little when I am arguing does not imply that I am criticizing in any way the statements made by the Senator from Montana. What I am referring to is the fact that the Senator from Montana arose to express some kind of agreement with the proposal made by the Senator from Florida. The Senator from Florida is asking, by his amendment, that Congress vest in the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to allocate quotas when the emergency passes.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield to me, let me say that my amendment is proposed subject to a limitation as to percentage which I never got a chance to mention when I was discussing the matter a moment ago.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. Mr. President, I submit that, in the first place, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida means a delegation by Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture of the power to fix quotas. It is a delegation for which I am unwilling to vote, because I have a lively recollection of the fact that last January those of us who are representing the beet-sugar industry appeared before the Secretary of Agriculture and asked him not to reduce the acreage of beets. In Colorado, Wyoming, and all other beet-producing States there were producers who, in accordance with the invitation of Congress and the law, had expanded their acreage. There were producers who had planted additional crops. The Secretary exercised the jurisdiction and the discretion which he then had and cut down the acreage by 17 percent. I am not willing to delegate further discretion during this emergency.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator to permit me to continue for a moment.

Mr. PEPPER. Would not the Senator prefer to answer questions with reference to delegation of authority before he leaves his discussion of that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well; I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, I was about to ask the Senator from Wyoming how else he would suggest that the goal might be attained.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to discuss that point.

Mr. PEPPER. And, in the second place, I was about to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he recognizes the fact that the realm in which the discretion might be exercised is very small and definitely limited in its extent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that when the bill was originally introduced its sponsors, after having canvassed the situation up and down, in seeking to do the best they could for every producing area, including the producing area in Florida, realized that there was no possible way to expand production in continental United States in years of normal consumption except by reducing the quotas of Cuba or the Philippine Islands That is the only way we can do it unless we reduce production in one or the other of the interior divisions; and, of course, no one wants to do that.

So we came to the conclusion that the most we could do would be to provide for an increase of 4 percent; and that would mean a reduction of about 50,000 tons in the Cuban quota. That reduction of quota was not to take place immediately and everyone who had studied the sugar problem knew that it would not become effective immediately. But articles about the contemplated reduction were published in the newspapers, particularly in the eastern newspapers and magazines whose editors wear blinders when they deal with the sugar problem. It was regarded as an attack upon Latin-American countries which are capable of producing sugar. The State Department opposed it; and it was perfectly obvious to us that, in the circumstances, the sugar law itself would be destroyed unless we yielded with the wind. So we brought in the bill which is now before the Senate. We agreed to that modification. What the Senator from Florida proposes now is to say to the world that the Secretary of Agriculture may make the reallocation which the State Department said the Congress should not make. The Department of State will be just as much opposed to clothing the Secretary with authority to take quotas away from Cuba and foreign countries other than Cuba as it was opposed to the small 4-percent increase which was offered by the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are trespassing on the time of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid the Senator is limited in his understanding of the amendment which I have proposed below what its content really is. I do not restrict the discretion of the Secretary in his power to reallocate quotas and what he might take away to offshore areas. I have left the discretion uncontrolled as to where he may get it, but I have limited the amount he may allocate.

Mr O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should prefer to have that done here openly before everybody, before the occupants of the galleries, before the press, than I would have it done in the office of any administrative official.

Mr. PEPPER. Again I come back to the question of the method of doing this thing. I do not know of any way whereby anyone can write now into law and determine now how these new facilities are to be distributed over the country or in what area they are to be distributed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am coming to that if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. PEPPER. What I proposed, therefore, was that we place a limit upon the exercise of his discretion but give the Secretary the power within a narrow limit, relatively—2 or 3 or 4 percent or something like that—to allocate the quotas on the basis of equitable principles among the people of this country engaged in the production of sugar cane and beets and in the marketing of sugar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President, let me continue my answer to the Senator. I have every conviction that by the passage of this bill, extending the Sugar Act for 3 additional years and providing an incentive, as we would do, to the domestic producers to increase their production, we shall finally succeed in driving it into the comprehension of some of those who have administered the law and some of those in the State Department who have resisted the law that the best source of supply for all Americans is the American producer. I have every confidence that it will become clear in this war as it became clear in the first World War, that we ought to depend upon our domestic producers for sugar. We will be able under this bill, if it shall be enacted, to continue to provide sugar to the consumer of the commodity at a reasonable price; we shall continue to be able to guarantee to the worker on the plantation, on the farm, and in the refinery here and elsewhere under the flag of the United States a reasonable wage; we shall be able to continue to guarantee to the producer that he shall get a fairer share in money of the total commodity than he ever got before, and at the same time we shall have stimulated our production and have maintained our price. We shall be able to convince all other countries that the time has come to increase the production from domestic sources. Three years is the period of the extension. At the end of that time the Senator from Florida can join the Senator from Colorado, appear before the Finance Committee, and present the proposed amendments to the quotas when they can be considered in the light of the advice of the experts.

Mr. PEPPER. And they will be received just as they have been received during the 5 years I have been a Member of the Senate, and we will be told, as the able Senator has told me every time a similar bill has come up—and it has come up three or four times since I have been here—that some time in the future will be the golden day of opportunity, but it is never when the bill is being considered, when the law is being written. The known purpose and effect of this bill was expressed by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in the committee the other day when he said, "Well, if the new producers are going to be eliminated at the expiration of the emergency, they had better know it now, had they not, rather than to be surprised later?"

So a great many advocates of the bill—it may not be in the intention of the able Senator from Wyoming or the able Senator from Colorado, but it is in the content of the bill—have a deliberate purpose that notice shall now be given to all the new producers, "You need not come back here and claim you are surprised or suffering especial hardship when you are cut off at the end of the emergency and the privilege, the vested privilege, is restored to those who had it when the emergency began."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida would undertake to cure the defect which he so eloquently and ably points out by granting additional discretion to the very officer who has made the restrictions when he had the power.

Mr. PEPPER. If the able Senator, with his known and very much admired ingenuity, can suggest some alternative by which the same objective can be accomplished, I much prefer certainty to an illusory discretion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, let me say—and I apologize to the Senator from Colorado for trespassing so much upon his time——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This discussion is on the bill; it is to the point, and we all want to hear it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of the sections of this bill as it was introduced provided for a new reallocation of the Philippine deficit. We felt it was necessary to abandon that reallocation not because there was anything wrong in the reallocation; not at all; but because the language of the bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, and myself was drawn before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and it did not take into consideration the possibility that we would have to distribute the Philippine deficit to other producing areas, to Cuba and other foreign countries, in a little different way from that which was provided by the bill. So we withdrew it. But it is perfectly obvious that that is a question that has got to be studied, and I am hopeful that the House committee may take up the bill which the Senate passed months ago reallocating the Philippine deficit and, by conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the representatives from Florida from the Louisiana area, and from the beet area, we may go into a committee session and work out a proposal which will bring about the result which the Senator from Florida desires. I think it can be done in that way. I think it cannot be done in the way the Senator is proposing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say that if that is what ought to be done, it should be done before we pass this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It cannot be done before we pass the bill, because——

Mr. PEPPER. We are passing a bill that will "freeze" this law for 3 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; any bill is subject to amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator must recall that the present law expires on the 31st of December. The House ought to act upon this matter before that date. Therefore, we have not the time in December to go into these technical details, and that is why I hope the Senator from Florida will not urge his amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall have to wait and offer the amendment in my time. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senators for their contributions.

Mr. MURDOCK rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator from Utah desire to interrupt me?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I should like to make an observation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, ever since coming to the Senate I have admired the logic and eloquence of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; but I can hardly follow the argument he makes today.

The Senator says he fully supports the system of quotas so far as continental United States is concerned; but does he not realize that the very purpose of the quotas was, and is today, to "freeze" production in continental United States? That is the very purpose of the quota system; but the Senator from Florida rises here today and says that he wants, by delegation of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, to protect the new producers and the new processors who may come in, and he makes the statement that they come in legitimately.

I contradict and disagree with the statement that they come in legitimately. They cannot come in legitimately unless they come in under the law. They cannot come in under the law; so they come in, How? After we perpetuate what I consider an iniquitous system of quotas which limits production in the United States, the only way in which a new producer can come in is not under the law but under the regulation of the Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the quotas is to limit continental production. We found out, every time we have tried, to secure some little expansion in continental United States, that the very purpose of the quota system is, or was, to "freeze" and continue the freezing of production in continental United States. Senators are calling for additional production in the beet fields and in the cane fields of continental United States. We have heard it emphasized today, have we not, by able Senators, that there is to be a very material deficit in the sugar imports from the Philippine Islands? I will admit that we need unity with Cuba, with the Philippine Islands, and with the other insular possessions of the United States; but I also take the position that they need us today a great deal more than we need them, and we are doing ten times as much for them as they will ever be able to do for us.

We are confronted today by the fact that the House has increased by the very small percentage of 1.18 the amount of

sugar that may be produced in continental United States. If the Senator from Florida, the Senators from Nebraska, the Senator from Wyoming, and the other Senators here today believe there should be expansion in continental United States, when will the time be more opportune; when will it be more propitious to take a step in that direction by passing the House bill today?

I cannot agree with the Senator from Florida that his position is logical when he says he wants to invite others to come in, but is still unwilling by law to increase the production in the United States.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the preliminary remarks of my kind friend the able Senator from Utah. I am afraid, however, I have not translated my thoughts very well into words if I have given him the impression that my position is illogical.

I have not limited the Secretary's discretion in my proposed amendment to taking some quota away from domestic areas. I have given him, in the proposal, power to find it wherever it may most equitably be found.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator answer a question for me? If continental expansion is now invited, why does the Senator object to doing it by law, instead of by a delegation of power to the Secretary of Agriculture to do it later on by administrative order?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to have a chance to answer that question. Essentially, Mr. President, it is because the House bill will not give to the Secretary or to any other authority any discretion to allocate fairly the increase which might become available.

If the House bill were to become law, I suppose probably a few additional tons might be available to the State of Florida; but under the law as it now exists, with the historical base as the criterion, one corporation in Florida would get 85 percent of every additional acre that might be allowed us. I have not yet found a way to break that vise, and I do not know any way to give the new producers recognition except to give some administrative agency authority to give them a share of the new production or the new facilities which might become legal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was asking the Senator from Colorado to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the Senator from Colorado to give me just a minute more to answer the inquiry of my friend from Utah. The question of whether continental United States should be frozen into an existing quota set-up is not the only question, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is frozen; is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. And we cannot get away from it. We are told today that all limitations and all restrictions are taken off, but the very fact that the limitations are taken off only by the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not by law, means that the limitations are still there, and that capital will not invest on the mushroom production that we might have during this emergency.

Mr. PEPPER. I believe I have presented a question of principle in regard to this matter. I will state the principle. I realize that the historical base will always be an integral part of a quota system, but I claim that there has been injustice in the past in making the historical base almost the criterion, not merely an influential factor. I mean that, after all, the sugar bill which became the Jones-Costigan Act relatively froze the situation as it existed in 1934. Does the able Senator, whose fairness is recognized in this body, contend that anybody having a farm, not by chance engaged in the production of sugarcane or sugar beets in 1934, is forever outside the scope of the elect, and forever to be illegitimatized so far as his Government and country are concerned in relation to his right to produce sugarcane or sugar beets?

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator ask me that question?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I say that any American farmer, whether he lives in Florida, in Louisiana, or in my State, or any other Western State, should be allowed, so long as sugar is a deficit crop and not a surplus crop, to cultivate every acre he possibly can. My position on the subject is that we should produce all we can in this country, and then allocate whatever deficit there may be to the Philippine Islands, our other insular possessions, and Cuba.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but the essential error of the Senator's reasoning, and the principle of the bill so far as it has been practiced, is that the right to produce the domestic quota is essentially limited to a given set of people who were engaged in the business at a given time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would be willing to take it off. Would the Senator from Florida?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me make a final statement. I believe we are in substantial accord on that point. I claim that 1934 is no magic year which forever shall be the vise into which relativity is frozen.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is 1941 a magic year?

Mr. PEPPER. No; but I say that 1937, when there were certain changes, for which we were grateful, was a fairer year than 1934 for this purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield to me, I think perhaps I can convince the Senator from Florida that he is in error.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let the Senator from Florida continue his statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me finish my statement. In 1937 few variations were made. There has been no essential change since that time, except that under the new producer sections of the law the authorities can allow an increase of 5 or 10 acres, which means relatively nothing, so far as that is concerned.

It is proposed that the law be reenacted with the same limitations in it. I merely say that we should look at the whole picture in the determination of the quotas, in the selection of the people who have a right to produce. Start with 1934, if that is desired, and continue through 1937, pass 1941, and even go to the end of the emergency, and see the historical base from the beginning of sugar legislation to the end of the emergency, then allocate evenly among the people of the United States whatever quota there is. I do not know how much will be available.

I agree with the able Senator from Colorado that a larger percentage of our domestic quota should be produced in this country. But I say that if we produce but 100,000 tons in the whole United States we should not make 1934 and 1937 the criteria of the division of the quota. We should take the historical base over the whole period, from 1934 to the end of the emergency. I am perfectly willing that the people who have been in the picture longest should have the greatest consideration, but at the same time I protest as vigorously as I can against slamming the door of legitimate opportunity forever in the faces of people who have come into the production of sugar and the marketing of sugar since 1934 and 1937.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida asks that the Secretary be given additional discretion, and he says that under the present law the historical basis is frozen, as it were, and he protests against that. The Senator has referred, however, to the act. It is altogether appropriate to read the section in question.

Mr. PEPPER. From what page is the Senator about to read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. From page 9, of Public Law No. 414, of the Seventy-fifth Congress. It is subsection (b) of section 302 of title II. It reads:

> (b) In determining the proportionate shares with respect to a farm, the Secretary may take into consideration the past production on the farm of sugar beets and sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar or liquid sugar and the ability to produce such sugar beets or sugarcane, and the Secretary shall, insofar as practicable, protect the interests of new producers and small producers and the interests of producers who are cash tenants, shareтenants, adherent planters, or sharecroppers.

Mr. President, that is now in the law. It vests in the Secretary the discretion to give consideration to new producers. The Senator from Florida argues for a new discretion to be given to the Secretary of Agriculture, upon the ground that the Secretary has not exercised the discretion with which he is already vested to the satisfaction of the producers in Florida.

The fact of the matter is that independent producers, new producers, in Florida, have received an increased proportionate share from the Secretary under this provision. So I again reach

the conclusion which I announced a little while ago, that the Senator from Florida will do much more toward getting what we all desire, an increased opportunity for our domestic producers to expand their production to their capacity, by cooperating with those of us who have been studying this problem than by undertaking to take away from Congress the power and the authority to fix the various proportions, and vest the authority in the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the able Senator admit, then, that the Secretary has the power which my amendment proposes to give him? I do not wish to do a vain thing, but if he can make that admission on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the able Senator from Colorado, if the power of which I speak is already vested in the Secretary, and that will be expressed on this floor as the sentiment of the Senators responsible for the proposed legislation, and the Secretary shall take note of it as a part of the debate upon the bill, there is no reason for my offering my amendment. But does that apply to the marketing of sugar, as well as to the proportionate sharing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; this applies to the proportionate sharing; but that really governs the whole matter. The Secretary was directed by the Congress to take into consideration the new producers. My whole point is that the bill is so drawn that it comes as nearly as is humanly possible to balancing the various conflicting interests with the foreign policy of the Government, and, having done that, I am hoping that we may proceed with a united front, the Senator from Colorado with the rest of us, to convince the administration that we should rely upon our domestic producers in a larger proportion than we are now relying, and that the basic quotas, which are only basic, should be modified so as to gain an additional proportion for the domestic producers of sugar beets and sugarcane.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say two things in response to what my able friend has just stated. In the first place, all of us know that the sugar authority of the United States is Dr. Bernhardt, whom we know to be sitting on the Senate floor at this moment. I should like to consult him about his interpretation of existing law to ascertain whether in his opinion the authority which I have proposed for the Secretary now exists. If it does, I am adequately satisfied, if the Secretary will note the debate here, and observe the discussions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I must be perfectly frank with the Senator. The discretion of the Secretary is bound by the basic quotas; there can be no question about that. I believe those basic quotas should be expanded for Florida and for Louisiana and for the beet area. I quite agree with the Senator in that respect. But I comprehend as a realistic fact that we cannot do that in the time which remains this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With regard to what the Senator from Wyoming has just stated, let me say that we are very anxious to get the bill through today so that it can go to the other House and be acted upon there. The Members of the House are anxious to return to their homes over the Christmas holidays, and we must get the bill through by the first of the year, so we want to get it to the House some time today.

Mr. PEPPER. I assure the Senator that I have no desire to obstruct the passage of the bill in any sense of the word, and I will not stand in the way of what he suggests.

My second point of reply is that, so far as the practical consideration is concerned, we find ourselves in the situation that if the new producers were not represented in this Chamber, for example, by anyone, we will say, but the Senators from Nebraska and the Senators from Florida, we are not vain enough about our persuasive power to believe that we would be able to have the law substantially changed at the end of the emergency. That is to say, if the ones to be driven out of the picture were the new producers only we would not have very much assurance that we would be able to have the law changed after the emergency was over, and when we came to the Senate and said, "Senators, the actual situation existing in Florida is that new producers have come in and new mills have been built. The situation in Nebraska is that new producers have come in, there are new proportionate shares, and perhaps a new mill has been built." Other Senators sitting on the committee and sitting on the floor, being secure by reason of the law itself and by reason of the historical base, in the retention of the mills located in their States, and the proportionate shares in their States, might be sympathetic and always would be kind, but we could not depend on them to be so very helpful in pressing the Department to give the continental United States a larger percentage of the total consumption. But if they are faced by a law which says, "Look here, if there has to be a reduction in the facilities of the United States those facilities must be distributed relatively equitably over the whole United States," then it can be seen how comparatively stronger our effort in this body would be. That is the reason why all of us, if we are to have a cut again, ought to share proportionately in the cut.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to say to all Senators that we have been very generous to them in giving them time to debate this question. But we are anxious to have this measure passed and sent to the House tonight. This debate cannot run on forever.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from Montana. I know he will not take long.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Colorado has just said regarding the necessity of expediting the consideration of this measure. I certainly have no desire to prolong the proceedings. I very seldom interrupt or intrude myself into the discussions on the floor, but I feel that I should be entitled to make some brief observations with reference to the debate which has been proceeding throughout the afternoon. I would much prefer to see a matter of this kind threshed out before a committee and thus avoid taking up the time of the Senate in prolonged discussion back and forth among the Senators, which unduly delays proceedings here. It seems to me that many of these questions could very properly be disposed of before the committee.

Mr. President, for the very purpose of obviating the criticisms which were made against the proposals offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I proposed an amendment providing for an increased quota for continental United States of 200,000 tons of beet and cane sugar, to be allocated between the cane producers and the beet producers under the formula provided in the act. It had been brought to my attention that the deliveries of sugar in this country had greatly increased during the past few years. During 1939 and 1940, my understanding is that the withdrawals of sugar have averaged about 200,000 tons a year in excess of the previous yearly withdrawals.

I understand that during this year, 1941, there is an increase of 1,000,000 tons in the consumption of sugar. That is a tremendous increase. I think it is natural to expect an increase in view of all the conditions. I have a number of telegrams from various business concerns and industries throughout the country which are engaged in manufacturing food products, showing the enormous increase in the use of sugar in their various plants. The increase in the use of sugar averages from 25 to 30 percent.

In the face of that situation and with the greatly increased consumption of sugar within the United States, it seems to me it would be very desirable and reasonable to permit this very slight increased quota which I propose for the United States—slight in comparison to the entire amount of sugar involved.

My amendment provides for an increased allotment of 200,000 short tons, in addition to the amount that would be allowed under the bill itself.

Before the committee when the bill was being considered, I, together with representatives of the Western Beet Growers Association, appeared and submitted arguments justifying the slight increase I have mentioned in quotas for mainland cane and beet growers.

Mr. President, it seems to me that such action would obviate the criticism made by various Senators who have objected to the proposal made by the Senator from Florida. It would permit a very slight increase, which I believe would be justified.

Naturally, this country is growing. Our population is increasing. The consumption of sugar will naturally increase, as it has during these recent years, as the result of increased business activity. But even after the war effort is over, it seems to me there will be a continued greater use of sugar in the United States than there was prior to the war period.

If this small allotment is allowed for the continental United States, I do not see how it could cause any material injury to or interference with the outside producers. It certainly should not be subject to any serious criticism by the State Department or by any other department of the Government, because it

relates to sugar which is necessary to be produced as the result of the increased consumption of sugar in the United States, and any increased consumption in the United States should be divided among the producers within the United States.

I merely offer this suggestion at this time in connection with the general discussion of the subject. I am much impressed by the representations made by those in charge of this proposed legislation in regard to the lifting of restrictions on plantings and their general advice relating to the problem of increased production in the United States. If we can have a reasonable expansion of beet acreage that is all we want. We are now assured that we will have that increase. I hope it will work out that way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have a great deal of sympathy with the argument advanced by the Senator from Montana, but our position is that we want to get some legislation through Congress. If we should attach to this bill the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, even though it sounds reasonable and logical, it would endanger the final enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If we do not begin voting pretty soon, we will not get any legislation anyway.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall conclude my statement very shortly, I will say to the Senator from Michigan.

The sugar situation in the United States from a consumer's standpoint is critical if not outright alarming. Cuban sugar is cleaned up. The last million tons is going into alcohol to manufacture smokeless powder. Philippine sugar importation is shut off by the war. On December 13, last, the Office of Production Management restricted sugar in the United States to 30 days' supply to jobbers and wholesalers. O. P. M. officials said the order was needed "to protect the man on the street" by conserving sugar and preventing large users and jobbers from buying it up. That illustrates how dangerously close the demand has overtaken the supply and how essential it is that the supply be bolstered.

The records disclose that the cost of producing a ton of beets in 1938–39 was $6.75, while the price received by growers was $6.61, or 14 cents less than the cost of production. In 1941 the cost of production advanced 81 cents a ton with no increase in remuneration to the growers, and for 1942 the cost will be greatly increased again. Our beet growers are asked to produce a generous crop for 1942, but domestic beet and cane growers cannot be expected to do so at a disastrous loss. The pending measure will give the beet grower a little over $8 per ton for his beets, obviously somewhat below the cost of production. In the first World War, Mr. Hoover recommended the price of beets be $10 per ton in 1918, $11 in 1919, and $12 in 1920. The pending legislation is, therefore, very moderate and should be enacted without further delay as a very necessary war measure.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall take not to exceed 1 or 2 minutes. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado one or two questions. Does the Senator know if there have been any idle sugar processing plants in Cuba during the last year or two?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not informed as to that. I cannot answer the question.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is an admitted fact that they are operating to their full capacity. Are there any idle processing plants in the United States which process imported raw sugar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not informed as to that.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe there are. I am quite certain the facts will show that they are all operating to full capacity. But it is a fact, as I stated last April, that at least one beet-processing plant in Nebraska, and I think one or two others in the United States, were not permitted to operate. At that time several of us pleaded on the floor as earnestly as we knew how to obtain regulations or rulings from the Department of Agriculture which would permit our farmers to produce beets as they have been doing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado joined in those pleadings.

Mr. BUTLER. We tried to obtain rulings which would permit the operation of the Nebraska plant. Of course, incidents since that time bear out the wisdom of what we suggested. I am not blaming anyone for not adopting our suggestion at the time; but I see no way to cure this situation except by passing a bill similar to the one which was sent to the Senate by the House, which would establish a precedent permitting a gradual increase in the production of domestic sugar.

We are interested in international good relationships; but we are also interested in our own people. I believe we should give at least as much serious thought to their welfare as we apparently give to the development of the theories of international free trade which are being brought upon us through the administration of the reciprocal-trade agreements, with which I am decidedly not in agreement.

There is an old saying in America to the effect that we have never lost a war and have never won a conference. The way things are shaping up in the handling of the sugar question, I fear we are to continue never to win a conference. I certainly hope that we can maintain the record of the past, of never losing a war.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the passage of the bill. However, I wish to make a few observations.

I expect to vote for the bill now pending, but I do not believe that it will insure a sufficient sugar supply for the Nation. I will vote for it simply because we must have some bill to keep the sugar situation from chaos.

We are now at war. We must win that war, regardless of cost, and we should be doing everything possible to guarantee that all supplies necessary for successful prosecution of the war will be available. Food, of course, is one of the most vital of these supplies, and sugar one of the most important foods.

Several times during the last session of Congress, and again during the present session, I pointed out that the international picture made it necesasry to depend largely upon domestic production of sugar. This is especialy true now, in my estimation, for three main reasons.

First, to prevent a recurrence of the sky-rocket sugar prices during the first World War when we were at the mercy of offshore producers.

Second, to release ships to take care of war supply lines.

Third, to transfer shipping from such items as sugar which can be secured here, to other materials which we must import.

I sought to bring this precarious situation to the attention of the Department of Agriculture after it had issued an order on January 29 reducing the domestic beet-acreage allotment by 16.2 percent. I spoke to the Senate on February 20, urging the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider his order. I also wrote to the Secretary stating that the shipping situation in a world at war necessitated reexamination of his policy. I received a reply a few days later. The Secretary enclosed a copy of a statement made by the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines.

That statement said that the Philippines would be able to fill its quota; and the Secretary, by endorsing the Resident Commissioner's views, seemed to be fully satisfied that the lower quotas set in January were adequate to care for the Nation's needs.

In my speech of February 20, I pointed out several pertinent facts in relation to the shipping situation. I said:

> There seems to be every prospect that the pressure on shipping because of war conditions will increase for some time. This will inevitably affect our sugar supply from overseas.
>
> The fundamental consideration at this time, it seems to me, must be to encourage American sugar growers to raise an ample supply of sugar, in order that American consumers will not have to be so largely dependent for their sugar supply upon islands so far removed from the mainland. Our security demands that we act to insure an adequate supply of sugar produced upon the American continent.

That was on February 20, Mr. President. Nevertheless, in the face of this unpredictable international picture the Department of Agriculture was cutting domestic acreage—not increasing it, Mr. President, but cutting it. It is not necessary for me to point out that the Department's judgment was in error. Facts and events will speak for themselves.

As the months went on the shipping situation grew steadily worse. When I spoke on the floor in May I pointed out figures on the lack of ships to carry sugar from the Philippines, Hawaii, Cuba, and the other West Indies nations. By that time freight rates had risen as much as 500 percent over pre-war costs, and still we were making ourselves further dependent on offshore deliveries of sugar.

In June the Department of Agriculture made its first admission that its estimates of consumptive requirements for 1941 were wrong. An increase in marketing allotments amounting to 275,000 tons was made. On July 19 a second increase in marketing quotas was announced. On July 30 an additional increase of 740,000 tons was made, and on August 29, a fourth increase was announced. A fifth increase in the estimate of consumptive requirements was made in September. Five times in less than 5 months the Department found it necessary to revise its judgment. This is sufficient proof of the Department's failure to comprehend just what the situation was. It is adequate indication of the lack of foresight with which the entire sugar situation has been approached.

All this, however, is now water over the dam. Our job now is to be as farsighted as possible. Our task is to look at the situation clearly. We must go to work to correct the errors we have made and to settle the problems with which we are faced. We know that the war is bringing another sugar crisis to the Nation. We know that a shortage in supply for 1942 and for subsequent war years is inevitable. We cannot expect the delivery of any of the Philippine quota and we cannot guarantee an adequate supply for movement of sugar from other offshore sources, particularly Hawaii. Sugar rationing seems likely, no matter what stringent control efforts the Government may make.

Figures show that the normal annual consumptive requirements for the United States are nearly 7,000,000 tons. Under the provisions of the 1937 act, as amended, the first 6,682,670 tons are allocated, as to source of supply, as follows:

Philippine Islands	1,029,782
Cuba	1,911,476
Foreign, other than Cuba	26,412
Domestic beet	1,549,898
Mainland cane	420,167
Hawaii	938,037
Puerto Rico	797,982
Virgin Islands	8,916
Total	6,682,670

Actual deliveries of sugar for the calendar years of 1939 and 1940, in short tons, were 6,867,533 and 6,890,709, respectively. Deliveries of sugar for the first 11 months of 1941 exceed deliveries for the same period of 1940 by more than 1,000,000 tons. Since in many ways 1941 has been an abnormal year, let us assume that our consumptive requirements for 1942 will be at least equal to the average for 1939 and 1940, or about 200,000 tons in excess of basic quotas. This is, indeed, a most conservative assumption, for many experts believe that our consumptive requirements will be as much as 7,500,000 tons instead of approximately 6,900,000 tons, which I shall consider as a basis for my estimates.

This calculation, moreover, does not include the increased wartime demand. We have not taken into consideration the fact that the manufacture of alcohol for war purposes will require more than a million tons. We have not taken into consideration the needs of our allies. Let us then compare the available supply with our wartime requirements to see just what our problem is.

Our normal requirements, taking an average of 1939 and 1940, is, at the minimum, 200,000 tons over the basic quotas. This, as I have said, is most conservative. In addition we will need at least 1,000,000 tons for the production of alcohol for war purposes. Then we must offset the Philippine deficit amounting to more than 1,000,000 tons. Furthermore, estimates are that we cannot expect delivery of more than half of the Hawaii quota, or about 500,000 tons, instead of the usual 1,000,000 tons. This means that we shall need to cover at least 2,700,000 from other sources.

Cuba's normal production for export approximates 3,600,000 tons. Of that we have in the past been taking nearly 2,000,000 tons. If conditions are favorable, we may be able to secure an additional 500,000 tons to aid in making up the deficit with which we are faced. It is impossible to say what increase we can count upon from foreign countries other than Cuba.

It is evident, thus, that we are going to be faced with a minimum deficit of something like 2,200,000 tons of sugar.

As I said at the opening of my statement, I will vote for this bill, but my vote will be cast more or less under protest because the bill really does not settle the problem with which we are faced.

Of course, we are all concerned with successful prosecution of the war. This means we must make every effort to maintain proper understanding with our friends and allies. Many Members of the Senate have, in the past, expressed concern about the effect of any changes in our sugar policy upon our good-neighbor program. Yet we all know, for example, that the Philippines will be unable to deliver their 1,000,000-ton quota. Would we be harming our friends, allies, or good-neighbor program if we established a policy by which the domestic grower would be able to cover that deficit? And would not such a change be desirable as far as our war program is concerned?

The Senate endorsed such a change last June by passing Senate bill 937 by a vote of 45 to 26, and I hope that the House will join in this endorsement. Especially now there is every reason to support such an alteration, and no adequate reason to oppose it. Our sugar policy ought also to provide for adequate prices and increased acreage for, and protection to, those communities which already have established a record of sugar production.

After all, we must attempt to consider our policies in light of the future if we possibly can do so. Some time, and I hope soon, peace must once more come to this war-torn world. If, during wartime, we become more and more dependent upon foreign nations for our sugar supply, then we shall be asked after the war is ended to continue such a policy in the name of the good-neighbor program. As the law now reads, foreign nations other than Cuba are allowed to fill the Philippine deficit. If we permit this to occur, we shall encourage foreign nations to make unprecedented increases in their sugar production, to build new factories for processing sugar, and to hire more labor for the fields and for the manufacturing plants. So, again, we shall be making ourselves utterly dependent upon conditions beyond our control. Again we will be failing at a critical time in our history to do what seems to be only logical; that is, to encourage our own growers and processors to expand their operations. Furthermore we shall be creating false economic situations in many of our neighboring nations, for which they and we must eventually suffer. We must remember, too, that sugar factories and fields all over the world are being destroyed, and we certainly ought to take the opportunity to increase our sugar production in order to aid in meeting the post-war shortage which will take years to make up.

One word about the increased benefit payments provided for. This provision is one of the improvements in the bill, but we must keep in mind that the extra benefits will be largely taken away from the American farmer by the anticipated reduction in the Cuban sugar tariff.

Mr. President, if this measure is passed by both Houses of the Congress, and signed by the President, it will be written upon our lawbooks for 3 years. I think events will prove that, if we are to secure a supply of sugar which will meet even 75 or 80 percent of our needs, we shall be forced to reexamine our sugar-production policy, and to enact new and additional sugar legislation to provide for production within the limits of the United States of the great bulk of the sugar we require, instead of our present production of less than 50 percent of our requirements. I want to say now, Mr. President, that I do not expect to wait 3 years, or even 1 year, to take action to secure modification of some of the provisions in the pending measure.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me ask the able Senator from Colorado whether the committee amendment is now open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think the substitute amendment has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Has the substitute amendment proposed by the Finance Committee been agreed to by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not been agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the substitute amendment proposed by the committee now open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. PEPPER. On behalf of my colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. Title II of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 213. (a) Upon the termination of the emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized (1) to revise the quota for each domestic sugar-producing area, and (2) to revise the proportionate shares with respect to each farm in such areas.

"(b) Such revision, in the case of each domestic sugar-producing area, shall be made on the basis of the marketings of sugar or liquid sugar in such area during said emergency; but in no event shall such revision result in increasing or decreasing the quota for any such area by more than 2 percent of the total consumption requirements.

"(c) Such revision, in the case of a farm, shall be made in an equitable manner on the basis of the production of sugar beets or sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar or liquid sugar on the farm during said emergency."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Herring	Reynolds
Bridges	Hill	Rosier
Brooks	Holman	Russell
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bunker	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tobey
Chandler	McCarran	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Doxey	Murray	Wheeler
Ellender	Norris	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DISTRICT MOTOR-VEHICLE-FUEL TAX—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I present the conference report on House bill 5558, the bill increasing the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, and to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill; and agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the conference report was considered and agreed to.

CERTIFICATION OF DRUGS COMPOSED OF INSULIN

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mrs. CARAWAY. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, House bill 6251, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6251) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6220. An act to amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to announce to the Members of the Senate that it is desirable, if possible, to wind up a good deal of loose ends of legislation today, in order that the Senate may not have to convene tomorrow, if it can be avoided. The list includes the disposition of the pending sugar bill; it includes two bills from the Judiciary Committee, one dealing with alien registration, and another conferring authority to summon witnesses upon the board appointed by the President to investigate the situation in Honolulu; it includes the conference report on the selective draft extension bill; it includes an appropriation for housing legislation, which the Committee on Appropriations is now in session considering. So I hope Senators will remain here and cooperate as much as possible in disposing of this program, so that, if it is disposed of, the Senate may be able to adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say to the able leader that I only have two amendments to which I am going to address myself very briefly, and will ask for a vote on them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not undertaking, in any way, to shut off the Senator, but I wanted the Senate to be advised of the program.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly share the sentiments expressed by the Senator, because I know all of us want to conclude the consideration of the measures referred to.

SUGAR QUOTAS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5988) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before beginning my remarks, I should like to modify the amendment as I sent it to the desk. In line 3, subsection (b), I desire to strike out the words "in such area."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified as requested.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if Senators will be good enough to give me their attention for 5 minutes or so, I shall not trouble them further.

I feel that there is a principle involved in this proposed legislation in which other Senators are interested, particularly Senators whose States have small quotas of sugar or whose constituents propose to go into the production of sugar whenever opportunity allows. It is to these that I primarily address myself in what I have to say.

The committee amendment proposes to continue for 3 years the existing sugar law. It does not disturb the quotas which are prescribed in the existing law. It is admitted by the able Senators who are handling the bill on the floor today that it will not be applicable until the emergency is over. In other words, it is not legislation that is to operate today, next week, next month, next year, the year after that, or probably the year after that. It is legislation which is intended to become effective when the peace comes—an uncertain date in the future.

Therefore, Mr. President, since we are legislating for a future day and a future time, I have a right to ask that consideration be given to conditions as they exist at that time; and that is all my amendment proposes.

As the law now is, quotas are set up for the offshore areas, for the mainland beet area, and the mainland cane area. Although the Secretary does have discretion, as the able Senator from Wyoming pointed out, to vary proportionate shares inside an area, he has no authority to go outside the area in any alloca-

tion, either offshore or in another domestic area. He also has authority, in allocating marketing quotas, to take into consideration ability to market and past marketing history; but obviously the new mills that come into the picture during the emergency will not have a very long marketing history, and therefore will get, under the existing law, a very small quota of what may be available.

What I propose, therefore, Mr. President, is that we confer upon the Secretary himself a limited discretion for the purpose of doing equity, and that is all. But the opponents of the amendment, the proponents of the substitute, say it is all right to legislate for 1944 or 1945, but it is wrong to say that the quotas shall be distributed on the basis of conditions as they exist in 1944 or 1945.

Mr. President, my amendment proposes to correct that condition. It provides that upon the termination of the emergency proclaimed by the President, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized (1) to revise the quota for each domestic sugar-producing area. That means to revise it in the light of conditions as they then exist in the world. That is, if we are entitled to a larger share of world production, we will get it in the discretion of the Secretary. The Secretary is also authorized (2) to revise the proportionate shares with respect to each farm in such area. That will mean, therefore, that if a new farmer begins to grow sugar and is growing sugar when the quotas go back into effect, the Secretary will have authority to take into consideration the acreage of such a farmer and to give him a fair share of any quota that may go to his area.

Mr. President, I suggest that that is only fair and that the contrary means to preserve conditions as they now are, to the injustice of those who come into the picture during the emergency. All I ask is that the Secretary have authority to consider the new producers and the new facilities.

Mr. President, I want only 5 minutes more on my amendment.

I want Senators to be aware of the fact that if the bill passes as it is now proposed by the committee, every farmer in their States who plants sugar beets or sugarcane during the emergency will be cut off when the emergency is over. His neighbors will be permitted to continue to produce sugar beets or sugarcane, but he will not be. I want Senators to know that every sugar mill that is built in their States will be put out of business when the emergency is over and everybody else engaged in milling sugarcane or sugar beets will be permitted to continue.

If Senators do not think it is fair for the Secretary or somebody else to be vested with some discretion to give new mills and new farmers at least some consideration, then my amendment has no virtue or merit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have a second amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert, at the proper place in the committee amendment, the following:

Amend section 302 (b) by dropping off the period, replacing it by a colon, and adding the following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That the proportionate share for any farm shall not exceed 50 percent of the total proportionate shares for all farms within a State, so long as there are applicants for proportionate shares within such State with ability to produce."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, ever since I have been advocating an increased sugar quota for my State, I have advocated, as a fair corollary to that, a fair division of the quota in each State among the people of that State.

In my State, due to a historical accident, one corporation has 85 percent of the total acreage of the State devoted to growing sugarcane. Ever since I have been here I have tried to obtain for the bona fide farmers of the State the right to grow sugarcane. If Senators want to preserve in my State a monopoly under which one corporation has 85 percent of all our quota, of course, they will vote against this amendment. All I propose is that the limit of the amount one person, firm, or corporation may have in one State shall be fixed at 50 percent of the total quota for the State.

The largest share of the State's total quota that one producer has in any other State is 7 percent, in the State of Louisiana. In my State, for example, last year we had 24,000 acres as our quota. One corporation had 20,000 of those acres, another corporation had 3,000, and all the rest of the people together had 1,000 acres.

I have nothing against this corporation; but if we are to preserve a monopoly, surely it ought to be distributed fairly among the people of a given State. I do not even propose to distribute it fairly. I merely limit the share that any one person, firm, or corporation may have to not to exceed 50 percent of all that the State has. I submit that that proposal does not affect any other State. It is fair, or at least it is not unfair, to the corporation. I am simply trying to get an opportunity for bona fide farmers of Florida, owning their own farms, to grow sugarcane without having to be tenants of some corporation, as in an ancient feudal system.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment does not apply solely to Florida, but that it applies to all the States.

Mr. PEPPER. It applies to all the States, but Florida is the only State that would be affected.

Mr. McNARY. It is general in its application, is it not?

Mr. PEPPER. It is general in its application, but the fact is that it would affect only Florida.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I should object to legislation for any one State alone. This is general legislation, as I understand.

Mr. PEPPER. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. But it applies only to Florida, by virtue of a certain situation.

Mr. PEPPER. That is true. As Dr. Bernhardt can tell any Senator on the floor, there is no other State in which a situation exists which even approaches that situation. I do not suppose any Senator wants any one farmer or one corporation in his State to have more than 50 percent of all the State has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated, and I ask for the consideration of the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment of the committee it is proposed to strike section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of Section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. (a) The amount of the base rate of payment shall be 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar or liquid sugar, raw value."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The total payment with respect to a farm shall be the product of the base rate specified in subsection (a) of this section multiplied by the amount of sugar and liquid sugar, raw value, with respect to which payment is to be made, except that reduction shall be made from such total payment in accordance with the following scale of reductions:

"Reduction in the base rate of payment per hundredweight of such portion	
"That portion of the quantity of sugar and liquid sugar which is included within the following intervals of short tons, raw value:	
"350 to 700	$0.05
700 to 1,000	.10
1,000 to 1,500	.20
1,500 to 3,000	.25
3,000 to 6,000	.275
6,000 to 12,000	.30
12,000 to 30,000	.325
More than 30,000	.50"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment would be to strike out the increase which would be made, under the terms of the bill, in benefit payments. The increase is from 60 cents a hundred to 80 cents a hundred.

I do not think this is the time to increase benefit payments out of the Treasury of the United States, when we are faced with the colossal expenditures we are called upon to make for national defense. As it now stands, the bill would cost the Treasury $10,000,000 each year in the payment of the increases in benefit payments from 60 cents to 80 cents a hundred.

The large corporations to which reference has already been made would participate, contrary to the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, in the

increased benefit payments provided by the increase up to 80 cents.

The Senator from Florida has referred to the United States Sugar Corporation. That corporation received last year $470,007.41. Under the pending bill the corporation would receive $474,807.41. Increases would be paid all along the line to these huge corporations.

I hold in my hand a list of about 30 corporations, each of which receives more than $100,000 out of the sugar-allotment program. Of these corporations only 3 are in the United States. The Realty Operators, Inc., of New Orleans, which now receives $121,235.67, would receive $126,035.67 if the bill were enacted in its present form.

The next is the South Coast Corporation, of New Orleans, which now receives $181,220.81, and which would receive $186,020.81.

This list shows the large benefit payments to corporations. Not a single individual grower is in the class receiving over $100,000. They are all large producers.

The Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. receives $567,000 a year, and would receive under the terms of the pending bill $572,000, in round figures.

The Honolulu Plantation Co. received $276,000, and under the terms of the pending bill would receive $281,000.

The Maui Agricultural Co., Ltd., receives $392,000; under the pending bill it would receive $396,000.

The Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., receives $510,000. Under the terms of the pending bill it would receive $514,000.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of corporations which now receive more than $100,000, and figures showing the increase each company would receive if the pending bill were enacted as it is.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of payments of $100,000 or more made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per hundred pounds had been in effect

	Payment made under existing act	Payment which would have been made if provisions of proposed bill had been in effect
Realty Operators, Inc., New Orleans, box 910	$121,235.67	$126,035.67
South Coast Corporation, New Orleans	181,220.81	186,020.81
United States Sugar Corporation, Clewiston	470,007.41	474,807.41
Ewa Plantation Co., Ewa, Hawaii	443,021.49	447,821.49
Grove Farm Co., Ltd., Puhi, Kauai	144,273.07	149,073.07
Hamakua Mill Co., Paauilo, Hawaii	168,978.60	173,778.60
Hawaiian Agricultural Co., Pahala, Hawaii	296,439.94	301,239.94
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Puunene, Maui	567,740.74	572,540.74
Hawaiian Sugar Co., Makaweli, Kauai	245,614.72	250,414.72
Hilo Sugar Co., Hilo, Hawaii	$208,560.74	$213,360.74
Honokaa Sugar Co., Haina, Hawaii	253,155.22	257,955.22
Honolulu Plantation Co., Aiea, Oahu	276,926.80	281,726.80
Hutchinson Sugar Plantation Co., Paauhau, Hawaii	159,694.52	164,494.52
Kahuku Plantation Co., Kahuku, Oahu	207,843.38	212,643.38
Kaiwiki Sugar Co., Ltd., Ookala, Hawaii	101,915.14	106,715.14
Kekaha Sugar Co., Ltd., Kekaha, Kauai	344,944.87	349,744.87
Kilauea Sugar Plantation Co., Kilauea, Kauai	120,358.96	125,158.96
Kohala Sugar Co., Hawi, T. H	340,764.57	345,564.57
Koloa Sugar Co., The, Koloa, Kauai	156,979.56	161,779.56
Laupahoehoe Sugar Co., care of T. H. Davies & Co., Ltd., Honolulu, T. H	158,015.23	162,815.23
Lihue Plantation Co., Ltd., Lihue, Kauai	510,084.57	514,884.57
Maui Agricultural Co., Ltd., Paia, Maui	392,089.49	396,889.49
McBryde Sugar Co., Ltd., Eleele, Kauai	228,390.01	233,190.01
Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., Waipahu, Oahu	510,062.64	514,862.64
Olaa Sugar Co., Ltd., Olaa, T. H	249,441.54	254,241.54
Onomea Sugar Co., Papaikou, T. H	208,861.31	213,661.31
Pasuhau Sugar Plantation Co., Paauhau, T. H	112,036.44	116,836.44
Pepeekeo Sugar Co., Pepeekeo, T. H	119,018.84	123,818.84
Pioneer Mill Co., Ltd., Lahaina, Maui	383,757.38	388,557.38
Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., Waialua, T. H	444,225.97	449,025.97
Wailuku Sugar Co., Wailuku, Maui	211,050.40	215,850.40
Waimanalo Sugar Co., Waimanalo, Oahu	102,035.82	106,835.82
Cambalache, Central, Inc., Arecibo, P. R	168,891.06	173,691.06
Coloso, Central, Inc., Coloso, P. R	150,921.98	155,721.98
Eastern Sugar Associates, Caguas	447,959.73	452,759.73
Fajardo Sugar Growers Association, Fajardo	528,839.15	533,639.15
Finlay Bros. & Waymouth Trading Co., Veg Alta	105,619.73	110,419.73
Georgetti, Compania, S. en C., Barceloneta	101,961.75	106,761.75
Gonzalez, Martinez Manuel, Box A, Salinas	134,376.26	139,176.26
Luce & Co., S. en C., Aguirre	614,643.01	619,443.01
Mercado, Mario, e Hijos, Guayanilla	106,520.01	111,320.01
Roig, Antonio, Successores, S. en C., Humacho	313,814.76	318,614.76
Russell and Co., Sucrs., Esenada	344,804.73	349,604.73
Seralles, J., Est. and Wirshing & Co., S. en C., Ponce	370,211.75	375,011.75
Toa, Compania Azucarera del, Toa Baja	125,168.43	129,968.43
Hakalau Plantation Co., Hakalau, T. H	143,189.46	147,989.46

Comparison of payments of $100,000 or more made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per hundred pounds had been in effect—Continued

	Payment made under existing act	Payment which would have been made if provisions of proposed bill had been in effect
CONTINENTAL SUGAR BEET AREA		
CALIFORNIA		
Aaroe, A. & Son, Soledad	$13,710.87	$17,461.88
Allied Land & Livestock Co., Stockton	17,233.57	21,294.69
Amen, Henry, Woodland	25,680.72	30,144.08
Bass, Arthur, Stockton	11,819.52	15,398.54
Best, Don G., Woodland	18,225.89	22,334.25
Bouendaerede Bros., Long Beach	10,061.39	13,219.01
Browning, J. L., Colusa	21,454.54	25,716.64
Bunn, Lum, Walnut Grove	14,758.68	18,604.94
California Delta Farms, Inc., Stockton	30,174.14	34,851.48
California Lands, Inc., Sacramento	22,280.10	26,581.51
California Packing Corporation, Tracy	43,837.30	48,637.30
Carden, Morris, Davis	12,902.84	16,580.36
Carden, R. E., Woodland	11,843.42	15,424.64
Central Produce Co., Guadalupe	12,454.60	16,091.36
Chong, Look L., Walnut Grove	16,660.41	20,689.34
Christenson, Arnold E., Grimes	11,394.76	14,916.02
Cook, Peter, Jr., Reo Vista	12,955.10	16,637.36
Darsie, Hutchinson & Pettigrew, Inc., Walnut Grove	11,304.76	14,801.50
Empire Farms, Inc., Stockton	38,586.41	43,386.41
Farmer's Produce Co., Ltd., Brawley	10,874.13	14,253.40
Fong, Yen, Sacramento	18,715.57	22,847.23
Fujita, J., Stockton	10,722.21	14,060.06
Garin, H. P., receiver for Garin Co., H. P., Salinas	14,161.85	17,953.82
Gebicke, R. A., Butte City	10,110.32	13,281.31
Giguiere, Morris R., Yolo	14,478.23	18,299.00
Giovannoni, Louis, Walnut Grove	10,642.14	13,958.14
Golden State Asparagus Co., Oakland	14,549.89	18,377.12
Greer, A. J., Davis	14,616.97	18,450.32
Greer, F. J., & Sons, Davis	16,541.41	20,549.72
Haines, Charles F., Hamilton City	15,840.79	19,785.38
Hanson, A. B., Santa Maria	14,586.52	18,417.08
Heringer Bros. & Son, Inc., Clarksburg	56,658.64	61,458.64
Hiatt, P. J., Woodland	10,907.28	14,295.61
Hiramatsu, N., Guadalupe	17,357.18	21,424.16
Holland Land Co., Clarksburg	10,886.46	14,269.08
Holmes, Lester J., Clarksburg	10,067.99	13,252.89
Hunt Bros., El Centro	16,761.46	20,822.48
Iriyama N., Guadalupe	10,099.83	13,267.94
Irvine Co., The, Tustin	10,092.72	13,258.91
Kelley, John C., Stockton	34,959.66	39,759.66
Kruell, Ralph, Clarksburg	13,404.70	17,127.80
La Brea Securities Co., Santa Maria	10,554.23	13,846.28
Lacy Bros., Stockton	25,762.80	30,230.05
Lavis, Carlson & Zeigler, c/o Carlson, H. T., Woodland	10,639.05	13,954.29
Lauppe, L., Sacramento	10,824.95	14,190.82
Leonard, L. L., Woodland	10,210.33	13,408.57
Lewallen, John L., Stockton	11,205.26	14,674.87
M. & T., Inc., Chico	12,096.13	15,700.34
Mandeville Island Farms, Inc., Stockton	41,733.66	46,533.66
McDonald Island Farms, Ltd., Stockton	32,895.89	37,694.89
McFadden Bros., Salinas	10,571.48	13,868.19
McGrath Est. Co., D., Oxnard	18,689.14	22,819.57
Medford Island Co., Stockton	14,324.61	18,131.36
Merwin & Yelland, Clarksburg	26,846.18	31,365.03
Mitaral, Henry, Sunnyvale	13,870.97	17,636.48
Moore, Richard & Allen, Grimes	12,919.01	16,598.00
Morris Bros., Grimes	26,787.27	31,303.32
Newhall Land & Farming Co., Santa Maria	15,776.37	19,715.00
Nunes, J. D., & Sons, Salinas	10,712.06	14,047.11
Nyland, A. S., Hollister	17,221.39	21,281.93
Oeste, C. T., & Knaggs, George Davis	13,704.03	17,454.38
Oda, Y., Woodland	11,355.97	14,866.67
Parella, C., Sacramento	17,882.15	21,974.16
Roddick, A. L., Soledad	15,403.76	19,308.62
Shafter Farms Co., Shafter	10,968.94	14,374.08
Sing Bros., Wheatland	13,328.89	17,045.18
Slater, C. E., Clarksburg	12,002.58	15,598.28
Spreckels Sugar Co., Sacramento	52,234.62	57,034.62

Mr. BYRD. I also ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks a list of those receiving between $10,000 and $100,000, and the increases they would receive if the pending bill were enacted in its present form.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of payments of $10,000 to $100,000 made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds had been in effect

Comparison of payments of $10,000 to $100,000 made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds had been in effect—Continued

	Payment made under existing act	Payment which would have been made if provisions of proposed bill had been in effect
CONTINENTAL SUGAR BEET AREA—Continued		
CALIFORNIA—continued		
Stuhlmuller Bros., Woodland	$10,144.21	$13,324.43
Studarus, C. C., Clarksburg	14,325.52	18,132.38
Totman, Clifford, Rio Vista	11,846.72	15,428.24
Ueda, Chiyono, Stockton	12,847.78	16,520.30
Westgate, E. W., Stockton	15,426.88	19,333.82
Wetherbee, C. H., Clarksburg	21,271.21	25,524.58
Wilson, George H., Clarksburg	30,242.47	44,042.47
COLORADO		
American Crystal Sugar Co., Denver	57,769.21	62,569.21
UTAH		
Utah-Idaho Sugar Co., Salt Lake City	14,530.17	18,355.64
WYOMING		
Compton, J. A., Worland	51,210.58	56,010.58
MAINLAND SUGARCANE AREA		
LOUISIANA		
Alma Plantation, Ltd., Lakeland	24,961.23	29,390.31
Armelise Planting Co., Paincourtville	15,312.86	19,209.44
Bayou Cypremort Co., Louisa	11,154.55	14,610.40
Bergeron & Walton, route No. 1, Napoleonville	11,866.03	15,449.36
Blanchard Planting Co., Tallieu	17,703.13	21,786.56
Burton-Sutton Oil Co., Inc., White Castle	16,291.17	20,276.72
Buttram & Browne, star route B, Franklin	11,113.83	14,558.46
Caffery, John M., Franklin	16,157.92	20,131.40
Caire & Graugnard, Edgard	22,462.78	26,772.86
Caldwell Sugars, Inc., Thibodaux	23,760.13	28,132.02
Catherine Sugar Co., Inc., Lobdell	12,610.35	16,261.28
Cypremort Stores, Inc., star route A, Franklin	12,382.68	16,012.88
Delgado-Albania Plantation Commission, Jenerette	14,110.06	17,897.36
Devall Company, Ind., Chamberlain	12,232.33	15,848.96
Dugas & LeBlanc, Ltd., Paincourtville	36,787.77	41,587.77
Duhe, J. P., New Iberia	13,489.62	17,220.44
Farwell, Charles A., New Orleans	13,161.16	16,862.12
Foster, W. Prescott, Franklin	61,668.93	66,468.93
Gay, Edward J., Planting & Mfg. Co., Plaquemine	25,058.70	29,492.50
Godchaux Sugars, Inc., New Orleans	97,518.16	102,318.16
Hymel-Steffins, Inc., Reserve	17,139.47	21,196.08
Kahao, M. J., Kahns	11,430.29	14,961.24
Lanaux, T., Sons, Lucy	18,050.33	22,150.33
Laws Co., Harry L., Inc., Cinclare	26,931.42	31,454.35
Leche, John, R. F. D., Thibodaux	11,613.35	15,173.60
Lemann & Thibaut, Donaldsonville	12,022.08	15,614.72
Lepine, J. Wilson, Thibodaux	16,161.53	20,135.24
Levert Land Co., J. B., Thibodaux	16,912.20	20,954.24
Levert-St. John, Inc., St. Martinville	28,370.17	32,961.57
Louisiana State Penitentiary Angola	62,633.37	67,433.37
Milliken & Farwell, Inc., New Orleans	65,108.82	69,908.82
Murrell, George M., Bayou Goula	19,760.38	23,941.79
Patout, M. A. & Son, Ltd., Patoutville	13,540.23	17,275.76
Robichaux, E. G., Co., Labadieville	20,860.38	25,094.15
Robichaux, Francis, trustee for heirs of E. G. Robichaux, deceased, Labadieville	20,876.71	25,111.31

Comparison of payments of $10,000 to $100,000 made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds had been in effect—Continued

	Payment made under existing act	Payment which would have been made if provisions of proposed bill had been in effect
MAINLAND SUGARCANE AREA—Continued		
LOUISIANA—continued		
San Francisco Planting & Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Lions	$18,720.71	$22,852.57
Savoie, Clarence J., Belle Rose	16,805.21	20,837.48
Shadyside Co., Ltd., star route A, Franklin	21,959.47	26,245.63
Slack Bros., Inc., Rosedale	13,044.84	16,735.28
Sterling Sugars, Inc., Franklin	48,403.16	53,203.16
St. James Operators, Inc., box 910, New Orleans	10,220.04	13,420.96
St. Paul Bourgeois, Inc., Jeanerette	16,685.83	20,707.28
Supple's Sons, J., Planting Co., Ltd., Bayou Goula	23,435.68	27,792.12
The Maryland Co., Inc., Franklin	15,431.34	19,338.68
Thibaut, B. & D., Napoleonville	27,551.58	32,104.01
Triangle Farms, Inc., McCall	24,546.69	28,956.03
Valentine Sugars, Lockport	16,487.97	20,491.40
Westover Planting Co., Kahns	26,306.78	30,799.96
Wilbert's Sons, A., Lumber & Shingle Co., Plaquemine	73,358.44	78,158.44
Wilkinson, H., Sr., Port Allen	20,735.50	24,963.36
FLORIDA		
Douglas, A. B., Fellsmere	13,306.80	17,349.50
Leonard, E. F., Fellsmere	10,936.40	14,332.64
Tiedtke, John, Clewiston	12,727.00	16,350.60
HAWAII		
Gay & Robinson, Makaweli, Kauai	94,448.95	99,248.95
Honomu Sugar Co., Honomu, T. H.	91,482.31	96,282.31
Kaeleku Sugar Co., Ltd., Hana, Maui	80,537.30	85,337.30
Rice, William Hyde, Ltd., Lihue, Kauai	42,577.20	47,377.20
Waiakea Mill Co., Hilo, T. H.	86,570.34	91,370.34
Waianae Co., Waianae, Oahu	89,062.88	93,862.88
Wailea Milling Co., Ltd., post-office box E, Hakalau, T. H.	30,851.68	35,561.28
Waimea Sugar Mill Co., Ltd., Waimea, Kauai	36,267.43	41,067.43
PUERTO RICO		
Acosta, Jose B. Ramirez and Humberto Martinez, San German	10,033.78	13,183.80
Aledea Agricultural Corporation, Arecibo	13,696.73	17,446.40
Alfonso Carreras, Louis, Arecibo	13,287.62	17,000.12
Alianza, Central, Inc., Arecibo	26,440.79	30,940.20
Angel Tio, Juan, San German	21,356.43	25,613.90
Angel Tio, Juan, trustee for Juan Angel Tio and Antonio R. Matos, joint operators, San German	21,154.47	25,402.26
Angel Tio, Juan, trustee for Juan Angel Tio and Santiago Sambolin, joint operators, San German	21,138.72	25,385.76
Avalo Garcia, Juan, Juncos	15,824.09	19,767.20
Barreto, Arturo, Aguadilla	11,039.92	14,464.38
Bayamon, Asociacion Agricola de, Bayamon	58,423.29	63,223.29
Behn Brothers Association, San Juan	20,077.15	24,273.66
Berrios, Ramon L., box 23, Guarbo	10,655.65	13,975.36
Buena Vista Agricultural & Dairy Co., Carolina	22,160.27	26,455.95
Cabassa, Jacobo L., box 183, Ponce	58,435.41	63,235.41
Calaf, Jaime, trustee for Jaime Calaf and Federico Calaf, joint operators, Wamati	73,683.74	78,483.74
Calderon Rivera, Rafael, Caguas	31,821.30	36,577.05
Carbonell, Salvador, Mayagues	10,968.04	14,372.96
Caronda, Francisco, Juncos	12,307.64	15,931.04
Carlo, Delfin Rodriguez, box 187, Sabana Grande	11,817.47	15,396.32
Cartagena, Nicolas M., box 605, Caguas	12,156.62	15,766.28

Comparison of payments of $10,000 to $100,000 made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds had been in effect—Continued

	Payment made under existing act	Payment which would have been made if provisions of proposed bill had been in effect
PUERTO RICO—Continued		
Cautino, Genaro Guayama	$28,580.52	$33,182.01
Cerra Becerril, Luis, box 39, Rio Piedras	17,527.53	21,602.64
Cervoini, Eduardo, trustee for the heirs of the estate of Cervoini Massari, deceased, Arroyo	14,085.72	17,870.72
Cooperativas, Agricolas: Cuatro Calles Enriqueta, Concordia, Yague, Catalina, Garonne la Nueva, Garonne la Vieja and Columbia, jointly, Arroyo	88,268.24	93,068.24
Cooperativas Agricolas: Palma, Felicita, Providencia, and Bordelaise, jointly, Arroyo	46,796.39	51,596.39
Esteves, Alberto, Aguadillo	28,452.85	33,048.25
Fajardo, Ross and Carolos L., box 293, Mayaguez	29,427.03	34,068.83
Fas, Jose J., Cabo Rojo	10,755.55	14,102.48
Fernandez Ortiz, Angel, trustee for Rosario Garzot and Matilde Garzot, joint operators, box 94, Naguabo	10,022.86	13,169.94
Fernandez, Faustino, box 111, Naguabo	18,816.75	22,953.22
Figuerola, Miguel, box 504, Caguas	26,945.30	31,468.87
Fonalledas Cordova, Jaime, trustee for the heirs of Jaime Fonalledas, deceased, Toa Baja	42,546.04	47,346.04
Fraticelli, Antonio, box 746, Arecibo	17,402.40	21,471.52
Fraticelli, Antonio, trustee for Antonio Guidicelli Grillasca and Antonio Fraticelli, joint operators, Arecibo	20,667.33	24,891.97
Fuentefrias, S., Est., box 51, Ceiba	11,936.05	15,525.69
Garcia Mendez, M. A., post-office box 267, San German	12,559.16	16,205.44
Gilormini, Domingo, trustee for Otilia Lluberas Negroni, Ascunsion Negroni Albedia, Domingo Gilormini and Sobrinos de Arturo Lluberas, joint operators, Guayanilla	39,554.99	44,354.99
Godreau & Co., S. en C., Salinas	29,194.44	33,825.12
Godreau, Elias & Ga., Sucs. de, post-office box 43, Salinas	34,734.50	39,534.50
Gonzalez & Co., Scurs. de Jose, S. en C., Guayama	88,660.52	93,460.52
Gonzalez, Diego Gonzalez, Isabela	10,523.10	13,806.67
Gonzalez Perez, Felix, Yauco	14,281.30	18,084.14
Gonzalez, Rafael M., box 85, Gurabo	16,115.97	20,085.57
Guillemard, A., trustee for the heirs of Mateo Fajardo Cardona, deceased, Mayaguez	98,701.19	103,501.19
Guillemard, A., trustee for the heirs of Mateo Fajardo Davilla, deceased, Mayaguez	20,424.95	24,638.05
Hijo, Jose F. Aponte, box 103, San Lorenzo	12,217.89	15,833.14
Irizarry Cancel, Cornelio, San German	15,045.44	18,917.76
Iturregui, Nicolas, box 31, Trujillo Alto	14,075.66	17,859.81
Livingston, Clara E., Dorado	12,093.57	15,697.53
Lopez, Rafael H., Aguadilla	21,313.08	25,568.47
Lucas P. Valdivieso, Jorge, Central Pellejas, Adjuntas	16,636.28	20,653.22
Lucas P. Valdivieso, Jorge, trustee for the heirs of Lucas P. Valdivieso, deceased, box 1144, Ponce	66,811.31	71,611.31
Lucchetti, Acosta F., trustee for Juan Michel Lucchetti, Triston L. Lucchetti, joint operators, box 141, Yauco	12,132.02	15,739.47
Lugo Ramirez, Juan San German	13,518.90	17,232.43
Maria, Ana. Sugar Co., Mayaguez	12,188.81	15,801.43
Martinez, José, box 58, Yabucoa	11,818.00	15,396.91
Mayaguez Sugar Co., Inc., box 569, Mayaguez	65,285.96	70,085.96

Comparison of payments of $10,000 to $100,000 made to sugar producers on the 1939 crop with payments which would have been made if proposed basic payment rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds had been in effect—Continued

	Payment made under existing act	Payment which would have been made if provisions of proposed bill had been in effect
PUERTO RICO—Continued		
Mendez, Antonio, Naguabo	$11,626.79	$15,211.36
Mendez, Eduardo, Jr., trustee for the heirs of Eduardo Mendez, deceased, San Sebastian	21,122.60	25,368.92
McConnie, Julian O., box 716, Caguas	19,774.98	23,957.12
Manrique, Cipriano, Caguas	16,914.48	20,956.67
Morell, Manuel, post-office box 86, Arecibo	10,829.36	14,196.46
Nevares, Hermanos, Toa Baja	20,311.97	24,519.69
Nido & Co., box 27, Arroyo	12,664.00	16,319.82
Ortiz, Luis, Caguas	10,747.01	14,091.64
Padovani Giorgetti, Carlos, box 703, Mayaguez	13,088.24	16,782.62
Pepino, Asociados del, San Sebastian	58,118.73	62,918.73
P. R. Consolidated Fruit Co., Bayamon	14,491.91	18,313.90
Ramirez, Ubaldino, trustee for Ubaldino Ramirez and M. A. Garcia Mendez, joint operators Mayaguez	16,156.59	20,129.91
Rio, Rafael Torrech, box 193, Bayamon	11,775.12	15,350.13
Rios, Antonio Valdes, box 161, Arecibo	10,245.93	13,453.92
Rodriguez Garzot, William, trustee for the heirs of the estate of Faustino R. Fuertes, deceased, Naguabo	10,527.84	13,812.71
Rotger, Efren, Naguabo	10,589.53	13,891.22
Sambolin, Santiago, San German	11,497.46	15,046.77
Sauri, Jose, trustee for Jose Sauri and Carmen Sauri, joint operators, box 1349, Ponce	26,020.62	30,500.18
Sauri, Rafael, box 1947, Ponce	13,055.46	16,746.86
Sauri y Subira, Corporation Azucarera, box 1390, Ponce	26,234.63	30,724.49
Semiday, Jose, trustee for Jose Semiday and Santos Semidez, joint operators, Villalba	21,002.58	25,243.18
Sergio, Gabriel and Margarita Ortiz Toro and Maria del Toro Vda. Ortiz, Jayuya	21,722.80	25,997.69
Quinones Salazar, Ernesto, box 125, San German	14,510.87	18,334.59
Quintana Colon, Domingo, Yabucoa	13,012.97	16,700.52
Quintero & Davila, Ltd., box 1658, Manati	39,181.30	43,981.30
Ramirez, Roseli Alfredo, Mayaguez	99,074.89	103,874.89
Sociedad Agricola de Rio Piedras, Rio Piedras	98,181.94	102,981.94
Soller Sugar Co., Inc., Arecibo	44,401.73	49,201.73
Stella, Jesus, post office box 46, Guayanilla	14,415.22	18,230.24
Subira, Luis Frau, trustee for Providencia Subria, Concepcion Subria and Maria Subria Echenarria, joint operators, box 1783, Ponce	28,700.47	33,307.63
The Bank of Nova Scotia, San Juan	58,953.91	63,753.91
Tio, Felix E. Bayamon	13,954.16	17,727.26
Tomas, Subirana Mir Dr. Ashbord St. No. 38, Santurce	28,305.08	32,893.41
Torres, Troche, Julio, trustee for Allah Torres and Marino Torres, joint operators, box 61, Ponce	11,192.89	14,659.34
Usera, Vicente, Ponce	22,668.18	26,988.10
Vallecillo, Geronimo, box 3835, Santurce	17,690.42	21,773.29
Velazquez, Rodrigues Leoncio, box 126, Caguas	28,927.23	33,545.20
Verdaguer Hacienda, Aguirre	24,512.95	28,920.71
Victoria, Central, Inc., Carolina	74,212.97	79,012.97
Zeno, Alcides, trustee for the heirs of Dario Franceschi, deceased, and Ann A de Zeno, joint operators, Yauco	13,571.56	17,309.89

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall not discuss the matter further. I am in complete sympathy with the request of the majority leader that the proposed legislation be expedited this afternoon as much as possible. I hope the Senate will adopt my amendment, and let the benefit payments remain as they are at present, because it seems to me they are sufficiently high. If the proposed increase shall be made, as I have said, it will cost the United States Treasury $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All I desire to say, Mr. President, is that I hope the amendment will be rejected. If it shall be agreed to, the economy of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and parts of the areas of Louisiana and parts of the areas of California will be completely upset, and I think this is a very bad time to be upsetting economies. They are badly enough upset as it is. I certainly hope the amendment will be rejected.

I ask that a table showing the income and expenses under the Sugar Act of 1937 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of income and expenses under Sugar Act of 1937

	Fiscal year 1938 (actual)	Fiscal year 1939 (actual)	Fiscal year 1940 (actual)	Fiscal year 1941 (actual)
(A) Revenue: Tax collections	$33,508,820	$69,194,645	$73,601,560	$80,146,351
(B) Expenditures—Payments to producers:				
Continental sugar beet area	16,540,213	23,121,703	21,687,898	23,188,119
Continental sugarcane area	5,382,710	6,752,392	5,560,132	4,192,596
Hawaii		12,768,552	8,973,715	8,851,541
Puerto Rico		9,471,022	10,364,274	9,117,437
Subtotal	21,922,923	52,113,669	46,586,019	45,349,693
Administrative expenses	237,350	696,696	800,805	769,293
Tota expenditures	22,160,273	52,810,365	47,386,824	46,118,986
(C) Excess of revenue over expenditures	11,348,547	16,384,280	26,214,736	34,027,365

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the amendment of the committee.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5988) was read the third time, and passed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 919) thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

REGISTRATION OF PROPAGANDA AGENTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2060, Order of Business No. 949, requiring the registration of certain persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2060) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

INVESTIGATION OF JAPANESE ATTACK ON HAWAII

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 259, a measure of some importance, to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, and documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, Senators now present will recall that I introduced a similar joint resolution last

evening, a companion measure to the one now being considered, Senate Joint Resolution 121. The House joint resolution was passed by the House early today, and I am asking that the House joint resolution be considered at this time, and then I shall ask that Senate Joint Resolution 121 be indefinitely postponed.

This is a stereotyped measure, granting to the commission appointed by the President to investigate the disaster in Hawaii the power to subpena witnesses, and to petition courts, in the event an obstinate witness should refuse to testify or should refuse to produce books and papers, so that such witness might be punished for contempt in any of the Federal courts. There was no objection to the measure in the Committee on the Judiciary of either House, and I understand the joint resolution passed the House this morning without a dissenting vote. If there are any questions to be asked, I shall be glad to answer them. It is necessary that the commission have the power sought, because they will start on their labors very shortly, and they want to subpena some witnesses before they proceed to Hawaii to inaugurate the investigation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this is essential legislation, and there is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask that Senate Joint Resolution 121, Calendar No. 955, the companion measure, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGISTRATION OF PROPAGANDA AGENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2060) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like briefly to explain Senate bill 2060. It is an amendment to the act of June 8, 1938, for the registration of foreign-propaganda agents. The pending bill has the approval of the Department of Justice, the Post Office Department, and the Department of State. It is not a punitive bill necessarily, but a bill of disclosure. It enlarges the registration powers and makes them more complete. It defines what is meant by propaganda agents of foreign political powers, and also forces a disclosure of their principals.

The amendment, which was adopted unanimously in the Judiciary Committee, merely makes some slight changes for clarity in the bill as originally drafted, but we felt that in order to shorten the bill the amendment should be substituted for the original language of the bill.

In four or five respects the bill enlarges the present law. It requires full information as to principals, not only one but all principals. It requires full information as to agents of foreign governments. It excludes proper diplomatic representatives of foreign governments from its provisions, and affects only those who are engaged in the dissemination of political propaganda. It requires the labeling of all political propaganda, and requires registration, so that this country cannot be used as the base for dissemination of political propaganda in the South American republics.

If there are any questions to be asked on the matter I shall be glad to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was to strike out, beginning in line 1, page 2, down to and including line 21 on page 24, and to insert from line 22 on page 24 to line 6 on page 49, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631, U. S. C., title 22, sec 233 (a) to sec. 233 (g)), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"It is hereby declared to be the policy and purpose of this Act to protect the national defense, internal security, and foreign relations of the United States by requiring public disclosure by persons engaging in propaganda activities and other activities for or on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals so that the Government and the people of the United States may be informed of the identity of such persons and may appraise their statements and actions in the light of their associations and activities.

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. As used in and for the purposes of this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals;

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) A government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) An individual affiliated or associated with, or supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of this section 1 (b);

"(3) A person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and is a citizen of and domiciled within the United States or that such person is not an individual, is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and has its principal place of business within the United States. Nothing in this clause (3) shall limit the operation of clause (5) of this section 1 (b);

"(4) A partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(5) A domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, subsidized directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (3), or (4) of this section 1 (b);

"(c) Except as provided in section 1 (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' includes—

"(1) Any person who acts or agrees to act, within the United States, as, or who is or holds himself out to be whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, servant, agent, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal;

"(2) Any person who within the United States collects information for or reports information to a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits or accepts compensation, contributions, or loans, directly or indirectly, from a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits, disburses, dispenses, or collects compensation, contributions, loans, money, or anything of value, directly or indirectly, for a foreign principal; who within the United States acts at the order, request, or under the direction, of a foreign principal;

"(3) Any person who assumes or purports to act within the United States as an agent of a foreign principal in any of the respects set forth in clauses (1) and (2) of this section 1 (c); and

"(4) Any person who is an officer or member of the active or reserve military, naval, or other armed forces of any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of section 1 (b) hereof, or who is an officer of or employed by any such foreign principal; and proof of any affiliation or employment, specified in this clause (4), of any person within a period of 5 years previous to the effective date of this act shall create a rebuttable presumption that such person is an agent of a foreign principal;

"(d) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' does not include any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the Postmaster General a sworn statement in compliance with section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 553), as amended, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (2), or (4) of section 1 (b) hereof, or by any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this act;

"(e) The term 'government of a foreign country' includes any person or group of persons exercising sovereign de facto or de jure political jurisdiction over any country, other than the United States, or over any part of such country, and includes any subdivision of any such group and any group or agency to which such sovereign de facto or de jure authority or functions are directly or indirectly delegated. Such term shall include any faction or body of insurgents within a country assuming to exercise governmental authority whether such faction or body of insurgents has or has not been recognized by the United States;

"(f) The term 'foreign political party' includes any organization or any other combination of individuals in a country other than the United States, or any unit or branch thereof, having for an aim or purpose, or which is engaged in any activity devoted in whole or in part to, the establishment, administration, control, or acquisition of administration or control, of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision theref, or the furtherance or influencing of the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof;

"(g) The term 'public-relations counsel' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in informing, advising, or in any way representing a principal in any matter pertaining to political or public interests, policies, or relations;

"(h) The term 'publicity agent' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in the publication or dissemination of oral, visual, graphic, written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including publication by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or otherwise;

"(i) The term 'information-service employee' includes any person who is engaged in furnishing, disseminating, or publishing accounts, descriptions, information, or data with respect to the political, industrial, employment, economic, social, cultural or other benefits, advantages, facts, or conditions of any country other than the United States or of any government of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or of a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(j) The term 'political propaganda' includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person (1) which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrine, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissension, or (2) which advocates, advises, instigates, or promotes any racial, social, political, or religious disorder, civil riot, or other conflict involving the use of force or violence in any other American republic or the overthrow of any government or political subdivision of any other American republic by any means involving the use of force or violence. As used in this section 1 (j) the term 'disseminating' includes transmitting or causing to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or offering or causing to be offered in the United States mails;

"(k) The term 'registration statement' means the registration statement required to be filed with the Attorney General under section 2 (a) hereof; and any supplements thereto required to be filed under section 2 (b) hereof, and includes all documents and papers required to be filed therewith or amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, whether attached thereto or incorporated therein by reference;

"(l) The term 'American republic' includes any of the states which were signatory to the Final Act of the Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics at Habana, Cuba, July 30, 1940;

"(m) The term 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States;

"(n) The term 'prints' means newspapers and periodicals, books, pamphlets, sheet music, visiting cards, address cards, printing proofs, engravings, photographs, pictures, drawings, plans, maps, patterns to be cut out, catalogs, prospectuses, advertisements, and printed, engraved, lithographed, or autographed notices of various kinds, and, in general, all impressions or reproductions obtained on paper or other material assimilable to paper, on parchment or on cardboard, by means of printing, engraving, lithography, autography, or any other easily recognizable mechanical process, with the exception of the copying press, stamps with movable or immovable type, and the typewriter.

"REGISTRATION

"SEC. 2. (a) No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplements thereto as required by this section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) hereof or unless he is exempt from registration under the provisions of this act. Except as hereinafter provided, every person who is an agent of a foreign principal on the effective date of this act shall within 10 days thereafter, and every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal after the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, of which one copy shall be transmitted promptly by the Attorney General to the Secretary of State for such comment, if any, as the Secretary of State may desire to make from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this act. The registration statement shall include the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this act:

"(1) Registrant's name, principal business address, and all other business addresses in the United States or elsewhere, and all residence addresses, if any;

"(2) Status of the registrant; if an individual, nationality; if a partnership, name, residence addresses, and nationality of each partner and a true and complete copy of its articles of copartnership; if an association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals, the name, residence addresses, and nationality of each director and officer and of each person performing the functions of a director or officer and a true and complete copy of its charter, articles of incorporation, association, constitution, and bylaws, and amendments thereto; a copy of every other instrument or document and a statement of the terms and conditions of every oral agreement relating to its organization, powers, and purposes; and a statement of its ownership and control;

"(3) A comprehensive statement of the nature of registrant's business; a complete list of registrant's employees and a statement of the nature of the work of each, unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General; the name and address of every foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act; the character of the business or other activities of every such foreign principal, and, if any such foreign principal be other than a natural person, a statement of the ownership and control of each; and the extent, if any, to which each such foreign principal is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party;

"(4) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is an agent of a foreign principal; a comprehensive statement of the nature and method of performance of each such contract, and of the existing and proposed activity or activities engaged in or to be engaged in by the registrant as agent of a foreign principal for each such foreign principal;

"(5) The nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received within the preceding 60 days from each such foreign principal, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;

"(6) A detailed statement of every activity which the registrant is performing or is assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or any other person other than a foreign principal and which requires his registation hereunder;

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and, if an individual, the nationality, of any person who has within the preceding 60 days contributed or paid money or anything of value to the registrant in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this section 2 (a) and the amount or value of the same;

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding 60 days in furtherance of or in any way in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person;

"(9) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is performing or assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or for a foreign principal or for any person other than a foreign principal any activities which require his registration hereunder;

"(10) Such other statements, information, or documents pertinent to the purposes of this act as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may from time to time require;

"(11) Such further statements and such further copies of documents as are necessary to make the statements made in the registration statement and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(b) Every agent of a foreign principal who has filed a registration statement required by section 2 (a) hereof shall, within 30 days after the expiration of each period of 6 months succeeding such filing, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth with respect to such preceding 6 months' period such facts as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may deem necessary to make the information required under section 2 hereof accurate, complete, and current with respect to such period. In connection with the information furnished under clauses (3), (4), (6), and (9) of section 2 (a) hereof, the registrant shall give notice to the Attorney General of any changes therein within 10 days after such changes occur. If the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, he may, in any particular case, require supplements to the registration statement to be filed at more frequent intervals in respect to all or particular items of information to be furnished.

"(c) The registration statement and supplements thereto shall be executed under oath as follows: If the registrant is an individual, by him; if the registrant is a partnership, by a majority of the members thereof; if the registrant is a person other than an individual or a partnership, by a majority of the officers thereof or epersons performing the functions of officers or by a majority of the board of directors thereof or persons performing the functions of directors, if any.

"(d) The fact that a registration statement or supplement thereto has been filed shall

not necessarily be deemed a full compliance with this act and the regulations thereunder on the part of the registrant; nor shall it indicate that the Attorney General has in any way passed upon the merits of such registration statement or supplement thereto; nor shall it preclude prosecution, as provided for in this act, for willful failure to file a registration statement or supplement thereto when due or for a willful false statement of a material fact therein or the willful omission of a material fact required to be stated therein or the willful omission of a material fact or copy of a material document necessary to make the statements made in a registration statement and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(e) If any agent of a foreign principal, required to register under the provisions of this act, has previously thereto registered with the Attorney General under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201), the Attorney General, in order to eliminate inappropriate duplication, may permit the incorporation by reference in the registration statement or supplements thereto filed hereunder of any information or documents previously filed by such agent of a foreign principal under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201).

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 3. The requirements of section 2 (a) hereof shall not apply to the following agents of foreign principals:

"(a) A duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such officer;

"(b) Any official of a foreign government, if such government is recognized by the United States, who is not a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, or a citizen of the United States, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such official are of public record in the Department of State, while said official is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such official;

"(c) Any member of the staff of, or any person employed by, a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, other than a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, or information-service employee, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such member or employee are of public record in the Department of State, while said member or employee is engaged exclusively in the performance of activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such member or employee;

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 48), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder.

"The exemption under this subsection shall not be available to any person who knowingly secures or acquires, or assists in securing or acquiring, or attempts to secure or acquire, on behalf of a foreign principal or principals, for any purpose whatsoever, the ownership or control, direct or indirect, of 1 percent or more of the outstanding voting securities, or the direction or control by any means whatsoever of any of the policies of or of any partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, organized or operating as a business enterprise under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the political or military jurisdiction of the United States;

"(e) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or of the fine arts.

"FILING AND LABELING OF POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

"SEC. 4. (a) Every person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act and who transmits or causes to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons shall, not later than forty-eight hours after the beginning of the transmittal thereof, send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act to transmit or cause to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons, unless such political propaganda is conspicuously marked at its beginning with, or prefaced or accompanied by, a true and accurate statement, in the language or languages used in such political propaganda, setting forth that the person transmitting such political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted is registered under this act with the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., as an agent of a foreign principal, together with the name and address of such agent of a foreign principal and of each of his foreign principals; that, as required by this act, his registration statement is available for inspection at and copies of such political propaganda are being filed with the Department of Justice; and that registration of agents of foreign principals required by the act does not indicate approval by the United States Government of the contents of their political propaganda. The Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe the language or languages and the manner and form in which such statement shall be made and require the inclusion of such other information contained in the registration statement identifying such agent of a foreign principal and such political propaganda and its sources as may be appropriate.

"(c) The copies of political propaganda required by this act to be sent to the Librarian of Congress shall be available for public inspection under such regulations as he may prescribe.

"(d) For purposes of the Library of Congress, other than for public distribution, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are authorized, upon the request of the Librarian of Congress to forward to the Library of Congress 50 copies, or as many fewer thereof as are available, of all foreign prints determined to be prohibited entry under the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of all foreign prints excluded from the mails under authority of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230).

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to permit the entry and the Postmaster General is authorized to permit the transmittal in the mails of foreign prints imported for governmental purposes by authority or for the use of the United States or for the use of the Library of Congress.

"BOOKS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 5. Every agent of a foreign principal registered under this act shall keep and preserve while he is an agent of a foreign principal such books of account and other records with respect to all his activities, the disclosure of which is required under the provisions of this act, as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and shall preserve the same for a period of 3 years following the termination of such status. Until regulations are in effect under this section every agent of a foreign principal shall keep books of account and shall preserve all written records with respect to his activities. Such books and records shall be open at all reasonable times to the inspection of any official charged with the enforcement of this act. It shall be unlawful for any person willfully to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to attempt to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to cause to be concealed, destroyed, obliterated, mutilated, or falsified, any books or records required to be kept under the provisions of this section.

"PUBLIC EXAMINATION OF OFFICIAL RECORDS

"SEC. 6. The Attorney General shall retain in permanent form one copy of all registration statements and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda furnished under this act, and the same shall be public records and open to public examination and inspection at such reasonable hours, under such regulations, as the Attorney General may prescribe, and copies of the same shall be furnished to every applicant at such reasonable fee as the Attorney General may prescribe. The Attorney General may withdraw from public examination the registration statement and other statements of any agent of a foreign principal whose activities have ceased to be of a character which requires registration under the provisions of this act.

"LIABILITY OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 7. Each officer, or person performing the functions of an officer, and each director, or person performing the functions of a director, of an agent of a foreign principal which is not an individual shall be under obligation to cause such agent to execute and file a registration statement and supplements thereto as and when such filing is required under sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) hereof and shall also be under obligation to cause such agent to comply with all the requirements of sections 4 (a), 4 (b), and 5 and all other requirements of this act. In case of failure of any such agent of a foreign principal to comply with any of the requirements of this act, each of its officers, or persons performing the functions of officers, and each of its directors, or persons performing the functions of directors, shall be subject to prosecution therefor.

"ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person who—

"(1) Willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder, or

"(2) In any registration statement or supplement thereto or in any statement under

section 4 (a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda or in any other document filed with or furnished to the Attorney General under the provisions of this act willfully makes a false statement of a material fact or willfully omits any material fact required to be stated therein or willfully omits a material fact or a copy of a material document necessary to make the statements therein and the copies of documents furnished therewith not misleading—

shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) In any proceeding under this act in which it is charged that a person is an agent of a foreign principal with respect to a foreign principal outside of the United States, proof of the specific identity of the foreign principal shall be permissible but not necessary.

"(c) Any alien who shall be convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate, any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder shall be subject to deportation in the manner provided by sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890) as amended.

"(d) The Postmaster General may declare to be nonmailable any communication or expression falling within clause (2) of section 1 (j) hereof in the form of prints or in any other form reasonably adapted to, or reasonably appearing to be intended for, dissemination or circulation among two or more persons, which is offered or caused to be offered for transmittal in the United States mails to any person or persons in any other American republic by any agent of a foreign principal, if the Postmaster General is informed in writing by the Secretary of State that the duly accredited diplomatic representative of such American republic has made written representation to the Department of State that the admission or circulation of such communication or expression in such American republic is prohibited by the laws thereof and has requested in writing that its transmittal thereto be stopped.

"APPLICABILITY OF ACT

"SEC. 9. This act shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 10. The Attorney General may at any time make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

"SEC. 11. The Attorney General shall, from time to time, make a report to the Congress concerning the administration of this act, including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 13. This act is in addition to and not in substitution for any other existing statute.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.'"

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Upon the effective date of this act, all powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of State under the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631), as amended, shall be transferred to and become vested in the Attorney General, together with all property, books, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations used by or available to the Secretary of State for carrying out the functions devolving on him under the above-cited act. All rules, regulations, and forms which have been issued by the Secretary of State pursuant to the provisions of said act, and which are in effect, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, revoked, or repealed.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its approval, except that prior to such sixtieth day the Attorney General may make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as our colleague from West Virginia knows, he and I with others on the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary who considered this proposed legislation, spent many hours in consideration and study of the problems involved. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to page 40, the section which commences with line 6, and runs through line 20, and to recall to him the discussion we had as to whether, in the first place, that exemption should be in the bill, and whether the 1 percent or more should be retained as a basis for the degree of control of a corporation which was being sought. Does the Senator recall our discussions about that?

Mr. KILGORE. I do.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator that I have within the last 24 hours been consulted by several members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who renewed to me much of the sort of argument and objection which we considered at such length in our committee. They tell me that if that section were out there would be no slightest obstacle, in their judgment, to the House receiving the bill, giving it a House number, and passing it at once. Whether the consideration of speed and expedition in the handling of the legislation is such as to justify our reconsidering the committee amendment in that particular at this time I leave to the Senator. I suggest to him respectfully, however, that the exemption we then discussed and placed in the bill, may not be necessary in the light of the fact that since the bill was reported from the committee we have also amended the Trading With the Enemy Act on the floor by passing the President's war powers bill. In that particular we have gone much farther with reference to the prohibition, much less the licensing, of the acquisition of stock in this country in behalf of a foreign principal, and it may well be that the powers given by the President's war powers measure go so much farther than anything we are doing or saying here that the proposed action may be unnecessary.

With such considerations in mind, if our colleague from West Virginia shares my view, as I now express it, that we would be wise in deleting lines 6 to 20 inclusive, on page 20, I should be glad to have him offer the amendment, or if he chooses, I shall offer it.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his suggestion. We discussed the matter in the committee. The weakness which I see in the stand taken by the House is the fact that the Trading With the Enemy Act does not apply to puppet states such as Vichy, France, and Spain, and other countries whose nationals could come in and acquire stock. That was my only reason, as I stated in the committee, for insisting on the 1-percent rule, and requiring registration in order to block the Swiss or any other nationals in Europe from dealing through agents. This would not prevent the purchase of stock. It would simply require the registration of the principal who purchased it. I do not think it is an unreasonable requirement at a time like this. But the Department of Justice has no objection to striking out the provision, though I feel it should be left in the bill as a proper safeguard, as did the entire committee when we discussed it. What influence has been working in the House committee I do not know. But I still cling to my belief.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say simply to the Senator that there is no amendment to the committee amendment pending; none has been offered by me. I am still supporting my own committee's position on the matter. I say, however, that it is a perfectly proper consideration to entertain at this time, in view of the fact that under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as they appear in the War Powers Act which the Senate passed 2 or 3 days ago, the President may prohibit entirely all transactions of whatever kind for any foreign government, including puppet states. Let me say further, that he also may permit transactions under such regulations as he chooses to make. Therefore, since under his regulations he will have the power and, in fact, does have the power, to reach the very type of transaction involved here, I think we might be well advised to strike out lines 6 to 20, inclusive, on page 40 of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. I may suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that he offer the amendment and let the Senate decide with respect to it, because I think as a result of this discussion, the Members of the Senate are well aware of the circumstances. Let the question be decided by the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his cooperation and courtesy in considering the matter. In order to bring it to a head, I move to strike from page 40 lines 6 to 17, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 40 of the committee amendment it is pro-

posed to strike out lines 6 to 17, inclusive, as follows:

"The exemption under this subsection shall not be available to any person who knowingly secures or acquires, or assists in securing or acquiring, or attempts to secure or acquire, on behalf of a foreign principal or principals, for any purpose whatsoever, the ownership or control, direct or indirect, of 1 percent or more of the outstanding voting securities, or the direction or control by any means whatsoever of any of the policies of or of any partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, organized or operating as a business enterprise under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the political or military jurisdiction of the United States."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I asked that the provision be read because, as I remember, the action of the Judiciary Committee did strike out what the amendment seeks to strike out. I may not have been present when final action was taken, but I heard the discussion in the Judiciary Committee, and it was my opinion that the consensus there was that there should be no limitation of 1 percent. A dozen corporations might each acquire 1 percent, which would not be very difficult, and thus be exempted from the operation of the law. I remember that in my participation in that discussion I took the attitude that I did not think that 1 percent ought to save a corporation if it were otherwise guilty, and that there ought to be no exemption. Therefore, I believe that the amendment should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] desire recognition on the amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. I agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2060) was passed.

EXTENSION OF MILITARY SERVICE AND REGISTRATION OF MANPOWER—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out "nineteen" and in lieu thereof insert "twenty."

On page 2, line 4, of such Senate amendment strike out "nineteen" and in lieu thereof insert "twenty."

On page 4, line 11, of such Senate amendment strike out "nineteen" and in lieu thereof insert "twenty."

On page 4, line 12, of such Senate amendment strike out "nineteenth" and in lieu thereof insert "twentieth."

On page 4, lines 17 and 18, of such Senate amendment strike out all of section 8.

On page 4, line 19, of such Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 9" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 8."

On page 5, line 7, of such Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 10" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 9."

On page 5, line 11, of such Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 11" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 10."

On page 5, line 22, of such Senate amendment strike out "them" and in lieu thereof insert "him."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF DISBURSING AND CERTIFYING OFFICERS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5785, Calendar No. 953. Before submitting the request let me say that the bill is strongly urged by the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren. It passed the House unanimously, and has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Prior to the reorganization of 1933 each of the Government departments had its own disbursing officer. By the reorganization of 1933 the disbursing officers were abolished, and one disbursing officer was set up in the Treasury Department to do all the work of disbursement for all the departments with the exception of the War Department and the Navy Department. One disbursing officer now acts on the recommendations of certifying officers in the various departments.

As the law now stands, the certifying officers are not required to be bonded, and the Comptroller General feels very strongly that the certifying officers should be under bond.

There has also been some confusion as between the duties of the disbursing officers and those of the certifying officers. The Comptroller General feels that the duties of the respective officers should be specifically stated in the statute so as to eliminate the confusion. That is what the bill does. It requires that the certifying officers of all the various departments shall be under bond, and it makes clear and specific the duties of the disbursing officer and the duties of the various certifying officers.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5785) to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the 1st day of the fourth month following the date of its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5785) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from General Hines, Administrator of Veterans Affairs, addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, enclosing a copy of a letter from the Comptroller General to General Hines.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 17, 1941.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: Further reference is made to your letter dated October 25, 1941, requesting a report on H. R. 5785, Seventy-seventh Congress, "An act to fix the responsibility of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes."

In connection with the preparation of a report on this bill, the Veterans' Administration addressed a letter to the Comptroller General, under date of November 4, 1941, asking his views as to the effects of the bill, if enacted, on certain laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Under date of November 12, 1941, the Comptroller General, after quoting the above-mentioned letter dated November 4, 1941, set forth his views as to the effects of the bill, if enacted, particularly with reference to the questions raised by the Veterans' Administration. A copy of the Comptroller General's letter dated November 12, 1941, is enclosed.

Assuming that your committee will concur in the views of the Comptroller General as to the purpose and effects of the bill, if enacted, the Veterans' Administration has no objection to the proposed legislation.

If the bill is to receive favorable consideration by your committee, it is suggested that it would be desirable to incorporate the Comptroller General's letter in the committee's report on the bill to remove any doubt as to its purpose and scope, if enacted.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Administrator.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, *November 12, 1941.*

ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Veterans' Administration.

MY DEAR GENERAL HINES: I have your letter of November 4, 1941, as follows:

"Pursuant to understanding reached in conference between representative of this Administration and your office, I have the honor to present for your consideration certain questions of seeming doubt in connection with the probable construction of certain provisions of H. R. 5785, Seventy-seventh Congress, 'A bill to fix the responsibility of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes.'

"The bill, having been passed by the House of Representatives, is now pending before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Pursuant to a request of the chairman of said committee for a report, there has been prepared the attached proposed letter calling attention to possible application of certain provisions of the bill which it is feared would be inimical to the purposes of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. It is appreciated that the bill is broadly drawn and that it could be construed other than as indicated and in such manner as not to affect or repeal, by implication or otherwise, existing provisions of laws pertaining to veterans. In view of the doubts that have been expressed, I shall be glad to have the advantage of any views you may express regarding specifically the points mentioned herein.

"Aside from purely administrative and procedural questions, the more important points relate to (1), statutes permitting, under prescribed conditions, the waiving of overpayments under laws pertaining to veterans, (2) the relief of disbursing and certifying officers where such payments have been waived, and (3) the finality of decisions on questions of fact and law in connection with claims for gratuities and benefits provided by such laws.

"The provisions with respect to waiver have been in effect for many years and are contained in Section 28 of the Act of June 7, 1924, as amended, World War Veterans Act, which was saved from repeal by Section 7, Public No. 2, Seventy-third Congress. Such provisions have been extended to benefits under more recent legislation by the first section of Public No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, adding the section numbered 6 to Public No. 484, Seventy-third Congress.

"Because of the apparent inequity of holding disbursing officers in cases where recovery from the payee is waived, thereby depriving such officers of right of recoupment, legislation has been enacted from time to time relieving such officials in such instances. The present law applicable to both disbursing and certifying officers is Public, No. 324, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 7, 1939, which provides:

" 'That no disbursing officer and no certifying officer of the Veterans' Administration shall be held liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount from the payee is waived under existing laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.'

"While not a necessary, it would seem that a probable construction of the pending bill, if enacted into law, would be to set up a different measure of relief for disbursing and certifying officers; and to the extent that there is any conflict it would seem that the later enacted law would be controlling.

"The third question arises through the provision of section 3 of the pending bill to the effect that certifying officers shall have the right to apply for and obtain a decision by the Comptroller General on any question of law involved in the payment on any vouchers presented to them for certification. For the purpose of expediting the granting of relief in connection with laws administered by the former Veterans' Bureau and the Veterans' Administration, provision has been made for years for the finality of decisions by the head of the agency. Section 5 of the act of June 7, 1924, World War Veterans' Act, contained such provision with respect to questions of fact, and said section, as amended July 3, 1930, included questions of law. These provisions were reenacted in more definite form in section 5, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and were given broader uniform application in section 11, Public, No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress. Similar provisions were enacted in section 310, World War Adjusted Compensation Act.

"Having in mind that repeal by implication is not favored, it may well be that the provisions of section 3 should not be construed or applied so as to affect the finality of decisions under the statutes mentioned above. On the other hand, if there should be any doubt with respect to this matter either as to the intent of the Congress to modify existing law or not to repeal the same, it would seem to be proper and desirable legislative procedure to amend the pending bill in the interests of certainty and clarity. If, for example, it be the intent not to repeal or modify the provisions of existing law in this respect, this could be made certain by adding a proviso to section 3 to the effect that the provisions thereof (concerning the right to request legal opinions of the Comptroller General) should not apply to any case wherein the decision of a Government agency is made final by statute. It may be, indeed, that such amendment is not considered necessary, but in view of the careful thought and attention that have been given to such matters in the past resulting in the legislation mentioned, it would seem that consideration should be given to this question in connection with the pending bill.

"As indicated, I shall be very glad to have the benefit of your views and will gladly cooperate with you to any extent desired in connection with resolving any doubtful questions."

You will understand, of course, that as a general rule it would not be proper for me to attempt an authoritative construction of a bill pending before the Congress, or to render a binding decision in that respect. However, since the bill H. R. 5785 was introduced in the Congress as a result of the recommendations of this office as contained in the Annual Reports of the Comptroller General for the fiscal years 1939 and 1940, for the purposes therein indicated and in substantially the form recommended, I have no hesitancy in informing you that if the bill be enacted in its present form I would not construe the enactment as affecting—by way of modification, repeal, suspension, or otherwise—any statutes such as those mentioned in your letter relating specifically to waiver of overpayments or recoveries, the relief of disbursing and certifying officers, the finality of administrative decisions, etc.

The need for the legislation contemplated by the bill H. R. 5785 is explained fully in the annual reports of the Comptroller General, referred to above, and has arisen by reason of the confusion presently existing as to the exact nature and extent of the duties and responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers. The purpose of the bill is not to enlarge the ultimate liability with respect to properly accounting for public funds but, as evidenced by its title, its purpose is to fix definitely the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers by clearly defining their separate respective duties and liabilities in order that the present confusion with respect thereto no longer will exist. Also, it is intended to vest in this office authority which it does not now have to grant relief in certain meritorious cases in which, under existing law, relief could be granted only by specific action thereon by the Congress. In other words, the bill would provide an additional means of relief without taking away any existing means.

There appears nothing in the bill indicating—and no apparent basis for inferring from the objects sought to be accomplished—that, in the final analysis, there should be a liability of the Government for an improper payment where, under existing laws such as those mentioned by you, there now is no liability.

The foregoing appears amply supported by the well-established principles that statutes should be given a reasonable construction consistent with the circumstances under which they are enacted and the objects and purposes sought to be accomplished; that repeals by implication are not favored; and that where there are two statutes upon the same subject, the earlier being special and the later general—as would be the situation here—the presumption is, in the absence of an express repeal or an absolute incompatibility, that the special statute is to remain in force.

Under the circumstances, I believe you will agree that no amendment to the bill H. R. 5785 is necessary to preserve any authority the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or the Veterans' Administration now has under the specific statutes mentioned in your letter or under any other statutes.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

PRICE CONTROL—OILS AND FATS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have been in touch with the Office of Price Administration most of the day, and I am very happy to be able to say that the Price Administrator is now engaged in a reconsideration of his orders affecting the prices of cottonseed oil and various other oils which are in the same general classification. There are about 1,800. He will endeavor to bring the prices into line with the provisions and limitations fixed in the House bill as it passed the House, and in the bill as it was recommended to the full committee by the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which had charge of the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the price of oil will be fixed at 12¾ cents instead of 11¼ cents?

Mr. BROWN. I believe it is fair to say that that will be the probable result of reconsideration by the Price Administrator. I am advised that a short time—I think a matter of a few days—will be required to prepare the schedules and to make the formal announcement. But I am authorized to say that the limitations as contained in the bill passed by the House and as contained in the bill

as recommended to the full committee of the Senate by the subcommittee will be used as the basis for reconsideration of the prices fixed on oil; and I think that fully complies with the recommendations which the majority leader and myself made yesterday to the Price Administrator, and the representations which I made to the Senate at the time consideration of the Bankhead resolution was postponed.

Is there any question in the mind of any Senator interested in the matter?

Mr. WHEELER. I did not hear the Senator's opening statement with reference to what is proposed. Does he propose to introduce a bill?

Mr. BROWN. No. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and some 27 other Senators who are interested in the prices of various fats and oils, particularly cottonseed oil, were somewhat upset by the announcement that, by a very recent order of the Price Administrator, a price of 11¼ cents per pound had been fixed as a ceiling beyond which the cottonseed price could not go. Let me say to the Senator from Montana and to any other Senators who were not present yesterday, that the House has passed, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has approved, a limitation which would prevent the Administrator from fixing prices below the price level of any agricultural commodity price as of October 1, 1941. In the case of cottonseed oil that price is about 12¾ cents per pound.

In view of the resolution which the Senator from Alabama submitted, I thought it was fair to call the attention of the Price Administrator to the provision which would probably be enacted into law in the next 2 or 3 weeks as a floor below which he cannot go, and that it would be entirely proper for him to give consideration to that floor in his determination or reconsideration of this question. He is now doing so.

Mr. WHEELER. Then the Senator is not trying to take up the bill this afternoon?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Michigan completed his statement?

Mr. BROWN. I have.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor I report favorably, with amendments, House bill 6128, and I submit a report (Rept. No. 918) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, two members of the committee have expressed a desire to be present when the bill is considered. I should like to have the opportunity to send for them. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Herring	Reynolds
Bridges	Hill	Rosier
Brooks	Holman	Russell
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bunker	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tobey
Chandler	McCarran	Truman
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Downey	Murdock	Walsh
Doxey	Murray	Wheeler
Ellender	Norris	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana for the present consideration of House bill 6128, reported from the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum because of the absence from the floor of the Senate of a few Senators who I thought should be present at the time the bill is considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of House bill 6128 is to amend in certain particulars the so-called Lanham Act. A subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate held hearings on the bill and submitted a unanimous report to the full committee. The full committee, in turn, unanimously reported the bill which is now before the Senate.

I shall endeavor to point out the most important provisions which were adopted by the House, and which were, in turn, either accepted or modified by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

The House provided that the cost of permanent family dwellings should be——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the Senator going to move to consider the bill or has it already been taken up by the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. That has already been done by the Senate and the bill is now under consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] should be present, and I hope the officers of the Senator will see that he is notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Connecticut has been sent for.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the House of Representatives increased the average cost of permanent family dwelling units located within the continental United States from $3,500, which is now the limit in the Lanham Act, to $3,750. In view of the evidence adduced before it, the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate thought the amount should remain at $3,500.

The House of Representatives also increased the average cost of permanent dwelling units outside the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska, from $4,000 to $4,250, and, in like manner, the committee thought that the limit of cost should remain as is now provided in the Lanham Act. Also, the House provided an increase in the limit on any family dwelling unit from $3,950, as provided in the Lanham Act, to $4,500, and the Senate committee recommends that this increase be eliminated from the bill.

The only addition to that section recommended by the committee is a provision to build housing in the Territory of Alaska, and, because Alaska is so far removed from continental United States, and it is rather difficult to obtain materials with which to build houses there, it is provided that the cost of such housing shall not exceed $7,500 per family dwelling unit.

Under the Lanham Act three classes of employees are entitled to relief in connection with housing. They are, first, enlisted men in the naval or military services of the United States; second, employees of the United States in the Navy and War Departments assigned to duty at naval or military reservations, posts, or bases; and, third, workers engaged or to be engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense. The committee has added two other classes of employees. The first is:

(4) Employees of the United States whose duties are essential to the national defense.

The purpose of that amendment is to take care of housing in such places as the District of Columbia and other communities in a like situation.

Then the committee added a fifth class of persons by an amendment, which reads as follows:

(5) Officers of the Army and Marine Corps not above the grade of captain, and officers of the Navy and Coast Guard not above the grade of lieutenant, senior grade, subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War and/or the Secretary of the Navy.

It was pointed out to the committee that the officers in the foregoing lower grades receive from $1,800 to $2,400 a year, and it was thought that some provision should be made in order to take

care of them. The committee concurred in that view.

The Senate committee concurs in the House amendment increasing the defense housing authorization from $300,000,000, as presently written in the law to $600,000,000. Then, on page 3, line 17, after the word "expended", the committee recommends that the following words of the House amendment be stricken out:

in such amounts as the Congress from time to time shall make appropriations therefor.

It was thought that if that language were to remain in the bill, the Congress would first have to appropriate for each defense project as it was presented. For that reason the committee was of opinion that it is best to strike out that portion of the House language.

Section 4 of the bill now before the Senate has been stricken out by the committee. As will be noted, that section seeks to give authority to the Administrator, after the emergency shall be over, to sell or dispose as expeditiously as possible of all these housing projects. There is a further provision whereby the Administrator cannot dispose of any of these buildings or dwellings for slum-clearance purposes. The committee was of opinion that that amendment to the Lanham Act adopted by the House should be stricken from the bill, and that disposal of defense housing should be left entirely in the hands of the Administrator, as is provided, of course, under the present Lanham Act. It will be recalled that under the Lanham Act the Administrator is authorized to dispose of these projects, bearing in mind always the public interest. We have retained, however, a portion of the House provision and incorporated it in a separate amendment, reading as follows:

SEC. 5. Amend section 301 of such act by striking the period at the end thereof and adding a comma and the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator shall, upon the request of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments such housing constructed under the provisions of this act as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or the Navy."

As will be noted, the purpose of the modified amendment is to give the Administrator the right to permit the Navy Department and the War Department to obtain title to any defense-housing projects that can be used permanently by them.

The committee accepted section 5, now numbered 4, of the House bill, increasing the amount for defense public works from $150,000,000, as was authorized in the original Lanham Act dealing with community facilities, to $300,000,000.

Section 6 of the House bill was stricken out for the reason that that language is already in the existing Lanham Act, except for the words "which has not been previously sold or disposed of." The committee felt that there is no need to incorporate that wording in the act, and therefore the entire section 6 of the House bill was eliminated.

In the next section, No. 7, the House sought to fix the rents to be paid by the occupants on a basis of the project cost; in other words, an economic rent. As is now provided in the Lanham Act, discretion in fixing rentals is left to the Administrator, and the Administrator must take into account the salaries received by the occupants. At the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] an amendment was agreed to in committee that would have the effect of causing the Administrator to consider both the value of the dwellings and the remuneration received by the occupants in fixing the monthly rentals.

The modified amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 6. The second proviso of section 304 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the Administrator shall fix rentals, on projects developed pursuant to this act, which, insofar as is practical, shall be based on the value thereof as determined by him, but with due consideration where necessary to the incomes of the persons intended to be housed, and that rentals to be charged for Army and Navy personnel shall be fixed by the War and Navy Departments."

The next amendment deals with section 8 of the House bill. The committee struck from the House bill all of section 8 except the wording on page 5, line 25, beginning after the period in the sentence. That House amendment which was eliminated by the Senate committee, provided that the Administrator must construct all defense-housing projects through the Public Buildings Administration, or, in his discretion, through the War Department and Navy Department. The committee thought that provision should be stricken from the bill, thereby granting the Administrator authority to use such building agencies as now exist to construct these projects, rather than tie his hands by limiting him to the use of Public Buildings Administration and the War and Navy Departments. Under the bill, if the Senate committee amendment is concurred in, the Administrator will be able to use the best talent the Government now has at its disposal in order to build these housing facilities.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. As I understand—and this seems to me to be the most important section of the bill—the House has restricted the Administrator in his selection of the agency to construct the projects, while the Senate amendment will permit the Administrator wider powers, which will make possible the use of experienced agencies such as the United States Housing Authority, the Public Buildings Administration, and so on.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. When the Senate Defense Committee made an investigation of housing, we found that the projects constructed by the older agencies, particularly by the United States Housing Administration, were very efficiently and very effectively accomplished. In my judgment, it would be a sad mistake if the House provision should prevail, and the agencies with experience and ability should be no longer permitted to participate in the defense program. I trust that the Senate will adopt this amendment, and that the Senate conferees will do everything in their power, as I know they will, to prevail upon the House to have it included in the final form of the bill, for it is very important.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, when the original Lanham Act was before the Senate the same provision came from the House, and the Senate struck it out; and, as the law now reads, discretion as to which agencies shall handle the projects is left to the Administrator.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Striking out the language suggested by the House will leave the Lanham Act as now written, which permits the Administrator to utilize the various agencies. We have retained, however, this language from the House amendment:

Section 305 of such act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following sentence at the end thereof:

"Insofar as consistent with emergency needs, consultation shall be had with local public officials and local housing authorities to the end that projects constructed under the provisions of this act shall, so far as may be practicable, conform in location and design to local planning and tradition."

The amendment is self-explanatory, and the committee thought that it should be retained.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In discussing the amendment in question, I believe the Senate should be informed as to what occurred before the subcommittee.

Some evidence was adduced to the effect that under the original Lanham Act possibly nine different agencies of the Government were engaged in carrying out the provisions of the act; that some agencies were doing first-class work, while other agencies were not doing such good work. Notwithstanding the fact that it would have been advisable to concentrate all the functions embraced in the Lanham Act under one head, the committee felt that it would be best if the authority were left in the hands of the Administrator; and the committee was to advise the Administrator to the effect that it was the purpose, or at least the hope, that the Administrator would be able to concentrate as many of the functions under the bill within as few as possible of the agencies, because there was much evidence of confusion due to the fact that so many agencies were handling the work. There was duplication of work; but under the circumstances it was felt that, with the proper kind of an administrator—which the committee felt the Government now has—it would be best if we left to the Administrator discretion in handling the work.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say just a word or two?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thoroughly subscribe to the amendment which has been proposed by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee, vesting this discretion in the Federal Works Administrator; but I do not want this opportunity to pass without saying just a word, at least, in commendation of the excellent job which has been done by the United States Housing Authority. I am sure it is the sentiment of the committee that they should be given their just share of the work which is to be carried on under this bill, because all over the country the various housing authorities under the supervision of the United States Housing Authority here have faithfully and efficiently done a splendid job; and I know that all expect to see them continue to have a representative portion of this responsibility.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the able Senator from Florida. I was about to call the attention of the Senate to the splendid work that has been done by the United States Housing Authority, when I was interrupted by the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. CHAVEZ]. The committee did not hear one word of criticism about the United States Housing Authority. On the contrary all of the evidence heard pointed to the able and efficient manner in which that agency has carried out its mandate. The records of the agency show that the cost of all projects built under its supervision were under the maximum cost per unit, fixed by Congress when it adopted the Housing Act. More could be said but I feel quite sure that Senators are anxious to vote on the pending measure.

Mr. President, the last amendment suggested by the House of importance is included on page 6 of the bill, affecting section 306.

Under the Lanham Act, the Administrator has the right to bargain with the localities in which projects are built with respect to taxes; but the House adopted an amendment making it mandatory that local communities shall be paid taxes on all projects erected under the act, and the committtee concurred in that view. It is to be hoped that local communities will not take advantage of this change in the law, and will continue to cooperate and keep local taxes down to a minimum.

Mr. Charles F. Palmer, Housing Coordinator, suggested the following amendment, which was agreed to by the committee:

SEC. 10. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 311 the following new section:

"SEC. 312. Any agency designated by the President to provide temporary shelter under the provisions of Public No. 9, Seventy-seventh Congress, Public, No. 73, Seventy-seventh Congress, or the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriations Act, 1942, shall have the same powers with respect to the management, maintenance, operation, and administration of such temporary shelter as are granted to the Federal Works Administrator under section 304 and section 306 of this act with respect to projects constructed hereunder, and the provisions of section 307 shall apply to such temporary shelter projects and the occupants thereof."

The amendment is self-explanatory. It simply confers on an agency or agencies that have built temporary shelter, the powers of management, maintenance, operation, and administration, as are granted to the Federal Works Administrator under the Lanham Act, over projects under his jurisdiction.

Mr. President, that is about all there is to the bill, and unless there are further questions, I shall ask for an immediate vote by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 1, page 2, line 11, to strike out "$3,750" and to insert: "$3,500"; in line 13, to strike out "$4,250" and to insert "$4,000"; in line 14, to strike out "$4,500" and to insert "$3,950"; in line 21, before the word "shall," to strike out the word "Administrator" and insert "President"; in line 23, after the word "emergency", to strike out "he shall construct"; and in line 24, after the word "temporary" to strike out "units;" and the quotation marks and insert "shall be constructed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 3, line 2, before the word "*Provided*", to insert "(4) employees of the United States whose duties are essential to the national defense; (5) officers of the Army and Marine Corps not above the grade of captain, and officers of the Navy and Coast Guard, not above the grade of lieutenant, senior grade, subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and/or the Secretary of the Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 3, line 17, after the word "until", to strike out "expended in such amounts as the Congress from time to time shall make appropriations therefor:", and in line 19 to insert "expended," and quotation marks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 3, to strike out lines 20 to 25, inclusive, and lines 1 to 12, inclusive, on page 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 3 the following new section:

"SEC. 4. It is hereby declared to be the policy of this title to further the national defense by providing housing in those areas where it cannot otherwise be provided by private enterprise when needed, and that such housing shall be sold and disposed of as expeditiously as possible: *Provided*, That in disposing of said housing consideration shall be given to its full market value and said housing or any part thereof shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may, in his discretion, upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments such housing constructed under the provisions of this act as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 13, to strike out "5" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 4, to strike out lines 16 to 21, inclusive, as follows:

SEC. 6. Clause (b) of section 301 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(b) property acquired or constructed under this act (including schools and hospitals), which has not been previously sold or disposed of, shall be disposed of as promptly as may be advantageous under the circumstances and in the public interest."

And to insert:

SEC. 5. Amend section 301 of such act by striking the period at the end thereof and adding a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator shall, upon the request of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments such housing constructed under the provisions of this act as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or the Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 4, line 22, to strike out "7" and insert "6"; in line 24 after the word "fix", to strike out "fair"; in line 25, after the word "which", to insert "insofar as is practical"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "him", to insert "but with due consideration when necessary to the incomes of the persons intended to be housed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, page 5, line 4, to strike out "8" and insert "7"; in line 5, to strike out "to read as follows" and to insert "by the addition of the following sentence at the end thereof"; after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 305. In the construction of defense housing under this act the Administrator shall act through the Public Buildings Administration, or, in his discretion, the War Department and Navy Department: *Provided*, That any other agency lawfully designated by the Administrator to construct projects for which funds were available at the time of designation may continue such projects to completion: *And provided further*, That the Public Buildings Administration may utilize the services of local housing authorities in such construction herein authorized; and in carrying out the other provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to utilize and act through the Federal Works Agency and other Federal agencies and any local public agency, with the consent of such agency. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this act for defense housing or for defense public works and equipment therefor shall be available for transfer to any agency authorized in this section to construct the same. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the employment or utilization of the professional services of private persons, firms, or corporations.

In line 25, after the part stricken out, to strike out the word "consultation" and to insert "insofar as consistent with emergency needs, consultation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 6, line 5, to strike out "9" and insert "8"; and in line 18, to strike out "10" and insert "9;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 20, to insert the following:

SEC. 10. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 311 the following new section:

"SEC. 312. Any agency designated by the President to provide temporary shelter under the provisions of Public, No. 9, Seventy-seventh Congress, Public, No. 73, Seventy-seventh Congress; or the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriations Act, 1942, shall have the same powers with respect to the management, maintenance, operation, and administration of such temporary shelter as are granted to the Federal Works Administrator under section 304 and section 306 of this act with respect to projects constructed hereunder, and the provisions of section 307 shall apply to such temporary shelter projects and the occupants thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to be inserted at the proper place. I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert a new section at the end of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any provision of such act of October 14, 1940, none of the funds hereafter appropriated to carry out its provisions may be expended in connection with a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract; and all contracts hereafter entered into under such act shall be subject to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may state to the Senator from Missouri that I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6128) was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as a companion measure to the bill just passed, I reported this afternoon from the Committee on Appropriations a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) making appropriations to carry out the provisions of the bill just passed. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. As I understand, this is an appropriation measure to carry into effect the bill which has just been passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the principal purpose. However, there are two or three other items in the joint resolution, and I shall be glad to explain to the Senator and to the Senate what those items are.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount carried by the joint resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. The joint resolution provides $300,000,000 for nondefense housing and $50,000,000 for community facilities for those who are employed in defense areas.

Another item besides the housing appropriations is an emergency fund for the Territorial possessions. The administration needs $15,000,000 for that purpose and has asked for it.

Under the Procurement Division there is an item of $2,000,000.

For the relief of the Philippine Islands, for public relief and civilian defense, there is an item of $10,000,000. That was very urgently recommended by the President of the Philippine Republic. The request was sent to the authorities in Washington, and the War Department has very earnestly recommended the appropriation, and the committee thought it should be granted.

Mr. McNARY. Was there any contest in the committee with respect to any of these items?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; there was a contest with respect to the housing item. As I stated to the Senator a while ago, the bill was reported with the understanding that it would not be taken up until the so-called Lanham bill, the housing bill, was passed by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. In response to the question of the Senator from Oregon, I may say that some of us were curious to ascertain just how the $300,000,000 is to be spent. We were enlightened to the extent of being told that it was to be devoted to the purposes stated in the Lanham bill, one of which purposes, as the Senate knows, is the construction of residential housing for defense workers.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is for permanent housing.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; permanent residential housing for defense workers.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I sought to ascertain in some detail of what this housing was to consist, and where it was to go, but the testimony on that point was incomplete. However, the legislative bill has now been passed, and whereas in normal times I should be reluctant to support an item with so slender a basis of fact, I feel justified, in view of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and accepted, in supporting this appropriation, particularly in view of the fact that included in the bill is an item for the relief of the people of the Philippines, which I am sure commands the sympathy and support of all of us at this moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, I have no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION FROM BOMBING ATTACKS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I again respectfully call the attention of Senators present to Calendar No. 942, Senate bill 1936, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1936) to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Director of Civilian Defense, appointed under authority of Executive Order No. 8757, dated May 20, 1941, to provide, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, facilities, supplies, and services to include research and development for the adequate protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in such localities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, as may be determined by said Director to be in need of, but unable to provide, such protection: *Provided*, That such facilities and supplies may be loaned to civil authorities in accordance with said regulations: *Provided further*, That any department or agency of the Federal Government having equipment or supplies not required for its use may, subject to the approval of the Division of Procurement, Treasury Department, transfer the same without charge (notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of December 20, 1928, 45 Stat. 1030) to the Director of Civilian Defense for the purpose herein authorized.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to wear a uniform, insignia, arm band, or other distinctive article prescribed by the Director of Civilian Defense except in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the authority of section 1 hereof. Any person found guilty of violating the provisions contained in this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned for not more than six months, or both.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate was considered by the Committee on Military Affairs and was reported favorably. It is designed to provide fire-fighting apparatus and equipment for various departments and agencies of the Government and gives them authority to lend it to various political subdivisions.

It also gives the Civilian Defense Administrator power to make purchases of gas masks and other equipment which will be necessary to provide the proper protection to such towns and citizens and various industrial sections of the United States as are not now prepared and equipped or financially in a position to purchase such equipment for themselves.

I may add that the proposed legislation has the approval of the Director of Civilian Defense, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior, whose reports on the bill are embodied in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator has seen fit to call up the bill, because it is one in which I have taken considerable interest. The Senator has very ably outlined the measure.

As I see it, the bill provides four things. It authorizes the Director of Civilian Defense to provide facilities, supplies, and services in the United States and its Territories. It provides that the facilities which he has under his authority may be loaned to the civil authorities. It provides that existing Federal equipment, in the way of gas masks or fire-fighting apparatus, or other civilian defense articles, may be transferred to the States. It further provides a penalty relative to the wearing of civilian-defense insignia if not done according to regulations. As the Senator said, the bill is approved by everyone concerned, and has received the unanimous support of the committee. While I hope that the powers conferred under it may not be necessary, I feel that the Senate should take this step so that everything that can be done may be done to protect our civilian population.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very glad to have had the opportunity to yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts, because I recall with much appreciation that when the bill was under consideration by the committee he evidenced a great deal of interest in it. I may add that I had a talk today with Mayor LaGuardia, who communicated to me the necessity for bringing about the immediate passage of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATE DIRECTORS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2082, Calendar No. 947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2082) to extend the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment at the end of the bill to insert "or because of his appointment as a member of an Alien Enemy Hearing Board to assist the Attorney General in the execution of any proclamations heretofore or hereafter issued by the President under the authority of the Alien Enemy Act of 1798, as amended (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 21–24", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 5, 1941 (55 Stat. 150), be amended to read as follows:

"That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or the Selective Service Regulations made in pursuance thereof as a member of a local board, a board of appeal, an advisory board for registrants, as a State director, a Government appeal agent, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections as provided in section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; or because of his appointment as a member of an alien enemy hearing board to assist the Attorney General in the execution of any proclamations heretofore or hereafter issued by the President under the authority of the Alien Enemy Act of 1798 as amended (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 21–24)."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. VAN NUYS. The bill as originally introduced added to the exceptions from prosecution under the restrictions placed on the practice of law by former officers of the Government, certain persons appointed under authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or the Selective Service Regulations made in pursuance thereof. The committee amendment also adds members of the alien enemy hearing boards which are now being set up in each judicial district in the country by the Attorney General to hear the cases of aliens who have been incarcerated under the Enemy Alien Act. The added provision exempts the members of those boards. It is impossible to get members of these boards from the legal profession because nearly every law firm has some claim or some contract or proceeding in which the Government is interested. Such persons could not get any compensation, directly or indirectly, for their services if they were named to these boards; in fact, they would be subject to prosecution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is this a House bill or a Senate bill?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee report it unanimously?

Mr. VAN NUYS. It did.

Mr. McNARY. Were hearings had?

Mr. VAN NUYS. No; the measure was considered by the full committee. No subcommittee was appointed. A representative of the Department of Justice appeared before the committee and explained the measure.

Mr. McNARY. Is the bill on the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the calendar. The Chair will state to the Senator that it is Calendar No. 947.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The State Department, which heretofore has had jurisdiction, and the Post Office Department, which heretofore has in part had jurisdiction, have agreed that the matter should be placed entirely in the hands of the Department of Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I now move that the title be amended by adding thereto "and members of Alien Enemy Hearing Boards," so as to read:

A bill extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of Alien Enemy Hearing Boards.

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take the liberty to announce that, without objection, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized, during the adjournment or recess of the Senate following today's session to receive messages from the House, and that the Presiding Officer of the Senate is authorized to affix his signature to bills and joint resolutions ready for his signature.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in exectuive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. John F. Shafroth, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service to rank from the 2d day of November 1941.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Cuba; and Frank A. Schuler, Jr., of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, general, United States Army, retired, Army of the United States, to be general.

The Chair wishes to state that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] desires to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Lieutenant General MacArthur to be general without reference to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make that request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not hear the nature of the request. Does that apply to all the nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; only to the nomination of General MacArthur.

Mr. McNARY. And the other nominations go to the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from North Carolina proposes to ask unanimous consent for the confirmation of the nomination of Lieutenant General MacArthur to be general, without reference to the committee?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I have consulted some members of the committee, but I have

not been able to reach them all. Personally, I have no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have a very high estimate of General MacArthur, and have no objection to the confirmation of the nomination except that I am in some doubt as to whether there is a grade of general in addition to that of Chief of Staff. If we have ever authorized such a grade I do not know. I should like to have the Military Affairs Committee look into that question, and also the question of how many lieutenant generals are authorized. I believe we once authorized the promotion of four officers to be lieutenant generals. There are now nine. A representative of the War Department claims it can appoint as many officers to be lieutenant generals as the Department pleases without any further congressional authorization. I do not believe that is the law. General MacArthur is a fine gentleman and a good soldier. I do not begrudge him the rank of general. But I do not think a nomination should be made to a grade which is nonexistent.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it has never occurred to me to question the right of the authorities to name General MacArthur, or anyone whom they should desire to designate, as a full general. It has never occurred to me to question that right because certainly those in authority would not make a recommendation of such importance unless they knew they were possessed of the authority.

The reason it is now asked that the nomination be immediately considered by the Senate, without the usual formality and procedure of referring it to the Military Affairs Committee, is that General MacArthur is now in the Philippine Islands, at one of the most important points of all the world, where one of the most important battles of the war is taking place, and I know that no Member of the Senate doubts in the slightest that, insofar as ability and experience and military information and training are concerned, he is qualified to the very nth degree. His record is known to every Senator. I do not believe there is any military man anywhere in all the world who has a finer record, or a finer reputation than General MacArthur has. Senators remember his grades at West Point Military Academy on the Hudson I believe they were at least as high as those of any young man who was ever graduated from that institution. My recollection is that he was the youngest Chief of Staff the Army ever had. I might mention many other qualifications which he has from the standpoint of experience.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in connection with the point raised by the Senator from Texas, I think that undoubtedly under the National Defense Act of 1920 the President has authority to make an appointment of this kind. I cannot refer the Senator to the exact paragraph.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is claimed that there is legal authority for an appointment of this kind. The clerk of the Military Affairs Committee showed me the act. There is no such authority.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is a very able lawyer.

Mr. CONNALLY. There may be such authority in some of the bills which the Military Affairs Committee has been reporting. However, a man may not be appointed to a grade when there is no such grade established by law. The War Department cannot create a grade. Congress must create it.

I have no objection to General MacArthur. I think he is a splendid officer. But he is out there, and I assume he will fight just as valiantly for a couple of days as a lieutenant general as he would as a full general. I see no reason for undue haste. I shall not object to the confirmation of the nomination, but I shall enter on the Journal a motion to reconsider. If I find that there is no such grade, I will make such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think that we are simply profiting by the experience which we had in the World War. At that time it became absolutely essential to create four full generals for the purpose of transacting business with our Allies on an equal plane. I think the necessity for General MacArthur's promotion at this time is that if our Allies, with whom we shall have to deal in the Dutch East Indies, in the Malay Peninsula, and in the Philippines, create eight full generals to command over there, which they have done in one instance of which I know, General MacArthur will be outranked, and cannot do business with them on an equal plane. That is the reason for this nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. In the World War we had only two full generals.

Mr. TRUMAN. I can name four of them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Who were they?

Mr. TRUMAN. General Bliss, General March, General Pershing, and I cannot remember the other name, but there were four.

Mr. CONNALLY. My recollection is that we had two full generals, General March, Chief of Staff, and General Pershing. General Liggett was a lieutenant general in command of an army.

Mr. TRUMAN. The other three generals were at the peace conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. They may have been at the peace conference, but that did not make them full generals.

Mr. TRUMAN. They were full generals.

Mr. CONNALLY. The general from Alabama was a lieutenant general. There were two lieutenant generals and two full generals.

If Congress has authorized such an appointment, I shall not object. I shall not object to the confirmation of the nomination; but I cannot find out from the Military Affairs Committee how many lieutenant generals we have authorized. No one on the committee seems to know.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think the authorization is for as many as military necessity may call for.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is exactly what I am not in favor of. If we are to let the Army have all the lieutenant generals it wants, it will have as many lieutenant generals as it has colonels. It now has more lieutenant colonels than captains.

I shall not object to the confirmation of the nomination if the Senator insists on it; but the idea that a man cannot fight unless he is a general is ridiculous. I am surprised at the Senator from Missouri. He says that our allies are to have eight lieutenant generals. So far the Allies have not acted as though they had much more than eight soldiers. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I have already stated, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered on the Journal.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let me suggest that the purpose of the Senator from North Carolina will not be served if a motion to reconsider is pending. Why would not the best thing to do be to have the nomination referred to the committee and let it be reported at the next session of the Senate? The entering on the Journal of a motion to reconsider will prevent the transmission of any information to the President. Therefore, the nomination of General MacArthur will not be confirmed until the motion to reconsider is acted upon. Would not the Senator from North Carolina better achieve his purpose by letting the nomination go to the committee and let it be reported at the next session of the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to reconsider, because of the zeal of the chairman of the committee. However, I serve notice now that I will not vote for any more confirmations of nominations as generals or lieutenant generals until I know that there is legal authority for making such appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion of the Senator from Texas is withdrawn; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

There is no Executive Calendar printed for today.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of two nominations in the Foreign Service which I reported earlier in the day from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I refer to the nomination of Frank A. Schuler, Jr., to be a consul of the United States, and the nomination of Spruille Braden, of New York, to be Ambassador to Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Schuler, Jr., of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Spruille Braden, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Mr. Messersmith has been nominated and confirmed as Ambassador to Mexico. He is at present Ambassador to Cuba. Before he can leave for Mexico his successor must be appointed. Mr. Braden has been nominated to be his successor.

I am sure that most Senators know Mr. Messersmith. He is a career man of many years service. He was Assistant Secretary of State for a considerable period. He is especially capable in Latin American affairs. He speaks Spanish fluently and has done a good job. The President told me in conferring on the nomination that he felt that Mr. Messersmith had done the finest job in Cuba that has been done by any Ambassador we have had there in recent years.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, Mr. Messersmith, our present Ambassador to Cuba, has been named by the President to serve our country as Ambassador to Mexico. Mr. Braden, who has been serving us most creditably in Colombia, has recently been nominated to be Ambassador to Cuba. I do not think that our Government could have chosen a finer man or a man of better experience for that post. He has served well in a number of South American countries. It will be recalled that he was instrumental in bringing about a satisfactory conclusion of the dispute between Paraguay and Bolivia. I am very glad that we have the occasion to confirm his nomination as Ambassador to Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination of Spruille Braden to be Ambassador to Cuba? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McNARY I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 22, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be general

Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur (general, U. S. Army, retired), Army of the United States.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Edward Postell King, Jr., United States Army.

Brig. Gen. George Fleming Moore (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Marshall Parker, Jr. (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Richard Kerens Sutherland (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Clifford Bluemel, Infantry.
Col. James Roy Newman Weaver, Infantry.
Col. William Edward Brougher, Infantry.
Col. Albert Monmouth Jones, Infantry.
Col. Joseph Peter Vachon, Infantry.
Col. Bradford Grethen Chynoweth (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.
Col. William Fletcher Sharp, Field Artillery.
Col. Allan Clay McBride, Field Artillery.
Col. Clyde Andrew Selleck, Field Artillery.
Col. Spencer Ball Akin, Signal Corps.
Col. Charles Chisholm Drake (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.
Col. Richard Jaquelin Marshall (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

To be rear admiral

Capt. John F. Shafroth, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of November 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Evie L. Griffin, to be postmaster at Moundville, Ala., in place of G. B. Pickens, retired.

ARKANSAS

Ralph R. Rea to be postmaster at Harrison, Ark., in place of C. V. Wagley, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

William D. Gilchrist to be postmaster at Arrowhead Springs, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

CONNECTICUT

Bruce B. Randall to be postmaster at Bridgewater, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Leola W. Beck to be postmaster at Columbia, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

FLORIDA

Luther L. Callaway to be postmaster at Chiefland, Fla., in place of L. L. Callaway. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Bessie E. Guthrie to be postmaster at Cortez, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Minnie Blanch Payne to be postmaster at Longwood, Fla., in place of M. B. Payne. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

GEORGIA

Arthur C. Turner to be postmaster at Statesboro, Ga., in place of G. T. Groover, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Delmar D. Debault to be postmaster at Mason, Ill., in place of C. A. Ruffner, transferred.

Minnie D. Davis to be postmaster at Mooseheart, Ill., in place of M. D. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

Charles E. Myers to be postmaster at Pontiac, Ill., in place of K. M. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

INDIANA

Mary C. Shaffer to be postmaster at Arcadia, Ind., in place of Alva Davis, deceased.

Alva R. Staggs to be postmaster at Monticello, Ind., in place of Galen Benjamin, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Silvio Broussard to be postmaster at New Iberia, La., in place of Silvio Broussard. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1941.

Clifton T. Bigner to be postmaster at Pollock, La., in place of C. T. Bigner. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Robert H. Nelson to be postmaster at Shreveport, La., in place of R. H. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1941.

MAINE

Howard F. Wright to be postmaster at Wilton, Maine, in place of H. F. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1940.

MARYLAND

Guy M. Coale to be postmaster at Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of G. M. Coale. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1941.

MASSACHUSETTS

Anna R. Ellis to be postmaster at Norwood, Mass., in place of A. R. Ellis. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Elizabeth B. Phinney to be postmaster at Pocasset, Mass., in place of A. T. Swift, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Kenneth N. Hullett to be postmaster at Lakeville, Minn., in place of W. C. Ackerman, deceased.

Charles R. Whitcomb to be postmaster at Morgan, Minn., in place of A. J. Tauer, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Thomas E. Goodman to be postmaster at New Albany, Miss., in place of T. E. Goodman. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Lee R. Beckett to be postmaster at Pittsboro, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lloyd C. Hopkins to be postmaster at Walnut, Miss., in place of L. C. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired July 29, 1941.

MISSOURI

Byron E. Thornhill to be postmaster at Archie, Mo., in place of S. M. Cramer, transferred.

Charles A. Lawrence to be postmaster at Fenton, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lawrence M. Fry to be postmaster at Lake Ozark, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Fannie F. Norris to be postmaster at Wyatt, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

MONTANA

Herman J. Webster to be postmaster at Custer, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Oscar C. Clute to be postmaster at Dixon, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Goldie G. Dobravec to be postmaster at Noxon, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEBRASKA

Blanche E. Kammerer to be postmaster at Ashland, Nebr., in place of B. E. Kammerer. Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

Edith F. Francis to be postmaster at Belden, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Ethel L. Talcott to be postmaster at Crofton, Nebr., in place of Ethel Talcott. Incumbent's commission expired May 23, 1940.

Glenn D. Young to be postmaster at Firth, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

A. Otto Erdman to be postmaster at Venango, Nebr., in place of A. O. Erdman. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Mary May Holley to be postmaster at Waverly, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edith C. Hackl to be postmaster at Wynot, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEVADA

Florence Sears Jackson to be postmaster at Imlay, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore W. Drew to be postmaster at Intervale, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph R. Johnson to be postmaster at Mount Arlington, N. J., in place of J. R. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

William Guy Weaver to be postmaster at Woodbridge, N. J., in place of W. G. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired August 10, 1941.

NEW MEXICO

Arvil M. Waggoner to be postmaster at Bayard, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NEW YORK

Ethel M. Cross to be postmaster at Burlington Flats, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edward E. J. Kent to be postmaster at Cambridge, N. Y., in place of D. J. Sheridan, deceased.

Jay W. Metcalf to be postmaster at Deansboro, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Roxa A. Youker to be postmaster at Dolgeville, N. Y., in place of R. A. Youker. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

David J. McHenry to be postmaster at Granville, N. Y., in place of D. J. McHenry. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Walter B. Jaynes to be postmaster at Greene, N. Y., in place of W. B. Jaynes. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Marion L. Jenkins to be postmaster at Rensselaer Falls, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles R. McNair to be postmaster at Rockingham, N. C., in place of R. N. Stanaill, deceased.

Ola A. Sutton to be postmaster at Windsor, N. C., in place of W. M. Sutton, deceased.

OHIO

John Roth to be postmaster at Excello, Ohio, in place of John Roth. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Josephine M. Furey to be postmaster at Hanoverton, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Virginia Lange to be postmaster at Kelleys Island, Ohio, in place of Virginia Lange. Incumbent's commission expired July 29, 1941.

Bertha R. Murphey to be postmaster at Lakemore, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941

Theodore C. Gilroy to be postmaster at Waynesfield, Ohio, in place of T. C. Gilroy. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

OKLAHOMA

Laura Lonnie Dolphin to be postmaster at Boley, Okla., in place of L. L. Dolphin. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

Benjamine F. Cooksey to be postmaster at Fairland, Okla., in place of B. F. Cooksey. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Jennie R. Whittet to be postmaster at Freedom, Okla., in place of O. D. Moreland, transferred.

Carroll C. Sanders to be postmaster at Soper, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

George W. Blair to be postmaster at Yale, Okla., in place of G. W. Blair. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

OREGON

Odden L. Dickens to be postmaster at John Day, Oreg., in place of O. L. Dickens. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Eleanor E. McNally to be postmaster at Aliquippa, Pa., in place of E. E. McNally. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Edward P. Shamborsky to be postmaster at Eynon, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Sara J. Leonard to be postmaster at Groveton, Pa., in place of S. J. Leonard. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

Lewis H. Mensch to be postmaster at Marienville, Pa., in place of L. H. Mensch. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Mina H. Corbett to be postmaster at Mont Clare, Pa., in place of M. H. Corbett. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Sara A. Jeffries to be postmaster at New Salem, Pa., in place of S. A. Jeffries. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

William Lamar Sames to be postmaster at Richlandtown, Pa., in place of W. L. Sames. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

James K. Morrison to be postmaster at Williamsburg, Pa., in place of J. K. Morrison. Incumbent's commission expired August 14, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Dexter E. Ellerbe to be postmaster at Florence, S. C., in place of E. D. Sallenger, deceased.

Bertie Lee B. Williams to be postmaster at Neeses, S. C., in place of B. L. B. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

TENNESSEE

Burrell G. White to be postmaster at Bell Buckle, Tenn., in place of B. G. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1941.

TEXAS

Elsie G. Parker to be postmaster at Azle, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Ruth B. Reeves to be postmaster at Boling, Tex., in place of R. B. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

George V. Norman to be postmaster at Hempstead, Tex., in place of G. V. Norman. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Vernon R. Brooks to be postmaster at Joshua, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Alex Jones to be postmaster at Keller, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Frank J. Williams to be postmaster at Lipan, Tex., in place of F. J. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Fowler Magee to be postmaster at Montague, Tex., in place of Fowler Magee. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Ruby N. Hart to be postmaster at New Boston, Tex., in place of R. N. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Tug S. Pfeuffer to be postmaster at New Braunfels, Tex., in place of Richard Pfeuffer, deceased.

Louis H. De Mouche to be postmaster at Portland, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Frederick A. Benedict to be postmaster at Randolph Field, Tex., in place of F. A. Benedict. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

Hattie M. Sims to be postmaster at Ropesville, Tex., in place of H. M. Sims. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Rose Franger to be postmaster at Runge, Tex., in place of Rose Franger. Incumbent's commission expired August 11, 1941.

Dorothy B. Statton to be postmaster at Skellytown, Tex., in place of D. B. Statton. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

Steve R. Selleh to be postmaster at Thompson, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Lillian M. Bradberry to be postmaster at Warren, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

VERMONT

James Emil Petersen to be postmaster at Salisbury, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

VIRGINIA

Betty L. Morrissette to be postmaster at Midlothian, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Peter D. Holland to be postmaster at Moneta, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Bessie J. Deane to be postmaster at New Canton, Va., in place of B. J. Deane. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1941.

Robert L. McConnell to be postmaster at Nickelsville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

James R. Parker, Jr., to be postmaster at Providence Forge, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Nannie Lee Stickley to be postmaster at Rose Hill, Va., in place of N. L. Stickley. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941.

Edgar L. Boone to be postmaster at Troutville, Va., in place of E. L. Boone. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Mary R. White to be postmaster at Vinton, Va., in place of M. R. White. Incumbent's commission expired August 19, 1941.

WEST VIRGINIA

Peter J. Groseclose to be postmaster at Hemphill, W. Va., in place of P. J. Groseclose, Incumbent's commission expired August 21, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19 (legislative day, December 16), 1941:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Spruille Braden to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

Frank A. Schuler, Jr., to be a consul of the United States of America.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be general

Lt. Gen. Douglas MacArthur (general, U. S. Army, retired), Army of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost make known to us the secret and disposition of God; Thou

who didst humble Thyself unto death, grant that we may be confirmed in the holy faith. We pray that we may arise in the blessedness of hope and cheer and believe the words of comfort which Thou hast spoken unto us: "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint." We pray Thee to bless all churches, breathing upon them the sympathy and the joy of true brotherhood; unite them more and more in confidence, in cooperation of labor, and in the sacrifice of brotherly love. Oh, do Thou breathe upon our land the spirit of understanding, of duty, of temperance, that men may learn to love as they have learned to hate. Oh, blessed consummation, oh, joyful hour, when man to man shall brother be. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5558) entitled "An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. BURTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 588) entitled "An act to give to the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, on account of the condition of the calendar today, the Chair would rather not recognize Members for unanimous-consent requests to proceed for 1 minute, or for any time, until the business of the day is concluded.

The Chair, however, intends to recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] on a personal matter.

HON. WILLIAM TYLER PAGE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixtieth anniversary of continuous service in this House by our distinguished friend, William Tyler Page, the senior minority clerk.

On December 19, 1881, Mr. Page entered the service of the House as a page boy. Advancing steadily through diligent application, faithful service, and abiding loyalty, he has served under 14 Speakers and through the terms of 11 Presidents—a record of service and achievement without a parallel in the history of our beloved nation. From 1919 to 1931 Mr. Page served 6 terms with distinction as Clerk of the House.

A native of Maryland, where he still resides in Montgomery County, adjoining the District of Columbia, Mr. Page is a descendant of Carter Braxton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, from Virginia. He is likewise a collateral descendant of John Tyler, the tenth President of the United States. His first ancestor on this continent was John Page, who settled in Williamsburg, Va., in 1650. Colonel Matthew Page, the son of John Page, was one of the founders of the College of William and Mary. Another John Page was Governor of Virginia, and later was elected to the First and Second Congresses under the Constitution. From such deep root stems William Tyler Page's fine patriotism and unflagging zeal in defense of the fundamentals of American constitutional government. He is in a very real sense the personification of the America we all love and strive to preserve and defend.

When, as a lad barely 13 years of age, William Tyler Page left his employment as a printer's assistant in a small shop in Frederick, Md., to begin his service in the House of Representatives, Chester A. Arthur was President; Queen Victoria ruled the British Empire with the aid and guidance of Gladstone and Disraeli; and Bismarck was triumphant on the Continent of Europe.

From that day Tyler Page has seen the great panorama of world history unrolled—and in much of that history he has been a participant as well as an observer and recorder.

He began serving a Union of only 38 States—almost a whole generation before the first telephone was installed in this Capitol. He lived and breathed American history; and as his devotion to our national traditions matured, it fell to him at length to write for a Nation of 48 States the one great document which faithfully epitomizes the living spirit of America since its founding—the American's Creed.

That great work, which most Members of this House during the last quarter century, recite from memory, was composed by Tyler Page during the World War 23 years ago. Woven from the classic utterances of every generation of Americans, it will serve as an inspiration to patriots so long as this Nation shall prevail as the land of the free and the home of the brave.

On this happy occasion, I need not remind this House of the noble qualities of character and warm attributes of loyalty and friendship which have made Tyler Page an institution among us. You all have known his cordial greeting and friendly guidance. You have known his quick wit and lively humor. He has, on occasion, presided briefly in the Speaker's chair and at other times he has been called upon to open our sessions with prayer. For 60 years nothing about the House of Representatives has been above or beneath or beyond the earnest and conscientious attention of our good friend and wise counsellor, William Tyler Page.

I know that today I voice the sentiments of every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle when I wish for William Tyler Page continued happiness and prosperity which, as a great American, he justly merits.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself and also for my Democratic colleagues of the House, I join with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in the fitting remarks he has made with reference to our distinguishd friend, William Tyler Page.

To us of the House he is an institution. To the country he is a great American and an example to all. I know I speak the sentiments of my Democratic colleagues as well as all of my colleagues when I make the statement that I join with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in the appropriate remarks he has made on this occasion with reference to William Tyler Page, and to add one additional thought, that there are few men in the life of our Nation who have made a more profound and constructive impression upon the Americans of any generation than has William Tyler Page in his great lifetime.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the late Speaker Champ Clark one day approached Tyler Page and, placing a hand upon his shoulder, said:

"Is it true, Tyler, you were born right here in the Capitol?"

"Not exactly, Mr. Speaker," replied Page. "Not exactly, but, like our old friend, John Quincy Adams, I hope to die here."

Seventeen years before I first saw the light of day and 25 years before the dean of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] first came to Congress, Tyler Page was here. Coming as a page boy at the age of 13 and later holding various key positions as an employee of the House, he has been with the legislative branch for almost 40 percent of the full period our country has enjoyed the blessings of constitutional government. He has witnessed the evolution, yes, the revolution, of House pro-

cedure, observing the transformation from a so-called do-nothing body to a business body and today a defense institution unanimously determined to preserve our Republic and defeat the forces of aggression and oppression.

Tyler Page has been exceedingly kind to me during my years on Capitol Hill. He has been like a father. I love him for what he has done for our country.

He is the author of The American's Creed, which literally breathes the soul of America. Today it hangs in practically every schoolroom, lodge, veterans' home; it can be seen on the mastheads of many of our leading dailies, and I learned yesterday that it has a place of honor on every major vessel in the American Navy.

A salute for Tyler Page. Sixty years he has labored in this structure.

Some allude to him as the Patriarch of Pages. To me he is the helping hand in the House. And to America he must be inspiration itself.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one Sunday evening not long ago, I was listening to a radio program in tribute to a great American upon reaching his seventy-third birthday—the Honorable William Tyler Page, eminent author of the American's Creed, and at the present time clerk of the minority of the House of Representatives.

He began his life work at the age of 13 as a page boy, and since that time has held numerous offices in the House of Representatives. Today he has completed 60 years of service—the longest any individual has ever worked on Capitol Hill. He has served under 14 Speakers of the House. Every office that he has ever held he has filled with simple dignity and distinction. His personal charm and superior mental ability are known to all.

William Tyler Page carries in his veins the blood of many great Americans, and his philosophy of life and of Government has upheld the finest traditions and ideals of his ancestors.

It is a rare occasion to be able to eulogize a man, even though he is respected and loved, and at the same time pay tribute to a symbol of pure Americanism.

There is no need of my telling you how Mr. Page has helped me and other Members of Congress with his kindly counsel on numerous occasions. But in these times our thoughts are turned toward love of country and patriotism, and while you are undoubtedly familiar with the story of how he came to write the American's Creed, I think it is well worth repeating as I believe it is the pattern by which he lives.

This is what he told me. He was born 73 years ago in Frederick, Md., and early in life formed a friendship with a boy named Schley. Later on Schley went to Annapolis while Tyler Page went to the Capitol. This warm friendship between these two boys continued for many years. Finally, in the Spanish-American War, Schley, who had risen to the rank of commodore of the Navy, and who was temporarily in charge of the American Fleet, won a glorious American victory on July 3, 1898. The marvelous news of the victory of his old friend Schley thrilled Tyler Page and filled him with patriotism. He made the resolve that instead of celebrating the next day, the Fourth of July, in the usual way, he would shut himself up in his library and read the great and fundamental documents of the beginning of our country, such as the Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and the Farewell Address of Washington. That evening, after reflection on what he had read during the day, he made the further resolve that he would continue this practice of reading the great historical writings upon which our Nation was founded each Fourth of July thereafter, and he has kept that promise for forty-odd years.

In the war of 1917 a contest was held to write an American creed. Page submitted his manuscript and won the contest, and the Congress officially recognized it as the American's creed of our country. It would have been strange indeed if William Tyler Page had not eventually written this creed, for unconsciously, from the reading of these great works, he had been formulating in his mind such a creed for many years. It was the welling up from the soul of this man all of the devotion to liberty, all the ideals of his love of country.

Knowing the Apostles' Creed to have been a compilation expressing their doctrine and principles, which they practiced long before the creed was formulated, and the sources of its articles were the books of the Bible, he resolved that his American creed must also come from recognized authoritative and historical writings. He did not want to use his own words, and every word of the American Creed is taken from such documents as the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Washington's Farewell Address, the National Anthem, and other similar references.

I could do no better in paying tribute to William Tyler Page than to quote the American's Creed of exactly 100 words:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

Mr. Speaker, in these times of great emergency and war, if all of us would but devote ourselves to the carrying out—with our lives if necessary—these simple and elementary truths, these principles upon which our Government was founded and which have made it great, we would have the satisfaction of knowing we were doing our part in fulfilling the God-given destiny of our country.

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT.

COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE ATTACK ON HAWAII

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 259, to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, and documents.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259), as follows:

Whereas on December 18, 1941, the President by Executive order appointed Owen J. Roberts, William H. Standley, Joseph M. Reeves, Frank R. McCoy, and Joseph T. McNarney, a commission to ascertain and report the facts relating to the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) the commission appointed by the President by Executive order, dated December 18, 1941, to ascertain and report the facts relating to the attack made by the Japanese armed forces upon the Territory of Hawaii on December 7, 1941 (in this act called the "commission"), may, or by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate may, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions at any place within the United States or any place subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States. The commission or any member of the commission when so authorized by the commission shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the commission. The commission or any member of the commission or any agent or agency designated by the commission for such purpose may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States or any place subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under subsection (a), any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Process and papers of the commission, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the commission, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(d) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(e) All process of any court to which application may be made under this act may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(f) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the commission, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, because personally I know what the request is, but I think the gentleman from Texas might tell the House if this is not simply to give this commission which he wanted to appoint to inquire into the attack on Hawaii, an opportunity to summon witnesses?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] does understand the purpose of this House joint resolution. In a sentence, it is to implement the commission created by the President, headed by the distinguished member of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts. The commission's business is to investigate the attack of the Japanese on the Hawaiian Islands. Of course, it is necessary that that commision shall have power to summon witnesses, to administer oaths, and do the things ordinarily done by commissions which are charged with this character of responsibility.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I heartily favor the objective of this resolution. I do it only because this is an emergency measure. I appreciate that the conditions are not at all applicable to ordinary investigating committees or commissions. There is an express understanding that the language used in this resolution is not to set a precedent for future guidance of the Congress in the establishment of investigating committees or investigating commissions authorized or created by the Congress. The language of the resolution is cumbersome. The provision dealing with subpenaing of witnesses is far reaching. Indeed there are numerous innovations in the resolution. Only the necessities warrant such emergency legislation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I inquire in what way this resolution increases the power or changes the power of the commission appointed by the President?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman from Illinois mean increase the power of the commission beyond that which is ordinarily possessed by commissions discharging similar duties?

Mr. SABATH. Well, the gentleman stated it will implement the commission.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The commission, when created by the President, would have no authority to summon witnesses or administer oaths or do any of the things ordinarily required of a commission charged with this character of responsibility. This proposed legislation is merely to give to the commission the power which the commission must have in order to operate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT 2 WEEKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the membership of the House is more or less interested in knowing what the program will be for the next 2 weeks, and I take this opportunity to inquire if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] can tell us what we may expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be pleased to give the gentleman all the information I can.

The Selective Service Act, of course, has just gone to conference, and it is hoped that the conference report will be in by tomorrow.

The second deficiency appropriation bill is the next order of business to come before the House, and it is hoped this bill will be disposed of by tomorrow. If not, of course, it would have to be disposed of next week if it should have to go to conference, and, expressing my own personal opinion, I believe the House will accept the conference report on that bill.

The sugar quota extension bill is now being considered by the Senate. I understand that the Senate amendments are of such nature that it is not unreasonable to expect the House will agree to them. The present sugar law expires very soon. It is hoped this bill can be acted on tomorrow, but certainly if not tomorrow it will have to be acted on next week.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may bring up a bill with reference to telegraph wires, but I believe there is not much objection to it, from what I have been able to ascertain.

Outside of the necessary legislation that I have referred to, and maybe one or two other bills I do not have in mind at the moment, there will be no legislation for the House to act upon for the next 2 weeks. The President has informed the Speaker and myself that he has no recommendations to make to the Congress. If an exigency should arise demanding action by the Congress on some unforeseen situation, the Speaker will give the membership as much notice as possible.

We hope to complete this necessary program I have outlined by tomorrow. My own personal opinion is that there are no irreconcilable differences of opinion in these matters.

I repeat that except for the program outlined I know of no legislation to come before the House for the next 2 weeks, and it is not anticipated that the Chief Executive will send any recommendations to us for that length of time; but should the necessity arise for action by the Congress to deal with some unexpected situation the Speaker will give as much notice as possible to the membership.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not see the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs present, but I take the liberty of expressing what I believe is at least the hope of all the House conferees, that there will be an agreement around perhaps 3 or 4 o'clock this afternoon on the Selective Service Act. Anticipating that we would be appointed conferees, we held an informal session this morning with the Senate conferees. Pending our official appointment, we recessed until 3 o'clock. I repeat, I think the prospect is very good for an agreement within an hour or two. If this proves to be true, we expect to bring in the report this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Committee on the Judiciary will probably call up a bill after we dispose of the appropriation bill—a bill to amend the act which I had the honor of introducing—the registration of alien propagandists in this country. So far as I can ascertain from inquiry, there seems to be no division of opinion on the bill. It is accompanied by a unanimous report, and I doubt if there will be much controversy about it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]

tell us what appropriation bill is coming up?

Mr. McCORMACK. The second deficiency bill. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is in his seat waiting to be recognized. The quicker we allow him to call up the bill the sooner we shall be able to get the bill to the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS INCIDENT TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, FISCAL YEARS 1942 AND 1943

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 258, to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And pending that, Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] I should like to secure consent to limit general debate to half an hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and one-half by myself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman mean half an hour to a side?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman prefers it that way. I thought perhaps we could conclude this in half an hour altogether. I have no requests for time on my side.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It was my understanding that the gentleman would ask for an hour, to be equally divided, but that we would try to get through in less time if possible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and ask unanimous consent that general debate on the resolution be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 258, to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 258, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be notified when I have consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides legislation and appropriations urgently needed in the prosecution of the defense program. The resolution as presented carries definite appropriations amounting to $512,000,000 and in addition to that appropriates an indefinite amount equal to certain taxes on sugar from the Philippine Islands, which raises the total amount actually carried by the bill to approximately $550,000,000.

There are eight items in the bill, the first of which is for defense housing. Three hundred million dollars is provided for this purpose and that amount is supplemented by $150,000,000 for community facilities.

The rapid acceleration of our industrial program requires at once a vast amount of housing for the accommodation of families, especially in the vicinity of the larger industrial plants. Wherever practical, they are increasing the working day to 3 shifts and increasing the working week from 5 days to 6 days and in some instances to 7 days. The result is a demand for vast accretions in the labor supply. The present housing is not adequate for the present distribution of labor, and with these increases in factory schedules it becomes necessary to provide a large amount of additional housing. As a matter of fact, there is now definite need for something like 69,000 housing units, of which we here propose to supply 65,000 units.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who sat with our committee in the consideration of this item of the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. With reference to the two provisions for the Federal Works Agency, defense housing and community facilities in congested defense areas, legislation authorizing these sums is now in the process of enactment. The bill before us stipulates with reference to each of those appropriations to be made herein that these amounts shall become available when the authorization in H. R. 6128 is finally enacted into law. Of course, with that understanding, there will be no disposition on the part of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, whose representatives through the courtesy of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee sat with his committee when this matter was considered, to seek to interpose a point of order, but in order to make clear the legislative intent I think we should have a statement at this time not only that the money shall not be available for obligations until enactment of the bill H. R. 6128, which recently passed the House, but that it should also be administered in accordance with the law as that law may be modified by final enactment of H. R. 6128. Is that the intent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as stated by the gentleman from Texas, whose committee formulated the legislation under which it is proposed to administer this fund, we, in effect, collaborated with that committee in the consideration of this item and provided for the appropriation of this money with the understanding and upon the contingency that it became effective only if and when H. R. 6128, the Lanham bill, should be enacted into law; and with the further understanding that administration of the funds shall be under this bill as finally amended and approved by the Congress.

The facilities for which $150,000,000 is appropriated and which are as necessary as the housing itself, such as water, sewerage, hospitals, and schools are provided on an even smaller ratio as compared with the need. As represented to the committee, they had applications for a billion dollars worth of these facilities of which $400,000,000 were of top priority and class A needs.

Mr. McGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. With this allocation of $300,000,000, that makes $1,200,000,000 that we have provided for housing facilities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have appropriated $300,000,000 under the first Lanham Act; in the bill which the President signed yesterday but for temporary emergency housing $300,000,000 more; and the $300,000,000 included here.

The next item in the bill is the item for the Office of Government Reports. A little over a million dollars was provided in the Second Deficiency Act which became law July 1 last and coupled with the appropriation was the limitation that further funds should not be secured for this agency from any other source. It now develops that due to the war and other circumstances it is necessary to expand its activities.

Is is, therefore, proposed to supplement the amount already provided from the President's emergency fund. This provision is included merely in order to permit that increase in funds needed by this agency and does not carry additional appropriations.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman enumerate the specific activities in addition to those already being carried on by this bureau that this money is needed for?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are no additional items. It is merely an expansion of the present program.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the Office of Government Reports using some of the funds carried here for the construction of a bomb-proof shelter?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. None of these funds can be used for such purposes. The funds are provided for the purposes enumerated in the present law,

which makes appropriation of $1,093,730 for that purpose. This item merely expands the present activities of the agency.

The enrollment for the Civilian Conservation Corps has greatly decreased in the last few months. Of course, with the decrease in unemployment and the decreased need for relief, there is a decrease in the number of those who are eligible and available to fill the ranks in the C. C. C. camps. With the reduction of camps from approximately 1,500 or 1,600 to the present number of 900, and with the prospect of a further decrease in the number of camps, the equipment which has been used in this activity becomes surplus equipment. There is no one to use it. It is idle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 5 additional minutes.

This legislation makes it possible to allot this surplus machinery, which is now idle, unused, and deteriorating, to agencies of the Government which can make adequate use of it. The plan has the added advantage of reducing expenditures which otherwise might be required to supply these agencies with new machinery, and at the same time it relieves the demand upon the manufacturing facilities which are producing this machinery.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. In connection with the Office of Government Reports, when the item came up in the early part of the year I objected quite strenuously to the inclusion of this item in the Budget. I have studied this department and watched it very carefully. I am pleased to testify that it is one of the most efficient departments in the Government.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. By a coincidence, I had exactly the same experience as the gentleman from Ohio. In the beginning I did not see the need for it, but time has demonstrated that it is one of the most valuable agencies to which a Member of Congress can apply for information. My office has frequent occasion to consult it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman be good enough to revert to defense-housing facilities again? Does that category include fire apparatus and ambulances?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no provision here for equipment of that nature. We provide housing and facilities of the character indicated.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Before proceeding further, would the gentleman mind explaining the benefits, if any, to be derived by giving the Bureau of the Budget the power to dispose of the surplus property of the Civilian Conservation Corps rather than having it done by the Procurement Division?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is a decided advantage. The Procurement Division has no means of investigation; it has no means of judging which agency most needs the machinery, or of judging as between two agencies applying for the same machinery which should be entitled to priority. All they can do under the law is advertise and dispose of it to whoever applies. The Bureau of the Budget, however, which has jurisdiction over the estimates for supplying the needs of the various Government agencies, knows which agencies need such equipment and which should be given priority. It is also in a position to subtract from requisitions by any department the amount which it asks for machinery which can be supplied in this manner by the C. C. C.

Under the item for reserve supplies in territories and possessions we ask $50,000,000, of which $35,000,000 is to go to Hawaii and $15,000,000 to Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. As can be readily understood, there is great need under present war conditions, and there is a possibility of still greater need in the future for food, medicines, and hospital supplies.

The appropriation is to be used as a revolving fund. These supplies will be sold in the normal trade channels upon the payment of the actual cost to the Government. I believe there are a few instances in which in cases of destitution direct relief can be given, but the principal purpose is to provide a fund under which stock piles can be accumulated to be available in time of acute need.

An appropriation of $2,000,000 is requested to supplement the working capital of the Procurement Division the general supply fund. As you are aware, it operates under a working capital of $3,000,000, but due to increased needs in the last few weeks its capital has been depleted. It now has only $750,000, which is inadequate for its immediate needs. We add to its funds the $2,000,000 necessary, which will, as business declines again, be returned to the Treasury.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 3 additional minutes.

The last item is for relief in the Philippine Islands. The situation there is somewhat similar insofar as needs are concerned to that in the Territories just referred to, but the funds in this instance are derived from a different source.

Under the Sugar Act of 1937 we have been taxing the sugar industry of the Philippine Islands under a plan which permits us to return to them for economic readjustment such amounts as are derived from this form of taxation. Up to the present time we have never made an appropriation from these funds, but upon the urgent request of President Quezon, recommended and approved by General MacArthur, who is familiar with the situation there, we are providing the entire amount which will be derived from the sugar tax in the Philippine Islands by the time this bill is enacted, amounting on September 30 to $36,600,000 and probably by the time it becomes law, $2,000,000 more or a total of $38,000,000. In addition to this and out of appreciation of the loyal and gallant cooperation of the Filipino people in the emergency, the committee of its own accord, added $10,000,000 above the Budget estimate, which brings the total amount up to approximately $48,000,000 or $49,000,000 for this purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would like to know what agency will have jurisdiction of this $150,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This amounts in all to about $38,000,000. To what item of $150,000,000 does the gentleman refer?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The item on page 3, line 17.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It will be under the administration of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, including the Philippine sugar-tax collections as of September 30, including the maximum amount that the bill in its present form would make available to the Office for Government Reports, this bill carries a total of $549,400,000.

It includes eight items. In respect of seven of those items I have no objection. I am opposed to the eighth item, which is the first in the bill, the item requested by the Office for Government Reports.

The major item, as has been pointed out, is an item of $300,000,000 under the so-called Lanham Act, as amended, the bill recently passed by the House and now under consideration by the Senate. The record indicates something over 98,000 defense housing units assigned as of December 12, something over 81,000 of these under contract, and something over 45,000 actually completed. This item of $300,000,000 contemplates the construction of 65,000 additional units, all of which have been programmed in defense centers, total allotment being contemplated within 90 days, total construction being hoped for by summer. The item is contingent on approval by the Senate of the amended Lanham Act.

The second major item is an item of $150,000,000 for so-called community facilities, also in defense areas, practically all of the original $150,000,000 for this purpose having been allotted, the $150,000,000 requested here being desired to

meet, in part, projects already approved and classified as class A, or of urgent priority, amounting to something like $500,000,000. It is estimated that all of this money, if made available, will be allotted within 30 days. This item also is contingent on approval by the Senate of the amended Lanham Act.

The third item in size is an item in respect of the Philippine Islands under which all sums collected under the sugar tax prior to the enactment of this bill will be made available under the direction of the commanding general, General MacArthur, for public relief and civilian defense in the Philippines. As of September 30, the sum which would be made available in this way amounts to $36,600,000. To this sum has been added an additional $10,000,000 for the reasons given by the chairman of your committee and appearing in the final paragraph of the report.

Two other items are included, one for $35,000,000 for the Territory of Hawaii, and one for $15,000,000 for Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the first fund to be administered by the Surplus Marking Administration, the second by the Interior Department. Both sums are for the purpose of public relief and civilian defense, and may be characterized, perhaps, as stock piles of food, medicines, and other commodities which might be required in an emergency by these outlying possessions.

A further item of $2,000,000 is in respect to the general supply fund of the Procurement Division of the Treasury. The current fund amounts to about $3,000,000. Against that sum there is normally carried an inventory of about $1,000,000. Under existing conditions, however, it is necessary to carry an inventory of something like $2,300,000, leaving a balance for expenditure of only about $700,000. The increase requested, therefore, is due to increased inventory, and to increased prices all along the line, the general average increase during the past 12 months being about 19 percent.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. What is that fund? I don't happen to be familiar with it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is the normal fund for the purchasing of commodities desired by the various departments and agencies of the Government, centralized in the Procurement Division of the Tresaury.

Mr. LEWIS. I recall now.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It may be noted in respect to this bill that the hope, at least, exists that the $300,000,000 under the Lanham Act and the $50,000,000 under the two items for Hawaii and other outlying possessions will, in the long run, be in a large measure recouped.

The seventh item is the item requested by the C. C. C. No appropriation is involved. The record indicates that the C. C. C. camps have been reduced in number since April from about 1,500 to about 900. The result is that there are some 7,300 pieces of surplus heavy equipment on hand. All that is asked here is authority to transfer this equipment to any department or agency under authorization of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARE. There is no provision by which the Bureau of the Budget would be able to dispose of any of this property by sale or otherwise. It can be disposed of only by transfer to some other agency?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that such a provision exists in respect to surplus property, under existing law, without the necessity of any language here.

Mr. HARE. The Procurement Division has that authority, but if you transfer equipment to the Bureau of the Budget, I doubt whether the Bureau of the Budget would have the authority to make disposition by sale, and in view of the limitation placed here I doubt whether it would undertake to exercise that right, because within 2 years, if the war should close, we will probably need this machinery for constructing highways, and if it does not close the surplus will be needed in construction of highways in the meantime. I question the wisdom of disposing of this machinery by sale. I can see the value of transferring it to some other agency and utilizing it by some other agency, but I do not see the wisdom of giving authority to sell it promiscuously and limiting that authority to a period of 2 years.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman may be correct. I raised the same question in the committee, and understood that the authority is present under existing law. No additional authority is included in the present bill in this respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the final item, because personally I am opposed to the item, and regret very much that the committee has included it in the bill. I refer to the first item in the bill requested by the Office for Government Reports.

It has been said by one who has listened to the testimony of this agency before the Committee on Appropriations half a dozen times, that he has yet to hear one convincing reason for the existence of the agency. I share these sentiments, to a very considerable extent. Certainly, if it has justified, its existence, it has not in my judgment justified its continuance on a basis of $1,800,000 a year, and that is what you are in effect authorizing if this item stays in the bill, as far as this year is concerned, and I assume it means considerably more insofar as the next fiscal year is concerned.

This agency had about $830,000 in 1940. In 1941 they moved up to $1,004,000. In 1941 we gave them $1,075,000, the largest appropriation ever made by Congress in this connection, and we coupled with it a provision that the agency should not receive additional funds from any other governmental source. It is this limitation which it is sought to repeal in this act, in the light of the statement that the agency, if it is repealed, hopes and expects to obtain $800,000 additional from the President's emergency funds.

The agency now has a force of 438. It wants to go to 898. It now has funds for other obligations amounting to $275,000. It wants to go to $460,000. In other words, it is, in effect, asking for authority to double its force and its funds under this item in the bill.

Just what this agency does has always been somewhat of a mystery. Some of us have tried conscientiously to ascertain in various hearings. We are told that it acts as a clearing house for inquiries. We are told that it is supposed to assist the President in clearing information with State and local governments. We are told that it is to distribute information regarding departmental activities. We are told that it is also supposed to keep the President informed as to public opinion.

As a practical matter, we know that it runs a division of press intelligence, largely devoted to press clippings. We know that it runs a so-called information service, in addition to all of the other information services that we have. We know that it maintains a considerable force in the field, the exact purpose or justification for which I personally have never been able to find out.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. You say they maintain a considerable group in the field. Just what are these persons doing in the field?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have endeavored to find out on several occasions, I will say to the gentleman, without very much success. They are supposed to be "coordinating," they are supposed to be finding out public opinion, they are supposed to be reporting that public opinion to the President, as nearly as I can ascertain.

Mr. MICHENER. Do you mean that they have an agency going about the country—quite similar to the Gallup poll—to keep the White House advised as to the political reactions to acts performed by the administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand they are supposed, among other things, to act as a barometer to watch public reaction with respect to this, that, or the other Federal activity.

Mr. MICHENER. And they have over 400 on the pay roll now?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They have 438 persons and $275,000 in addition for other obligations.

Mr. MICHENER. And you are going to increase that number by 400 more?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They ask for 460 additional persons and about $200,000 additional for other obligations.

Mr. MICHENER. And we are drafting men for the military service all the way from 19 to 65 years of age. I certainly criticize your committee for bringing a bill of that type in here. Every dollar of this money must be borrowed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Every dollar of this money must be borrowed. We are authorizing the expending of money that is not in the Treasury. If we want to set up a public-sentiment sampling agency to compete with Gallup—if I understand correctly, Gallup says he only has an average of seven persons in each congressional district to do the sampling. He has only about 1,100 regular field paid employees. He only samples around 3,000 folks on most questions. Why should we have three or four hundred people—on borrowed money—running about the country sampling public sentiment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am opposed to the requested increase. It has not been justified, in my opinion.

I want to point out, in conclusion, that this request is made in spite of the fact, as we all know, that there is an information set-up in almost every department and agency in the Government; in spite of the Army and Navy intelligence set-up; in spite of the F. B. I. set-up; in spite of the set-up in O. P. M., which I suppose is larger than any newspaper set-up in the world; in spite of the Coordinator of Information set-up, under Colonel Donovan; in spite of the so-called Office for Facts and Figures set-up, under Mr. MacLeish. It seems to me the suggested expenditure is largely, if not entirely, a nondefense expenditure. I do not think the Congress ought to put its stamp of approval on an increase of this kind at this time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. I am fully in accord with everything the gentleman has said. In my 10 years of experience as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have never heard a more ridiculous presentation than these folks have made. The thing is screwy. It is anything you want to call it and I hope the gentleman moves to strike the $800,000 from the bill. This amount will purchase two four-motored bombers, which are far more important than additional personnel in this agency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman return for a moment to the Civilian Conservation Corps item? Do I understand correctly that this property cannot be sold?

The reason I speak of it is that we all know machinery is frequently more valuable than money in these days and I should like to be reassured, if the gentleman can reassure me, that this machinery will not be sold, but will be held for the use of other Government departments.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not absolutely clear on that point, Mr. Chairman. As I stated to the gentleman from South Carolina, it was my understanding that the authority is present in respect to surplus property under existing law wholly apart from the bill we are now considering.

Mr. LEWIS. I assume it is the intention of the committee in presenting this bill, and I am confident it would be of the House, that this machinery should not be sold, but should be held during this crisis for the use of other departments of the Government.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There is nothing in the bill which alters existing law in that respect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such additional time as he may require.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I will take 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I want to make it very clear that the appropriations for defense housing and community facilities in congested areas provided for in this bill will be administered in accordance with the terms of H. R. 6128 when it is finally enacted into law. I want to ask the gentleman if that is not only his own understanding and the understanding of the committee: That the money is to become available when H. R. 6128 is enacted and is to be disbursed in accordance with the terms of that act as enacted.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is my understanding. I believe I can say it is the unanimous understanding of the committee. It is the desire of the committee that we may benefit by the improved methods of administration, by the improved cooperation with local authorities, by the opportunity to take advantage of the services of architects in private life and by all the other amendments which that bill carries with it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified at the inclusion in House Joint Resolution 258 of an item on page 4, under the heading "Department of Agriculture, Surplus Marketing Division," of $35,000,000 to be appropriated as a revolving fund for the maintenance of an adequate supply of necessary food commodities in the Territory of Hawaii.

The problem of keeping on hand a sufficient supply of food for the needs of the civilian population of Hawaii, more particularly of the city of Honolulu, was first brought to my attention nearly a year ago, and in the interval I have been cooperating with the Governor of the Territory and other territorial and Federal officials in working out a program that would provide a revolving stock pile of food supplies for this purpose.

Our final program was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget this spring and summer. Unfortunately at that time, the urgency of our needs was not recognized, and the Bureau of the Budget disapproved of the proposed allocation of Federal funds for such a purpose. Since then the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture have cooperated in submitting to Congress its recommendations for the necessary funds to carry out our original program, expanded to meet present conditions.

I want to emphasize that this appropriation is not in the form of a grant, but the funds provided will constitute a revolving fund from which the cost of the purchase and shipping of the food needed for the civilian population of Hawaii will be defrayed, to be reimbursed through the sale of such foods through the usual channels of trade in the islands. There should be no loss to the Federal Government in the operation of this program, and in the meantime the assurance that food supplies will be continued will add to the feeling of security of the people of Hawaii and indirectly supplement the military defenses of that outpost of our national defense.

As originally proposed, it was not anticipated that any interruption of our food supplies would occur through direct enemy action, but more probably through the temporary diversion of shipping to more urgent military purposes. In normal times Hawaii maintains ample stocks of all food commodities on hand for the needs of its people for approximately 6 weeks. It is now generally apparent, as it was earlier to those of us more directly concerned, that this is not a sufficient margin of security, and that it will be necessary to keep on hand at all times approximately 6 months' stocks of food. I believe the military forces have on hand a quantity that will serve their needs for at least that length of time or a longer period. Dependent as we are upon water transportation, it is today apparent that the same provision must be made for civilian needs.

The question is often raised as to why Hawaii is not more self-sufficient in foodstuffs. Of course, this is purely a matter of economics. We produce and sell to other parts of the United States the commodities we can most efficiently grow, and we in turn buy from all over the country the products most efficiently raised there. This exchange of goods and commodities between the Territory and other parts of the Nation supports as a part of the interstate commerce of the United States a trade of approximately $250,000,000 annually. We buy the products of the farms and factories of the mainland in excess of $100,000,000 worth of goods every year.

Among these purchases are food crops that cannot be produced in Hawaii as efficiently as they are elsewhere. It is in these particular crops that we need to maintain surplus stocks.

Normally Hawaii is approximately 40 percent self-sufficient in food stocks. Due to the tremendous increase in population during the past 2 years, this proportion has shrunk until now we are probably not 30 percent self-sufficent. The crops we raise consist of vegetables and green foods, but do not include the staples which comprise so large a part of anyone's diet.

As a part of our emergency program Hawaii is prepared to increase its degree of self-sufficiency by an emergency plant-

ing of 12,000 acres in crops that will help to replace those we normally purchase from mainland communities. But even this emergency planting will not relieve us completely of the necessity of buying many commodities that could only be produced in small quantities and under great difficulties, such as wheat, corn, rice, and some dairy products.

Among the essential commodities we must continue to buy from mainland sources are the feed crops for our livestock, dairy, and poultry industry. Very little feed is grown in the islands, and it would be difficult for us to supply our own needs in these cereal crops.

The tables listed below indicate the type of food and feed products we must continue to purchase from the mainland, and show the increased consumption of recent years due to the additions to our population over the same period:

TABLE I.—*Shipments of certain foodstuffs from the mainland to Hawaii*

[In pounds]

Commodity	1939	1940	Actual, January–June 1941	Estimated, 1941
Animal oils and fats, edible:				
Lard	169,573	253,853	227,663	455,326
Oleomargarine	232,107	248,820	171,286	342,572
Total	401,680	502,673	398,949	797,898
Dairy products:				
Evaporated milk	14,727,955	14,511,249	10,470,805	20,941,610
Dried milk	845,702	1,261,022	1,182,990	2,365,980
Butter	4,106,622	4,772,390	2,660,443	5,320,886
Cheese	925,617	1,138,952	761,272	1,522,544
Total	20,705,896	21,683,603	15,075,510	30,151,020
Vegetable oils and fats, edible:				
Cottonseed oil, refined	2,012,423	2,573,952	1,690,165	3,380,330
Cooking fats other than lard	3,119,478	3,548,337	2,206,989	4,413,978
Total	5,131,901	6,122,289	3,897,154	7,794,308
Grain and preparations:				
Rice	83,940,869	82,870,689	52,482,200	104,964,400
Wheat	6,685,320	6,661,620	3,169,500	6,339,000
Macaroni and noodles	1,167,363	1,489,510	1,046,432	2,092,864
Biscuits and crackers	719,480	860,370	569,961	1,139,922
Oatmeal	505,238	608,720	417,493	834,986
Prepared wheat cereals	403,012	596,027	437,419	874,838
Wheat flour	34,772,164	31,272,780	22,828,316	45,656,632
Uncooked wheat cereals	438,027	438,331	499,812	999,624
Prepared corn cereals	371,503	418,903	278,468	556,936
Total	129,002,976	125,216,950	81,729,601	163,459,202
Grand total	[1] 155,142,453	[2] 153,525,515	101,101,214	[3] 202,202,428

[1] Plus 6 percent. [2] Plus 5 percent. [3] Plus 38 percent.

TABLE II.—*Shipments of certain feeds from the mainland to Hawaii*

[In pounds]

Commodity	1938	1939	1940	Actual, January–June 1941	Estimated total, 1941
Barley	2,197,872	3,460,896	3,889,968	10,038,432	20,076,864
Corn	9,900,016	13,299,888	11,624,368	4,454,352	8,908,704
Oats	953,888	693,120	552,032	282,912	565,824
Hay	1,402,720	1,209,700	1,366,400	490,560	981,120
Oil cake and oil-cake meal	2,253,440	2,591,680	9,495,360	10,301,760	20,703,520
Fish meal for feed	956,480	1,173,760	996,800	293,440	586,880
Mixed dairy and poultry feed	53,892,160	51,067,520	50,021,440	33,216,960	66,433,920
Other prepared and mixed feed	1,099,840	1,565,760	1,090,880	1,305,920	2,711,840
Rolled barley for feed	21,844,480	22,227,520	21,539,840	10,908,800	21,817,600
Other feeds, bran middlings	33,113,920	35,125,440	23,020,480	12,579,840	25,159,680
	127,674,816	132,415,184	123,597,568	83,872,976	167,745,952

TABLE III.—*Population estimates as of July 1, 1939 to 1941, inclusive*

[From Board of Health, Territory of Hawaii]

Area	July 1, 1939	July 1, 1940	July 1, 1941
City of Honolulu	154,476	180,986	200,158
City and county of Honolulu (exclusive of Honolulu City)	74,110	79,899	110,345
Total	228,586	260,885	310,503
City of Hilo	16,700	24,341	22,667
County of Hawaii (exclusive of Hilo City)	65,253	49,222	45,731
County of Kalawao, Molokai	504	465	461
County of Kauai	40,354	35,956	33,479
County of Maui	63,594	55,785	52,495
Territory	414,991	426,654	465,339

Population of Oahu increased 36 percent, 1938–41.

Hawaii has a definite program for making itself more self-sufficient in its food requirements, and Federal and local agencies are cooperating to this end, but our work needs the help of Congress in some specific legislation. I have tried for years to have the appropriation for the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station increased to the amount authorized by law, that is, $90,000. But heretofore the Appropriations Committee has cut this small amount down and has granted us less than the amount appropriated for every State in the Union.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I realize that the item for the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station is rather close to the gentleman's heart. Would the gentleman tell the committee what the present appropriation is for this experiment station?

Mr. KING. Surely. It is $67,500 in the current Agricultural Appropriation Act. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the authorized appropriation is $90,000 but we have never been able to get the full amount appropriated. We have been consistently cut down to less than the authorized amount. Now that the needs of our population have been so emphatically shown I hope that the next appropriation bill will carry the full amount of $90,000 for the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station.

Mr. POWERS. May I suggest to the gentleman first that there was considerable discussion before the committee about Hawaii becoming self-sustaining so far as the diversification of crops is concerned. The gentleman realizes, I know, that it is impossible to offer an amendment to this bill to increase that agricultural experimental station fund because it would be subject to a point of order; but I hope the gentleman will appear before the Agricultural Appropriation Committee and ask for this increase. I sincerely trust he gets it. I hope the other members of the committee feel as I do about it.

Mr. KING. I join in that hope. Another way in which Congress could assist in making Hawaii more self-sufficient in foodstuffs is to approve pending legislation to authorize a major irrigation project on the island of Molokai. I have worked on this plan for several years and now have come to a point where the executive departments concerned have given their tentative approval of the project and need only to have Congress authorize the financing of the proposed irrigation project along the lines followed in the Western States for similar projects. Here, again, the necessary appropriation would be in the form of a loan, to be repaid from the area irrigated, with half of the total cost guaranteed by the Territory of Hawaii and the remainder to be collected in water rates from the water users.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, all of us are especially concerned today with the welfare of our fellow citizens living on American islands in the Atlantic as well as in the Pacific, for these islands are our military outposts. I therefore take this opportunity to present some important, but little known, information about Puerto Rico and the difficulties faced by the people of Puerto Rico as a result of war conditions.

Our fellow Americans, the people of Puerto Rico, are energetically and enthusiastically doing their part in our war against the Axis. They are serving in the armed forces; they are manning defense industries; they are building naval and air bases.

In everything they are doing, however, they are handicapped by the difficult conditions under which they live. At this time I do not think that it would

be appropriate to precipitate a full discussion of these conditions, but I do wish to comment on two matters which could be and should be given immediate attention.

The first matter is the food supply on the island of Puerto Rico. Because of the failure to enforce the law which limits corporate property holdings to 500 acres and because of pressure to maintain exclusive dependence on sugar, little food is produced in Puerto Rico. The island is almost entirely dependent on the mainland of the United States for food supplies. Food in Puerto Rico is actually sold at a higher price than in the United States as a result of added transportation cost and scarcity. The income of the Puerto Rican people is lower than the average for the United States. The standard of living has been and still is much lower than the average for the United States; in fact, lower than the most depressed areas in the United States.

At present these conditions are seriously aggravated by war conditions. There is an actual shortage of food in Puerto Rico at the present time. Prices for available food are skyrocketing way out of reach of the average Puerto Rican.

Curtailment of shipping between Puerto Rico and continental United States is one factor in this situation. Another is the operation of our coastwise shipping laws, prohibiting any but United States registered ships to carry supplies to Puerto Rico, despite the fact that there are small boats in nearby Haiti and the Dominican Republic which could carry available supplies from these countries to Puerto Rico and, at least partially, relieve the shortage there.

Emergency communications can be and should be established between Puerto Rico and both Haiti and the Dominican Republic. During this emergency the operation of the coastwise shipping law could be and should be adjusted so that reserve supplies of food may be transported to Puerto Rico. Emergency communications should also be established between Puerto Rico and continental United States, with Federal subsidization of an adequate reserve food supply on the island.

These are necessary steps which can be taken without hardship.

The second immediate problem faced by the Puerto Rican people is one of defense. They recognize what we all know—that Puerto Rico is of strategic, military importance in our war against the Axis. Along with the other West Indies, Puerto Rico is subject to attack by the enemy before any other United States territory in the Atlantic.

Therefore, it is logical that Puerto Rico should be supplied with the essential defense weapons and the supplies essential to the protection of the civilian population. Antiaircraft equipment, fire-control aids, gas masks, and, above all, air-raid shelters are necessary for adequate protection against enemy attack. Sometime ago the insular legislature passed a joint resolution asking that the Federal Government construct air-raid shelters. Certainly this is a Federal responsibility and a most reasonable request. We should appropriate the funds necessary to build these needed air-raid shelters, and we should supply the Puerto Rican people with fire-fighting and other essential equipment.

Today, faced with serious difficulties, the Puerto Rican people are displaying their heroic spirit by pitching in with all of their energy and contributing in an all-out manner to victory over our Axis enemies. We should recognize their difficulties and give them the material aid they need and deserve.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am justified in taking any time or not on what I am going to say. The lay public of this great country of ours has been amazed, the people have been alarmed about what happened at Honolulu a couple of weeks ago. We have been told that our naval forces were taken by surprise there, which is bad; but yet to the average layman there is a great deal of comfort to be gathered in the fact that since we were taken by surprise we realize that on an equal footing, where we would be forewarned, as we are now, the United States naval forces will be able to take care of themselves.

I think there is a great deal of comfort in that to the average American citizen who is not versed in military affairs and strategy. What calls this to my mind is the fact that I heard Secretary Knox this morning addressing the graduating class at Annapolis, and he made the statement that our Navy was taken by surprise at Honolulu. He also made the significant statement that had they had even 30 minutes' notice of the approach of these Japanese warplanes they would have been able to have taken care of themselves and there would have been an entirely different story. He further stated that on the third wave of Japanese planes that came over, after our forces were on the alert, even though crippled as they were, they were able to cope with the situation and drove off these planes; that not one projectile from those planes hit its mark.

I say that is very comforting to the lay public. The public in this great country of ours now realizes that the Japanese are not supermen and that, given an equal chance, we will meet them and take care of them on their own ground.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that we have had a very determined cry from the taxpayers for reduction in nondefense items or appropriations, Congress still continues to make them. Even the loss the other day did not seem to bring home to us the necessity of doing first things first.

The gentleman who just preceded me seems to think that a few words reassuring us about our fighting men will be helpful. Maybe so, but I do not believe we need any reassuring on that point. What our fighting men may do on occasion does not bother me at all; we need not worry about them; but what this Congress does or may do from day to day worries me not a little.

For instance, let us take the first item in the bill—Government reports. You will recall a few days ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] referred to the fact that after a firm in his district had secured a war contract, a defense contract, that firm was called upon right away to buy advertising space in the Democratic State Press, I think it was.

Mr. JONES. The Democratic National Press.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Democratic National Press, which has no connection with the Democratic Party, at $300. It occurred to me that maybe this news-collecting agency down here, to which we are to give $800,000, that we are paying for, has some sort of connection—maybe it is with one of these defense brokers which enables what we used to call around the streams back home a leech or bloodsucker to fatten on defense contracts.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am terribly sorry; I cannot do it.

Mr. HOOK. I might give the gentleman some information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman better peddle it in his own district.

Then there is the story brought out by the Senate committee with reference to Tommy Corcoran and Charlie West. Perhaps this news agency now tells organizations and defense brokers who gets contracts and that maybe there is a chance for them. We do not need this news agency more than the boys need munitions. Those clippings are not going to do the fellows on the vessels or in the trenches any good.

Another thing right along that line of needless spending: Take a look at the big ditch they are digging down here between the White House and the Treasury Building. There is little over in the Treasury Building anyway except I O U's.

There is ample room over there for the President, his wife when she comes home, for the executive staff, for LaGuardia when he calls, for Sidney Hillman when he goes over to the Executive Mansion, or any of these Communists the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] referred to; and who last year were entertained at the White House. When any of those folks come over to the White House and we hear of any of the bombers coming over, all they have to do will be to run across the street and go down to the Treasury vaults. I repeat there is ample room down there. Why spend our money digging a dugout for the President and his executive staff, a place they can get into underground? Why frighten the people by constructing a bombproof shelter for the executive staff when the Army and Navy lacks equipment the money would help furnish?

We were told the other day when the conscription bill was up here that we did not have the housing for the soldier boys. We all know we do not have the equipment to train them. So why hire somebody to clip things out of newspapers and collect them and then tell someone else what is in them? Why spend money for bombproof shelters here in Washington

when it is needed for the Army for those on the fighting line?

Let us have our first things first. Let us get the tents for the boys, and the housing; the guns, the tanks, the bombers, whatever it may be, and all those other things that all know are necessary. Let us get those things, and then let us leave these newspaper clippings for some other time after the war is over. If you read the papers from day to day, each one of us gets these stories of the courage and heroism and sacrifice that are being displayed by our fighting men over on the other side, where the common man, the average fellow, is doing his part. And never while our Nation lives will their courage, their service be forgotten. So I suggest that we here in Congress save all this money by cutting out these nondefense expenditures and devote every dollar to helping our soldiers and sailors fight the battle which they are fighting for us by giving them the tools, the implements they must have to win, with which they can and will win.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no misinformation given to the House, I call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the fact that Charles Michelson, of the Democratic National Committee, informed not only the Democratic Members but practically everybody in this House, both Republican and Democratic, also the public generally some time ago, that the Democratic National Press has nothing to do with the Democratic Party. The innuendo of the gentleman from Michigan that the payment or any portion of it for any advertisement in that paper went toward the upkeep of the Democratic Party has no place on this floor. This publication is not connected in any way, shape, or form officially with the Democratic Party, this administration, or any of its agencies. It is no more connected with the Democratic administration than the philosophy of the Soviet Republics represents the Republican Party philosophy, and we know that there is no connection or comparison there. I resent such innuendo.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations herein made for the Office of Government Reports shall not be supplemented by funds from any source aggregating in excess of $800,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 2, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to consume 5 minutes. I have already presented my views fully on this item. I think, as far as the record goes, there has been no justification whatever for the increase of $800,000, which is in effect authorized by the language carried in the bill. I think the increase requested is largely nondefense expenditure. If we are ever going to make any attempt to hold down this character of expenditure, I think this is a good place to begin. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes, the time to be allotted to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there may be some difference of opinion as to the real service being rendered by the Office of Government Reports. It has always been more or less of a bone of contention ever since it was established as the National Emergency Council. Later the Congress authorized it by passing a bill authorizing the Office of Government Reports as an adjunct of the Presidential office. We gave them this year in the regular bill $1,075,000 We cut the Budget estimate from $1,500,000 and gave them $1,075,000.

The agency not only has a vast press clipping bureau which supplies all the Government agencies with press information over the country, but it has in most of the States a coordinating agency which undertakes to keep in touch with the various Government programs and coordinate them, getting statistical information and so forth, and furnishing this information not only to the President but to many Members of Congress and to the press. With the far-flung Government activities we are having and which we have had, some such agency is necessary. But aside from all of that, this agency is an adjunct of the Presidential office. We have given the President several hundred million dollars which he may allocate at will. He would not have to come to the Congress about this matter at all if he wished not to do so. He feels that he needs that expansion of this agency in view of the war. He could allocate to the Army, the Navy, the Department of Commerce, the Federal Trade Commission, or any agency he might choose any amount of money he might set aside to do any of this work he wants done, but our committee felt that it would be much more logical and much more orderly to have it all done by the one agency which we have set up to do it. Therefore, we have relaxed the limitation to the extent of $800,000, which was the amount the Budget recommended the appropriation be increased for this fiscal year.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I understand a report has been made to the chairman of the committee that $27,000,000 has been spent for the publicity departments of the various agencies of the Government outside of the Army and the Navy.

Would it be possible or could the gentleman say whether we are going to cut out the work of these other agencies if the work is to be done by a central bureau and not have it duplicated by the two agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that I join anyone who says there is vastly too much money being spent in these information agencies and we are trying to curtail that work or curb it, but the press clipping service in the Office of Government Reports is not duplicated in other agencies. I believe there is an opportunity to do this press-clipping work by one central agency and furnish it to the Army and the Navy and the other departments and agencies and do it much more economically than allocating it to these other agencies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 52, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Defense public works (community facilities): For an additional amount for defense public works (community facilities), including the objects specified under this heading in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and including the exchange, hire, repair, maintenance, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles and the purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference, $150,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $6,750,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for obligation until the date of enactment into law of the bill (H. R. 6128 of the 77th Cong.) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the committee, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 4, after line 2, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

"The limit of $3,900,000 upon the cost of the site and building, West Central Heating Plant, Washington, D. C., specified under this head in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby increased to $7,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have only one central heating plant supplying heat for all departmental buildings in the District of Columbia. For a long time we have realized the importance of supplementing it with another plant, which might be available in case of disaster or overload. As long ago as October 9, 1940, an appropriation was made providing for this plant, but due to uncertainty as to site, the matter has been delayed until now when it becomes imperative that it be erected at the earliest date possible. The original appropriation for this purpose was $3,900,000, but due to the increased cost of the new site and the increased cost of equipment, materials, and labor since the last estimate was made, it now requires an additional

$3,100,000 or a total of $7,000,000. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts and I would like to have his approval before it is submitted to the Committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand the Chairman has now received a Budget estimate for the required increase and also has a detailed itemization of the increase which can be furnished for the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The reason the item was not included in the pending bill was due to the fact that at the time the measure was reported we did not have an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget. We have received the estimate in the meantime, with a detailed break-down of the cost, and with the permission of the Committee I will supplement my remarks by including the break-down to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The break-down is as follows:

Original site on Potomac waterfront just south of new K Street Bridge.

Proposed site on K Street, in Georgetown, east of Twenty-ninth Street and across Rock Creek.

No increase in power—

Additional cost factors:	
Site (original estimate $42,000)	$108,000
New site requires expensive and extensive piling; erection of retaining walls; erection of building over a large sewer, adding to cost of construction and extension of building by 12 feet	674,000
Tunneling Rock Creek and increased length	330,000
Increased cost of equipment:	
Boilers	500,000
Other mechanical equipment	1,486,000
Total	3,098,000
Appropriation Oct. 9, 1940	3,900,000
Supplemental appropriation	3,100,000
Total cost	7,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 258, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6263) to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934, for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman from California please explain the legislation?

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do that. The essential parts of this bill very closely follow the act passed for the same purposes during the World War in July 1918. The bill as reported, however, makes some changes in the provisions of the old act. The three powers given to the President are here taken from the act of 1918. The effect of the act would be that the President, when there is a state of war or threatened war, involving the United States, if he deems it necessary in the interest of national security and defense, may, during a period not later than 6 months after the termination of such state or threat of war, and not later than such earlier date as Congress by concurrent resolution may designate; first, suspend or amend the rules and regulations applicable to any and all facilities or stations for wire communication within the jurisdiction of the United States, as prescribed by the Commission; and, second, cause the closing of any facility or station for wire communication and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, and, third, authorize the use or control of any such facility or station and its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe, provision being made for just compensation to be paid the owner. The provisions requiring just compensation are taken from the present law, which applies to radio. It is provided that the Government can make its offer, and if the owner refuses to accept it, the Government can pay the owner 75 percent of the amount offered, and the owner then has the right to go into court to recover whatever value he may be able to establish.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the bill the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. LEA. It has. I call attention to the provisions for terminating the powers conferred upon the President by this bill. The powers given the President will terminate in 6 months after the treaty of peace, or at such earlier period as the Congress may by concurrent resolution provide.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, peace might not be declared for 5 years after the end of the war.

Mr. LEA. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. By concurrent resolution Congress may fix the date of termination.

Mr. LEA. Yes; even if the President should refuse to act. The war will probably actually end with an armistice; legally it does not terminate until a treaty of peace is made which might be 1 or 2 years later.

I have an amendment I feel I should offer. I am not authorized to offer this amendment as chairman of the committee. I do so in order to clarify two provisions of the bill. One relates to the period in which the orders or regulations of the President may be operative. The bill clearly indicates the period in which the President may make the order, but I think it is subject to doubt as to when those orders shall terminate. In order to remove any doubt, I propose an amendment that will confine the operation of these orders or regulations to the period in which the President has power to exercise such authority. One effect of this amendment would be to prohibit any exercise of censorship over domestic communications by wire, so far as the provisions of this bill are concerned. The amendment I propose reads as follows:

(g) Nothing in subsection (c) or (d) shall be construed to authorize the President to make any amendment to the rules and regulations of the Commission which the Commission would not be authorized by law to make; and nothing in subsection (d) shall be construed to authorize the President to take any action the force and effect of which shall continue beyond the date after which taking of such action would not have been authorized.

I desired to confer with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], the ranking minority member, before taking this up, but I did not have an opportunity to do so before the House met today. However, I did confer with some members of the committee.

There is no authority of censorship over these wires in the present law and this amendment prohibits censorship in any regulation made by the President under authority of this bill because his power to suspend or amend regulations is limited to such as the Commission is authorized by law to make.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This prohibits censorship of domestic messages?

Mr. LEA. Yes.

The second portion confines the operation of the order to the period in which the President has the right to make the order.

The present law is susceptible of that doubt. However, that is corrected by this amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, where is the provision that terminates this by concurrent resolution? That all seems to have been

stricken out in the committee amendment.

Mr. LEA. It is at the bottom of page 2, lines 22 to 25:

May during a period ending not later than 6 months after the termination of such state or threat of war and not later than such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I may say at the outset that I am not going to object to the consideration of this legislation and to its passage at this time. This is just another one of those measures that is presented by the administration and the Army and the Navy asking for an additional grant of authority in order that military emergencies that may arise in the future may be met. It authorizes the President to take over telephone and telegraph lines. That is a tremendous grant of power. But it is said it is needed, and I am therefore supporting it.

However, I would like particularly to call the attention of the House to the report, which on page 3 specifically indicates the position of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce against general, over-all ownership or operation of communication systems. I think it could also be said that that language indicates the attitude of the committee in respect to general governmental operation or taking over of transportation facilities. Those words were written into the report in order that there be no misapprehension at all as to the intendment of the committee.

The committee, in reporting this legislation, had in mind only the possibile necessity for exercising, as a matter of military expediency, the broad grant of power vested in this bill. Chairman Fly specifically asked for the bill on that ground. It was emphatically stated by him that there is no present intention to take over these facilities.

There is one further thing that has come to my mind. I recall that when we had the ill-fated, so-called May bill from the Military Affairs Committee, that bill undertook to vest in the President the power to seize certain plants in defense industries in the event of stoppages of production arising out of labor disputes. There was included a specific provision that after the plants should be taken over, the employees would nonetheless remain employees of the company and would not become employees of the Government, thereby reserving to them their rights as employees in such operation. While there is no such specific provision in this bill, I trust that if any of these facilities are taken by the Government under this bill, the rights of employees will be protected.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I do not intend to object, I wish to emphasize the importance of enacting legislation of this character under the war conditions that now exist.

It is needless to say that the committee in reporting this legislation to the House does not intend that its section shall be taken as any indication of a willingness to support governmental ownership of our communications system. Our report definitely and clearly sets forth our opposition to any such policy. The language of the report in this respect reads as follows:

The committee wishes to emphasize that its approval of the proposed legislation in no way indicates approval of the general policy of Government control or ownership of communication facilities. Moreover, it is clear that no Government agency plans to take over and operate communication systems in general. This legislation is necessary, however, to enable the President, in particular instances, immediately to control and use wire facilities when wartime needs demand such immediate action. There is no law which now gives the President such power.

The bill, as originally introduced, was given very careful consideration. The committee, while in accord with the objectives sought to be attained, were nevertheless of the opinion that it was too broad and required restrictive provisions. As a result of this consideration several fundamental changes were made. The present bill represents those changes. In an effort to promote clarity and a more ready understanding of the powers given, and, the restrictions provided, this bill H. R. 6263, was introduced in place of the original bill as representing the last thought of the committee on the subject. The amendments to be offered by the chairman when the bill is before the House for amendment are likewise intended to clarify and restrict the powers granted by the bill. I am in full accord with them.

A reading of the bill will show that the committee has restricted the use of the power to a time of war or threat of war. The original bill was far broader than this, although I do not assume that the powers would have been used in any of the instances that the original bill provided for. However, it is not amiss to hold such extraordinary powers within clearly defined limits and to times of extraordinary necessity such as war or threat of war. This bill does that without in any manner handicapping the fullest use of our communication system whenever the President deems it necessary to take over such systems or parts thereof that may be necessary in the public interest. In this connection it should be noted that at no time was it made to appear that there was any lack of cooperation to the fullest extent by those operating our different communication systems.

This bill is offered solely on the basis of being prepared for any military exigency that may arise where it would seem from a military standpoint that operation and control could best be accomplished under Government direction. In the last World War 15 months elapsed before the Government, by proclamation of the President, took over the wire service of the Nation, and his proclamation continued the operation of each of the systems in the then operating officers and employees of the respective companies. It can be assumed, I think, that no different action would be taken if the occasion arises to take over the present systems or any part of them under this bill.

The attention of the House is also directed to the fact that the bill provides a definite method of providing compensation for the use of such systems, if and when taken over by the Government. It also provides that the bill shall not be construed to have any effect upon the existing laws or powers of the States with respect to taxation or to the lawful police regulations of the States, except wherein such laws, powers, or regulations may affect the transmission of Government communications or be construed to affect the issue of stocks and bonds by corporations owning such facility or station.

In conclusion, the attention of the House is directed to the fact that this bill is a war measure. It has the approval of the representatives of the Army, Navy, and Federal Communications Commission, but, it is particularly pointed out, as a war measure it is provided that all powers granted thereunder automatically cease within 6 months after the conclusion of the war or sooner by concurrent resolution of Congress. Thus, it would seem that every precaution has been taken that the extraordinary powers granted by this bill shall be confined solely to a time when national safety, security, and defense require the exercise of such. I commend the bill, together with the amendments to be offered by the chairman of the committee, to the favorable consideration of the membership of the House.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out that this bill definitely grants power to take over, to operate, to shut down, and to control any facility of communication by wire or radio, including such leased facilities as are utilized by the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press.

Personally I found it possible only to agree to such sweeping grants of power to the Communications Commission after we had drawn up some safeguards which leaves the residual power with the Congress to withdraw from the Communications Commission this power at any given time, and then only out of consideration to the very important military aspects of the problem we are trying to deal with. But I do think that it is fair that the vast power in this grant should be made a part of the recognition of the membership here at this time, and only the extraordinary situation, plus the safeguards that we built around it would permit me even for an instant to agree to such a grant of power.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1104; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 47, sec. 606), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Upon proclamation by the President that there exists a state or threat of war involving the United States, the President, if he deems it necessary in the interest of the national security and defense, may suspend or amend, during a period ending not later than 6 months after the termination of such state or threat of war or not later than such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, the rules and regulations applicable to any or all facilities or stations for

wire communication within the jurisdiction of the United States as prescribed by the Commission, and may cause the closing of any facility or station for wire communication and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or he may authorize the use or control of any such facility or station and its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe, upon just compensation to the owners."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 606), is hereby amended by striking out '(d)' in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof '(e)', and by inserting after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) Upon proclamation by the President that there exists a state or threat of war involving the United States, the President, if he deems it necessary in the interest of the national security and defense, may, during a period ending not later than 6 months after the termination of such state or threat of war and not later than such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, (1) suspend or amend the rules and regulations applicable to any or all facilities or stations for wire communication within the jurisdiction of the United States as prescribed by the Commission, (2) cause the closing of any facility or station for wire communication and the removal therefrom of its apparatus and equipment, or (3) authorize the use or control of any such facility or station and its apparatus and equipment by any department of the Government under such regulations as he may prescribe, upon just compensation to the others.'

"SEC. 2. Such section 606 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(f) Nothing in subsection (c) or (d) shall be construed to amend, repeal, impair, or affect existing laws or powers of the States in relation to taxation or the lawful police regulations of the several States, except wherein such laws, powers, or regulations may affect the transmission of Government communications, or the issue of stocks and bonds by any communication system or systems.'"

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEA:

Page 3, line 11, strike out "a new subsection" and insert in lieu thereof "two new subsections."

Page 3, line 18, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 3, after line 18, insert the following:

"(g) Nothing in subsection (c) or (d) shall be construed to authorize the President to make any amendment to the rules and regulations of the Commission which the Commission would not be authorized by law to make and nothing in subsection (d) shall be construed to authorize the President to take any action the force and effect of which shall continue beyond the date after which taking of such action would not have been authorized."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ACT REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF AGENTS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 394, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield the usual half hour to the gentleman from New York. At the present I shall use a portion of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule on H. R. 6269, a bill which has the approval of the Department of State, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Justice. Many hearings have been held on the bill, and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. I feel, consequently, that there will be no objection to the present draft of the bill.

The bill amends the act of 1938 known as the McCormack Act, recommended by the McCormack select committee, which act was amended and strengthened in 1939. This bill strengthens it in several additional particulars.

The bill also proposes to transfer the administration of the act from the Department of State to the Department of Justice, because the Department of Justice as the act is now administered has the legal jurisdiction and the obligation of carrying out prosecutions under the act.

It not only extends power to control propaganda activities emanating in the United States, but reaches out to Central and South American activities. You may recall that in the conference held in 1940 our Government, in conjunction with the South American and Central American republics, agreed to this procedure. The bill, as I stated, clarifies the enforcement of the McCormack Act. I admit that I, myself, have not had time to study the effect of the changes, but I have the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and both the majority and minority members of that committee who appeared before the Rules Committee, that careful consideration has been given to all the provisions, that the amendment of the act is necessary, and that the passage of the bill is requested by the departments I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, recalling that the majority leader was the chairman of a former select committee authorized to investigate to bring about the elimination of subversive activities, I wish to compliment him and the members of the former select committee who, after a few months' investigation, made a report to the House that was the basis for the legislation which was enacted and which the bill before us now proposes to extend.

I regret that when the Dies committee was created to continue its investigation of subversive activities along the lines of the McCormack committee, it deviated somewhat from the investigation and obtained continuous publicity by charging certain Government employees as being "pinks" or being connected with alleged communistic activities in the United States. I cannot help but feel that the chairman of the committee in investigating and assailing labor leaders lost a golden opportunity to actually bring to light the Nazi and Fascist propaganda activities that were rampant in the country, thus allowing them to continue and increase their activities. It is now evident that the propagandists engineered by the Nazi Gestapo became so bold that they actually encouraged Hitler in making him believe that they were so strong and powerful as to be able to block any move of the President of the United States to properly prepare our national defense. Personally I feel that this bill should not only include foreign agents, but also those who are acting indirectly for the Nazi-Fascist-Japanese propagandists who are supplying large sums of money to many organizations to disseminate discordant propaganda to create religious hatred.

In view of the fact that the chairman of the committee, who has devoted a great deal of time to the study of the bill and its every provision, is here and will thoroughly explain in detail each and every section of the bill, I shall not take further time on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely strengthens and broadens the original McCormack Act which requires the registration of enemy agents with the State Department. For the sake of the record I have to check up my good friend the chairman of the Rules Com-

mittee, Mr. SABATH. He said this bill had undergone numerous hearings. The bill was introduced only a few days ago and had probably one hearing. Is that correct?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say to the gentleman from New York, that the original bill had a number of hearings. After the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary considered the original bill, a clean bill was introduced which is the one made in order by this rule. No hearings were held on the bill as it is presently numbered, but the original bill out of which this one grows did have a number of hearings.

Mr. FISH. Before a subcommittee. I am strongly for the bill but I do not think it goes far enough.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has a passion for accuracy and ought to be reminded that this bill provides for registration with the Department of Justice and not with the State Department.

Mr. FISH. It provides for registration with both the State Department and the Department of Justice, does it not?

Mr. SABATH. It transfers jurisdiction to the Department of Justice.

Mr. FISH. If it does not require registration with both Departments, it certainly should. The people affected are Americans who are agents of foreign governments.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FISH. If it does not require their registration with both Departments, it certainly should.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the bill requires that copy of the registration be filed with the State Department.

Mr. FISH. That is exactly what I am saying; it requires registration with both Departments. I know the original McCormack Act required registration with the State Department.

One of my complaints about this bill is that it does not go far enough. Americans who are agents of foreign nations whose registration is on file with the State Department or the Department of Justice should be made known all over this country so the people may know who the agents are. I think there ought to be a clause in this bill requiring the State Department to publish in the newspapers the names of all these agents. How is anyone to know that an American citizen is an agent of a foreign government? The people involved are all American citizens. Major General O'Ryan, who holds a high position in the Government at the present time, a distinguished citizen of my State, was an agent of some Japanese firm, or the Japanese Government, not many months ago at a large compensation. He, of course, was creating good will, spreading so-called propaganda for friendly relations. But how was anybody to know General O'Ryan was an agent of the Japanese Government unless the State Department published that fact all over the country? I have a high regard for General O'Ryan, but I submit that the public should know the names of all agents of foreign governments. There should be in the bill a mandatory provision that these Americans who are agents of foreign governments whose names are on file with the State and Justice Departments should be publicized. The Department of Justice should be required to publish their names so the public would have knowledge of them, and I believe the Attorney General would approve of such a proposal as being in the interest of the public. Otherwise, how is the public to know?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The bill provides that all agents of foreign principals shall be required to register and their registration is a matter of record.

Mr. FISH. A matter of record at the Department. But how is anyone to know except by investigation. I would like to see that information broadcast. There cannot be any objection to it on the part of the Department of Justice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. All propaganda which is subject to the act must be labeled as such. If it is in writing it must indicate that it emanates from the agent of a foreign principal who has been registered with the proper authority. If it is over the radio, he must preface his remarks by saying that this is in accordance with the statute, that the registration is in accordance with this statute and that it is propaganda.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and they file every 3 months a statement with the State Department.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to make a statement, and I will ask the members of the committee to correct me if I am wrong. If I understand it correctly, one of the main purposes of this bill is to accomplish what the gentleman is complaining about at the present time, namely, to transfer this administration to the Department of Justice with the thought that full publicity will be given conscientiously and deliberately to these registrations in order that they may be matters of common knowledge to the American people. I am under the impression that is one of the principal reasons for bringing the bill in.

Mr. FISH. That is not in the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it is.

Mr. FISH. There is nothing that makes it mandatory in the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it is in the bill. I submit to the gentleman this thought: In the case of the State Department it is obviously very difficult, in view of the kind of work the State Department has to do, for it to do as effective a job of publicizing these things as the Justice Department can.

Mr. FISH. I think both of them should do it. If both have it, they both ought to do it.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. What the gentleman suggests is that the mere filing in the Department of Justice or in the Library does not give general notice to the American people.

Mr. FISH. That is it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman feels the public should know who these people are who are drawing money from foreign governments?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. They say that it does provide in the bill for such publication, or that such pamphlets or publicity shall be given, but I have not been able to find where there is a provision in the bill that would compel this publicity.

Mr. FISH. That is what I want to have accepted. I am for the bill 100 percent. I do not think it is sufficient to say that a man before he speaks over the radio has to submit a certain kind of preface. I want it known who these agents are, that they are on the pay roll of a foreign government, and everybody should know that.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that only recently the Department of State issued a news release in which it served notice on the American people who in any way had connection with these foreign free movements to either resign from them, and indicated that it wanted full publicity on these particular free-movement organizations. The State Department does not want the American people to belong to them, American citizens, and I think the gentleman is right. If this bill does not contain something whereby the general public can be protected, it should include that. Of course, I know we are all for the bill.

Mr. FISH. I think everyone is for the bill. It is simply a question of protecting the public.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS A. FORD. What the gentleman wants is the moment a man registers that that be broadcast over the country?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. And it is forgotten in a week.

Mr. FISH. Have it rebroadcast every 6 months.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. This bill provides every time a man makes an address,

whether it be printed or spoken over the radio, he has to preface the utterance with the statement that he is the registered agent of a certain government and that this is propaganda. That is provided in the measure.

Mr. FISH. And that is a good part of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. I think that is a more effective proposal than the type the gentleman is asking for.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the gentleman think that the provision in section 6 that this shall be a public record and open to public inspection and examination would insure that it would be pretty well published in the newspapers and disseminated throughout the country?

Mr. FISH. I do not see how anybody is going to know about it. The gentleman is not going to take the trouble—neither am I—to go down and see who is an agent of a foreign government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. During these times, when the public is interested in who might be an agent, that perhaps would make news that would ordinarily be disseminated throughout the country.

Mr. FISH. I do not believe so. I think there ought to be some way—and I hope we can find some way—to amend it to make the people aware of just exactly who these agents are. I hope there is some way to put it in the bill.

That is permanent law, too, is it not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly.

Mr. FISH. We are at war now. As I understand the bill, at the present time it will have very little effect on Americans who are either Nazi agents, Fascist agents, or Japanese agents, because if an American citizen today is an agent of any of the countries with which we are at war he is aiding and abetting the enemy, and that is treason. That is entirely different. It comes within the provision of the Constitution defining treason.

This is permanent law for the future. It does not go into effect until 60 days after it passes the Congress. It applies to all nations, the British, the French, Norwegian, and all the rest who have propaganda agents in this country. It has really and practically very little effect on those who are agents of enemy nations.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We are all agreeable to the proposition which the gentleman advances, that propaganda agents of foreign principals operating in this country should have their activities disclosed, but this bill does that. It does it in the most effective manner possible, by requiring that each time an agent of a foreign principal makes an utterance or writes or disseminates anything in his capacity as an agent of a foreign principal, he must label at the top of the written matter or state in advance of his verbal statement over the radio, or privately, his status, his name, his capacity as an agent of the foreign principal for whom he acts, and all the circumstances surrounding the transaction, so that the public is thoroughly advised. In addition, the names of all agents of foreign principals operating in this country are a matter of public record in the Department of Justice, and copies of their registration certificates are transmitted by the Justice Department to the State Department.

Mr. FISH. As far as it goes, it is fine. If a man is going to make a radio speech and prefaces it by saying, "I am an agent of X government," that is fine; but if a man comes to you and talks to you, he does not preface his remarks by saying, "I am an agent of a foreign government," does he? Certainly not, and you do not know that he is such an agent. Therefore the only way you can find it out is to have some publicity.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Would not that object be accomplished by requiring that periodically, say twice a year, there be published in the Federal Register the names of all foreign agents?

Mr. FISH. That is exactly what I want.

Mr. BLAND. Say it would be published there the first Monday in July and the first Monday in January; then the gentleman and I and everybody else would know that we could find in the Register as of that date the names of all foreign agents.

Mr. FISH. That is the purpose of my remarks. I am for the bill. I do not believe it goes far enough, because it leaves out that feature. I will support it anyway, of course. I am just offering that as what I believe to be a sound precaution.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS. I have observed that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is not on the floor at the moment. I should like to have it appear in the RECORD whether or not he approves of that.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman has already spoken to me today about it. The gentleman from Massachusetts is for this bill very strongly. He says that this just broadens his bill and puts some teeth in it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The penalty under the McCormack Act was 1 year of imprisonment and a fine of $1,000. That is increased to 5 years imprisonment and a $10,000 fine under this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman is advised that the gentleman from Massachusetts has gone over these proposed amendments and approves of them?

Mr. FISH. Very much so; he spoke to me and asked me to speak for the bill and support it today.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. This act is very complicated. May I ask the gentleman, or through him some member of the committee, if it cannot be read in such a way as to include among those who are required to register and to make statements concerning their connection with a foreign government any member of the Communist Party or a fellow traveler with such party?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman will have to take that up with members of the committee. He knows how I feel on that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the bill cover that point?

Mr. FISH. I will go as far as anybody in the House to have inserted in the bill anything of that kind, if it is germane.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the gentleman will yield, I should be glad to answer the inquiry of the gentleman from California.

Mr. FISH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. This bill covers individuals in the United States who are agents of foreign countries or foreign principals.

Mr. HINSHAW. Or a foreign political party, as I read the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is right. If he is an agent of a foreign political party and speaks in his capacity as such agent, he is required to register.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does he have to be paid by that foreign political party to make a speech or go on the radio or write something, or can he just do it of his own volition?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It has to be by means of an authorization by a foreign political party. Of course, if you speak independently as a citizen, regardless of what you may say, this bill does not cover you. This bill covers those who as individuals in this country speak as agents of foreign principals.

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield any more; I am sorry, but I do not have time.

This bill includes a provision for deportation; therefore, the agent must be an alien and not an American, because if he were an American, we could not deport him. The bill provides for deportation of those who violate the law. That could apply only to aliens.

If I had my way, so far as these alien Nazis or alien Fascists or alien Communists are concerned, I would just put them on an American boat and send them to Russia, Germany, or Italy, and let them fight over there, provided they would guarantee they would not come back to America. I am sorry that cannot be put into this bill, but there is a provision which requires the deportation of aliens who violate this law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman appreciates the fact that any alien who violates this law is subject to deportation and the gentleman also appreciates the fact that this is a publicity bill.

Mr. FISH. That is right.

I am now going to take 2 or 3 minutes to speak out of order in reply to a statement made here this morning in regard to our Navy. Whether we suffered very severe losses in Hawaii or not even we in Congress do not know at the present

time. We know what we have been told by the Secretary of the Navy. We do not know the extent of the losses, neither do the American people, but a colonel in the Army said yesterday in a public speech that the Navy was a gone goose or a gone gosling. I want to go on record as stating my belief that we still have the greatest, the best, and the strongest navy in the world, that our Navy is greater and more powerful and more efficient than the British Navy or the Japanese Navy, that there is no reason why we should not have faith in our Navy, in our personnel, in our ships, and in our future on the seven seas.

The Commission that has been formed by the President to investigate and get the facts will, I suppose, in due course report back. Everybody knows that we were caught napping. We do not know who is responsible for that situation. We were in a state of preparedness instead of a state of alertness. We should have been on the alert, of course, and we were not. We were only in a state of preparedness. We were caught napping and our ships were sunk, but, after all, let us be fair to our own Navy. Let us have faith in our own. Two of the British battleships—one of them far greater than any one we had out in Hawaii, two of them together, ready to go into battle—were destroyed by Japanese airplanes off the Malay Peninsula when they were all ready for battle. Yet when we were attacked in time of peace and Japanese airplanes came over the top of the hill to bomb on our ships we could not really defend ourselves. That is a different story. We have not anything to be ashamed of with respect to our Navy. Our Navy is not a gone gosling. Our Navy today is the greatest in the world, and that is why the Japanese Navy is not coming over to our coast or attacking our shores. They know our Navy is more powerful than theirs and can beat them in any naval action. We may have some difficulty if we go seven or ten thousand miles over there, but until the situation changes our Navy can protect this country both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, and we have nothing to fear whatever from any foreign nation.

I simply want to go on record as one who has always said that we have the greatest navy in the world. Every day British, German, Italian, and Japanese warships are going down to the bottom of the ocean and all the time we are building a two-ocean Navy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6269, with Mr. ZIMMERMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This bill would amend the present law regulating the activities of propaganda agents within the United States of foreign principals. It comes to the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary. Hearings have been held and are printed. It has the approval of the State Department, the Justice Department and the Post Office Department, which Departments are intimately concerned with the subject matter of the act. Representatives of the Departments appeared and testified in favor of the bill, and letters favoring it were received by the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear in the hearing record. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the author of the original bill of 1938, has expressed his full approval of this bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the Judiciary Committee and subcommittee.

Mr. O'HARA. There was some inference made here to the effect that there were very limited hearings on this bill. As a matter of fact we had a number of hearings on the bill, did we not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman is entirely correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I wonder if the gentleman would agree to an amendment that would define an agent as including the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund. Without such an amendment it will never be enforced against the Communist Party of the United States, and our committee has definitely shown that that party is an agent of the Soviet Union, and I propose to offer a specific amendment to that effect. I have tried for months to get the Department of Justice to prosecute the Communist Party and the members of the Communist Party for their failure to register under existing law and they have refused to do so. I propose to offer a specific amendment to that effect, and I make the prediction that if the House should agree to it, it will be taken out of the bill before the bill becomes a law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, for whom we all have the very highest regard because of his activity in connection with the activities of foreign agents, that this bill refers to persons in this country acting as agents of foreign principals. It does not refer to any particular or specific organization or party in the United States acting as an agent for a foreign principal. It refers to persons, and the persons included as the agents of foreign principals are specifically defined and spelled out. The definition of the term "person" in the bill is comprehensive and includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals.

Mr. DIES rose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I cannot yield further.

Propaganda has for many years been recognized as one of the most powerful weapons on earth. In very recent years its tremendous influence has come to be more and more clearly recognized. So manifest and well known is this fact that it is unnecessary to illuminate the point with illustrations which have abounded throughout the world. Our particular attention has been directed to the deadly effects of propaganda in the countries of Europe, and to the effects sought to be produced in the Latin and South Americas in our own hemisphere. In our own country propaganda in various forms flourished for years. In 1938 as a result of the disclosure of the special committee to investigate un-American activities our distinguished colleague, Mr. McCORMACK, introduced and sponsored a bill which became a law, by which American agents of foreign principals engaged in propaganda in this country were required to register with the State Department. That law has worked fairly well but amendments have been found to be desirable if, indeed, not essential, to the effective functioning of the law. The bill now before the House, H. R. 6269, is designed to amend the McCormack Act, requiring registration of propaganda agents of foreign principals to make the law more effective in the regulation of the far-reaching and important activities which it covers.

The bill is rather extensive in form, covering 26 pages, but much of it is devoted to the definition of terms and other more definite statements of what is already implicit in the existing law, so that it is in large part a clarification of the existing law rather than a modification of its substance. The amendments do not change the philosophy of the present law in its treatment of the subject matter. The fundament of H. R. 6269 is identical with that of existing law.

The amendments in the bill under discussion in addition to clarification by means of more complete definitions are:

First. New provisions — section 4 b, pages 17–18—requiring labeling and filing of copies of political propaganda with the Department of Justice and Library of Congress.

Second. Amendment transferring administration of the act from the State Department to the Justice Department—section 14, page 24.

Third. Amendment — section 1–j–2, section 8 d—extending application of the statute to include use of the United States by foreign agents as base for propaganda activities in South or Central America.

Fourth. Amendment—section 4 d, page 19—authorizing Treasury Department and the Postmaster upon request of the Librarian of Congress to forward to the Library of Congress foreign prints, notwithstanding the law which makes such prints unmailable.

Fifth. Amendment strengthening the enforcement penalty by increasing fine

from $1,000 to $10,000, and term of imprisonment from 2 to 5 years.

It is to be borne in mind and should be emphasized that this bill is not a repression measure. It amends the present law, which deals with propaganda agents or foreign agents not by prohibitory means but by making certain that the sender—the propaganda agent—is officially known as such by means of public registration with the Attorney General, copy to be submitted to the Secretary of State (sec. 2–a, p. 10), and that the recipients of such publications are definitely advised by means of full disclosure that the sender is a foreign propaganda agent and for whom he is acting. Thus the citizen is not interfered with in his right to say what he wishes to say, but is required to state that he is saying it in his capacity as a foreign propaganda agent. This bill and the law which it amends approach this whole subject upon the fundamental basis that if told who is the author and whom he represents, the public to whom the propaganda is addressed can be depended upon to make their own appraisal and reach their own conclusions as to such propaganda and to the weight or lack of weight to be given thereto. The bill turns the searchlight of publicity onto the identity, background, and interest of propaganda agents. It turns this light on with greater force and clarity than does the present law which it would amend. As an illustration of the type of the strengthening and clarifying effect of the amendments, I direct attention to the definition of the "foreign principal" in section 1–b–2, page 2, of the bill. This subsection causes to be included as a "foreign principal" an individual associated with or controlled in whole or in part by a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party. Such an individual is not included as a "foreign principal" under the terms of the existing law.

The report accompanying the bill contains the amendments in detail. As stated, the bill does not change the philosophy of the existing law, nor does it change the approach to the subject which has been determined upon by the Congress. It sets up with greater effectiveness a plan and system under which agents of foreign principals are required to make known their identity by registration and in which the public is fully advised that propaganda which comes to them is in fact propaganda and that the transmitter thereof is a foreign propaganda agent. The bill transfers the administration of the law from the State Department to the Justice Department, but sets up a definite liaison between the State Department and the Justice Department so that both are advised of the situation at all times.

The Post Office Department is interested in the bill because it provides a means by which incoming mail from foreign countries, which is now nonmailable under the existing law, may be transmitted in the United States mail to the Library of Congress for public inspection.

The bill contains a new section—section 8 (d), page 23—which permits coordination of efforts in the control of propaganda between the United States and Central and South America and other American republics in connection with propaganda attempted to be sent through the United States to any other American republic when the Postmaster General is informed by the Secretary of State that such American republic has indicated to the State Department that the admission of such propaganda in such American republic is prohibited and has requested that its transmittal there be stopped. This provision causes the law to carry out the commitment entered into by the signatories at the Habana Conference in 1940 under which each signatory undertook to attempt to protect the others against subversive activities originating within its borders.

The bill transfers the administration of the act, including the place of registration of statements of foreign propaganda agents from the State Department to the Justice Department.

This is in accord with the wishes of both departments and makes for simplification of enforcement, since the administration itself is placed in the Justice Department, which Department is charged with the responsibility of prosecuting offenders against the law.

It is to be hoped that the bill will be enacted in its present form, which has the approval of the State Department, the Justice Department, and the Post Office Department, who have expressed their desire that the amendments to the McCormack Act contained in the bill be adopted by the House in order that the law may be more effectively administered for the welfare and benefit of the people of the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman take a minute more?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes; I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. On page 17 in subsection (e) the bill provides:

> Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or of the fine arts.

That is one of the exemptions. Is not the exercise of the rights under that exemption the basis of a great deal of propaganda? Is it not true that through religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits that much of the propaganda is transmitted?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Not if taken in conjunction with the definitions which appear under section 1 of the bill. Those are reasonable exemptions which are necessary, in the opinion of the State Department, in order to maintain our proper relations with foreign countries, and also in the opinion of the Justice Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the registration of these foreign agents would be transferred from the Department of State to the Department of Justice?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. I am asking about the mechanics of it, because it comes under our Subcommittee on Appropriations. Will another appropriation be required, or can the mechanics in the Department take care of the situation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It will be a matter that will automatically be transferred.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the question I wanted to ask about the mechanics. The files and everything will be transferred from the State Department to the Justice Department?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. Inasmuch as our committee has both Departments, we can easily take care of the proposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has made a very fine explanation of the bill. There are two things which it does. This bill is not repressive legislation. It does not prevent anybody from printing anything anywhere or anyhow. It does not prevent anyone from uttering or speaking anything anywhere, anyhow. But it does attempt to inform the public as to whether or not the person expressing himself by means of the printed or the spoken word is the representative of a foreign agent at the time.

There is another very important feature of the bill that is being overlooked. This bill takes from the State Department the administration of the McCormack Act and lodges it in the Justice Department. In my judgment that is the most important part in this bill. In my judgment those back of the bill are more interested in this phase of it than they are with the trimmings. Possibly that is a desirable thing to do, but do not pass this bill without appreciating that fact.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he could suggest some reason why he thought that would be done?

Mr. MICHENER. Undoubtedly the proponents of the change feel it would be better, or else they would not propose it. That would be my best answer. Further than that, I do not know.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Not at this time. I only have a minute.

I do want to say that I hope the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], who understands this bill better than any other Member, will clarify some of the things about the bill concerning which I

am not sure. For instance, the gentleman stated awhile ago that anyone engaged in any of these activities which might be propaganda endeavors, even if speaking over the radio, would have to announce his principal, and that he was in the employ of a foreign agency or government before he proceeded. The same would be true of a printed article. Now, if a person is broadcasting—call it a good-will broadcast—and is in the pay of a foreign country or agent, will that person have to so state, and state the amount received for the broadcast?

Second. If a person were selling coffee, for instance, over the radio, in behalf of a foreign principal, and paid by a foreign government, would the person have to announce the amount received for the broadcast, and that the broadcast was propaganda within the meaning of this law?

Third. If lecturers, for instance, come to this country from foreign countries representing those foreign countries who happen to be our allies at this time, and speak before luncheon clubs, patriotic meetings, and so forth, come under the provisions of this bill? I would like to have the gentleman answer those questions, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman from Michigan asking me a question?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. My time has expired. The gentleman will have all the time he wants under the 5-minute rule. I ask him to explain those three things definitely.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a strengthening of the so-called McCormack Act, and is a bill which is designed to plug some of the loopholes in existing law with reference to foreign propaganda and foreign agents.

The very conscientious and able chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the subcommittee spent a great deal of time conducting hearings in which representatives of the State Department, the office of the Attorney General, and the Post Office Department appeared and testified in dealing with the various phases concerned in this bill. Parts of this bill are of a strengthening character and are not repressive, and, as the gentleman from Nebraska has outlined in his very fine presentation of this bill, are intended to fill in the gaps and plug up some of the loopholes that have existed in the present law.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], has raised some question as to the propriety of the transfer of the enforcement of this act from the Department of State to the Department of Justice.

That is one of the important transfers made in this bill, and its purpose is perfectly obvious: The Department of State has neither the time nor the means of enforcing the provisions of the McCormack Act or this act. The Department of Justice does. The purpose of this act is to transfer authority to the Department of Justice for the same purpose that all laws are enforced by them, because they are charged with the duty and are the law-enforcement body of our National Government—and very properly. I believe the transfer should be made.

I believe the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas suggested that we should have more teeth in this law. As a member of the subcommittee it is my opinion that it was the sincere desire of the Attorney General's office, the Post Office Department, and the Department of State that we provide ourselves with all the enforcement teeth necessary. If this bill needs strengthening, let us strengthen it, but personally I believe the bill carries sufficient power to enforce the control of all types of propaganda. If it does not I shall support the gentleman from Texas in any proper amendment he thinks should be in the bill.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Under the Registration Act, known as the McCormack Act, later amended by the Voorhis Act, there is ample authority justifying and requiring the Department of Justice to prosecute these organizations for failure to register. I say, and I say it deliberately as a firm conviction, that unless you specify the Communist Party of the United States it will never be included under the definitions in this bill.

Mr. O'HARA. I do not believe, under the definitions of this bill, the fact they are members of the Communist Party, the bund, or some other organization, necessarily requires that they be registered unless they act for the purpose of spreading propaganda.

Mr. DIES. What I intend to offer is an amendment that will include the Communist Party itself, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund as organizations that must be registered.

Mr. O'HARA. Is it the gentleman's desire that every member of these organizations should register?

Mr. DIES. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does not the gentleman from Minnesota agree that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas does not come within the framework of this bill for the reason that this bill seeks to control by registration the activities of all persons as defined in the bill, and not of organizations which might be picked out and particularly specified?

Mr. O'HARA. I think that is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. DIES. The definition of "person" in the bill also includes "association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals."

Mr. O'HARA. That is correct.

Mr. DIES. What possible objection could there be to the inclusion of an amendment that would specify certain organizations that our committee has unanimously found to be controlled by the Government?

Mr. FISH. And who take orders from foreign governments.

Mr. DIES. And who take orders from foreign governments. Unless you put that in there the bill will be of no real value to the country.

Mr. O'HARA. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I want the bill to have every grant of power necessary to accomplish the purposes of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman has referred to definitions. The definition the gentleman refers to is a definition of the term "foreign principal" as the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party. The agent of a foreign principal under section 1 (c) is a person, a person throughout. The term person is broadly defined in section 1 (a). There is not any provision in the bill naming as the agent of a foreign principal any particular organization as suggested by the gentleman from Texas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, our esteemed colleague [Mr. MICHENER], that if the agent is a representative of any foreign power, whether it is an Axis power or an Allied power, he comes within the provisions of the statute.

The gentleman from Michigan also asks whether or not a radio broadcaster would have to announce, if he were a foreign agent, the amount of money he received for the lecture or the broadcast. There is nothing in the bill which would require his indicating the amount of money he is to receive. There is a provision, however, for the Attorney General to make rules and regulations for the proper carrying out and enforcement of the statute; and I take it that it would not be unreasonable for the Attorney General subsequently to promulgate a regulation providing that anyone broadcasting over the radio or speaking on a lecture tour who comes within the restrictive provisions of this act shall preface his remarks by saying the amount he receives.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Would not that also give the Attorney General power to publicize the names of these agents so the American people could know who they were?

Mr. CELLER. If that were practicable the Attorney General could do it, and it might be advisable to suggest to the Attorney General that that be done. I would leave that, however, in the final analysis to our able and distinguished Attorney General and his splendid staff.

With reference to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] concerning the German-American Bund, the Communist Party, and the Kyffhauserbund, and I presume also he would include the Spanish Falange, and others, I deem it to be inappropriate to add an amendment of that kind to this bill, for I believe it would subsequently be held to be a violation of the first amendment with reference to equal protection of the laws being accorded to all persons.

Furthermore, he mentions but a few of these obnoxious groups. There may be many more. Others may start to function subsequently. Would they be included? I doubt it. He would thus weaken, not strengthen, the bill.

I cannot conceive that you can demand under the purposes of this bill and have it consistent with the purposes of this bill, that all members, say of the Communist Party, thousands of them, shall register as foreign agents. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that if it can be shown that the Communist Party is a foreign-dominated aggregation, that it is financially supported by foreign entities, then its members become foreign agents under the bill, and if those members as such foreign agents of foreign governmental entities disseminate propaganda in accordance with the provisions of this bill, then each and every one of those members of that foreign-dominated party would have to register under this act. I think that should satisfy the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman believe that the Communist Party will be required to comply with this bill?

Mr. CELLER. If the Communist Party comes within the provisions of the act, I may say to the gentleman that I think we should have sufficient confidence in the Attorney General to come to the conclusion that the Attorney General and his Department of Justice would enforce the act against it and will cover and embrace within its provisions the members of that party. I have implicit faith and confidence in the Honorable Frances Biddle, our Attorney General.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman himself believe that the Communist Party comes under the definition of this bill?

Mr. CELLER. As to that, I will bow to the superior knowledge of the gentleman from Texas. He knows more about that than I do. I detest that party, as I do the German-American Bund.

Mr. DIES. That is just the attitude we have confronted in the Department when undertaking to get some action and that makes it necessary that we specify these organizations.

Mr. CELLER. If the Department is negligent or inept or inefficient, then we have remedies aside from amending the bill in the way that the gentleman wishes. We can get after the Department in other ways. We can, if necessary, impeach those of the Department who are inefficient and those who are negligent. I repeat, I have the utmost confidence in that Department. It is doing a good job, especially in the emergency.

Mr. DIES. Can the gentleman find any possible objection to requiring an organization such as the Communist Party and the German-American Bund that are controlled from abroad to register and give information about their organizations?

Mr. CELLER. The amendment of the gentleman, I think, would be unconstitutional. I think also it would be inappropriate as far as this bill is concerned, because this bill covers individuals, not organizations. The Voorhis and McCormack bills would, I think, be sufficient for the gentleman's purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half additional minute, and will ask him if he will yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. If the Communist Party is included within the definition of "persons" in this act so as to bring the Communist Party under the prohibitions of this act, then there would be no necessity for the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill which is now presented to the committee, H. R. 6269, was carefully considered by Subcommittee 4 of the Judiciary Committee before it came to the entire Judiciary Committee and before it came to the House. It was my privilege to have served on that subcommittee. May I say for the distinguished chairman of Subcommittee 4, of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], that he has given much time and has exerted much effort on this proposed legislation. I wish to compliment him for his tireless efforts on behalf of this needed measure.

This bill is merely to put teeth in the present law. We have the McCormack Act, which was supplemented to some extent by the Voorhis Act, and this bill puts more teeth or greater implementation in the present existing law.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am very much interested in the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I wish the gentleman from Indiana would tell us whether or not he believes this bill covers an agent of the Communist Party in America?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am very glad to answer the gentleman's question and I am mighty happy that he asked the question. Under section 2 of this bill, page 9, you will find this language:

> No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplement thereto as required by section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) hereof.

May I say to the distinguished gentleman it is my opinion that that language under section 2 is broad enough to cover the various agencies which the distinguished gentleman from Texas has mentioned in the statement made before the committee.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I may say to the gentleman that the original language in the McCormack and Voorhis bills was broad enough to cover these organizations, and clearly required action, but we got no action, although I requested the Department of Justice months ago to proceed against the organization. The point I am making is, The only way you can get action is to specify these organizations that a committee of Congress has unanimously found to be under foreign control.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his observation, but the one fact alone that any department has failed to do its duty, and has failed to comply with the requirements of the law, is not sufficient in itself to require setting forth in this act the specific organization or organizations to which this act might apply. May I say to the gentleman from Texas, in addition, that if we attempt to name individually each and every organization which is to be brought in under the terms of this law, it is then going to be essential that we carefully name every organization which it is contemplated must comply under the provisions of this act—otherwise they will be excluded and will not come within the provisions of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is practically admitted, is it not, that some of the departments will not go after the Communist Party?

Mr. SPRINGER. From what the gentleman from Texas has just stated, that is entirely true. The departments have failed to act. That is an omission of duty on the part of those so failing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then what is the objection to taking them up and naming them, name by name, if that is the only recourse we have? We cannot get after the Attorney General and get any results from him.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman will recall the statement I just made, that if we start naming the organizations to which this bill shall apply it is essential that we name every organization, or those organizations which are omitted will be excluded from the bill. That is one of the elemental rules under statutory construction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That does not necessarily follow, does it?

Mr. SPRINGER. There is that very great danger involved in this proposed legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Is not the language which the gentleman just read broad enough to include the very organizations

the gentleman from Texas has mentioned as being foreign-controlled and subversive organizations?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the statement I have just made. It is my opinion that the language contained in section 2 of the pending bill is sufficient to embrace the organizations mentioned by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HEALEY. The word "person" as defined in the bill also includes any organization, does it not?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is my opinion; and the word "person" is broad enough in its construction to embrace every agent of a "foreign principal" regardless of who that foreign principal may be.

Mr. HEALEY. Any organization that is acting as a foreign agent, may I say, would come within the provisions of the proposed act.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true. I cannot conceive of any broader language and it is my firm belief that the language employed in the bill is all-inclusive.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The gentleman is familiar with the well-knowl legal maxim that the inclusion of the one means the exclusion of the other. Therefore, if you name one group and do not name the others, it is assumed in the law that the others are excluded.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true, and that is the statement I have just made; if we include a part we must include all, or those which are not included will not come under the provisions of the proposed legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that is true, and if there are these other organizations, why not name them, too?

Mr. SPRINGER. If we could ascertain and name all of them, then we would have legislation which would be broad enough to include each and every one. However, if any group should be inadvertently omitted from the bill, it is very doubtful if this proposed law would apply to those omitted. Very great care should be used if such amendment is made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You can name the bund and the Communist Party, anyway; there is a good start.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have just one other statement I wish to make. This bill applies to the registration of foreign agents. It applies to all agents of a foreign principal. I think it is imperative at this moment, when we are engaged in a war, that we learn who the agents of the foreign principals are. We want to know whom they represent. We want to find them out. We are in war, and we must prepare to defend ourselves not alone on the ocean but within our borders. This legislation is intended to meet that emergency at this particular moment. I hope this bill will pass and I hope it will not be amended so this legislation will be weakened. We need stringent laws upon this subject.

May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that under the provisions of section 4 all of the propaganda which is sent out by these agents of foreign principals must be labeled. This bill does not relate to the matter of preventing such propaganda from being sent out, but it does apply to the labeling of it so the people of this Nation may know from whom it came, and that it came from an agent representing a foreign principal. This will put our people on guard. They will take due care to publish to the Nation all such efforts on the part of those agents who would seek to disseminate propaganda which would create dissension or unrest in our country. We are united today in our all-out effort to win this war. Our people will not tolerate any activities which are not wholly and truly American. All un-American activities must cease in our country and all sinister and secretive methods used by all agents of foreign principals must now end. Our thoughts are for our own Nation, and with that thought before us we will vote on this bill, and I hope it passes in this great legislative body without a single dissenting vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ZIMMERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," pursuant to House Resolution 394, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendment strike out "nineteen" and in lieu thereof insert "twenty."

On page 2, line 4, of such Senate amendment strike out "nineteen" and in lieu thereof insert "twenty."

On page 4, line 11, of such Senate amendment strike out "nineteen" and in lieu thereof insert "twenty."

On page 4, line 12, of such Senate amendment strike out "nineteenth" and in lieu thereof insert "twentieth."

On page 4, lines 17 and 18, of such Senate amendment strike out all of section 8.

On page 4, line 19, of such Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 9" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 8."

On page 5, line 7, of such Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 10" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 9."

On page 5 line 11, of such Senate amendment strike out "Sec. 11" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 10."

On page 5, line 22, of such Senate amendment strike out "them" and in lieu thereof insert "him."

And the Senate agree to the same.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBT. R. REYNOLDS,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6215) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment in the nature of a substitute. However, most of the provisions of the Senate amendment are identical with those of the House bill. The differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment, and the provisions of the conference agreement with respect thereto, are as follows:

1. The House bill provided that, within the prescribed age limits, the requirements as to registration and the liability for military service should extend to every male citizen and to every male alien and every noncitizen national of the United States residing in the United States. The corresponding provisions of the Senate amendment extended such requirements and liability, within the prescribed age limits, to every male citizen and every other male person residing within the United States. There is no substantial difference between the effect of the House language and the effect of the Senate language. The conference agreement adopts the Senate language.

2. The House bill provided that liability for training and service should extend to men between the ages of 21 and 45. The corresponding provisions of the Senate amendment extended such liability to men between the ages of 19 and 45. In other words, the House bill did not make men between the ages of 19 and 21 liable for such service, while the Senate amendment did make them liable. The conference agreement provides that such liability shall extend to men between the ages of 20 and 45.

3. The Senate amendment amended section 5 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, so as to provide for the automatic deferment of all State officials chosen by the voters of the entire State. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

4. The Senate amendment repealed section 15 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act, which defines the term "dependent." The House bill contained no corresponding

provision. The conference agreement follows the House bill in this respect, and leaves the definition of dependent in existing law.

5. The House bill contained a section giving all personnel on active duty in the armed forces 120 additional days within which to secure, without medical examination, National Service Life Insurance; and also providing that such insurance could be obtained after the expiration of 120 days upon a showing of good health. The corresponding section of the Senate amendment (section 11) retained these provisions of the House bill; and it also provided that persons who, while in the active service between October 8, 1940, and the expiration of 120 days after the date of this act, shall have died or become totally disabled in line of duty shall be deemed to have applied for and been granted sufficient insurance to give them an aggregate of $5,000 of Government insurance. This would provide insurance in the amount of $5,000 for those persons, for example, who were killed or totally disabled when the *Reuben James* was sunk and when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provisions, with one change which corrects a clerical error. The conferees express unanimous understanding that the customary rules for administration of veterans' insurance including deduction for premiums and other charges will be followed.

A. J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DENNEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 6215, and I further ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6269.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6269, with Mr. ZIMMERMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, in order to explain my purpose in offering the amendments to which I have referred heretofore, permit me to review the record briefly.

Our committee began its work nearly 4 years ago. We obtained a great deal of evidence conclusive in nature showing that the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund are organizations that are completely controlled from abroad. I sent that evidence to the Department of Justice more than 2 years ago. I stated to the Attorney General that under the terms of the McCormack Act it was his duty to proceed against these organizations. The Government did not proceed against them, and to this day, as far as I have been able to learn, there has been no disposition to prosecute these organizations under the terms of this act.

Therefore, in order to make this very clear, so that there will be no discretion on the part of the Department of Justice in interpreting this act, I propose clarifying amendments. I call your attention to page 2, where the term "person" is defined to include an individual, partnership, association, corporation, or organization, or any other combination of individuals.

Then over on page 9 it is provided that no person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed this information with the Attorney General.

I have proposed an amendment to read as follows:

Including but not limited to the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund.

This is on page 4, line 2.

I also propose as another clarifying amendment:

The term "agent of a foreign principal" includes but is not limited to the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund.

Then, on page 11, I propose an insertion reading as follows: "Members, officers, and directors," so that organizations such as the Communist Party which refuse to surrender their membership records and perjure themselves before committees, that they be compelled under the terms of this act to file with the Department of Justice not only the information required in the act but also the names of their members, their officers, and their directors.

Now let me show you the advantage of such a provision. In Philadelphia when we seized all of the records of the Communist Party and the International Workers' Organization, we discovered there were many citizens in that town, listed in the private records of the Communist Party as being fellow travelers, who could be depended upon to cooperate with the organization, and we discovered that every officer in the League of Women Shoppers was a secret member of the Communist Party.

Certainly there cannot be any objection to full publicity. The argument is used that these organizations are already included under the terms of this bill. If that be true, then what could be the objection to specifying the organization? Your committee has unanimously found that these organizations are under the control of a foreign political party. The evidence is abundant, clear, and conclusive on that issue, that in every detail these organizations have been controlled from abroad.

Now let me be perfectly frank with you. If you do not include this in the bill, the Communist Party will never be proceeded against.

We do not know how many members of the Communist Party there are in the United States. Earl Browder testified there are 2,000,000 people in the United States who go with their organization the full way, and from records that we have obtained, it is amazing the number of people in some cities in the United States who cooperate fully with the Communist Party, and if you have any doubt about it you should inspect the records our committee has seized.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIES. And if we can require these organizations to file the names of their members, their officers and directors, you will find an amazing situation in the United States. You will find how the members of this organization have been able to secure important positions in trade-union movements, in organizations, and in Government service. And, of course, I know that if these amendments are included in the bill here it will either destroy the bill—that is, all interest in the bill will be lost before it finally reaches passage by both bodies, or it will be taken out in conference, because I have confronted a remarkable situation since our committee began this work, and that is that it is almost impossible to get some people to regard all forms of totalitarian movements as un-American. We find people who are willing to proceed to the utmost limit against Nazi groups, and with that I am in full accord, but when it comes to the Communists in the United States there is an entirely different attitude, and we cannot be inconsistent on this question. All of these movements are under foreign control. All of them should be dealt with as foreign-controlled organizations, and the least we have the right to require is that they register information with some department of our Government.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. My Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague why the language defining "persons" is not all-comprehensive.

Mr. DIES. I will answer that in this way: The language in the original McCormack Act and in the Voorhis Act is also equally clear. Yet under that language, if you will read the original McCormack Act and read the evidence our committee has, under both acts it was perfectly clear, but the Government would not proceed against them.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Does not the distinguished gentleman, who has worked very hard, know that the real Communist, the fellow who is so harmful to this country, does not belong to any Communist organization? Those fellows do not give themselves away, and my question is, What are you doing or what can you do concerning that group?

Mr. DIES. We have a number of the membership cards of the Communist Party of the United States. The last membership card shows on its face ap-

proximately the number 165,000, indicating that 165,000 paid-up members are in the party. Now, what I propose is that we say to these organizations, as well as the German-American Bund and the Kyffhauserbund, that they must register. I mention them because there is not any doubt about their foreign control. There are many other organizations that have on their board of directors members of the Communist Party or of the German-American Bund, but these organizations which I have named, it has been clearly shown, are completely dominated from abroad. What I propose is that the organization be required to file a membership list with the Department of Justice.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. But that does not answer my question. The fellows who are the most harmful never join the Communist organization in this country, and they are the fellows who are doing the directing and doing the real mischief, and the gentleman must know this. What is the gentleman going to do by way of trying to get at those people who are the real mischief makers in this country?

Mr. DIES. Of course, the gentleman is stating an assumption that I am not prepared to agree with, because I have no full information to that extent.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] of the committee.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee on the Judiciary is entirely in sympathy with the purpose that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has in mind, but I direct the attention of the committee to the fact that under the terms of this very bill, which has been thoroughly considered by members of the Committee on the Judiciary, the definition in the bill of the term "person" would include those whom the gentleman from Texas has in mind. These persons are the ones who are doing today the things because of which they should be required to register. I do not think there is any difference of opinion about that. "'Person' includes any individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals." If anybody can draw language more comprehensive than that to be put in a bill, I do not know how they can do it. I am entirely sympathetic with the purposes of my distinguished friend, but there is no use of cluttering up a bill by amendments, when it is perfectly clear that this bill includes all of the persons that could possibly come within the complaint of my distinguished friend. The complaint with reference to what may or may not have been done by the Department of Justice is immaterial here. You cannot make that sort of thing different by writing the same thing over and over again in a bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Could the matter not be inserted in the bill in this way: The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals, including the three the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] named.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is always dangerous to specify, when you have comprehensive, all-covering language in a bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If you named the Communist Party in this bill, then simply by changing the name of their party they would be without the terms of the bill. Insofar as that language is concerned, they could change the name of their organization.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wonder what the gentleman's opinion is about this proposition, that by specifically naming any group of persons, are we not enacting a bill of attainder?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I would like very much to hold this discussion to what I am talking about. It is always dangerous to begin to enumerate, when you are attempting to cover everybody under blanket terms of a bill. I think everyone realizes that. I hope that the gentleman will not insist upon his amendment to this very well considered bill.

Mr. DIES. Oh, I understand that the committee has done an excellent piece of work and I am not reflecting upon the committee in the least, but knowing as I do that under the terms of these other acts, they have refused to enforce them against the Communist Party and these organizations it has seemed to me that it becomes our duty to clearly specify.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You cannot enforce one law by enacting another one.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the importance of measures such as this is best brought out by the relation of personal experiences and I am going to take this time to relate an experience which I had, and which I believe this bill, if enacted into law, will definitely remedy. Shortly before the last election there was a move on within my district among the shops of the Endicott-Johnson Shoe Corporation, to disseminate malicious, subvervise propaganda, and the disseminators of this propaganda were those who were dedicated to my defeat for reelection. Those individuals were of a subversive element who were dedicated to not only my defeat from a personal angle, but to the very defeat of constitutional government within my district and throughout the country.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is not the gentleman's quarrel with that union in the Endicott-Johnson Co., that they sought to overthrow the gentleman rather than to overthrow the Government?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In answer to that statement I will say this, that their relationship with the Endicott-Johnson Corporation had nothing to do with what they said about me, and I have nothing but contempt toward any opposition this group might give me because I want no part of it. For that reason an accusation of that kind is out of order.

Mr. Chairman, only a few months ago this same group—and they are named in the revelations of the Dies committee, and I have talked with members of the Dies committee who have assured me that they are a definitely subversive group—attacked me maliciously and accused me of being against labor and also lukewarm to those elements which were interested in defending this country against totalitarianism. My answer to the people of my district was that they were simply using this accusation to weaken constitutional government, by which a Member of Congress is elected and upon which he depends for his reelection.

I submit at this time that the registration of the names of those individuals will bring about in the future a hesitancy on their part in attacking Members of Congress in their districts. They may go easy on what they have to say with relation to smearing and insulting the servants of constitutional form of government under the wing of protection they received from the magnanimity of the Constitution. For that reason I heartily endorse and expect to vote for the passage of this bill, and I hope it will be passed with the clarifying amendments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 1 minute, to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank both of you gentlemen and I desire the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], especially.

Every one of us is strong for the Dies committee and for the work it has done, in the main. Practically all of us have voted to create that committee, and for every appropriation they have asked and for every extension of power. But I am saying to the gentleman here, its chairman, in the utmost candor and with the kindliest feeling for him personally and for his committee officially, that he is rendering a disservice, in my judgment, to the cause he is seeking to further, and hurting the influence that he has with this body by this amendment, and I hope he will reconsider.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman himself in the Hobbs bill, approved by the Judiciary Committee, did the same thing You stated in that bill, "including the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund." Why did you do it then and now object to the same method?

Mr. HOBBS. I recognized that the gentleman was quoting the language from my bill when his amendment was read, and I thought that he was going to

ask me this question in an attempt to embarrass me.

Mr. DIES. Not at all.

Mr. HOBBS. There is no embarrassment. There is a vast distinction, as great as the error of the gentleman in offering it, between function of those words in my bill and in his amendment to this bill. In the Hobbs bill I wrote that any alien who sought to enter the United States for the purpose of acting in behalf of any foreign government or group, or in conjunction with any party, group, or organization, itself acting in behalf of any foreign government or group, or, without limiting the foregoing, any alien who comes here to act in behalf of the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Kyffhauserbund, the German-American Bund, or any other organization, foreign or domestic, successor to, or acting for, or in place of, or in conjunction with, any one of them, should be excluded from admission; and that any alien who so acts after getting into the United States should be deported. These provisions of my bill were based on the bedrock principle that the law of our land is that any alien who is in favor of the overthrow of our Government by force may be kept out, or, if he gains admission, may be put out; and that the courts have held again and again and again that the Communist Party favors such overthrow—such decisions being based on abundant evidence, given in open court under cross-examination, and subject to rebuttal by evidence contra—and the manifest truth that the bunds seek the same end.

But this bill has nothing whatever to do with the exclusion or deportation of aliens. It deals almost entirely with citizens of the United States. It requires the registration of any person who acts as a propaganda agent of a foreign principal. Your amendment, without a trial, without evidence except that given in an ex parte hearing before a committee—not in open court—would convict these three organizations of acting as propaganda agents of foreign principals, which is not an offense against our law, and require them to register as such agents wholly without regard to whether or not any one of them had ever so acted. If any one of them is such an agent—and I firmly believe each of them is—it is unquestionably required to register as such by the provisions of this bill as the Judiciary Committee reported it, without your amendment. If they are not, then they should not be required to register, thereby committing perjury.

Your amendment would render this bill, almost, if not quite, a bill of attainder, which is prohibited by the Constitution. I want to answer you on each of your three arguments; these three specific propositions: In the first place, if you evade the Constitution, if you ignore the Constitution, which says that no bill of attainder is within the power of Congress to pass, then you put it in the power of the Communist Party, by simply changing its name to "Friends of Freedom Party of the United States," or any other, to kill your law. It is not the accepted, legal way to legislate. A mere change of name would evade what you want to make binding law.

In the second place, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman that it opens wide the door and invites Congress to pass legislation which would base its conviction not upon sworn testimony in the courts of the land, but upon ex parte hearings before a legislative committee. That cannot be done and it is unworthy of the gentleman.

In the third place, the gentleman makes this rather startling argument: He says that unless we adopt his amendment the Department of Justice will not do its duty. I resent that, as everyone else should, and when he gets over the heat of debate, he himself, will regret having cast such an insinuation, or rather, having made such a charge.

The Department of Justice may not be perfect. It does not claim to be. No human institution is. The distinguished and honorable gentlemen who constitute its personnel are not inerrant, nor do they claim to be. But if the gentleman means to charge any one of them with dishonesty or willful refusal to perform his duty there is a perfectly legal way of proving his charge, if true, and it is his duty to submit the proof and let Congress act accordingly. However, there is no proof offered of a single dereliction.

The gentleman complains that the Department of Justice and the Attorney General have never on his reiterated demand prosecuted the Communist Party or the Kyffhauserbund, or any of these other bunds. I want to say to the gentleman just as straight as I can that he has no cause to complain because the Attorney General never instituted prosecutions against anybody. The gentleman has just as much right, and any other member of the Dies committee has just as much right, to institute a prosecution as has the Attorney General. Any American citizen has the right to institute prosecution if he has cause to believe that the law has been violated and so swears. The gentleman himself or any other American citizen has the right to go into court and swear out a warrant if he has reasonable cause to believe and does believe there has been a violation of the law, and initiate prosecution. Then if the Attorney General does not prosecute the gentleman can take other action. The gentleman is entitled to institute a prosecution in his own congressional district, or anywhere a violation of criminal law has occurred. The gentleman himself, or his committee, can appear in court as amicus curiae, or as private prosecutor. The gentleman has nothing to complain of. The courts are open to him or to any member of his committee to start a prosecution against the Kyffhauserbund, the German-American Bund, the Communist Party, or anyone else he feels is violating the law, and I wish he would do it and introduce in court the evidence his committee has unearthed, so that the law might pass upon the sufficiency and weight of the evidence and do justice.

But our committee has here presented a carefully drawn bill which will accomplish every desirable purpose within its scope without amendment. I urge the defeat of the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Texas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631, U. S. C., title 22, sec. 233 (a) to sec. 233 (g), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"It is hereby declared to be the policy and purpose of this act to protect the national defense, internal security, and foreign relations of the United States by requiring public disclosure by persons engaging in propaganda activities and other activities for or on behalf of foreign governments, foreign political parties, and other foreign principals so that the Government and the people of the United States may be informed of the identity of such persons and may appraise their statements and actions in the light of their associations and activities.

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. As used in and for the purposes of this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals;

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) an individual affiliated or associated with, or supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of this section 1 (b);

"(3) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and is a citizen of and domiciled within the United States or that such person is not an individual, is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and has its principal place of business within the United States. Nothing in this clause (3) shall limit the operation of clause (5) of this section 1 (b);

"(4) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(5) a domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, subsidized directly or indirectly, in whole or in part, by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (3), or (4) of this section 1 (b);

"(c) Except as provided in section 1 (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' includes—

"(1) any person who acts or agrees to act, within the United States, as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, servant, agent, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal;

"(2) any person who within the United States collects information for or reports information to a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits, or accepts compensation, contributions, or loans, directly or indirectly, from a foreign principal; who within the United States solicits, disburses, dispenses, or collects compensation, contributions, loans, money, or anything of value, directly or indirectly, for a foreign prin-

cipal; who within the United States acts at the order, request, or under the direction of a foreign principal;

"(3) any person who assumes or purports to act within the United States as an agent of a foreign principal in any of the respects set forth in clauses (1) and (2) of this section 1 (c); and

"(4) any person who is an officer or member of the active or reserve military, naval, or other armed forces of any foreign principal defined in clause (1) of section 1 (b) hereof, or who is an officer of or employed by any such foreign principal; and proof of any affiliation or employment, specified in this clause (4), of any person within a period of 5 years previous to the effective date of this act shall create a rebuttable presumption that such person is an agent of a foreign principal;

"(d) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' does not include any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the Postmaster General a sworn statement in compliance with section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 553), as amended, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are cititzens of the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication, is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined in clause (1), (2), or (4) of section 1 (b) hereof, or by any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this act;

"(e) The term 'government of a foreign country' includes any person or group of persons exercising sovereign de facto or de jure political jurisdiction over any country, other than the United States, or over any part of such country, and includes any subdivision of any such group and any group or agency to which such sovereign de facto or de jure authority or functions are directly or indirectly delegated. Such term shall include any faction or body of insurgents within a country assuming to exercise governmental authority whether such faction or body of insurgents has or has not been recognized by the United States;

"(f) The term 'foreign political party' includes any organization or any other combination of individuals in a country other than the United States, or any unit or branch thereof, having for an aim or purpose, or which is engaged in any activity devoted in whole or in part to, the establishment, administration, control, or acquisition of administration or control, of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof, or the furtherance or influencing of the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a subdivision thereof;

"(g) The term 'public-relations counsel' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in informing, advising, or in any way representing a principal in any matter pertaining to political or public interests, policies, or relations;

"(h) The term 'publicity agent' includes any person who engages directly or indirectly in the publication or dissemination of oral, visual, graphic, written, or pictorial information or matter of any kind, including publication by means of advertising, books, periodicals, newspapers, lectures, broadcasts, motion pictures, or otherwise;

"(i) The term 'information-service employee' includes any person who is engaged in furnishing, disseminating, or publishing accounts, descriptions, information, or data with respect to the political, industrial, employment, economic, social, cultural, or other benefits, advantages, facts, or conditions of any country other than the United States or of any government of a foreign country or of a foreign political party or of a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals organized under the laws of, or having its principal place of business in, a foreign country;

"(j) The term 'political propaganda' includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person (1) which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissensions, or (2) which advocates, advises, instigates, or promotes any racial, social, political, or religious disorder, civil riot, or other conflict involving the use of force or violence in any other American republic or the overthrow of any government or political subdivision of any other American republic by any means involving the use of force or violence. As used in this section 1 (j) the term 'disseminating' includes transmitting or causing to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or offering or causing to be offered in the United States mails;

"(k) The term 'registration statement' means the registration statement required to be filed with the Attorney General under section 2 (a) hereof, and any supplements thereto required to be filed under section 2 (b) hereof, and includes all documents and papers required to be filed therewith or amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, whether attached thereto or incorporated therein by reference;

"(l) The term 'American republic' includes any of the states which were signatory to the final act of the second meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American republics at Habana, Cuba, July 30, 1940;

"(m) The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States;

"(n) The term 'prints' means newspapers and periodicals, books, pamphlets, sheet music, visiting cards, address cards, printing proofs, engravings, photographs, pictures, drawings, plans, maps, patterns to be cut out, catalogs, prospectuses, advertisements, and printed, engraved, lithographed, or autographed notices of various kinds, and, in general, all impressions or reproductions obtained on paper or other material assimilable to paper, on parchment or on cardboard, by means of printing, engraving, lithography, autography, or any other easily recognizable mechanical process, with the exception of the copying press, stamps with movable or immovable type, and the typewriter.

"REGISTRATION

"SEC. 2. (a) No person shall act as an agent of a foreign principal unless he has filed with the Attorney General a true and complete registration statement and supplements thereto as required by this section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) hereof or unless he is exempt from registration under the provisions of this act. Except as hereinafter provided, every person who is an agent of a foreign principal on the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter, and every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal after the effective date of this act shall, within 10 days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, of which one copy shall be transmitted promptly by the Attorney General to the Secretary of State for such comment, if any, as the Secretary of State may desire to make from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this act. The registration statement shall include the following, which shall be regarded as material for the purposes of this act:

"(1) Registrant's name, principal business address, and all other business addresses in the United States or elsewhere, and all residence addresses, if any;

"(2) Status of the registrant; if an individual, nationality; if a partnership, name, residence addresses, and nationality of each partner and a true and complete copy of its articles of copartnership; if an association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals, the name, residence addresses, and nationality of each director and officer and of each person performing the functions of a director or officer, and a true and complete copy of its charter, articles of incorporation, association, constitution, and bylaws, and amendments thereto; a copy of every other instrument or document and a statement of the terms and conditions of every oral agreement relating to its organization, powers, and purposes; and a statement of its ownership and control;

"(3) A comprehensive statement of the nature of registrant's business; a complete list of registrant's employees and a statement of the nature of the work of each, unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General; the name and address of every foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act; the character of the business or other activities of every such foreign principal, and, if any such foreign principal be other than a natural person, a statement of the ownership and control of each; and the extent, if any, to which each such foreign principal is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party;

"(4) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is an agent of a foreign principal; a comprehensive statement of the nature and method of performance of each such contract, and of the existing and proposed activity or activities engaged in or to be engaged in by the registrant as agent of a foreign principal for each such foreign principal;

"(5) The nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received within the preceding 60 days from each such foreign principal, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;

"(6) A detailed statement of every activity which the registrant is performing or is assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or any other person other than a foreign principal and which requires his registration hereunder;

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and, if an individual, the nationality, of any person who has within the preceding

60 days contributed or paid money or anything of value to the registrant in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this section 2 (a) and the amount or value of the same;

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding 60 days in furtherance of or in any way in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person;

"(9) Copies of each written agreement and the terms and conditions of each oral agreement, including all modifications of such agreements, or, where no contract exists, a full statement of all the circumstances, by reason of which the registrant is performing or assuming or purporting or has agreed to perform for himself or for a foreign principal or for any person other than a foreign principal any activities which require his registration hereunder;

"(10) Such other statements, information, or documents pertinent to the purposes of this act as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may from time to time require;

"(11) Such further statements and such further copies of documents as are necessary to make the statements made in the registration statements and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(b) Every agent of a foreign principal who has filed a registration statement required by section 2 (a) hereof shall, within 30 days after the expiration of each period of 6 months succeeding such filing, file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth with respect to such preceding 6 months' period such facts as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may deem necessary to make the information required under section 2 hereof accurate, complete, and current, with respect to such period. In connection with the information furnished under clauses (3), (4), (6), and (9) of section 2 (a) hereof, the registrant shall give notice to the Attorney General of any changes therein within 10 days after such changes occur. If the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that it is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, he may, in any particular case, require supplements to the registration statement to be filed at more frequent intervals in respect to all or particular items of information to be furnished.

"(c) The registration statement and supplements thereto shall be executed under oath as follows: If the registrant is an individual, by him; if the registrant is a partnership, by a majority of the members thereof; if the registrant is a person other than an individual of a partnership, by a majority of the officers thereof or persons performing the functions of officers or by a majority of the board of directors thereof or persons performing the functions of directors, if any.

"(d) The fact that a registration statement or supplement thereto has been filed shall not necessarily be deemed a full compliance with this act and the regulations thereunder on the part of the registrant; nor shall it indicate that the Attorney General has in any way passed upon the merits of such registration statement or supplement thereto; nor shall it preclude prosecution, as provided for in this act, for willful failure to file a registration statement or supplement thereto when due or for a willful false statement of a material fact therein or the willful omission of a material fact required to be stated therein or the willful omission of a material fact or copy of a material document necessary to make the statements made in a registration statement and supplements thereto, and the copies of documents furnished therewith, not misleading.

"(e) If any agent of a foreign principal, required to register under the provisions of this act, has previously thereto registered with the Attorney General under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201), the Attorney General, in order to eliminate inappropriate duplication, may permit the incorporation by reference in the registration statement or supplements thereto filed hereunder of any information or documents previously filed by such agent of a foreign principal under the provisions of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201).

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 3. The requirements of section 2 (a) hereof shall not apply to the following agents of foreign principals:

"(a) A duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such officer;

"(b) Any official of a foreign government, if such government is recognized by the United States, who is not a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, or a citizen of the United States, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such official are of public record in the Department of State, while said official is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such official;

"(c) Any member of the staff of, or any person employed by, a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, other than a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, or information-service employee, whose name and status and the character of whose duties as such member or employee are of public record in the Department of State, while said member or employee is engaged exclusively in the performance of activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such member or employee;

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private, nonpolitical, financial, mercantile, or other activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 48), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;

"(e) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or of the fine arts.

"FILING AND LABELING OF POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

"SEC. 4. (a) Every person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act and who transmits or causes to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons shall, not later than 48 hours after the beginning of the transmittal thereof, send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal and required to register under the provisions of this act to transmit or cause to be transmitted in the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce any political propaganda (i) in the form of prints, or (ii) in any other form which is reasonably adapted to being, or which he believes will be, or which he intends to be, disseminated or circulated among two or more persons, unless such political propaganda is conspicuously marked at its beginning with, or prefaced or accompanied by, a true and accurate statement, in the language or languages used in such political propaganda, setting forth that the person transmitting such political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted is registered under this act with the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., as an agent of a foreign principal, together with the name and address of such agent of a foreign principal and of each of his foreign principals; that, as required by this act, his registration statement is available for inspection at and copies of such political propaganda are being filed with the Department of Justice; and that registration of agents of foreign principals required by the act does not indicate approval by the United States Government of the contents of their political propaganda. The Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe the language or languages and the manner and form in which such statement shall be made and require the inclusion of such other information contained in the registration statement identifying such agent of a foreign principal and such political propaganda and its sources as may be appropriate.

"(c) The copies of political propaganda required by this act to be sent to the Librarian of Congress shall be available for public inspection under such regulations as he may prescribe.

"(d) For purposes of the Library of Congress, other than for public distribution, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are authorized, upon the request of the Librarian of Congress, to forward to the Library of Congress 50 copies, or as many fewer thereof as are available, of all foreign prints determined to be prohibited entry under the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of all foreign prints excluded from the mails under authority of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230).

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 305 of title III of the act of June 17, 1930 (46 Stat. 688), and of section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 230), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to permit the entry and the Postmaster General is authorized to permit the transmittal in the mails of foreign prints imported for governmental purposes by authority or for the use of the United States or for the use of the Library of Congress.

"BOOKS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 5. Every agent of a foreign principal registered under this act shall keep and preserve while he is an agent of a foreign principal such books of account and other records with respect to all his activities, the disclosure of which is required under the provisions of this act, as the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, may by regulation prescribe as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this act and

shall preserve the same for a period of 3 years following the termination of such status. Until regulations are in effect under this section every agent of a foreign principal shall keep books of account and shall preserve all written records with respect to his activities. Such books and records shall be open at all reasonable times to the inspection of any official charged with the enforcement of this act. It shall be unlawful for any person willfully to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to attempt to conceal, destroy, obliterate, mutilate, or falsify, or to cause to be concealed, destroyed, obliterated, mutilated, or falsified, any books or records required to be kept under the provisions of this section.

"PUBLIC EXAMINATION OF OFFICIAL RECORDS

"SEC. 6. The Attorney General shall retain in permanent form one copy of all registration statements and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda furnished under this act, and the same shall be public records and open to public examination and inspection at such reasonable hours, under such regulations, as the Attorney Genera' may prescribe, and copies of the same shall be furnished to every applicant at such reasonable fee as the Attorney General may prescribe. The Attorney General may withdraw from public examination the registration statement and other statements of any agent of a foreign principal whose activities have ceased to be of a character which requires registration under the provisions of this act.

"LIABILITY OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 7. Each officer, or person performing the functions of an officer, and each director, or person performing the functions of a director, of an agent of a foreign principal which is not an individual shall be under obligation to cause such agent to execute and file a registration statement and supplements thereto as and when such filing is required under sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) hereof and shall also be under obligation to cause such agent to comply with all the requirements of sections 4 (a), 4 (b), and 5 and all other requirements of this act. In case of failure of any such agent of a foreign principal to comply with any of the requirements of this act, each of its officers or persons performing the functions of officers, and each of its directors, or persons performing the functions of directors, shall be subject to prosecution therefor.

"ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

"SEC. 8. (a) Any person who—

"(1) willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder, or

"(2) in any registration statement or supplement thereto or in any statement under section 4 (a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda or in any other document filed with or furnished to the Attorney General under the provisions of this act willfully makes a false statement of a material fact or willfully omits any material fact required to be stated therein or willfully omits a material fact or a copy of a material document necessary to make the statements therein and the copies of documents furnished therewith not misleading, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) In any proceeding under this act in which it is charged that a person is an agent of a foreign principal with respect to a foreign principal outside of the United States, proof of the specific identity of the foreign principal shall be permissible but not necessary.

"(c) Any alien who shall be convicted of a violation of, or a conspiracy to violate, any provision of this act or any regulation thereunder shall be subject to deportation in the manner provided by sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890), as amended.

"(d) The Postmaster General may declare to be nonmailable any communication or expression falling within clause (2) of section 1 (j) hereof in the form of prints or in any other form reasonably adapted to, or reasonably appearing to be intended for, dissemination or circulation among two or more persons, which is offered or caused to be offered for transmittal in the United States mails to any person or persons in any other American republic by any agent of a foreign principal, if the Postmaster General is informed in writing by the Secretary of State that the duly accredited diplomatic representative of such American republic has made written representation to the Department of State that the admission or circulation of such communication or expression in such American republic is prohibited by the laws thereof and has requested in writing that its transmittal thereto be stopped.

"APPLICABILITY OF ACT

"SEC. 9. This act shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, the insular possessions, including the Philippine Islands, and all other places now or hereafter subject to the civil or military jurisdiction of the United States.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 10. The Attorney General may at any time make, prescribe, amend, and rescind such rules, regulations, and forms as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

"SEC. 11. The Attorney General shall, from time to time, make a report to the Congress concerning the administration of this act, including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 13. This act is in addition to and not in substitution for any other existing statute.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the 'Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.'"

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIES: Page 2, line 17, after the word "individuals", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma and the following: "including but not limited to the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane. I submit that the section of the bill dealing with definitions is limited to persons who are to constitute the foreign principals.

The CHAIRMAN. The section deals with definitions. This being so, it would be appropriate and in order to add another definition.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to interpose a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I interpose the point of order that this amendment is not in order because it is unconstitutional, being in conflict with that portion of the Constitution forbidding bills of attainder, in that there is no proof submitted to any court or any other body other than in an ex parte hearing before a committee which tends to prove the guilt of any one of these organizations of the offense of being a propagandist of a foreign power.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot and is not in position to rule upon the constitutionality of the amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. If the Chair please, I should like to point out that under the adjudication of a Speaker of this House my point of order is well taken and apt. There are precedents to support my contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that it is not a matter that the Chair can rule on. It would be a matter for the House to pass upon, but not the Chair.

Mr. HOBBS. The precedents of the House, established by previous occupants of the chair, support my contention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair respectfully submits that the precedents are the other way. The Chair cannot rule upon the point of order submitted by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a brief statement as a member of the Judiciary Committee and as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on this bill. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives has no desire other than to cause this bill to be made applicable to every agent of a foreign principal who comes within the broad definitions of a person, or of an agent of a foreign principal which are contained in the bill.

It is not necessary to discuss further the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, because it has already been fully discussed; but I reiterate that the term "person" already is so inclusive as to comprehend within its terms the very object sought by the gentleman from Texas. Should the gentleman's amendment be adopted, the effect might be to reduce the effectiveness of the bill by limiting its application to the specific organization or organizations to which his amendment refers.

I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, almost every Member of Congress goes back to his own district and denounces the Communists and tells his constituents what he wants to do to the Communists, what the Congress wants to do to them, how the alien Communists ought to be deported, yet when an amendment comes before the House, a simple amendment to put some teeth

and strength into the bill in order to bring the Communist Party and the bundists directly under the provisions of the bill, then we begin to run to cover.

We pussyfoot and shadow-box to avoid the issue, which is very simple, to strengthen this bill to include the Communist Party and the bundists which almost 99 percent of the people back home want done; yet, for some technical reason or for some unknown reason we evade the issue, we pussyfoot, we run to cover, and do nothing about it. Let us stop giving lip service and get down to real action.

I ask the Members of Congress to stand up and vote their convictions by supporting the Dies amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIES) there were—ayes 58, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon the effective date of this act, all powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of State under the act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631), as amended, shall be transferred to and become vested in the Attorney General, together with all property, books, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations used by or available to the Secretary of State for carrying out the functions devolving on him under the above-cited act. All rules, regulations, and forms which have been issued by the Secretary of State pursuant to the provisions of said act, and which are in effect, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, revoked, or repealed.

Mr. DIES (interrupting the reading of sec. 2). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIES. I have an amendment to page 4, line 2. What is the Clerk reading now?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Where is the Clerk reading?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk had begun to read section 2.

Mr. DIES. This just carries out the original amendment adopted by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 2, after "principal", insert paragraph 1A, as follows:

"The term 'agent of a foreign principal' includes but not limited to the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Had not the Clerk proceeded to read another section of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas was on his feet seeking recognition, and it is proper at this time to consider the amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the Chair's decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas was on his feet at the time the Clerk started to read, and for that reason he is entitled to submit his amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will reread the Dies amendment.

The Clerk reread the Dies amendment.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order for the same reason stated in the previous ruling.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIES: Page 11, line 7, after "employees", insert a comma and the following: "members, officers, and directors."

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, this merely makes it necessary for the Communist Party, the German Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund to file the names of their members, officers, and directors in order to comply with the act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Texas recognized in connection with this amendment for the same reason he was recognized to offer his previous amendment; namely, he was on his feet, we having passed section 1?

The CHAIRMAN. The section is still open to amendment, and the gentleman would have that right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. May I inquire where the Clerk is reading?

The CHAIRMAN. Section 1 goes over to page 25, and section 1 is now open to amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Had not the Clerk commenced the reading of section 2 under the caption "Transfer of Administration"?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ruled that the gentleman from Texas was on his feet at the time the Clerk started reading and therefore would be entitled to recognition. Section 1 is still open to amendment.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKEOUGH. What is the amendment on which we are now asked to vote?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the Dies amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLAUGHLIN) there were—ayes 53, noes 13.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by HINSHAW: On page 17, line 17, strike out all of subsection (e).

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, subsection (e) reads as follows:

Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or of the fine arts.

Subsection (e) is the subsection under section 3 which exempts persons who engage in these cultural pursuits from registration under this bill. I should like to read a few words from the section defining political propaganda:

The term "political propaganda" includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way influence a recipient or any section of the public within the United States—

And so forth. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the wisdom and ability of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I call your attention to the fact that one of the best ways to put over propaganda in any country is through the so-called cultural activities.

I call your attention to House Report No. 1543, filed this morning by the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, of which I am a member. You will find in there the information that a German monastery is located in a town called Boa Vista in the United States of Brazil. That isolated but strategically important place has a perfectly good radio station, and there is a Diesel-engine power plant available to operate the radio.

I do not believe we can afford to allow those who are engaged in cultural activities to come over here and have free reign in the United States without registering their business and giving information as to who employs them, and all the rest of the information desired by the Department of Justice or the State Department. It seems to me that when you merely take those who are willing to admit that they are employed by a foreign government as propaganda agents, and leave out all those others who are engaged in propaganda just as surely, then you are making a great mistake.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Does not the gentleman think that if an organization were spreading propaganda of a kind prohibited by this act it would not be engaged in bona fide religious, and so on, activities?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have read the definitions of propaganda and those who

make it. I say to the gentleman it is very largely a matter of opinion whether it is propaganda or whether it is not, or whether a person has to register himself as such an agent or not. I cannot see that there is any way in this bill that you can force a person who claims to be engaged in the cultural pursuits, but actually is engaged in propaganda, to register with the State Department under the bill as it is now written. I say again that the cultural pursuits offer one of the finest media for the dissemination of propaganda that anyone can conceive of, and it is well used by the Axis Powers, particularly in this country and in all the other American republics as well.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am certain that my observation now will not be a hysterical one, but I do know that in the exchange of professors between universities in different countries so-called cultural propaganda has been carried forward in the educational system of the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is absolutely true.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would the gentleman's amendment include American citizens who are putting out propaganda of such a nature that they are presuming to act as salesmen for other countries?

Mr. HINSHAW. If they are operating for and on behalf of a foreign government in any of these cultural pursuits, then this certainly would cover their activities.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Does not the gentleman think that friends of this country, those with amicable ideas back of their entry here, would not feel that any stigma attached to them as a result of their being called on to register?

Mr. HINSHAW. None whatever. If they are friends of this country they will be delighted to register and would be delighted to have that fact published in all the newspapers. I do not see why we have to be such a lot of sissies in this country when it comes to regulation of the acts of agents of foreign countries. I have been in a good many foreign countries in both recent and less recent times, and I want to say that in foreign countries they go over one's record with a fine-toothed comb before entry and then keep a very sharp eye out for one's activity while there. I think it is correct to say that the United States is the only place in the world today that an alien can go about taking photographs without serious consequences.

Those who are friendly to this country and are visitors among us are proud of their friendship, and so are we. If they are not friends of ours, then they want to keep it secret.

I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and just ask these people to register and let us know who they are.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the bill which we have before us today, the Committee on the Judiciary conferred with the Department of State, the Justice Department, the Post Office Department, and those agencies of the Government which are concerned intimately with the administration and enforcement of this measure. Certainly there is no Member of this body who has the slightest desire to interfere with the State Department in the maintenance of friendly relations with foreign countries.

I call attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment under consideration seeks to strike out a section which merely exempts from registration as an agent of a foreign principal those who are engaged only in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts. Surely if the persons named step over the border or step over the line and engage in activities that do not come within the terms and provisions of this exemption, the Department of Justice, which, after all, is the Department which is seeking this bill and seeking to strengthen this law, will devote its attention to the matter and require registration on the part of such persons. This would only permit an exchange of professors or the carrying on of bona fide religious or scientific pursuits on a reasonable basis between countries abroad and our country. And, mind you, this is a reciprocal matter. If we require unreasonable conditions and terms to be complied with by bona fide persons coming to our country's shores, then, of course, the countries abroad will do likewise. Not a member of the Judiciary Committee is seeking in any way to shield anyone who is an agent of a foreign principal who should come within the terms of this bill, but certainly this is a reasonable exemption, and I submit that it should be retained in the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was just going to ask the gentleman if it is not true that probably this country maintains more missions and churches in foreign countries that perform a very wonderful service than almost any other country and if we adopt a provision like this might it not subject these missions and churches to such restrictions in other countries?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Also I would like to ask the gentleman if the definition of political propaganda is not so broad that it might include parts of regular establishments that have no such connection with propaganda.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I think there is no question but that we might be stepping into the very field to which the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee refers.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman will agree with me that if a person engaged in any of the pursuits enumerated in section (e) and is engaged in propaganda, he still has to register under this measure.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Of course, and that is the thing to be kept in mind at all times while we are considering this bill. It requires all persons to register who are within the class which the gentleman from Minnesota has just so well described. I urge, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] be not adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HINSHAW) there were—ayes 10, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: On page 21, after line 23, insert "The Attorney General shall publish, as he deems advisable, the names of all agents of foreign nations as of January 1 and July 1 of each year."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple clarifying amendment. The agents of foreign nations have to register either with the State Department or the Attorney General's office, or both. The public does not know who these agents are. The public is entitled to know who they are for their own protection, including Members of Congress. This proposal calls for some publicity but leaves a great deal of latitude with the Attorney General. I believe the Department of Justice would favor it. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment, for without it nobody can possibly know anything about these foreign agents. I am for the bill as it is, but I believe my amendment will strengthen it and help make effective its main purpose against the spreading of foreign propaganda.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that in section 6, page 21, line 16, of the bill the word "public" appears, so that the law will read, if passed in the form of the present bill, that copies of registration statements shall be public records. Mr. Chairman, that is a public disclosure, and I submit that is a sufficient disclosure of those who are required to register.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Just a moment. I call attention to the fact that this is not a repressive measure. This is a measure which will merely cause those in this country who are acting as agents of foreign principals to register and to label material which they put out in the form of political propaganda so that those who read that material may know who the author is and whom he represents. I submit that the filing of the registration

in the office of the Attorney General, the Department of Justice, and sending a copy of it to the Secretary of State, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the bill, will constitute a public record. I submit the amendment should not be adopted. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman is correct in quoting the section to which he referred, then his answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York is complete, but did he quote the entire section?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Which section?

Mr. COX. The section from which the gentleman quoted making these reports a public record. Are they not made available to the public in the discretion of the Attorney General?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They are open to the public in the ordinary way.

Mr. COX. What does the remainder of the section say?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am speaking definitely with respect to the record, the section which provides that these reports shall be a public record, open to the public examination and inspection at such reasonable hours, under such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe. Why should they not be open to the public under those conditions? Certainly a department has the right to prescribe regulations with respect to the inspection of its records. Otherwise, the work of the department might be disrupted. If that is the only objection which the gentleman from Georgia has, then I submit that his objection has a very thin foundation.

Mr. COX. Under the language of the bill is it within the discretion of the Attorney General to withhold these records from the public?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. No; it is not.

Mr. COX. Then I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. And if these words were not actually in there as written by the committee, the courts would construe that the Attorney General had the right to impose reasonable hours for inspection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. What harm is there putting the searchlight of publicity on these agents and letting the people know who these people are?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not yield any further.

Mr. FISH. How is the public to know?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The registration statements will be a matter of public record, open to public inspection. The Committee on the Judiciary is as anxious as is the distinguished gentleman from New York that the public be advised of the identity and activities of agents in this country of foreign principals.

I submit that through the filing of registration statements these agents will receive full publicity if the bill is enacted without the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further debate, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ZIMMERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6269, that pursuant to House Resolution 394 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Dies amendment. There are three of them, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the three be taken at one time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that all the amendments adopted are Dies amendments, and the Chair will put the amendments en bloc. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 61, noes 9.

So the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5558. An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949; and

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL CEMETERY, PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 793) to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., for printing in the RECORD.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 793) to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
LISTER HILL,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The following statement is in explanation of the differences between the bill (S. 793) as passed by the House and the bill as agreed to in conference:

The bill as passed by the Senate authorized the Secretary of War "by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise" to acquire the land necessary for carrying out the purposes of the legislation.

The House amended the bill by striking out ", purchase, condemnation, or otherwise" so that, as amended, the bill would have authorized acquisition of the land only by donation.

The action recommended by the conference committee is that the House recede from its amendment, thus permitting the land to be acquired by "donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise".

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 793.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

NATIONAL CEMETERY IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

MAY], the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, and the other members of the committee, and particularly those named as conferees on S. 793, for agreeing to recede from the House amendment which was originally made to the bill I introduced, H. R. 950, which was identical to S. 793.

If the House had persisted in the amendment, it would have resulted in blocking the establishment of a national cemetery for all of the Northwest States, which is so much needed. The amendment adopted by the House required local interests to furnish the site for the cemetery, which imposed a condition impossible of performance at this time, in view of the fact that the cemetery will serve Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, and it would be impractical to make financial arrangements to purchase the site. Furthermore, the obligation of the Federal Government to provide a national cemetery for the burial of deceased veterans who in time of need have come to the defense of our country and in many cases have given their lives as a forfeit, is as binding upon the Nation as providing for the care of the veterans themselves during their lifetime. As I pointed out when this bill was before the House, this bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to establish and maintain a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., for war veterans. The Secretary of War is authorized under the terms of the bill to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such a cemetery. At the present time there is great need for such a cemetery. Existing facilities are wholly inadequate to care for the burial of veterans in the Northwest area. The Federal Government had a plot set aside in the Lincoln Memorial Cemetery in Portland for the burial of deceased veterans, but this plot is fully occupied. The State of Oregon purchased adjoining land a few years ago to provide facilities for veterans' burial which was intended for a limited time only, and I understand is now entirely inadequate. Funds are not sufficient to maintain this plot adequately and to provide for the increasing number of burials of veterans made necessary by death in this locality.

The nearest veterans' cemetery is in San Francisco, a thousand or fifteen hundred miles distant from the various portions of the territory which would be served by a veterans' cemetery in Portland. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

There are in the State of Oregon 41,219 World War veterans, 41 Civil War veterans, 47 Indian war veterans, 2,673 Spanish-American War veterans, and 398 peacetime veterans. In the State of Washington there are 64,999 World War veterans, 46 Civil War veterans, 65 Indian war veterans, 4,169 Spanish-American War veterans, and 747 peacetime veterans. Idaho has 15,547 World War veterans, 11 Civil War veterans, 19 Indian war veterans, 672 Spanish-American War veterans, and 103 peacetime veterans. Montana has 20,610 World War veterans, 5 Civil War veterans, 75 Indian war veterans, 892 Spanish-American war veterans, and 148 peacetime veterans. The figures for Alaska are a total of 2,500. In the above States there are a total of 142,285 World War veterans, 103 Civil War veterans, 206 Indian war veterans, 8,406 Spanish-American War veterans, and 1,396 peacetime veterans. The total number of veterans in the above territory is 154,896.

The average age of the World War veterans is 48; Spanish-American War veterans, 66; Civil War, 96; Indian war, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day; Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day; Civil War, 3 a day; and Indian war, 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are approximately 4⅔ deaths per day. This figure does not take into consideration the peacetime veterans or officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, since mortality figures covering these groups are not available.

Most of the veterans in the abovementioned States would only have to be transported within a radius of 400 to 500 miles, with the exception of Alaska, which is some 1,200 miles away. At the present time, if a veteran wishes to be buried in a national cemetery, his body must be sent to San Francisco, which would be a distance of from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, or even further to Alaska.

Another thing that should be taken into consideration is the fact that in the last year or so there have been established numerous Army and Navy camps in the Northwest. There are pursuit bases established at the following locations in the Northwest: Portland Columbia Airport, McChord Field at Tacoma, Pendleton, Spokane; a large munitions dump at Hermiston, Army camps at Fort Stevens, Camp Clatsop, Camp Murray, Camp Lewis, Navy stations at Tongue Point at the mouth of the Columbia River, and a large Navy and Coast Guard personnel located in the Puget Sound area. The approximate number of Army and Navy personnel in these various camps would run well over an additional 100,000 men who would be entitled to burial in a national cemetery.

We also have in this Northwest area four veterans' hospitals, besides the one at Portland—one at Walla Walla, 248 miles from Portland; Boise, Idaho, 479 miles from Portland; Roseburg, Oreg., 196 miles from Portland; and a new Army hospital located at Vancouver, Wash., 8 miles from Portland.

Under the increased military activities in the Northwest and the war in the Pacific, Portland is the principal center of extensive military activity. The number of the Army and Navy personnel in active service in the various encampments in the Northwest are considerably in excess of 100,000 men, and these numbers are being steadily increased. As I have stated, there are 5 veterans' hospitals in the radius of Portland as the center. Most of these men reside in the Northwest in the area which will be served by a national cemetery. It is but natural, of course, that there will be a number of deaths, in addition to those taking place in normal times, and after the intensified defense program ends. These men who have taken part in it and have been enrolled in the service will be eligible for burial in the veterans' cemetery as death may overtake them in the future. These increased demands will greatly overburden the already inadequate burial facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of the Nation and particularly of the Northwest will appreciate our action in passing this bill without the House amendment.

EMPLOYMENT OF NATIONALS ON PUBLIC WORK IN HAWAII

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2086), to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what the bill is?

Mr. GREEN. This is a bill that was passed by the Senate, recommended by the Navy Department, which would permit the employment on national-defense projects in Hawaii of Filipino common labor. There is no objection on the part of the House Committee on the Territories. They have added an amendment which I will ask to be considered. It is favorable to the minority members of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. And it is agreeable to the gentleman from Hawaii, Mr. KING?

Mr. KING. Yes. I would say to the gentleman that this is emergency legislation, merely dealing with restrictions as to the exclusive employment of citizen labor permitting the employment of nationals as well as citizen labor on defense projects.

As stated by the chairman of the Committee on the Territories, this legislation was requested by the Navy, and has passed the Senate. The amendments recommended by the committee meet the points raised by a representative of organized labor. The bill as amended should serve the urgent purpose for which it was intended, rendered even more imperative since the enemy attack on Hawaii, and that is, to make available to our defense needs the nationals of the United States now barred by statute from Government employment.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, authority is hereby granted for the employment of nationals of the United States upon any public work carried on in the Territory of Hawaii by the Government of the United States, whether the work is done by contract or otherwise.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "otherwise", insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That such employment shall be as common laborers only and only upon public work carried on for the national defense: *Provided further*, That any national of the United States admitted into the Territory of Hawaii pursuant to section 8 (a) (1) of the act approved March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 462), for employment as herein authorized shall, upon the termination of such employment, be returned to the Philippine Islands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTOR-VEHICLE-FUEL TAXES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949, for printing in the RECORD.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5558) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered one, two, and three and to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

(1) The bill (H. R. 5558), as passed by the House, provides for the increase of the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia by 2 cents per gallon, i. e., to a total of 4 cents per gallon. The Senate amendment numbered 1 provides for an increase in the tax of only 1 cent per gallon, i. e., to a total of 3 cents per gallon. The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment.

(2) The House bill provides that the increase in the tax shall be effective during a period beginning January 1, 1942, and extending to and including June 30, 1949. The Senate amendment numbered 2 extends the period during which the increase shall be effective an additional 2 years, to and including June 30, 1951. The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment.

(3) Senate amendment numbered 3 amends existing law relating to sales of gasoline by agencies of the United States in the District of Columbia for use in privately owned motor-vehicles so that the full amount of the tax, as increased under the bill, will be collected and paid to the District of Columbia. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 5558, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time of the House at this late hour, but I do regret that the conference committee has seen fit to cut these taxes down by one-half. I think the people of the District of Columbia who buy gasoline in the District of Columbia ought to be willing to go along and pay at least the average tax that is paid throughout the country. That tax averages 4½ cents a gallon. I just do not think it is quite fair, in view of the need of funds by the Federal Government, in view of the need of improvements for highways in and about the District of Columbia, that we should reduce this tax, because everywhere throughout the country we are increasing taxes. I do not think it is fair to reduce it here.

I hope the Committee on the District of Columbia will go into the situation a little more carefully and find out about the needs of the use of taxes, and bring to the floor again a bill increasing the tax 1 cent per gallon. I am asking the chairman if he will not give this matter a little more careful study with a view to bringing in a measure as he suggested once, for a 4-cents-per-gallon tax, because even then it is not as much as we pay over in the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Rees, that the chairman can promise on behalf of the District Committee, continued careful study of this problem of increased gasoline tax for the District of Columbia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I trust the gentleman will see to it somewhere along the line that a 4-cent gas tax does go into effect in the District of Columbia. I think it is fair to the people throughout the United States. It is only fair to the people who live in the District, who can well pay their fair share of the taxes. I think the gentleman agrees with me on that point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to say that I commend the gentleman from Kansas for his perseverance in this matter and his study of the problem. I think he and I are not very far apart on a solution of the problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], who offered the amendment in the House which increased the tax from 2 cents to 4 cents.

Mr. SPRINGER. This conference report, which is now before us, fixes the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia at 3 cents per gallon, instead of 4 cents per gallon, as provided in the bill as it passed the House, on an amendment which I offered.

I hope this conference report is not agreed to. I have given this matter some study. As stated by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, there is not a great difference between us on this subjcet. Our only difference is 1 cent per gallon on the gasoline tax, which would raise $1,500,000 annually. He introduced the bill (H. R. 5558) which provides for the increase of the gasoline tax 1 cent per gallon. As you know, the present gasoline tax in the District of Columbia is only 2 cents per gallon. I introduced H. R. 4549, which would increase this tax 2 cents per gallon. Most of the States have gasoline taxes as high as 4 cents per gallon; many of them collect a gasoline tax of 5 cents a gallon; and some have a 6-cent gasoline tax; and I believe one or two, possibly three have a tax as high as 7 cents per gallon; that means the tax collected by the States or local governmental agency is in addition to the 1½ cents tax imposed by the Federal Government. On the average, among our several States, taking the States as a whole, the tax is 4.4 cents per gallon, while at the moment the tax in the District of Columbia is but 2 cents per gallon. If this conference report is adopted the tax will be raised to 3 cents per gallon. The amendment which I offered and which was adopted by the House increased it to 4 cents per gallon. That is a little less than the average gasoline tax which is now paid by the several States.

I call attention to the fact that the gasoline tax in those States adjacent to the District of Columbia, Virginia, Maryland, and West Virginia is higher than the tax within the District. The very low tax in the District of Columbia is decidedly unfair to those engaged in handling gasoline just across the line in the nearby States.

I wish to call attention briefly to page 2 of the Senate report on this bill, where the statement is made:

Due to the limited amount of these appropriations—

And they are speaking of the appropriations which have been made in favor of the District of Columbia, part of that

money coming from your State and my State to make up these deficiencies—

they have been insufficient for at least the past 7 years to provide for the major operations on the highways of the District which have become increasingly necessary to meet to the best advantage the rapidly increasing demands of motor-vehicle traffic. As a result, while the automobile users of the District have been enjoying a reduced gasoline tax equal to about one-half of the average rate of gasoline tax in the United States, they have failed to make the major improvements in their highways which the increasing traffic has demanded.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hold in my hand an analysis of the Federal contributions which have been made to the District of Columbia from 1925 to 1940, both years inclusive—money which came from taxes paid by the taxpayers of your State and my State—to the extent of $118,875,000. I repeat, those appropriations came from the Federal Treasury and thereby made necessary increased taxation of your people and my people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Do I understand the gentleman is opposing the conference report?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am opposing the conference report; yes. And may I say in addition that if this tax remains at the 1-cent increase, as proposed by this conference report, the highway improvement program proposed by the committee will not be completed for approximately 12 years. If this gasoline tax is fixed at 4 cents per gallon, as this bill passed the House, the program will be completed in approximately 8 years, and funds will be available for other purposes that will thereby decrease the taxes which are placed upon the people in the various States of our great Nation, for the purpose of making funds with which to aid the District of Columbia in maintaining her government.

For the reasons I have assigned and because of the unfairness of the rate as between the District of Columbia and the various States of the Union, I ask that this conference report be rejected and that the conferees be instructed to insist on increasing the rate of gasoline tax to 4 cents per gallon so that it is fair and equitable to the other States of the Nation.

The District of Columbia is favored, indeed. In the Washington Post, of this date, on page 34, we find an article which comments upon the fact that Washington, D. C., has the lowest tax rate of any large city in our Nation. The tax upon real estate is very low—$1.75 on each $100 of value; there is an exemption of $1,000 on the personal property of each taxpayer. With an unusually low rate of gasoline tax—which is now but 2 cents per gallon—the people do not pay taxes here nearly equal to the taxes paid by the people of the several States. There should be a fairness on the part of the District—and, until she pays her fair share of the maintenance of her own government, the several States should not be called upon to assist her. The people in our Nation's Capital should bear their fair and equitable portion of taxes—and they should maintain their own government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and also of the Fiscal Relations Committee for the past 5 years, I have a full appreciation of the point the gentleman has expressed in his discussion of this matter. I am heartily in favor myself of increasing the gasoline tax, and have so stated in the committee on many occasions, by 2 additional cents.

I believe the problem we are up against today, however, is whether or not we will accept this compromise report of the conference committee or allow the bill to fail of passage at this session and get nothing from the additional 1 cent. After the first of the year we enter a new session, and it may be several months before we can again initiate legislation that will bring in additional revenue in order to carry the tremendous load of the highway-improvement program mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana and by the District Commissioners. For these reasons I believe it is just common sense to accept the conference report in the hope that later on, after the first of the year, the District of Columbia Committee and the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, of which I am a member, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who also has approved the 2-cent increase, will be able to give further impetus to this particular question.

I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the House at this late hour except to round out the debate on this conference report. I trust there will be no disposition to delay this important matter. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a member of the subcommittee which considered this subject very carefully and ranking minority member of the full committee that has been active in considering this subject for many months, has signed the conference report along with your chairman who is now speaking. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], who preferred 2 cents, has also agreed and has joined the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself in submitting this report to the House.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], will recognize, of course, that the Chairman of the House District Committee was perhaps the first individual who presented a bill to Congress for an increase in the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia. I did so for the reason that more money must be available to improve the streets, bridges, and so forth, here. I cannot therefore be charged with any dereliction of desire to meet this problem as it confronts the taxpayers, not only of the District of Columbia but as it bears indirectly on the adjoining States as well.

The gentleman from Indiana contends that the needed work will not be done in a sufficient number of years under the 1-cent increase. With that view there can be disagreement. However this is a beginning, a very desirable one. I now read a letter addressed to Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON, United States Senate, in which Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Public Roads under date of December 18, 1941, writes as follows:

DECEMBER 18, 1941.

Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BURTON: This will confirm the statements which I have made to you in several recent conferences relative to the emergency road program for the District of Columbia.

The present traffic across the Potomac River between Washington and Virginia points is in excess of the capacity of the highway and bridge facilities now available. Superimposed upon this situation, the new War Department Building and other activities of the Federal defense agencies now definitely located on the Virginia side of the river will require a new movement of an estimated twenty to thirty thousand people across the river twice each day.

The access roads on both sides of the river which lead to or carry traffic away from the now available bridges must be completed simultaneously with the building operations to house this large concentration of employees.

There are four projects in the District of Columbia road program which have become of emergency importance because of their relation to the movement of traffic in this area.

After numerous conferences as to ways and means of financing the emergency program required in order to obtain completion of these projects at the earliest practicable date, we have agreed to include an allotment of $2,500,000 from funds carried for access roads in the Defense Highway Act.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner.

That statement throws a light on what is to be done on defense roads into the District, supplementing the program to be carried out with the funds to be raised by the added gas tax.

At this point I wish to state that Senator BURTON has given thorough study to this problem as chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate District Committee that has looked into this situation and which has held extensive hearings. He feels that 2 cents is not now needed to finance the highway improvements.

Let us remember that we are embarking on a highway program, with funds by an additional tax, to run for 9½ years. We are carrying this program not only to 1949, as in the original House bill, but are extending it to June 30, 1951, as provided in the Senate measure. This will bring in approximately $1,500,000 annually in excess of the present gas revenue for the District, which is, roughly, $1,700,000 a year. The additional 1 cent makes the District of Columbia tax now 3 cents plus the 1½ cents Federal tax.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESPONSIBILITY OF DISBURSING AND CERTIFYING OFFICERS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5785, to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the fourth month following the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the changes made in the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was favorably reported by the House committee unanimously. It passed the House unanimously. The Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, sent an amendment to the Senate which was adopted by that body merely providing for the effective date. Mr. Warren said it would take about 4 months for the various departments and Government agencies to comply with the law. This is all the amendment provides.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS AND EXPLOSIVES ON BOARD CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2119, to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels, and I ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has had committee consideration?

Mr. BLAND. The bill has had committee consideration, and it was reported unanimously by the committee with an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman state for the benefit of the other Members of the House what the bill does?

Mr. BLAND. The bill is one requested by the Attorney General of the United States and the first paragraph of the letter to the Speaker of the House covers existing law.

Under existing law, seamen are prohibited from wearing sheath knives aboard any ship registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States. There is, however, no law forbidding a person to carry explosives or dangerous weapons on board any such vessel, nor prohibiting the possession of such dangerous instrumentalities thereon. Upon a study made by the Attorney General, it was found that this hiatus prevailed in the existing law, and this is for the purpose of correcting it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who brings, carries, or has in his possession any dangerous weapon, instrument, or device, or any dynamite, nitroglycerine, or other explosive article or compound on board of any vessel registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, or any vessel purchased, requisitioned, chartered, or taken over by the United States pursuant to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of title to or the use of domestic or foreign merchant vessels for urgent needs of commerce and national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1941 (Public, No. 101, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), without previously obtaining the permission of the owner or the master of such vessel, or any person who brings, carries, or has in his possession any such weapon or explosive on board of any vessel in the possession and under the control of the United States or which has been seized and forfeited by the United States or upon which a guard has been placed by the United States pursuant to the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220, U. S. C., title 50, secs. 191–194), without previously obtaining the permission of the captain of the port in which such vessel is located, shall, upon conviction, be imprisoned not more than 1 year or fined not more than $1,000, or both.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the personnel of the armed forces of the United States or to officers or employees of the United States or of a State or of a political subdivision thereof, while acting in the performance of their duties, who are authorized by law or by rules or regulations to own or possess any such weapon or explosive.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: At the end of the bill add as a new section, to be known as section 3, the following:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, or repeal any provision of section 4472 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (54 Stat. 1023; U. S. C. 1940 Ed., title 46, sec. 170)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF MARIHUANA IN THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6196) to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this bill been considered by the committee?

Mr. BLAND. This bill was considered at the same time as the other bill and unanimously reported by the committee. The report has already been filed with the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I ask that the gentleman explain the bill. These are very important bills and we do not want to interfere with them, but I doubt the advisability of coming in late at night with important legislation of this kind without saying anything to anybody about it, rising on the floor, receiving recognition, and attempting to pass very vital legislation by unanimous consent. It should not be done. In the future on this side we shall object to any legislation that is brought up by the gentleman from Virginia or anyone else unless they at least tell us they are going to bring it up.

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will pardon me, I took this matter up with the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and obtained his consent to bringing up these bills.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Massachusetts told me what was coming up but evidently he just neglected to put that on the list.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman was shown both bills and agreed that they might be brought up. There was no objection to them. I always do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 11 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), relative to crimes against the public health and safety, is amended by adding at the end of said chapter a new article numbered 9 and reading as follows:

"ARTICLE 9—MARIHUANA

"SEC. 581. Control of marihuana: It shall be unlawful for any person to produce, manufacture, compound, possess, sell, give away, deal in, dispense, administer, or transport marihuana in the Canal Zone, or to import marihuana into or export it from the Canal Zone, except under license as provided in section 583 of this title: *Provided, however*, That nothing in sections 581 to 584 of this title shall be construed to affect any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of the United States relative to the sending, carriage, transportation, or delivery of marihuana from the Canal Zone into any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or insular possession of the United States: *And provided further*, That nothing in sections 581 to 584 of this title shall apply to marihuana aboard vessels which enter and depart from Canal Zone waters without discharging any of such marihuana, or to shipments of marihuana by common carrier in transit through the Canal Zone, even though such marihuana be discharged at a port of the Canal Zone for transshipment.

"SEC. 582. Definitions: As used in sections 581 to 584 of this title, the term 'marihuana' shall have the meaning now or hereafter ascribed to it in the Internal Revenue Code of the United States, and the term 'produce' shall mean (a) plant, cultivate, or in any

way facilitate the natural growth of marihuana, or (b) harvest and transfer or make use of marihuana.

"SEC. 583. Licenses: The Governor of the Panama Canal may issue any licenses necessary under the terms of section 581 of this title to permit such uses of marihuana as are related to its administration to patients by physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, and other practitioners, or to research, instruction, or analysis.

"SEC. 584. Punishment for violations: Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of sections 581 to 584 of this title shall be punished for the first offense by a fine of not more than $100, or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 30 days, or by both, and shall be punished for each subsequent offense by a fine of not more than $500, or by imprisonment in jail for not more than 6 months, or by both; and any marihuana involved in any violation of section 581 to 584 of this title may be seized, and the court may order its confiscation and destruction."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SUGAR ACT OF 1937

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5983) to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 513 of the Sugar Act of 1937 as amended (relating to termination of powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 513. The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1944, except that the Secretary shall have power to make payments under title III under programs applicable to the crop year 1944 and previous crop years.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 301 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by striking out 'in the 1937, 1938, and 1939 crops' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in the 1940 and subsequent crops.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 304. (a) The amount of the base rate of payment shall be 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar or liquid sugar, raw value.'

"(b) Subsection (c) of section 304 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The total payment with respect to a farm shall be the product of the base rate specified in subsection (a) of this section multiplied by the amount of sugar and liquid sugar, raw value, with respect to which payment is to be made, except that reduction shall be made from such total payment in accordance with the following scale of reductions:

"'Deduction in the base rate of payment per hundredweight of such portion	
"That portion of the quantity of sugar and liquid sugar which is included within the following intervals of short tons, raw value:	
"'350 to 700	$0.05
700 to 1,000	.10
1,000 to 1,500	.20
1,500 to 3,000	.25
3,000 to 6,000	.275
6,000 to 12,000	$0.30
12,000 to 30,000	.325
More than 30,000	.50'

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 307 of the Sugar Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 307. This title shall apply to the continental United States, the Territory of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable to the 1942 crop and subsequent crops.

"SEC. 5. Section 3508 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of taxes under the Sugar Act) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3508. Termination of taxes: No tax shall be imposed under this chapter on the manufacture, use, or importation of sugar after June 30, 1945.'

"SEC. 6. Section 503 of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (relating to payments to the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1942' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to explain the changes that were made in the Senate?

Mr. FULMER. Yes; I shall be very glad to explain the changes.

May I say to the gentleman and the Members of the House that the Senate struck from the bill all reference to or provisions dealing with quotas. They simply extended the Sugar Act for 3 additional years, with the 80-cent benefit payment as contained in the bill as it left the House.

Mr. HOPE. Substantially all the bill does now is to extend the act, plus the increase in the benefit payments?

Mr. FULMER. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. There is also a child-labor amendment, as I understand.

Mr. FULMER. There is a minor amendment about child labor, concerning Louisiana.

Mr. HOPE. It is similar to the one the House passed 2 or 3 years ago, which was retroactive in its application at that time?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOPE. Is this the same amendment we passed at that time? It is my understanding that it is.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. It is the same amendment.

Mr. FULMER. Yes; it is the same amendment.

Mr. O'HARA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state whether or not this bill leaves the acreage allotment the same?

Mr. FULMER. This bill does not deal with the acreage allotment at all. It merely extends the provisions of the Sugar Act.

Mr. KLEBERG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the bill still contains some small payments on the lower brackets?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's understanding that during the coming year there will be no individual acreage allotments in the sugar program?

Mr. FULMER. I am not sure about that; I am not posted on it.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas it might be well to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has announced that there will be no acreage restrictions this next year on sugar.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am sure this bill in its present form is not very satisfactory to the domestic sugar producers of this country, but is seems to me it is the only opportunity we are going to have to secure a continuation of the act which is very important and very necessary, and for that reason I think the amendment should be agreed to, although I do not believe it is a very satisfactory measure.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. As I understand the bill as it now reads, the Senate has only changed the increased continental quotas contained in the original House bill.

Mr. FULMER. It does not deal with the quotas at all.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. They struck that from the bill?

Mr. FULMER. That was stricken from the bill and this simply extends the original act and the benefit payments as carried in the House bill with a minor labor amendment affecting the State of Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will permit, there is no change in the sugar-cane quota, is there?

Mr. FULMER. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address of the gentleman from Georgia I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of Members asking permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Dr. Doerner, of the United States Bureau of Mines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, in reference to figures on selective service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, and in my own behalf I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a lawyer in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] may be granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in making this unanimous-consent request, I join all Members on this day in paying tribute to William Tyler Page who today is celebrating the sixtieth year of his service in our Nation's Capitol.

Recently Members of this House and other distinguished people joined together in a radio program complimentary to this great American, and at the request of many of those who participated in that William Tyler Page birthday ceremony, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein the entire proceedings of that radio program, and additional letters, regardless of the space it shall take in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Archbishop John J. Mitty, of the archdiocese of San Francisco at St. Mary's Cathedral in San Francisco, on Sunday, December 14, 1941, when a military mass was said commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of all special orders previously made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made on H. R. 5558.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks delivered in the consideration of House Joint Resolution 258, at that point, and include some tables prepared by myself, and revise and extend my remarks in the discussion of Senate 2086 at that point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief poem entitled "Remember Pearl Harbor" written by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may extend his own remarks and include a radio address delivered by him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short letter from First Lt. Lewis M. Sanders, of Ft. Wayne, on his work in Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order by which I was permitted to address the House for 5 minutes today, and that I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LAST THURSDAY IN NOVEMBER A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 41, making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 3, strike out "last" and insert "fourth."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution making the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. TOLAN were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

BLACK-OUTS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, southern California greatly appreciates the solicitude of the Mayor of New York, but suggests that he go back to New York and practice his black-outs there as we have already lost some 4 hours in practice black-outs, which amounts to a million or a million and a half man-hours of labor and much of it on defense production. That is a terrific thing when you consider the pressing need for building airplanes and ships. The people who order practice black-outs had better consider the fact that they are stopping defense industries unless such industries are to be exempted. You cannot stop and start a production line again with the same ease that you turn a spigot.

I suggest that these things be seriously considered and that the gentleman from New York return to New York and try the black-out in New York for 4 hours and see how they like it. They, in New York, are a lot closer to enemies of the United States than we are in California and they have a great many more enemy aliens there than we have. Furthermore, we in southern California have had a civilian-defense organization, and a mighty good one, since long before the Mayor of New York ever thought of civilian defense. Perhaps, he has gone out to California to learn something about civilian defense that he could use in New York and spread over into New

Jersey. At least we speak English in California.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer the criticism of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], with regard to the activities of the mayor of the city of New York in his capacity as Director of Civilian Defense. Certainly it is not contended very seriously on the part of the gentleman from California that the mayor of the city of New York orders black-outs just for the sake of having black-outs. I believe the American people realize the seriousness of the danger we are facing, and any action that is taken is taken only to prepare against anything which may come from the enemy.

I think it ill behooves anyone to make such silly criticism as has just been made by the gentleman from California. The danger to our country, particularly on the west coast, requires cooperation and not criticism of efforts made to prepare for any eventuality.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

SALE OF DEFENSE BONDS IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but I rise at this time to suggest that the Secretary of the Treasury present as a Christmas present to the Congress of the United States and to some 1,500 employees around the Capitol of the United States some room and some officer within the Capitol structure from whom we can purchase defense bonds. It may come as a shock to some of the Members to know that you cannot buy a defense bond in the Capitol of the United States of America. Despite the fact that we have in some instances been rather brusque in our demands on the patriotic bankers of the United States to sell defense bonds, and I have never heard of one of them who was not willing to cooperate, despite the fact that we have appropriated billions day by day, week by week, and month by month for defense; despite the fact, also, that we have instructed the postmasters all over the United States to offer defense bonds for sale; nevertheless, the fact remains that you cannot buy defense bonds in the Capitol of the United States.

These 1,500 employees come to work early in the morning, and many of them are here late at night, as they are right now; yet if they want to do their patriotic duty to their country and help pay the tremendous cost of this war, they have to ask permission to leave their duty and go uptown to the post office or some bank uptown in order to invest their funds in the defense of America.

I think certainly the Secretary of the Treasury can during this period between now and the first of the year assign somebody to the Capitol, or perhaps one of our many Capitol postal employees to that privileged duty, so as to make it possible that Members of Congress as well as the employees of the Capitol may be able to more readily purchase defense bonds on the Capitol Grounds of this great Nation.

RICHARD L. BROWN

The second matter I want to discuss, Mr. Speaker, is one that pains me rather deeply, and I mention this subject with some degree of hesitancy, and only because some of the rest of the Members may find themselves in the same embarrassing position I found myself just recently.

On December 13, I received a telegram from the prosecuting attorney of Petoskey, Mich., which reads as follows:

Parents of Richard L. Brown—I shall not mention the name of the vessel at Pearl Harbor—are anxious regarding his safety. Wire, collect, Western Union.

Immediately on receiving the message I called the Navy Department to find out what had become of Richard L. Brown and whether or not he was safe. Based on information I received from the Navy Department officially, I wired as follows:

Official information indicates ship and personnel mentioned your telegram safe.

Those parents, because of Japanese press reports—and our own—had been worrying for more than a week about the safety of their son, and I hastened upon official advice to assure them that their boy was safe.

Imagine my embarrassment, sorrow, and disgust, last evening when I returned from the floor to find lying on my desk an issue of the Petoskey Evening News of December 16, containing an article in the middle of the front page outlined in heavy black mourning, with the heading "Dick Brown killed in opening attack on Pearl Harbor."

Reading down through this article I find that this young man who was president of his high-school class and who graduated just a short time ago from the Petoskey High School was killed in the attack on Pearl Harbor. An official telegram sent but 48 hours after I had probably brought relief and joy to anxious parents and told them their son was safe—another telegram was sent to the parents revealing the sailor's death and asking that no mention be made of the ship to which he was attached. The article goes on to state:

The telegram was delivered to a friend of the family who broke the news to the parents, fearful of their son's fate since first news of the attack came 10 days ago.

As their Congressman who had officially requested and transmitted information 2 days previously, I was not even called to be advised of the tragic error.

It seems to me there is something woefully wrong with the Information Service of the Navy Department when they cannot or will not give accurate information to Members of Congress in answer to requests for such information received from anxious parents. I endeavored to follow this matter up last night with Admiral Nimitz, but he was out of the office. I talked to his assistant, who told me they had instructed their Information Service henceforth to answer such queries by saying that there was no mention on the casualty lists received to date of the passing of any particular individual.

I might mention in passing that the reason I do not disclose the name of the vessel is because the vessel to which this boy was attached was not included in Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox's official report of what happened at Pearl Harbor. That vessel, however, was claimed to have been sunk by the Japanese. It was that claim which added to the worries of those anxious parents, an anxiety which I inadvertently allayed.

I learned further from reading this article that this young man was a member of the ship's cook's crew whose station in time of attack was to man a machine gun in antiaircraft fire. Surely the ship's cook's crew could be easily checked for casualties.

The Navy's explanation is that in the case of some of the boats that were sunk their records went down with the ship and therefore it was necessary for the Navy Department in Washington to send crew lists to Hawaii against which the known survivors could be checked so they could make up accurate casualty lists. But Mr. Knox and the Navy claim this particular boat was not sunk, and if so that excuse is invalid in this instance. The Japs said it was, and now maybe it was, despite Mr. Knox's report, which, let me say, I have heretofore thought was a most courageous, straight-from-the-shoulder, factual report from one who has been far too loquacious in the past for his own good or his country's good, and who by that report as contrasted with some of his boastful statements in his magazine articles must have experienced much sense of personal humiliation. Now, I do not know that that vessel has been sunk, but I do say that I hope the Navy Department in the future will be a bit more careful in giving this information to Members of Congress, and I caution each of you to be very certain that when you advise the parents back home you be sure that you know the boy is alive before you cause additional suffering or anxiety to the parents and embarrassment to yourself if a case such as this is repeated.

The article in the Petoskey Evening News in reference to this gallant lad, and to which I referred above, is as follows:

[From the Petoskey (Mich.) Evening News of December 16, 1941]

DICK BROWN KILLED IN OPENING ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR

The tragedy of war struck Petoskey in full force today when an official telegram revealed the death of Richard Brown, of the United States Navy.

Brown, the red-headed student manager of Petoskey High School athletic teams, Life Scout, and president of his class in the junior year, died in the surprise Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Oahu, early Sunday morning.

The official telegram, addressed to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. Leo Brown, of 908 East Lake Street, revealed the sailor's death and asked that no mention be made of the ship to which he was attached.

The telegram was delivered to a friend of the family who broke the news to the parents,

fearful of their son's fate since first news of the attack came 10 days ago.

The news of Brown's death brought war close to Petoskey, thousands of miles from the scene of the conflict. The flag at the high school was placed at half mast this morning and at noon a delegation of Boy Scouts placed the flag in Pennsylvania Park at half mast.

Brown was 23 years old last spring. He enlisted in the United States Navy September 24, 1939, and served as a seaman. In a letter written to his parents on December 2 he revealed that he had won the rating of ship's cook, third class. Naval veterans here said that the ship's cooks man antiaircraft guns during combat.

In high school Brown was one of the best known and most popular of his class. He was president of the class of 1938 in its junior year. In his third and fourth years in school he served as student athletic manager. He was a member of the Hi-Y Club for 3 years, and secretary-treasurer of the organization in his junior year. He served on the student council during his sophomore year and played football and basketball during his freshman year.

Entering the Boy Scouts when a lad he rose to the rank of Life Scout and served as senior patrol leader and assistant scoutmaster of troop 5.

Surviving, in addition to his parents, are: A brother, Robert, a student at Albion College; and his grandmother, Mrs. Marie Amberg, of Petoskey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia), for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia), for 10 days, on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter that I wrote to the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Concurrent Resolution 57, providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on the bill H. R. 5479, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "five" and insert "two."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein copy of an editorial published in Organized Labor of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]?

There was no objection

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 588. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and for other purposes;

S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; and

S. 2096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1047. An act to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385);

H. R. 5726. An act to amend Public Law No. 74 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 5800. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5925. An act to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936;

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6223. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6233. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 20, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1183. A letter from the acting director, national legislative committee, American Legion, transmitting two copies of the financial statement of their organization for this year up to October 31, 1941; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1184. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces on the last day of November 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1185. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to suspend the operation of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 74), as to the requirement of submitting detailed estimates, for the approval of the Secretary of War, of expenditures exceeding $5,000 upon any building or military post or grounds about the same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6023. A bill to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6044. A bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6196. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the

control of marihuana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOLAN: Select Committee to Investigate National Defense Migration. House Resolution 113. Resolution to inquire into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migration caused by the national-defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 6215. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, to aid in insuring the defeat of all the enemies of the United States through the extension of liability for military service and the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1554). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. (Rept. No. 1555). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 5558. A bill increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949 (Rept. No 1556). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 6273. A bill to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by setting new maximum limits on allowances for losses of distilled spirits by leakage or evaporation while in internal-revenue bonded warehouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6274. A bill to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr MAAS:

H. R. 6275. A bill providing for the issuance of a sailor's medal and a marine's medal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER:

H. R. 6276. A bill to provide that no person shall be barred from enlisting, or serving, in the military or naval forces of the United States because of having been previously dishonorably discharged therefrom on the ground of misconduct in the nature of a misdemeanor and providing further that a conviction for a misdemeanor or a felony under civil law shall not constitute a bar to such enlistment and service, under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEY:

H. R. 6277. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district courts of continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 6278. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6279. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6280. A bill to amend the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6281. A bill to regulate the promotion and retirement of certain officers of the line of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 6282. A bill relating to the penalty for the marketing of tobacco in excess of the farm-marketing quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. Res. 395. Resolution to investigate what methods will best insure the continued production of essential minerals after the war shall have ended; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6283. A bill for the relief of Franklin E. Ludwig, Mary Taylor, and Frank A. Taylor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6284. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gaber; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6285. A bill for the relief of Clarance A. Houser and his wife, Mrs. Jewel Houser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6286. A bill for the relief of Lee Watts; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2192. By Mr. CULKIN: Resolution of citizens' public expenditure survey of New York State, urging that Congress effect all possible savings in Federal nonessential, nondefense spending; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2193. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the New York State taxpayers rally on nondefense governmental spending, urging Congress to effect all possible savings in Federal nonessential, nondefense spending in the interest of national defense and the general welfare of the public; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2194. Also, resolution of the Queens County Council and Postal Garrison, No. 1639, Army and Navy Union, Department of New York City, requesting that under the revised edition of Veterans' Benefits of the Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, House Document 666, paragraph (5), shall be amended to read as follows: "Hospital or domiciliary care for veterans who served in the armed forces of the United States of America regardless of length of service during peace- or war-time who (a) were not dishonorably discharged from their last period of service; (b) swear that they are unable to defray the expenses of hospitalization or domiciliary care, including the expenses of transportation to and from a Veterans' Administration facility; and (c) are suffering with a disability, disease, or defect which, being susceptible of cure or decided improvement, indicates need for hospital care, or which, being essentially chronic in type and not susceptible of cure or decided improvement by hospital care, is producing disablement of such degree and of such probable persistency as will incapacitate from earning a living for a prospective period, and thereby indicates need for domiciliary care"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2195. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions of the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, Julius P. Heil, and the State Advisory Committee on Unemployment Compensation, representing both employer and labor representatives, opposing any and all proposals to transfer authority from the States to the Federal Government in the field of employment security, whether such transfer be proposed to be made openly or through subterfuge and indirection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2196. Also, resolutions of Italian-American Club of Beloit, Wis., pledging themselves in a body to support the United States Government, and State and city governments, the defense council, and all civic organizations that stand for the defense of the United States and its final victory in the present World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2197. Also, resolution of the Kenosha Chapter, No. 20, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Kenosha, Wis., placing their services at the call of the United States Government during the present World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2198. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, Cambridge, Mass., regarding views on price-control legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2199. Also, petition of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, Cambridge, Mass., opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our everlasting Father, we pray that Thou wilt accept the thanks and praise of our grateful hearts. Do Thou sanctify our joys and add to them sincerity, deep earnestness, and consecrated endeavor, making these days a season of faith and trust in Thee, healing the wounded arteries of human breasts everywhere. Grant that the advent of Mary's Holy Child may soften the asperities of war and hate, casting beams of luster and hope through the shadowy times of an uncertain future. We pray that peace, brotherhood, and confidence and all the fruits of the spirit may blossom in the soil of the Christ garden. In Him how beautiful are patience and long-suffering, and how unspeakable is the wonder of His love! When once the Star of Bethlehem ceases to shine, what a black socket there will be in the sky of this torn world! Oh, may He be born in us and formed in us, the hope of glory, our Lord Immanuel. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1936. An act to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2060. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended; and

S. 2082. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6128. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. If the House will indulge the Chair for a moment, the Chair can say to the Members that the House has acted upon every measure the President has asked in connection with national defense. If the President has any other communication to make to the Congress between now and the 3d of January, the Chair is not informed of it, and is of the very definite opinion that he has none. The President has been assured by me that if between now and the 3d of January any emergency matter should arise, if he would let me know I would by telegram ask the Members of the House to return.

I believe it is perfectly safe for each and every Member who desires to do so to be away from Washington until the 3d of January, until or unless there is further notice to the contrary.

The Chair desires to leave this evening and have a little holiday with his own people down in Texas. Before a resolution is offered, I desire to say that I wish each and every one of you a happy holiday at home.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri to offer a resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 396), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., a Representative from the State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE ANTHRACITE COAL PRODUCING REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law No. 355, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to Investigate Ways and Means for Improving Economic Conditions in the Anthracite Coal Producing Regions of the United States the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOLAND] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, ask for a conference, and appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LANHAM, BELL, and HOLMES.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES OCCASIONED BY ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE FORCES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1994) to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this bill was reported unanimously by the House committee?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. It was introduced originally at the request of the Navy Department, and, at the request of the War Department, it was broadened to include them. My understanding is that a similar statute was passed in the Sixty-fifth Congress, during the World War. The purpose of the bill is to give the armed forces authority to settle claims up to $1,000 because of operations in foreign countries where private property or persons are damaged or injured.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill is similar to an act that was in existence during the World War?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If there was a necessity or a reason for the law at that time, there are many more reasons for it now; for instance, we are in Trinidad, we are in Iceland, and we are in Egypt now. We shall be in every country where we have a base; we shall be in a great many more countries.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the gentleman correctly expresses the situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist, and for the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to appoint a Claims Commission or Commissions, composed of officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, to consider, adjust, determine, and make payments in final settlement of bona fide claims on account of damages caused by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces, or individual members thereof, in a foreign country or possession thereof, including places located therein which are under the temporary or permanent jurisdiction of the United States, to the property, public or private, or the persons of inhabitants of such foreign countries, where the amount of such claim does not exceed $1,000: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered by such Commissions unless presented within 1 year from the date of the accrual of said claim: *Provided further*, That any such settlements made by such Commissions under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 2. All payments in settlement of claims under section 1 of this act shall be made out of the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel", as to Navy and Marine Corps claims, and out of such appropriation for the Military Establishment as may be determined by the Secretary of War as to Army claims.

SEC. 3. This act shall be supplementary to, and not in lieu of, all other provisions of law authorizing consideration, adjustment, determination, and payment of claims by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Kansas City Star in regard to the United States Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Douglas Enterprise of Douglas, Wyo., of December 16, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a clipping from the National Ohio Independent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very able and comprehensive address by Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board, before the Mortgage Bankers Association of America in New York City on October 3 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain editorials from the Barre Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to proceed for 1 minute to read a telegram I received, as follows:

RUTLAND, VT., *December 19, 1941.*
Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have started a movement, effective this date, to refund to our customers 2 percent of their purchases in United States defense saving stamps to aid our Government in its war effort. Retail sales last year were $53,000,000,000; and if this movement would be followed by all retail merchants, our Government would sell an additional billion dollars' worth of United States defense saving stamps. Suggest issue of a 2-cent United States defense saving stamp that will enable consumers to save more stamps.

With your help, Vermont can lead the way in this movement.

WILLIAM I. GINSBURG,
President of following Rutland stores: Economy Department Store, Varsity Clothes Shop, Vogue Shop, Sports Shop, Outlet Trading Post.

I have communicated the contents of this telegram to Secretary Morgenthau and to Executive Director of Defense Savings Stamps Sales.

There seems to me to be much merit in the proposition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand the address I am inserting as a part of my remarks may exceed the allotted amount to some extent; and if so, I ask unanimous consent that it may be permitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, in the debate yesterday on the Registration Act, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] stated that certain amendments offered by me violated the Constitution. I have had occasion to make some investigations this morning and to consult some authorities with reference to the question, and I am convinced that the gentleman is entirely in error. A bill of attainder is a legislative act inflicting punishment without a jury trial. No such attempt was made by the amendments which the House adopted. What I want to call to the attention of the House is that every effort will be made to take these amendments out of the bill in conference. I have read the bill very carefully, and I can say that if these amendments are taken out of the bill, the measure to a large extent will be ineffective. It will not be enforced against these organizations, and, if these amendments are permitted to remain in the bill, I can assure you that they will do more to protect this country against "fifth column" activities than any measure we can devise.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear that our armed forces in Hawaii were not on the alert. Whether that be true or not, we can be thankful that one individual here in Washington has been continually on the alert.

In January 1939 the Navy awarded a contract for building an additional large graving dock in Pearl Harbor, the contract date of completion being in October 1942. It took about 6 years to build the old graving dock out there.

Due to the unrelenting driving of Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, who was at one time a resident of my congressional district, who was not satisfied with the October 1942 completion date, this new dock was turned over completed and ready for use the 17th of last month, nearly 1 year ahead of time and in time to meet the urgent need for docking facilities at that far outpost in the Pacific.

Ben Moreell's foresight and push and determination in this instance has proven of inestimable value to the Navy and national defense, and he deserves the Nation's commendation.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, if the press reports of the speech of Col. H. C. Kress, Muhlenberg, before the Curtiss-Wright Corporation Flying Club are true, they should entitle him to retirement for the good of the service. That he is not capable of analyzing the efficacy of long-range planning is proven by the fact that he is incapable of analyzing a situation after it has occurred. It is quite obvious that it was not a lack of airplanes which made possible the devastating surprise attack of the Japanese on Honolulu December 7. It is also quite obvious that if there had been more planes at Hickam Field on the morning of December 7 just that many more would have been destroyed by being caught helpless on the ground.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have several requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the yellow peril and to include therein a copy of a letter I have written to the parents of some of the boys in my district who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Tupelo Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks of a few days ago on Japanese activities in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this House about 2 weeks ago passed a bill to do something about the distressing labor situation in this Nation, in view of the further fact that that bill has been sidetracked and smothered in another body, and in view of the fact that a conference has been called by the president of labor and industry to iron out their difficulties without resorting to legislation, and in view of the further fact that it is now reported that that conference is deadlocked on the question of the closed shop, I think it is well that the House know some of the things that are happening today in the labor world.

You have heard a lot of talk that all of the strikes are over and all the labor disputes were going to be dissolved immediately, and fade away, and you have

not seen much about it in the newspapers. The general impression seems to be that all labor difficulties are settled. That is not the fact. I asked the Conciliation Service of the Labor Department yesterday what was the status of labor disputes, and I find as of yesterday there are now 613 labor disputes alive and pending before the Conciliation Service, notwithstanding the war with Japan.

I shall call attention to one or two specific items that are going on now, today. One of them will be of particular interest to the farming element of the Nation, and Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts, and certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letters follow:

CENTRAL GREYHOUND LINES,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 14, 1941.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Further in acknowledgement of yours of December 11, to which I replied by wire yesterday; also mailed you copies of the complaints upon which temporary injunctions were issued against the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America in the State courts of Massachusetts and New York. I am enclosing herewith copy of the order which was issued in the Supreme Court of the State of New York yesterday upon the complaint before that court.

Although the pickets in the States of Massachusetts and New York have been withdrawn in accordance with these restraining orders, the union still refuses to authorize the men to return to work, and the operations of Central Greyhound Lines out of Cleveland, and between Cleveland and New York, between New York and Boston, between Boston and Albany, and between Albany and New York are still suspended due to the refusal of the union to permit its employees to return to work.

Also, the busses of other lines operating into the city of Cleveland are not allowed to run into the large motorbus terminal in that city. The terminal and garage in Cleveland are still picketed due to the dismissal of the plaintiff's complaint seeking an injunction by the Cleveland court. There are a number of other bus lines operating into Cleveland besides Central Greyhound Lines which ordinarily use the terminal and the operation of all of these lines, not involved in any controversy in and out of the Cleveland terminal are stopped. Within this terminal there has recently been fitted out accommodations for servicemen by the United Service Organizations. These accommodations are rendered practically useless by reason of the stoppage of motorbus service into the terminal and the surrounding of the building by pickets.

In reference to the closed shop, I recall the statement which you made to me when I was in your office during the time this same union had in effect a strike on Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines in violation of its existing contract. This issue, together with the other issues, had then been referred to the Secretary of Labor at Washington as the arbitrator. In the award handed down by the United States Secretary of Labor the closed shop was imposed upon Pennsylvania Greyhound Lines. I enclose herewith copy of the original decision of the Secretary, copy of the exceptions and objections of the company to the award as it related to the closed shop and other matters; and also copy of the final decision of the Secretary imposing the closed shop upon the company.

I realize that that company is not in position to complain about the closed shop, as it could have refused to agree to having the closed-shop issue submitted to arbitration by the Secretary. However, all of the operations of the company were tied up involving tremendous losses, and to date there has been no effective procedure confirmed which permits an employer to recover his losses by reason of a strike in violation of an existing contract with a labor union. In spite of representations which have heretofore been made and since reiterated, that the Government would not force upon employees the joining of a union as a condition of employment, the award of a closed shop by the Secretary of Labor was contrary to such announced policy.

The company realizes the situation arising by reason of the existing strike on Central Greyhound Lines is exceedingly serious and is directly affecting national defense. The motorbus industry is moving thousands of servicemen and selectees, especially at this time, when men are returning home for Christmas holidays, many of whom have been stopped en route and ordered to return to camp. The movement of servicemen from the many camps in the South to their homes in the Northern and Eastern States involves a transportation by interline arrangements between the various carriers whose service is coordinated. The stoppage of the service of Central Greyhound Lines has resulted in passengers moving into joint terminal points in the territory of Central Greyhound Lines having their journey by motorbus interrupted at the transfer points and the passengers compelled to seek other means of transportation for the continuance of their journey for which they held through tickets.

So far as we have knowledge there is no disposition on the part of the union to permit their employees to return to employment at the strike centers on Central Greyhound Lines, although the company has solicited the return of the men to employment.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN BOWEN.

HUDSON TRANSIT LINES,
Hackensack, N. J., December 16, 1941.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing of your excellent efforts to stabilize labor conditions in this country, and at the suggestion of Greyhound, we are submitting to you the following information as to our own situation.

Our operators were members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, which organization has a contract with us in full force and effect until December 31 of this year. Last Wednesday we met with a committee in connection with the negotiation of a new contract. On Friday morning, without any previous warning, a representative of the transport workers' union of the Congress of Industrial Organizations called on us and advised us that this union had a majority of our employees as members. We advised him of the contract in effect, and that we would honor that contract until its completion. Two of our garage force had been discharged for failure to report for work, and after their discharge had apparently joined the transport workers' union. At the time of their discharge, and prior thereto, our garage men had no union affiliation. The transport workers' union insisted that we reinstate these two men at once, but on account of their previous record with the company, we took the position that the act of our superintendent in discharging them was justified, and we refused to override him and order their reinstatement. This took place yesterday afternoon. Last night the transport workers' union ordered the drivers on strike and we are unable to operate. This seems to be a direct instance of union raiding on the part of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and we are positive that no strike vote was taken. As a matter of fact, we have not in any way violated the contract under which we are operating.

We assume that this is only one of many such instances that are occurring in the country, and we submit this information to you for such use as you may desire to make of it. We will be very glad to furnish you with any additional information you may require. A copy of our timetable is enclosed, so that you may be advised of our operation and the territory affected.

Respectfully yours,

HUDSON TRANSIT LINES,
D. CLINTON DOMINICK,
President.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I asked the Department of Justice about a case that is now going on out in the West that deals with the subject of farm labor in the picking and packing and transportation of fruits. Here is the situation in the Yakima Valley, in the State of Washington, which is a famous apple-growing section. Those farmers out there have gathered their apples and have packed and shipped them to the markets of Chicago, Minneapolis, and sundry other markets. The labor dispute there is this: That these farmers out there who like to have their children, and perhaps their wives and daughters and neighbors, help them pick their apples in the busy season, have declined to agree to a closed-shop agreement with the migratory fruit pickers' union. The result of that is that the teamsters' union, which seems to be a sort of a parent of this migratory fruit pickers' union, has proceeded to boycott apples from the Yakima Valley, in the State of Washington. There are carloads of fruit rotting in Chicago today which these little farmers, through the year's effort and hard work, have raised and sent to market, because the teamsters' union refuses to permit them to be unloaded in the Chicago market and various and sundry other large markets, where they have been shipped for the Christmas trade. That is the sort of condition growing out of the closed-shop argument that exists in your Nation not 2 weeks ago but today simply because the farmers of that section will not agree to a closed shop with these migratory fruit pickers.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does the gentleman know that on yesterday, at the request of the International Apple Association, representing these Yakima shippers whose fruit is being destroyed, the Department of Justice was requested, through its Mr. Arnold, to take some action to protect the damage that was being done to the apple shippers, and that he reported the Government had no power under the law under which he could operate?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is just what I am talking about. If the Senate had passed the bill which we passed 2 weeks ago, we would have a law that would stop this foolishness.

I have received a letter from the Department of Justice which sets out the

matter in detail. The Department of Justice is powerless without legislation.

Now, the representative of these poor little fruit farmers out there in the State of Washington came on here, and he has been wearing out his shoe leathers for 3 or 4 days going from one department to the other, trying to see if there was not some power in this Government to stop this outrage and permit these people to sell their fruit. I am informed that he went to the O. P. M. and saw Mr. Sidney Hillman. Sidney Hillman simply said, "We do not have anything to do with apples. You will have to go somewhere else." He went to the Department of Agriculture, and they sent him somewhere else. He went to the Department of Justice, and they were candid and honest enough to say that "Unless we get some law there is nothing we can do about it."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman will recall that the Ways and Means Committee in its amendments to the Social Security Act defined the words "agricultural labor," which the gentleman from Virginia incorporated in his bill last year. Would not that law have settled the question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Exactly. That is just what I am coming to. Two years ago this House passed an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act and that went to another body and it underwent the same chloroforming operation which the bill we passed 2 weeks ago underwent. If that bill had been enacted into law, this condition could not exist today, because, as the gentleman from California just said, we put in a definition of "agricultural worker," which would stop not only the National Labor Relations Board but would stop the Wage and Hour Board from assuming jurisdiction that Congress never gave them, namely, to interfere with farm labor. Now, that is the situation with regard to fruit.

That condition is going on all over the United States today. The farmers of this Nation, if that is to be permitted to continue, will suffer a serious loss. I have numerous letters, telegrams, other communications, and personal calls from up and down the west coast of this Nation where these migratory fruit pickers have formed a union and where the teamsters' union will not permit the products of those farms to go upon the markets of this Nation.

In the meantime we have going on down here a conference of labor and industry. That conference, as I said before, has been deadlocked because the industries just say, "We are not going to be a party to fastening the yoke of the closed shop on this Nation during its time of peril." That is what the whole controversy is now in that conference, because the labor representatives insist upon having the right to insist upon the closed shop, and the gentleman who did that at the Nation's peril 2 weeks ago and obtained his closed shop in the coal industry is sitting at the head of that table saying to the American people, "You shall not have peace in the labor field unless we shall have the closed shop in defense industries."

But I told you about the teamsters' union and what they are doing in this circumstance. The teamsters' union is headed by a gentleman named Daniel Tobin. While these members of the teamsters' union are committing these outrages upon the farmers of America today that I have just told you about, the head of that union, Daniel Tobin, selected by the President as one of the representatives to settle this question, is also sitting around the table with John L. Lewis, saying to the American farmers and the American people, "You shall not market your products unless you give us the closed shop and submit to our will."

Now, the plain question is, How long are the American people going to permit themselves to be subjected to such dictatorship?

There are one or two others that I would like to mention. My time has expired, but I want to go into the transportation question. Transportation is probably more serious than the food question, and I have not raised the transportation question yet.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LEA. I just wanted to call attention to the fact in connection with this threatened strike affecting the fruit in the Northwest, that the strike is so timed as to prevent this fruit from reaching the Christmas market and therefore subjects the farmers to acute need for some relief.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the point I am going to raise, but I wanted to emphasize and bring out the suggestion that if these labor agitators succeed in getting the closed shop during this great national emergency a terrible problem will face the millions of young men we are drafting into the service, for when they are released after the war they will find a closed shop and no job.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That question has not been given as much emphasis as it should have been given. If the unions are permitted to carry out their program of enforcing the closed shop in all industry—and that has been the effort ever since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, then the five, six, seven, or eight million young men whom we are taking out of their walks in life and forcing into the Army at $21 a month will come back and be the great army of the unemployed. No matter what their employer may have told them before they left, when they get back the employer will be forced by the unions, no matter how good his intentions may be, to say that he cannot reemploy that man because he has a closed shop, that the man has got to apply to the union and get a permit. When he applies to the union the union will tell him they cannot take in any new members, that they already have two or three millions unemployed. There will be no way for him to get in the unions or for him to get employment. It is a monopoly that is simply going to be terrible in this country, and yet we do not seem to be doing anything about it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Briefly, but I want to touch on the question of transportation.

Mr. HARE. I just want to make an observation supplementing the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi. Does not the gentleman from Virginia believe that these three, four, six, or eight million men, when they return to civil life after this emergency, will have the training to enable them to write a formula that will take care of this conflict we are having between industry and labor?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Perhaps so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Briefly, but my time is running.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wanted to make a further observation on the question raised by the gentleman from Mississippi, and that is that if the situation continues that long, when these men come back, they are going to join with the farmers of this country in fixing the responsibility for the continuance of this situation directly where it belongs—at the White House. Of course, I do not see how we can wait that long for a solution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Perhaps they will believe that some of the responsibility lies with the Congress of the United States, which is supposed to make the laws of this Nation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The House has repeatedly tried to do its duty.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They certainly have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And so has the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have tried to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the transportation situation a little. The Greyhound Lines had a strike on their system about a year ago, the employees insisting upon the closed shop. The employer—the Greyhound Lines—agreed to everything except the closed shop. Very foolishly, the Greyhound Lines, not having the experience we now have on the subject of arbitrating, agreed to arbitrate the question of the closed shop.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Greyhound Lines then did not know what

happened to an employer when he agreed to arbitrate the question of the closed shop; so they agreed to arbitrate it, very foolishly. The Secretary of Labor was made the arbitrator of the question of the closed shop. You know of course the answer. The answer was that the closed shop was forced upon the Greyhound Lines. They entered into a contract in which, among other things, they agreed that all questions in dispute should be submitted to arbitration so that there should be no strike on the Greyhound Lines. Since the war—not 3 weeks ago, but since the war—while this Greyhound Bus Line has contracts with the Government for the transportation of troops and is, as you know, one of the most important transportation lines in the United States, they have had strikes called where they refused to submit the question in dispute to arbitration in violation of their contract.

Those strikes are now tying up lines. I am not going to use all of my time, but will insert with my remarks a letter from the general counsel and a telegram which I received on yesterday from him. I will read the telegram. It is as follows:

Strike on Central Greyhound Lines still in progress; operations from Cleveland to New York, New York to Boston, New York to Albany, Boston to Albany, Cleveland to Buffalo, Cleveland to Detroit, tied up; courts in Massachusetts and New York issued temporary injunctions against picketing; unions failed to authorize men to return to work; injunction action in Cleveland dismissed by court. Am forwarding copies of complaints of New York and Massachusetts courts by air mail, special delivery. Approximately 200 busses out of operation account strike; union yesterday ordered all our Cleveland telephone operators to discontinue service and they today failed to report for work.

IVAN BOWEN.

The courts held that there was no labor dispute there. They had a contract in which they agreed to arbitrate and which they refused to carry out; nevertheless, the men did not go back to work on the Greyhound Lines and they are tied up.

I do not know how they heard about me, but the Hudson Transit Lines sent me a letter on yesterday. The Hudson Transit Lines has a network of bus operations throughout the State of New York. Their operations extend pretty well all over the State. They have a contract with the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and that contract does not expire until the 1st of January. They happen to have two men who did not show up for work the other day and these men were fired. Those two men went over and joined the C. I. O. So the representative of the C. I. O. came over to the Hudson Transit Lines and told them to put these two men back to work or, "We will call a strike on all of your lines." The company told them that they had a contract, a perfectly valid bargaining contract, with the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, "And we propose to carry out that contract. As a matter of fact, we expect to renew the contract."

What happened? That very night without any warning or notice to the company or to the public or to the United States Government which is using these lines for the transportation of troops, they called a strike on the Hudson Transit Lines and tied up that system of transportation. That was purely and simply a case of the C. I. O. raiding the contract of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of foolishness that is going on in this Nation today, not 2 weeks ago when we passed much needed legislation not the day after the war started when everybody thought that all labor difficulties were now going to fade out of the picture, but today, after a war has been going on for 2 weeks. Those kind of things are happening every minute of the day and, as I told you awhile ago, when I called the Conciliation Service yesterday I found there are now pending unsettled 613 labor disputes.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is more serious than we realize. In the first place, it does not make any difference what this conference down here agrees to, these fellows like Lewis, Tobin, and the big shots in the labor movement cannot control these strikes. They have never been able to do so.

Let me call attention to another instance which never got into the newspapers. I got this by telegraph. Only this past week in Youngstown, Ohio, or that vicinity, the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. had what they called an unauthorized strike, in which some two or three hundred key employees of that concern making steel for this Government now in its hour of gravest danger, when we need every ounce of steel we can get, just up and walked out and tied up this plant employing 1,800 men, which, as I said before, is engaged in making steel for the United States Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from the Stockton Evening Record of Saturday, December 13, 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from an American-Italian paper of Stockton, Calif., indicating that the American-Italians of that county, some 7,000 of them, are strongly behind the United States Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 47, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, TO STATE DIRECTORS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE AND MEMBERS OF ALIEN ENEMY BOARDS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2082, extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the House bill is like the Senate bill?

Mr. HOBBS. I am informed by the clerk of our committee that they are identical.

Mr. MICHENER. The House bill was unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee and is now on the calendar?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; it is No. 533 on the Union Calendar of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I notice this difference: The title of the Senate bill is "A bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards."

After the amendment was placed in the House bill, which amendment also appears in the Senate bill, giving certain authority under the Alien Enemy Act of 1789, the House provided for change of title. The House bill corrects the title while the Senate bill does not. Is the gentleman prepared to say that the House committee did wrong and that we should pass the Senate bill without the House correction?

Mr. HOBBS. No. I think it would be good parliamentary practice if we followed the lead of the Judiciary Committee of the House and amended the title, but I understand the Parliamentarian of the Senate is of the opinion that this is not necessary.

Mr. MICHENER. The Senate bill is just the same without the corrected title as that provided by the House committee. Is the gentleman, as one of the leading members of the Judiciary Committee and at all times a stickler in matters of that kind, prepared to concede that the Senate Parliamentarian knows more about this matter than does the gentleman who now has the floor, and his committee?

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the compliment of the gentleman, but I cheerfully concede that the able Parliamentarian of the Senate knows infinitely more than I do. I believe the procedure in our committee was far preferable, but, as I understand, the rules are not as Procrustean with regard to the titles of Federal laws as they are with regard to State laws. If this were a State law, of course, this could not be done. The amendment of the body of the bill would require also the amendment of the title. However, under Federal procedure and practice, I understand that is not required.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to hold up the bill, and I shall yield to the distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary if he wants to accept the judgment of the Parliamentarian of the Senate as to the proper form of draftsmanship as against the judgment of the gentleman who is now making the request, plus the entire House Committee on the Judiciary. If the gentleman has gone into this matter to such an extent that he wants to assume that responsibility and establish that precedent, then far be it from me to interfere with his plan.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invoke the ruling of the Chair on that point. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this bill was identical in the House and the Senate versions, but in the House committee an amendment was made in the body of the bill to include other officers than originally were named in the House bill, namely, the members of alien-enemy hearing boards. The House committee conceived it to be wise to amend the title to show that the amendment had been put in the bill, but the Senate, in passing the bill, although it adopted the House amendment, did not amend the title.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Alabama has not submitted a parliamentary inquiry. He has asked the Chair for a legal opinion on what the gentleman himself admits is debatable. Under the rules of the House, the Speaker of the House is not required to render legal opinions, at least without notice.

Mr. HOBBS. I am not contending that the Speaker is required to do so. I am asking as a matter of the grace and indulgence of the Chair that he do so, and advise us if the Senate version be adopted, the limited reference in the title would be sufficient to carry the full bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the title of the bill is identification more than anything else. Mr. Justice Brewer in the case of *Patterson* v. *Bank Eudora* (190 U. S. 169) held—

That the title is no part of the statute and cannot be used to set at naught its obvious meaning.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MICHENER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the amendment provides:

Or hereafter issued by the President under the authority of the Alien Enemy Act of 1798.

Will the gentleman tell us what that act is? It is a long way back, and Congress might be interested in knowing what powers it is reviving.

Mr. HOBBS. That question does not bother the gentleman who is now occupying the well, since he and the gentleman from Michigan were both here on the floor when that act of 1798 was passed, if I recall correctly. However, he took at least as much part in that debate as I did, and is probably far better qualified than I to advise the House now as to its provisions. I would be presumptious were I one of the junior Members of this House, just a babe in arms compared to him, to attempt to enlighten the distinguished gentleman from Michigan on such a subject, or anyone else in his presence. Hence, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Michigan for the purpose of sitting at his feet for instruction.

Mr. Speaker, a law was passed years ago which required that any Federal employee must have been out of the Federal service for 2 years before he could take a case against the Government. That is good legislation for peacetime, but in wartime, when we have the draft boards, and alien enemy hearing boards, giving their time unstintedly to the Federal service, free gratis and for nothing, with no salary at all, and having nothing whatever to do in their duties with the ordinary operations of the departments of the Government, a different situation is presented. Your Committee on the Judiciary and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate unanimously approved these bills, which will broaden the scope of the bill we passed last year, extending to lawyers who serve the draft boards free of charge an exemption from the 2-year inhibition.

There is no controversy at all on the merit of this bill. The House committee favorably and unanimously reported the bill. It is on the Calendar of the House. The Senate committee reported the bill unanimously and the Senate passed it. Therefore, I ask that the Senate bill be passed and that the House bill be laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the lucid explanation made by the distinguished gentleman, and the urgency of the bill, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 5, 1941 (55 Stat. 150), be amended to read as follows:

"That nothing in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 or the Selective Service Regulations made in pursuance thereof as a member of a local board, a board of appeal, an advisory board for registrants, as a State director, a Government appeal agent, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant training and service because of conscientious objections as provided in section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; or because of his appointment as a member of an alien enemy hearing board to assist the Attorney General in the execution of any proclamations heretofore or hereafter issued by the President under the authority of the Alien Enemy Act of 1798, as amended (U. S. C., title 50, secs. 21–24.)"

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6044) was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I purposed discussing the same subject to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] addressed himself a few moments ago. The gentleman from Virginia, however, did so splendidly in presenting the question to the House, and through the House and the press to the country, that I shall forego the desire to enter upon any further discussion of that question.

I do want to make this observation, however, and I make it regretfully, that the record that has been made and that is being made on the labor question constitutes the blackest page in the whole history of this Republic. It makes me wonder just what is the matter with those in command, just what is the objective they have in view when they tolerate and in some cases encourage the performances on the part of the gangsters in labor which were detailed by the gentleman from Virginia in his statement.

Here at this very moment, when this labor-capital candy pulling is going on down here at the White House conference, we find labor prosecuting an appalling continental conspiracy against the people of this country. The fruit growers' case, to which the gentleman from Virginia referred, is one where the farmers in the affected area are small growers, in the sense that their farms consist usually of 10, 15, or 20 acres. There is an average indebtedness running from $500 to $700 per acre on these orchards. Some years are good and some are bad. To them this happens to have been a good year. Their crops have been gathered and packed and are now moving into the market, but because in the processing of those commodities they had to use their families—their wives and their children—due to a lack of a sufficiency of migratory labor, which takes care of only about 40 percent of their labor needs, this confounded teamsters' union, headed by Dave Beck and acting through the A. F. of L., has come down upon them and is prohibiting the marketing of their fruits. This fruit is now at Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, but it cannot be unloaded because the local teamsters' unions, acting through the A. F. of L., have declared these "hot goods," and they are being picketed. Where any of the fruit happens to be unloaded, these pickets follow the truck to the retailer and picket his store. It all means a terrible loss to the growers, and for no reason other than his family helped pick, wash, and pack the fruit.

Mr. Speaker, can you think of a more shameful situation that could exist in this country of supposedly free people?

Again, I want to inquire, what is the purpose—what is the objective—that some people have in mind when they fail to use the power that is in their hands to crush any such insurrection, any such lawlessness, any such outrage against honest people as is being perpetrated by these infernal gangsters?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Daniel Tobin is the president of the teamsters' union, and he is sitting at the peace table down here, ostensibly undertaking to make peace while his union is doing the things the gentleman has arraigned.

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman sees any parallel between that situation and the attack at Pearl

Harbor while the Japanese Embassy was here talking peace.

Mr. COX. Yes. While pleading for peace, they are stabbing this country in the back.

I want to say this to you: Most people feel that this so-called peace conference now in progress at the White House is being used to circumvent Congress in the adoption of legislation dealing with just the kind of situation as is being discussed here this morning—a shameful thing to tolerate. It is being used to stop the Smith bill at the other end of this Capitol.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman advise the Congress who is responsible and who called this so-called peace conference that is now being held?

Mr. COX. Well, that is pretty generally understood. I do not care to discuss that point; but I again say to you that the labor record that has thus far been made and is being made is a disgrace to any civilized country in this world. I am ashamed of it, and I cannot see how it should be possible that people who are seriously interested in the perpetuity of this Government, as a free, constitutional government, could have the slightest tolerance for what is going on.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said he had had a communication from the Department of Justice. I had a communication in response to an inquiry that I made. Now, Mr. Thurman Arnold is not a reactionary, he is not an economic royalist, but if you will pass the Smith bill, as public sentiment demands it should be adopted, if you will put some power in the hands of Thurman Arnold, he will crush this insurrection against America and against the soldiers now in the camps whom you are training to bleed and die for the country.

Let me inquire here, is a country that will tolerate conditions like these worth giving your young manhood to save? That is a question that the individual must answer for himself.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. This is a matter we are all trying to get at the bottom of and understand, and I think the gentleman will concede that the House has been very open-minded on this matter, even those who usually have voted opposite to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The House has behaved beautifully, but another influence has intervened.

Mr. PATRICK. In the very matter that the gentleman is talking about, would the Smith bill do the thing the gentleman has in mind ought to be done in this particular case? I may not have the same slant that the gentleman has, even with respect to the extent of the outrage he is referring to. These gentlemen or these racketeers, as he calls them, are merely making the protest that the law allows them to manifest by saying: "We will go and picket in manifesting our position," protesting to the public."

Mr. COX. Oh, do not stand here in this House and defend such conduct as has been described here this morning.

Mr. PATRICK. I am merely stating facts. I am not stating them as a defense or as an attack, but am stating the fact merely regarding this picketing by workers, being brought up as it has been brought up here today, as if the Smith bill would change the condition to which the gentleman refers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a factual statement on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

The issue is clear. Will the farmer be permitted to pack the crops he produces, using his wife and children to assist in the work, and then be allowed to sell the crops he has produced? Dave Beck, head of the Teamsters' Union, of Seattle, Wash., says "No." And thousands of dollars' worth of fruits meant for sale for Christmas are now standing in the freight yards at terminals because organized labor is forbidden to touch or handle it and the message comes from Dave Beck, of Seattle. He is the boss.

The particular instance has arisen with regard to the fruit crops grown in the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington. The crops have been good this year, and in order to harvest them the school children and the wives of the farmers have not only aided in harvesting but also in the packing and preparation of fruits for market.

The union has fought since August for a closed shop. The chief members of the union were the migratory workers who, starting in California, moved northward as the crops are harvested and packed. It is impossible to harvest the crop and pack it with help of this nature. It is inadequate.

The crops are now saved. The packing-house labor has practically lost the fight for this season. But the crops must move to market, and this is where Dave Beck comes in, for he is head of the teamsters' union. Since the growers would not recognize a closed shop for those workers who assisted in packing, they are not going to be allowed to sell the fruit they grew. The markets are being closed to Yakima fruit.

A meeting was called at Cleveland for 9 o'clock this morning, which would close all eastern markets in the United States to Yakima fruits. The teamsters union has sent pickets who will warn all labor that fruits from Yakima are "hot cargo," and must not be touched. Unless the markets between Chicago and the East are available no producing district in the United States can survive financially.

In Minneapolis, where the strike is now on for a week, and an injunction has been secured, to restrain labor from interfering with the unloading of cars of fruit and its sale at wholesale, the pickets have been placed to follow the fruit from the wholesaler to the retailer and to warn all purchasers that the fruit is "hot cargo" and the retailer had better not buy it for sale in his store. On December 18 the following cities were declared closed, with all fruit from Yakima to be boycotted and any fruit unloaded to be picketed: Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, San Francisco, Oakland, Tucson, Phoenix, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, and all the chain stores owned by Safeway and Kroger throughout the United States.

There is no question of wages. Standard wages were paid. The issue is confined to the issue of the closed shops, and from this time on, if this strike wins, a farmer will not be able to organize a cooperative and to enter that cooperative with his own family to prepare his fruit for market, unless his family enter the union. Yakima is a region of small farmers. Many of them 10 or 20 acres. No individual operating alone is equipped to grade, pack, wash, and prepare his fruit for market, so the farmers have joined together and organized packing plants for the purpose. Now, the question arises, Must all such packing plants be operated by union labor and as closed shops? Dave Beck says they must, or he will forbid the movement of the fruit to market.

For nearly a decade the fruit grower has been having very serious economic problems. There was one good crop year in Yakima, to wit, 1936, in the last decade, until this one. The indebtedness on these farms is several hundred dollars per acre, on the average. This year looms to the growers as the one opportunity to liquidate some of their indebtedness. But the teamsters union determined that it will wreck all possibility of securing satisfactory sales unless the producers agree immediately to their demand for a closed shop and its recognition for the future. Mr. Hillman says this question is not a matter of defense, and the Department of Labor says that the question is one whose status remains to be fought out, regardless of any proposals which may be made with regard to the stoppage of strikes because of the needs incurred by the country being at war. These producers are told to send their representatives to a tribunal of three of whom two are Department of Labor representatives to meet at Seattle at 10 o'clock Monday and the case will there and then be closed. But the issue remains, for the fruit is left tied up, boycotts remain, thousands of dollars will be lost. The fruit is standing on the tracks. It was meant to be sold for Christmas. Instead of being sold, it is accumulating in the yards. And the growers are losing the money which they expected to use for Christmas.

The representatives of the producers at the request of the committee appointed by the Governor of the State of Washington, have signed a statement that they will agree to a truce and agree to arbitrate all differences. But it is not enough for Dave Beck. For the teamsters union, so far, has declined to accept even a certification hearing by the Labor Board. And the teamsters' union does not represent more than 20 percent of the employees concerned. The question has gone beyond the point of the producers agreeing to a truce and to arbitrate all questions, which was requested by a commission appointed by the Governor of the State, for Beck has made up his mind that he is going to "rule or ruin." He will neither submit the case to a certified hearing before the Labor Board, nor will he accept a truce. The question arises in the minds of these growers as to who is in control of the United States. The growers advise that press releases report undertakings by labor to cease strikes, yet labor continues to sabotage food as indicated. The situation is on all fours with the Japanese Ambassadors discussing peace proposals in Washington and blasting Pearl Harbor. There is no difference in the minds of the growers of Yakima.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5558. An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951;

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday; and

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the order heretofore adopted, the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1186. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2200. By Mr. ENGEL: Memorial of the Muskegon Employers Association, of Muskegon, Mich., offering to lend all aid possible to the Federal Government in the prosecution of the war and that all facilities be placed at the disposal of the Federal Government for such purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2201. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 86 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages, including beer, within and about these camps and vice in the vicinity of them; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2202. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the New Jersey Association for Health and Physical Education, informing the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Governor of the State of New Jersey that the entire membership of the organization holds itself in readiness to execute any assignment allocated to it for the successful prosecution of this war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2203. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by Chapter No. 14, Disabled American Veterans, Beloit, Wis., unanimously passed by their organization offering their services to the United States Government during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2204. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution of the Associated Industries of Nebraska, by W. D. Lane, president; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2205. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Federation of Glass, Ceramic, and Silica Sand Workers, Local No. 4, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2206. Also, petition of the International Union United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Labor.

2207. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Lansing, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor and the national defense program; to the Committee on Labor.

2208. Also, petition of the City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2209. Also, petition of the First Baptist Church of Paola, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the manufacture of liquors and malt beverages to the manufacture of materials for our common defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2210. Also, petition of the president and fellows of Yale University, New Haven, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program to safeguard the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2211. Also, petition of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program to safeguard the State and Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1941

The Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, who understandest all Thy children, and through whose gift of faith we bring our perplexities to the light of Thy wisdom, thereby receiving the blessed encouragement of Thy sympathy and a clearer knowledge of Thy will: Open Thou our eyes, that we may behold Thy gracious hand in all Thy works, and evermore give Thee thanks that Thy blessed Son hath exalted lowliness and given a new radiance to common existence by casting about it a halo of glory that never can grow dim.

Help us to make it the purpose of our life to redeem all untoward circumstances, to exalt all that is cast down, that we may become supreme by fulfilling the myriad claims of our destiny. And, as we approach the Christmas-tide with its insistence upon purity, the rights of motherhood, the innate holiness of that which is begotten, let a new age dawn upon us, that we may cast away the works of darkness and put upon us the armor of light. We ask it in the name of Him who by His birth hath cleansed our race at its fountainhead, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 19, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 19, 1941:

S. 334. An act for the relief of James C. Dyson;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of William Corder; and

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Broderick.

On December 20, 1941:

S. 1244. An act for the relief of the Kennelly Furniture Co.;

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mary S. Gay; and

S. 1550. An act for the relief of Carl Chalker.

SHIPBUILDING RECORD AT FORE RIVER, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on Saturday night last, in the city of Boston, an event took place which I believe is of national interest and national significance. On that evening a celebration was had because of the fact that at the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass., the world's record for building ships was broken. At that yard a 10,000-ton cargo carrier was completed in 63 working days. The time of 90 days had been allotted, and that was considered remarkable, but, due entirely to the enthusiasm and the industry of the individual workers themselves, this ship was completed in 63 days.

That was before the war broke out; and if individual enthusiasm can achieve results of that kind before the war began, I think there is every reason to believe, now that we are in support of our men in the Philippines and in the Pacific generally, that this kind of industrial record can still further be surpassed. I believe that the workers at the Fore River Shipyard have set an example which is a stimulating one for the country as a whole. So, for that reason, I wanted to make mention of it here on the floor of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 19th instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received on December 20, 1941:

That Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., a Representative from the State of Maryland, was elected Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives during the absence of the Speaker.

That the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each without amendment:

S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries; and

S. 2082. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on

the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 793) to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5558) increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949.

That the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii; and

S. 2119. An act to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

That the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday.

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANHAM, Mr. BELL, and Mr. HOLMES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6196. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana;

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire; and

H. R. 6269. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended.

That the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 57) providing for the printing of additional copies of hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives on the bill (H. R. 5479) to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 19th instant,

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred on December 20, 1941, as indicated:

H. R. 6196. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code in relation to the control of marihuana; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 606 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the purpose of granting to the President, in time of war or threatened war, certain powers with respect to communications by wire; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 19th instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that, on December 20, 1941, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 588. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and for other purposes;

S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps;

S. 2096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5558. An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951;

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday;

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents.

NUMBER OF MEN IN ACTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE IN THE LAND FORCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the number of men on the last day of November 1941 in active training and service in the land forces under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS ON PUBLIC WORKS IN HAWAII

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2086) to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii, which was, in line 9, after the word "otherwise", to insert a colon and the following provisio: *"Provided,* That such employment shall be as common laborers only and only upon public work carried on for the national defense: *Provided further,* That any national of the United States admitted into the Territory of Hawaii pursuant to section 8 (a) (1) of the act approved March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 462), for employment as herein authorized shall, upon the termination of such employment, be returned to the Philippine Islands."

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXPEDITION OF THE PROVISION OF HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houes thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL UNION, NO. 72, U. A. W., WISCONSIN—COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution of Local Union No. 72, U. A. W. (C. I. O.), in the State of Wisconsin, relative to proposed legislation affecting communications workers, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the jobs, working conditions, and wages of thousands of working men and women in the communications industry have been placed in jeopardy by the schemes of the owners of the industry for the creation of monopolies through mergers of the major wire, radio, and cable telegraph companies; and

Whereas these monopoly-merger plans are being engineered with complete disregard for the interests of the public, labor, and national defense; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission and other Government agencies have given sanction to these monopoly plans without having established that such plans would not be inimical to the interests of the public, labor, and national defense; and

Whereas the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, in a report issued on October 28, joined with the Federal Communications Commission and the companies by making recommendations which would open the door to mass lay-offs; and

Whereas there is grave danger that an attempt will be made to push permissive mer-

ger legislation through Congress without benefit of public hearings; and

Whereas the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in convention assembled, fully supported the fight of the American Communications Association for absolute protection of all present employees of the communications companies in any legislation which would permit mergers in the industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local No. 72, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, joins with the American Communications Association in demanding that the appropriate congressional committees afford labor an opportunity to present its viewpoint on any legislation which may be introduced affecting communications workers by calling public hearings on such proposed legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to United States Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY and Congressman SMITH of Wisconsin; to the Federal Communications Commission and the American Communications Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

RESOLUTIONS OF FRANK C. ARMSTRONG CAMP NO. 3, UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS, OF TOPEKA, KANS.—SUPPORT OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the members of Frank C. Armstrong Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, of Topeka, Kans., pledging their services to the Government in waging war against the Axis powers until complete victory has been achieved. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the unwarranted attack by the forces of the Imperial Government of Japan on the American forces and in American-held territory, while peace negotiations were being carried on between representatives of the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States, is viewed with horror and abhorrence by us, as are the following acts of war declarations by the Axis powers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Frank C. Armstrong Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, in regular meeting assembled, hereby unanimously pledge ourselves, and every resource at our command, to the support of our Government in waging war against the Axis powers until their efforts have been crowned with complete victory, and freedom is established in the world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Kansas, our Representatives in Congress, the National Tribune, the Topeka Daily Capital, the Topeka State Journal, and our national and State department headquarters.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, anyone who knows the gentleman would expect just the sort of thing in the letter addressed by Mr. Hoffmann and his associates to the President under date of December 11, 1941. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the matter which the Senator presents?

Mr. NYE. I present a letter written by Theodore H. Hoffmann, national chairman of the National Council of the Steuben Society of America, addressed to the President, proffering full and hearty support in the prosecution of the war. If the Senator would like to have the letter read I should be delighted to have that done.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I merely wished to know what the matter was.

There being no objection, the letter containing a declaration by the Steuben Society of America was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 11, 1941.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The National Council of the Steuben Society of America wishes to convey to you the following declaration adopted by its executive committee at a special meeting:

"DECLARATION

"The Steuben Society of America has consistently maintained that the power to declare war rests solely in the Congress of the United States.

"Congress now having declared war against Japan, Italy, and Germany, it becomes the duty of every American to loyally support our Government in prosecuting that war to a successful conclusion.

"We are again a united people.

"Our country first, last, and all the time."

We desire further to pledge to you, our President and Commander in Chief, the wholehearted support of our entire organization and membership in this national emergency, and offer our services in whatever capacity we, collectively and/or individually, may best be fitted for.

With these assurances of our loyalty and support, believe us to be,

Respectfully,

THEO. H. HOFFMANN,
National Chairman.
F. W. MAYER,
National Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MEAD, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 3487. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 921).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 5822. A bill to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 922).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2094. A bill to provide for the rank and title of the Commandant of the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 923).

INCREASE OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report favorably, without amendment, Senate bill 2149, to amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps; and I submit a report (No. 920) teheron. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the routine morning business has not as yet been concluded, has it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it has not as yet been concluded.

Mr. McNARY. I want to have that done first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair should state, however, that the Senator from Massachusetts is submitting a report in the regular order under reports of committees.

Mr. McNARY. I thought the presentation of the report was accompanied by a request for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. McNARY. I object to that until the routine morning business is concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will lie over temporarily.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 20, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 588. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and for other purposes;

S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps; and

S. 2096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2150. A bill to amend section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2151. A bill to suspend the operation of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 74), as to the requirement of submitting detailed estimates, for the approval of the Secretary of War, of expenditures exceeding $5,000 upon any building or military post or grounds about the same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2152. A bill to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2153. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy, additional shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. DOWNEY introduced S. J. Res. 122, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

PRICE CONTROL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to House bill 5990, the so-called price-control bill, which I ask to have printed, printed in the RECORD, and

referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the amendments were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 3, at the end of line 2, to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: *"Provided,* That the purposes herein set forth are to be secured by and through a delegation of legislative powers, as provided herein, and under the conditions herein stated and within the limits set forth in title — of this act."

On pages 9 and 10 of H. R. 5990 strike section 3, relative to agricultural commodities and at the proper place insert the following:

TITLE—RELATING TO PARITY PRICES AND POWERS DELEGATED

PLAN TO ASSIST IN THE CONTROL OF INFLATION THROUGH A FAIR, JUST, AND EQUITABLE REGULATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF PRICES ACCORDING TO A DEFINITE FORMULA

SEC. —. Section 301 of title II, of Public Law No. 430, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved February 16, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 301. General definitions: For the purposes of this title and the declaration of policy—

"(1) 'Parity,' as applied to the price for any commodity is that price which will give to such commodity a value or purchasing power with respect to articles that the producers of such commodity may buy equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the base period as adjusted and provided herein:

"(a) The base period for the purposes of this title is the 10-year period from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1929, inclusive.

"(b) In calculating the 'parity' price for any commodity, such price with respect to value or purchasing power shall be determined at any given time on the basis of the price relationship existing between such commodity and the articles that the producers of such commodity may buy as such relationship existed during the base period and as provided in this section.

"(c) For the purpose of calculating the 'parity' price for any commodity, the index number of 100 as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 1926 shall equal the base price for all articles that producers may buy.

"(2) All parity prices for commodities shall be calculated as nearly as possible on the formula provided for cotton, as provided herein, and the base price and parity price for cotton shall be calculated on the following formula:

"(a) The base price for cotton shall be the average price of spot seven-eighth-inch Middling cotton as such price was current at the 10 recognized southern concentration points at the close of such markets on the 1st and 15th days of each month during each fiscal year of the base period, and the average of such bimonthly prices shall be considered the average or base price for cotton during such base period: *Provided,* That if either the 1st or 15th day of any month falls on Sunday or a legal holiday when any or all of the selected market places are closed, then the market close on the first succeeding market day shall be considered: *Provided further,* That the base price for wheat shall be the average price of No. 1 wheat as such price was current at not to exceed 10 general wheat markets or wheat concentration points on the 1st and 15th days of each month during each fiscal year of the base period, and the average price for such wheat at such points during such base periods shall be considered the average or base price for wheat for the purposes of this act: *Provided further,* That the base price for corn, rice, tobacco, and any other commodity shall be calculated on the same formula as that provided for cotton and wheat: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Agriculture is herein authorized to select not to exceed 10 general market places for any farm commodity other than cotton, and the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to select not to exceed 10 general market places for commodities other than farm products, and each to calculate the average or base prices of commodities as provided herein.

"(b) The average price of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, or any other commodity during the base period, as provided in (2) (a) above, shall be the base price for any such commodity.

"(3) The 'parity' price for cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, or any other commodity as provided herein shall be calculated at any given time by using the all-commodity index number as ascertained by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and by multiplying the base price of any commodity by the said index number the product ascertained will be the parity price for such commodity."

SEC. 2. The provisions of said section 301 as amended herein with respect to farm commodities shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, and with respect to all other commodities the provisions of said section shall be administered by the Secretary of Commerce, and the parity prices for the base agricultural products shall be calculated and publicly announced at least once during each calendar month of each year.

SEC. —. The Administrator, as provided in title — of this act, with respect to fixing prices on and for any commodity, farm, industrial, or otherwise shall be governed at all times by the parity price of such commodity as calculated and publicly announced by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the Secretary of Commerce, as provided herein: *Provided,* That—

(a) The Administrator is authorized to secure from the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Commerce the average or base price on or for any commodity as provided in this title and is authorized to secure from the Department of Labor the current index number as defined herein and may calculate, as provided herein, and announce the parity price of or for any commodity at any time.

(b) The Administrator is not authorized to and shall not fix a price on or for any commodity at any time at a figure below the parity price of such commodity calculated and determined as provided herein.

(c) When the current market price of any commodity is (1) at parity or (2) is within five points below parity, the Administrator is authorized to consider, determine, and fix a price for or on such commodity, as provided herein and to make such order or orders, and to take such action as may be necessary to fix and stabilize such price on or for such commodity until modified or rescinded by an appropriate order as provided by this act.

(d) Upon the approval of this act the Administrator is authorized to consider the current price of any commodity and if he finds that such price is above parity as provided herein, he is authorized to investigate such price and if he finds, upon such investigation, that such current price is unwarranted, unjust, and indefensible after such a finding he is hereby authorized to fix a price on and for such commodity which will bring such price to a fair and just relationship with the other prices in our domestic economy.

(e) With respect to the price of any commodity of which we have a surplus and so long as such price of such commodity does not reach within five points (percent) of parity as provided herein, the Administrator is without authority to act.

(f) The Administrator shall not fix a price on or for any byproduct, processed article, finished product, or similar or comparable commodity, or on any byproduct, finished product, or similar product, either made or derived from such similar or comparable commodity, which will have the effect of reducing the price of any other commodity below the current parity price for such commodity.

(g) Any order made by the Administrator fixing any price on or for any commodity, or article, at a higher or lower figure than the limits authorized by this act shall be null and void.

PROTECTION AGAINST AIR RAIDS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit a simple Senate resolution, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 211), as follows:

Whereas the Constitution confers powers upon the Congress to provide for the common defense; and

Whereas the Senate has exclusive jurisdiction over the Senate wing of the Capitol and the Senate Office Building; and

Whereas the United States of America is now at war with various governments and peoples; and

Whereas it is necessary for the safety of the Senate, the Members and employees thereof, and of the employees of the Senate and Senators located in the Senate Office Building that all possible measures for their safety be provided for at the earliest possible opportunity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

(1) The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Architect of the Capitol be, and they are hereby, requested to make a survey and study of the Capitol Building, the Senate Office Building, and the buildings and grounds under the jurisdiction of the Senate, with view to locating and preparing suitable and proper shelter from possible air or other raids and attacks; and

(2) The said Sergeant at Arms and the said Architect of the Capitol be, and they are hereby, requested to make a report to the Senate at their earliest convenience.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In support of the resolution I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post under the heading "Yesterday's fiasco."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of December 22, 1941]

YESTERDAY'S FIASCO

There is no use mincing words; the practice air-raid alarm yesterday morning was a flop. It was a flop because the vast majority of local residents did not hear the alarm. They were, to be blunt, the victims of a magnificent build-up with little or no follow-through. Cooperating with the District Defense Council, the press and radio had urged householders to take the practice maneuver seriously. Thousands of residents throughout the District were consequently prepared for the alarm, which was supposed to come between 9 and 10 a. m. It came, as a matter of fact, at 8:44. But neither the "alert" nor the "all-clear" signal at 9:27 was generally audible.

The reason for the fiasco is, of course, quite clear. The Defense Council has no funds; it cannot even purchase sirens, the first essential of air-raid protection. To be sure, it has installed on the Pepco building an old fire siren which some persons heard yesterday morning. And it has asked for nine new sirens which will cost an estimated $17,000. But until the Defense Council obtains those sirens—and it is by no means

certain that nine will be enough—the District has to get along as best it can with its one old siren and the warning apparatus of local fire houses and police cars. In this circumstance, needless to say, the majority of local residents won't know whether there is a real air raid in progress until bombs fall and the resulting explosions are heard.

This predicament is inexcusable. We are living in the Nation's administrative nerve center, which Army officials are free to admit is not only a possible but a likely object of attack. In spite of this danger, it is difficult enough, considering customary civilian inertia, to get householders to go through the motions of civilian defense. When they do make the effort, as was the case yesterday morning, and then can't even hear the warning signal, they are naturally disgusted and distrustful of further practice maneuvers. There is, of course a way to counteract this frame of mind. It involves immediate purchase of sirens by drawing upon the President's special defense funds. Local officials have said they are "hopeful" of obtaining a special allocation. But they have been hopeful for weeks and the money has not been forthcoming. Further delay, with District defense far behind schedule, will entail community hazards which cannot be dismissed lightly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I also ask permission to have read at the desk at this point a short news item appearing in today's press under the heading "Bombers to raid United States, predicts Mrs. Roosevelt."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask what disposition was made of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma? Has it been referred to a committee or ordered to remain on the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be appropriately referred.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the news item presented by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

BOMBERS TO RAID UNITED STATES, PREDICTS MRS. ROOSEVELT

NEW YORK, December 21.—Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt predicted tonight the enemy would attempt a bombing raid of some United States city with a view of slowing industry and breaking civilian morale.

"An effort will, of course, be made by the enemy to take us again unawares to raid some city where there is a big defense industry," the First Lady declared in her regular weekly commercial broadcast over an N. B. C. network.

She urged that all people keep on the alert and prepare for an attack. Mrs. Roosevelt declared that it was part of the attacker's tactics to wreck as many workers' homes as possible in order to slow production.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The inquiry is whether objection was made to the resolution being considered before I asked for immediate consideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Oklahoma to ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. I submitted the resolution and asked that it be read for the information of the Senate, when I was asking to have some data placed in the RECORD in support of the resolution, but I understood the Senator from Oregon made some inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon merely asked what disposition had been made of the resolution, and the Chair informed him it would be appropriately referred.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Over a year ago I submitted a resolution, known as Senate Resolution 316, which requested the War Department to make a study of air-defense raids and security shelters. I placed in the RECORD a number of telegrams from mayors and Governors saying that nothing had been done in any place except New York City, where the mayor had taken some action to protect his city.

After I had submitted the resolution, and after I had submitted data to the Senate, I asked permission to have the resolution considered. Its consideration was objected to. It is now a year and a half since the resolution was submitted; and, in order that the record may be clear, I ask permission now to present as a part of my remarks a copy of Senate Resolution 316, submitted on September 19, 1940, and have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 316) submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on September 19, 1940, is as follows:

Whereas the United States is taking steps to increase and strengthen our several military defense units; and

Whereas in the prosecution of this program it is deemed advisable to give major consideration to defenses against airplanes and airplane warfare; and

Whereas the European war discloses that the major part of the military activities are conducted in the air and take the form of airplane attacks against cities, railways, water supplies, and such military establishments as airplane factories and factories engaged in the production of ammunition and military supplies; and

Whereas in the present attack upon England planes of a bomber type are used to transport bombs to be released over vital points; and

Whereas in this kind of warfare it is necessary to protect the civilian population against bomb attacks by the construction of bomb retreats consisting of underground rooms and spaces; and

Whereas in order to perfect our military defense program it is deemed advisable to give consideration to the construction of rooms and spaces underground so that in case of an air attack the civilian population may find places of comparative safety against such attacks: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that our military authorities and those in charge of developing our defense program should give consideration to the location and construction of adequate public retreats and shelters to accommodate the people; be it further

Resolved, That our military authorities and those in charge of our military defense program be requested to consult and confer with the constituted legal authorities of the States and cities located along the border of the United States to the end that they may be advised and induced to take proper steps in cooperation with the Government in the establishment of such retreats and shelters; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event legislation and funds are found to be necessary in carrying out this program, the said War Department and those in charge of our defense program be, and are hereby, requested to prepare and submit to the Congress appropriate recommendations on this subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The other day, in connection with the hearings on the military bill, I inquired of an Army officer what consideration had been given to the question of the construction of air defense raid shelters. After reflecting a while he blushed and said, as I remember, "None that I know of." I then asked him, "Suppose you should be advised right now that an enemy air fleet was above the Capitol Building, what would you do?" He blushed again and said he thought he would go home. I wondered if he had a bed at his home high enough for him to get under, because beds and tables are about the only shelters we now have.

I think it is high time that this matter should be given due consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

DECENTRALIZATION AND REDUCTION OF NONDEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some time previous to our Nation getting into the war there were a number of discussions on this floor relating to the subject of decentralization. From Friday's newspapers it appears that the President has transferred from Washington some 10 different Federal agencies. Also, for some time past there has been discussed on this floor the question of the need of cutting nondefense overhead in government. I have written to the President a letter, dated today, covering those very subjects. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 22, 1941.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Friday evening last you announced the transfer of more than 10,000 Federal workers in 12 Federal agencies from Washington to other cities in this Nation. In doing that you put into effect what many of us contended should have been done long ago; only we believe you have not gone far enough.

We hope that step is but the beginning of decentralization of Government agencies. We believe there are many more agencies which should immediately be taken out of Washington; so doing will make government more efficient.

What is more, such a move will stop in some measure the tremendous Government building program in the District of Columbia, with resulting bottlenecks and inefficiency. Taking additional agencies out of Washington will make available space which is much needed here to add efficiency to the war effort.

What is more important, Government in taking this step will put into other cities and other communities Government pay rolls, which are sadly needed there in this war period. As you know, Mr. President, there are communities that have been sadly depleted by Government because of the centralization of defense activities in other areas.

There is a great demand in this country for a "pruning" of all Government activities and agencies which are not necessary for defense. The Agriculture Department, the Interior Department, and others have "mushroomed" under your administration during the past years. Here in Congress we know that when a man heads up any department in Government he seems to have but one purpose, and that is to make his department bigger and more expensive to operate. As a result, bureaucracy has run rampant, efficiency is forgotten, and the obligation to the taxpayer is overlooked.

Think of it! This year the "overhead" of the Department of Agriculture is over a billion dollars—more than the total cost of government some years back. I call to your attention that in 1932 there was a pledge to abolish useless commissions and bureaus and to save not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Just as common sense dictated your move in relation to these 12 agencies, so conscience and common sense should dictate further decentralization of Government and defense agencies, and "pruning" of personnel in those departments which are not especially connected with the war effort.

With compliments of the season, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED WE STAND—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on December 20, 1941, on the topic United We Stand, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR NEELY ON BALLOTS AND BAYONETS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered in the House of Representatives on September 23, 1918, by former Senator M. M. Neely on the subject Ballots and Bayonets.]

ECONOMIC MOBILIZATION—ARTICLE BY HON. JESSE JONES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, from the Washington Daily News of December 22, 1941, under the headline "All-out economic mobilization must come in 1942," which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION AND PRICE CONTROL—EDITORIAL BY W. A. MACPHERSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by W. A. Macpherson on the subject of inflation and price control, published in the Lamar Daily News, of Lamar, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

BASIS OF PRICE CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of December 22, 1941, entitled "The Basis of Price Control," which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITY OF NAVAL COMMAND—EDITORIAL FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Naval Unity of Command Vested in Admiral King," published in the Baltimore Sun of December 22, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

AIR FORCE—ARTICLE BY AL WILLIAMS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Al Williams entitled "Air Force Is Answer," which appears in the Appendix.]

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT PHILATELIC AGENCY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of Sunday, November 30, 1941, entitled "Post Office Department's Philatelic Agency Celebrating Twentieth Anniversary This Week," which appears in the Appendix.]

IN GOD WE TRUST—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "In God We Trust," which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE CONTROL—OILS AND FATS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day which will be read.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 209, submitted by Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and 27 other Senators), on December 17, 1941, as follows:

Resolved, That the Price Control Administrator be, and he hereby is, requested to suspend the order issued by him on the 12th day of December 1941, fixing a ceiling on oils and fats, and take no further action in the matter of ceilings on oils and fats until final action has been taken on the pending price-control bill.

Mr. McNARY. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

The routine morning business is concluded.

NATIONAL CEMETERY IN VICINITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. HOLMAN) submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 793) to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows: That the House recede from its amendment.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
LISTER HILL,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXPEDITION OF PRODUCTION OF EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 2111, Calendar No. 941. It is a bill to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina be kind enough to explain the purport of the bill before consent is given for its immediate consideration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. McNARY. I ask to have the title of the bill stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the title of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2111) to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the bill is short, and I shall read it. It provides:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized in his discretion to establish and carry out a program designed to recognize the effectiveness of the contribution of industry and labor to the defense effort, and to expedite future production, including the award of insignia, emblems, and other nonmonetary awards, the dissemination of information by such means as he may select, and the use of such other methods, similar in character, as the Secretary of War may determine to be desirable.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to effectuate the purposes of this act during the fiscal year 1942 not to exceed $3,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no objection.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is merely a bill to encourage the workers and the superintendents in factories and the directors of industry to increase war production.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2111) to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the national defense, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY CODE FOR ALASKA

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, last Friday there was passed in the House of Representatives a bill providing for the establishment of a military code for the Territory of Alaska. It was passed in the House without objection.

The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate has had the bill before it for a number of days, and we have been considering it. We unanimously reported it favorably this morning, so the bill does not yet appear on the calendar. It merely provides for the establishment of a Territorial military unit in Alaska, where it is needed immediately, since the National Guard of Alaska has been called into service. This Territorial guard is needed to protect certain industries in Alaska. The bill was sponsored by the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. DIMOND.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now considered, if there is no objection. Otherwise I shall ask that it go to the calendar and be considered tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand from the statement of the Senator that the bill has not been reported to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It was ordered reported this morning.

Mr. McNARY. I think it should go to the calendar. The Senate will have a session tomorrow.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There is no objection to that. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

INCREASE OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2149, which I reported earlier in the session.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator explain the purport of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. The bill was introduced a few days ago. It provides for increasing the authorized strength of the Navy from 300,000 to 500,000 and the authorized strength of the Marine Corps from 60,000 to 104,000.

The reason for immediate action is that the enlistments in the Marine Corps have increased very rapidly in the last 2 weeks, and the authorized strength of 60,000 will be filled within a day or two, and applicants seeking to enlist could not be taken into the Marine Corps because there would be no authorization unless the bill were enacted within a day or two.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no objection

Mr. WALSH. The bill provides for an expansion of the personnel of the Navy and the Marine Corps to the full extent that can be taken care of at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2149) to amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), be, and the same is hereby, amended, as follows:

(a) Section 1, second sentence, delete the words "three hundred thousand" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five hundred thousand."

(b) Strike out section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. Hereafter the authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps shall be 20 percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy. The President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase this number to 104,000."

DAYLIGHT SAVING DURING NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, shortly after the attack upon Pearl Harbor demands and suggestions began to come to me from the Pacific coast suggesting that, as a matter of vital national defense, daylight-saving time should be inaugurated. I thereupon telegraphed General DeWitt, at the Presidio, in San Francisco, to ascertain whether he favored such a measure. In reply he advised me by telegram that he did favor it; that we needed it; and that he had recommended it to the War Department. I therefore telephoned the War Department—the office of Mr. Patterson, Under Secretary of War—and was advised that the War Department has considered the matter for some time, especially in the interest of national defense.

Upon looking up the law on the subject, I find that it is conceded that Congress has the right in peacetime to fix the standard of time under the general constitutional provision that Congress shall have the right to coin money and to fix weights and measures and standards, but there seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether, in wartime, the President would have the right to change the standard of time under his wartime powers.

About 6 months ago, I am advised, the President sent a message to Congress asking that he be given the power to change the standard of time. A bill was also introduced in the Senate by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] 6 months ago. To date I understand nothing has been done, and I believe several similar measures were introduced in the House of Representatives.

In my opinion, this is a matter on which we should act today. Men are dying in the Philippines and in the Hawaiian Islands. California and the Pacific coast generally have become the arena of war. If we can shut off for 1 hour the use of petroleum and coal by the utilities; if we can prevent accidents by such action; if we can speed up industry, we can thereby do more than by a multitude of other measures. Of course, I have no desire to have Congress in any way override the President of the United States, but I submit a resolution on this subject and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its approval of any action which the President should deem necessary or advisable, in the interest of the national defense, with respect to advancing the standard time of each zone, during the present national emergency, for 1 or more hours.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not rise at this time for the purpose of expressing an opinion concerning the value of the objective of the resolution. I merely wish to propound a question. How would the change be applied to Pacific coast time, or Philippine time, or Hawaiian time? What would be accomplished by it? The Senator does not make that clear to me.

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand the War Department now desires to advance the clocks 1 hour so as to provide generally for 1 hour more of daylight, because most people are not up and about their work until there has been daylight for 1 or 2 hours.

Mr. McNARY. Does the resolution contemplate daylight saving for all the zones in the United States or for merely those to the west of the eastern meridian?

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand the War Department favors a complete change all over the United States by advancing the clocks 1 hour. But I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I am merely offering a resolution, by which the Senate would say to the War Department and to the President, "The problem is now in your hands to solve in whatever way you think is best."

I may say further to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the War Department has already given a great deal of attention to this subject, and 6 months ago asked the Congress for this power. I think it would be of immense strategic importance to the Pacific coast and likewise to the other sections of the United States. I am not merely suggesting this for the Pacific coast, but—knowing war conditions out there—I think we should not lose one day in giving this very important power and responsibility to the President and to the War Department.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is very apparent from the lucid remarks of the distinguished Senator from California that this is a daylight-saving proposal applicable to all the zones, as well as to eastern time, in Washington, mountain time, and Pacific coast time. It seems to me to be an effort to transfer our responsibility as legislators to the War Department and to the Executive, a responsibility which is absolutely legislative. I do not know of any organic law which permits the President to change the time throughout all the zones of this country. It is true that bills have been introduced on the general subject, but this measure would seem to say to the President and to the Secretary of War, "Go ahead and do as you please." We do not ordinarily legislate in such fashion. There should be an expression in a statute on the subject. This is my view at this particular time, and I offer it with the best of intentions. It may be the proposal is very meritorious. I have no objection to changing the time and to increasing the daylight time, for from now on daylight will be growing longer. I believe this morning at 12:45 was the exact time when the northern portions of the earth began to tip toward the sun. But, Mr. President, I do not believe what is sought to be accomplished can be accomplished in the way the Senator from California suggests. For that reason I suggest to him that the matter be given a little more study.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am not suggesting any particular plan. I am simply asking the Senate of the United States to say to the President and to the War Department, "Whatever you deem vital in the interest of national defense, go ahead and do tomorrow."

I may say to the distinguished Senator that while men are dying and ships are being torpedoed on the Pacific coast, the Congress will be virtually inactive until January 5. To put through a committee some measure providing definitely what may be done may take weeks and even months. Meanwhile vitally needed petroleum and coal are being unnecessarily used. By far the greater percentage of accidents occur during the darkness. Greater industrial efforts may be achieved if the proposed action is taken.

Mr. President, we are engaged in bitter war. I am not endeavoring in any way to indicate by this resolution what should be done, but am simply recognizing that in wartime we must give to someone wartime powers, so that action can be taken with dispatch instead of waiting for the slow passage of weeks or months.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The proposal is in the form of a Senate resolution, is it not?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. It is impossible for the Senate, acting alone, to change a law or to give any authority on this subject. If we are to give authority to the President or to the Secretary of War, we cannot do so by a simple Senate resolution. We cannot amend existing law merely by agreeing to a Senate resolution. The Senate alone cannot amend the law. It cannot be done without the concurrence of the House.

I suggest that in order to take any steps which would have legality action should be had by means of a joint resolution instead of a Senate resolution.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the very correct and logical comments which have been made by the Senator from Nebraska. I realize that what he says is, of course, accurate. But it is intended that a similar resolution be introduced in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, probably, under his wartime powers, the President now has the right to take the action proposed to be taken, but that is not entirely certain. If, however, each branch of Congress by a simple resolution such as this should indicate to the President and to the War Department that it is satisfactory to the Congress for them to go ahead, I think within a few days we would obtain relief in this situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I concur in the suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. Of course, the Senate cannot by a simple resolution pass a law. If the Senate were to agree to the resolution, it would merely be an expression of the opinion of the Senate that the President and the executive departments have the Senate's consent to go ahead. But they cannot go ahead without legal authority. Even if this were a joint resolution proposing to give authority, it strikes me it is not in proper language. It simply says that the Senate approves whatever may be done hereafter, but language conferring authority should be different from that. It should authorize the President, or the Secretary of War, or whoever may be designated, to do a certain thing. In view of the uncertainty as to whether the President has authority, and in view of the interest of the country in the matter, if it is to affect the whole country, it seems to me the resolution should be referred to the appropriate committee for study. Even if it were a joint resolution, I should make that suggestion. Much as I appreciate the interest of the Senator from California in the matter, as well as its urgency, I hope he will pursue that course, for I do not think the resolution would accomplish what the Senator has in mind. It would not change the law. It simply says that whatever may be done, whether it is lawful or not, would meet with our approval. I doubt whether that would be wise legislation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I admit, of course, that this is not the best procedure. I will admit that very probably the best procedure would at some time, many weeks or many months from now, yield results. Of course, if objection is made by any Senator, I cannot have the resolution considered. I hope that the Senate and the House of Representatives will make some immediate effort to deal with the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from California asked for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; because it has already been indicated to me that there would be objection. Therefore I shall not ask for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire the resolution to go over under the rule?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution, and in lieu thereof to introduce a joint resolution relating to the subject matter, and I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands, then, that the Senator from California introduces a joint resolution in lieu of the simple Senate resolution, which is withdrawn.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) relative to daylight-saving time during the national emergency, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate in this connection a statement I made the other day with reference to the immediate consideration of resolutions offered from the floor pertaining to the war situation. I realize that it is always embarrassing to have to object to the present consideration of any resolution which any Senator feels is worthy of immediate consideration. I have had to object to the immediate consideration of other resolutions offered from the floor which have not had the attention of a committee, and it is entirely possible that without such restraint we might some day, in the heat and passion of the moment, adopt some resolution which would not be wise.

I think there is no such urgency about these matters that they cannot receive the consideration of a committee. Most of the resolutions and the bills which have been passed since the war began 2 weeks ago were first sent to committees, with the exception of the war declarations themselves, and in one case the committee took informal action before the joint resolution was adopted and before the President delivered his message. But I think it is a wise and cautious course of procedure that in the present emergency important matters be considered by a committee before they are brought to the floor, unless they are of such urgency they cannot afford to wait. In justice to the Senate and to the whole situation I feel I must take that position regardless of who may be the author of any given resolution.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; gladly.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, I want to make my position entirely clear. I think it would be entirely inappropriate for me or any other Senator in this summary fashion to attempt to change the standard of time anywhere in the United States. But I want to make it very clear that the joint resolution is not meant to have any effect of that kind, but merely to give the President and the War Department the power to do what they think should be done. They have been studying this subject for months. The President 6 months ago asked for this power.

SUPPLIES OF CRUDE OIL FOR INDEPENDENT REFINERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, during the past month I have been receiving information from representatives of small refiners of crude oil in Wyoming and elsewhere in the Rocky Mountain region to the effect that they are unable to secure adequate supplies of crude oil. It is represented that some of the large producers—or perhaps I should say the integrated companies—which have producing subsidiaries as well as refining subsidiaries, at least have not found it convenient to sell oil to the small independent refiners. It is represented that, as a result, several of them are threatened with serious dislocation.

Of course, this difficulty is a part of the problem of little business. After the complaints were made to me I asked the Geological Survey to make a report on the price of crude oil produced in the public lands of Wyoming, and to make whatever comment seemed desirable from the information available to the Geological Survey upon the general question. That report was sent to me last month. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point together with the table and additional material attached to the letter.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, November 29, 1941.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In response to your request by telephone, I transmit herewith a table and statement prepared by Mr. Stabler giving information on quantities and prices affecting the crude-oil situation in Wyoming.

The reasons that have governed the Standard Oil Co. and its subsidiaries in their postings of field prices and variations therein are not positively known in the Survey and would have to be inferred. The difficulty that small refiners have in securing an adequate quan-

tity of crude oil for their operations is more easily understood. Independent producers prefer to sell to major refiners because they have better assurance of prompt and complete payment and because it is generally better for their business to be on good terms with their major competitors. They are likely to sell crude to independent refiners only when they cannot sell to majors or when they receive a substantially higher price from independents. Major producers have so many relationships with major refiners that they naturally look to the latter for such market as they need. They are naturally loath to encourage sales to independent refiners who compete with the majors in the local market for gasoline. All the crude oil shipped to Missouri is purchased by major refiners, and most, though not all, is produced by major producers. If a portion of this crude now shipped into a market where it competes with midcontinent and east Texas crude were made available to independent refiners in Wyoming, their needs would be fully satisfied.

These matters of disposal of crude oil, though interesting, are outside the jurisdiction of the Survey, except when they affect the royalty accruing to the United States. Wherever posted prices closely approximate the reasonable value of production, the Survey accepts such prices in its royalty computations. Otherwise it recommends to the Secretary that he establish a fair value for the purpose of royalty computations. In case there is demand for crude oil at a price at or above the price posted by majors, the Survey ordinarily recommends that the Government royalty be taken in oil and be sold at competitive bidding. Under this general policy, the royalty interest of the United States and of the States in production of oil from public lands is believed to be well protected, and independent refiners are given an opportunity to purchase at least a part of their requirements in an open market.

Cordially yours,

W. C. MENDENHALL,
Director.

(Enclosure.)

Production and prices of crude oil in Wyoming

Period	Production of crude oil (barrels)			Average posted price Mid-Continent 36° crude	Average posted price Salt Creek 36° crude	Average posted price Lance Creek crude (43°–44°)	Sales price Government royalty oil		Quantity Salt Creek and Lance Creek crude oil shipped to Missouri
	State of Wyoming	Salt Creek field (light oil)	Lance Creek field				Salt Creek	Lance Creek	
1933	11,171,500	7,150,000	27,500	$0.66	[1]0.66	$0.92	$0.856	(1)	None
1934	12,539,470	6,600,000	121,000	1.00	1.00	.92	1.226	(1)	None
1935	13,451,600	6,350,000	649,000	1.00	1.00	.92	1.063	(1)	None
1936	14,455,053	6,066,919	1,813,534	1.10	1.10	1.02	1.13	(1)	277,204
1937	19,477,314	5,895,574	4,274,754	1.22	1.22	.97	1.238	(1)	2,475,880
1938	18,900,626	[2]5,689,214	4,573,368	1.22	1.22	.97	1.187	(1)	3,658,282
1939	22,102,072	5,158,593	6,926,935	1.02	1.02	.77	1.036	(1)	6,556,719
1940	25,780,678	4,952,998	9,246,331	1.02	1.02	.77	1.023	(1)	6,269,784
1941:									
January	2,493,755	422,201	807,477	1.02	1.02	.77	(3)	(3)	895,790
February	2,181,092	377,594	737,147	1.02	1.02	.77	(3)	(3)	334,513
March	2,361,746	401,676	806,681	1.02	1.02	.77	(3)	(3)	310,573
April	2,435,827	406,583	821,938	1.07	1.02	.77	(3)	$1.085	335,560
May	2,694,576	404,305	841,937	1.07	1.02	.77	(3)	1.124	242,540
June	2,509,049	397,392	798,666	1.17	1.12	.92	(3)	1.188	276,563
July	2,671,301	415,516	723,585	1.17	1.12	1.12	(3)	1.186	120,709
August	2,537,823	351,303	704,803	1.17	1.12	1.12	1.175	1.208	104,000
September	2,615,335	423,582	676,024	1.17	1.12	1.12	1.148	1.186	184,060
Total	160,379,020	51,463,445	34,550,580						22,042,177

[1] Royalty taken in value at posted price except Apr. 1, 1937, to Mar. 1, 1938, during which royalty was taken in oil and sold for average price of $1.135, and July 1, 1939, to Mar. 31, 1941, when royalty value was computed at price of $1.02 fixed by Secretary.
[2] Includes both light and heavy crude.
[3] Royalty taken in value at posted price.

NOTE.—In addition, to Sept. 30 about 1,600,000 barrels of crude oil from Separation Flats (Wertz Mahoney, East Mahoney, and Lost Soldier fields) has been shipped to Missouri by Sinclair interests.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the table and related available information:

1. Production of oil in Wyoming has increased from a rate of about 11,000,000 barrels a year in 1933 to about 30,000,000 barrels a year in 1941. Annual production from the Salt Creek field has decreased a little over 2,000,000 barrels in the period, while annual production from the Lance Creek field has increased about 9,000,000 barrels. Most of the remaining increase comes from the Separation Flats area, including the Wertz, Lost Soldier, Mahoney, and East Mahoney fields.

2. For many years, until June 1941, the price posted for Salt Creek by Standard (Standard Oil Co. of Indiana or its subsidiaries) has been the same as posted by that company for midcontinent fields.

3. Coincident with the shipping of large quantities of Lance Creek crude to Missouri, a differential of 25 cents a barrel was established between Standard's posted prices for Lance Creek crude of 43° to 44° gravity and Salt Creek and Midcontinent crudes of 36° gravity, although these crudes all meet in the refining market in Missouri and pipe-line tariffs from field to refinery are the same for all.

4. Government sales of royalty oil from Salt Creek and Lance Creek have been to small independent interests and have generally been at or above midcontinent posted prices for crude of 36° gravity. This has been the only crude from these fields sold in an open competitive market, other crude having been disposed of under privately negotiated contracts.

5. Beginning in June and July 1941, Standard has seemingly discarded the differential in price between Salt Creek and Lance Creek, but now purchases crude in both fields at 5 cents a barrel below its midcontinent postings for 36° crude.

6. It is reported that independent refineries in the Rocky Mountain territory have great difficulty in obtaining a supply of crude oil adequate for their operations. Presumably this is because (a) they want only high-grade light oil; (b) they want quantities so small that large producers prefer not to bother with them; (c) the assurance of payment for crude they purchase is perhaps somewhat doubtful; and (d) the major producers have contracted with major refiners for substantially all crude not desired for their own needs, leaving only Government royalty oil and crude produced by independents available for purchase by independent refineries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order that there may be a complete statement in the RECORD, let me say that I have presented this matter to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Assistant Coordinator for Petroleum. The Secretary has been good enough to request the experts of his Department to make a study of the problem. I am hoping that it may be found possible by Executive action to stimulate the production of oil and to provide adequate supplies for the small independent refiners. If it is not possible to do so by way of Executive or administrative action under the law, then I feel that it is a matter which should be taken up through legislation.

PRINTING OF HOUSE BILL 6128—DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, with the amendments of the Senate numbered, a thousand copies of the bill (H. R. 6128) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. There has been quite a demand for copies of the bill as amended by the Senate on last Friday, and none have been printed as yet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE END OF DISUNITY—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the New York Times carried a splendid editorial entitled "The End of Disunity." To me it is of such importance that I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks. I sincerely hope and trust that every Senator who has not seen or read this editorial will take the time to read it, because it is very brief.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 21, 1941]

THE END OF DISUNITY

Americans have said very often in the last 2 years that "we are a divided people." In a sense the description was certainly correct, but not in the sense most commonly assumed, especially by the Axis Powers. We were not torn by racial divisions, like so many countries in Europe. We were not divided into two camps geographically, as we were during the war between the States, even though there were slight differences in the climate of opinion in different sections of the country. It is true that we had our "isolationists" and our "interventionists," issuing their statements and counterstatements. But the real division was not primarily between person and person; it was within the soul of the individual.

The history of America's attitude toward the war is not the history of one fixed group of persons against another fixed group. It is the history of individual indecision, vacillation and heart-searching; and of the final conversion of one individual after another. Many an American found himself in a state of Hamletlike irresolution; he was an "isolationist" one day, when he thought of the fearful costs of war, and felt, perhaps, that we were taking too great risks of involvement, and an "interventionist" the next day, when some new Nazi or Japanese crime made his blood boil, or when Britain seemed in greater peril and time seemed running short. It is this unsettlement within the individual that does so much to explain the inconsistencies in the Gallup survey—in which Americans

would declare themselves, for example, in favor of occupying Iceland jointly with the belligerent British forces, in favor of American naval convoys for ships carrying war materials to Britain, but against getting into the war.

That is why the treacherous attack by Japan, and the declarations of war by Germany and Italy, instantly united us and at last brought to many Americans, more than anything else, a sense of relief. Their spirit was no longer troubled; their soul was no longer divided; they knew at last what they must do.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States nominating several United States Attorneys for the District of Alaska, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry nominations of officers for temporary appointment as general officers in the Army, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jerome J. A. Borkovec to be postmaster at Berwyn, Ill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bessie Lois O'Brien to be postmaster at Manton, Mich.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. John F. Shafroth, Jr., to be rear admiral, to rank from the 2d day of November 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the benefit of Senators that it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, and that tomorrow, barring any exigencies that may arise in the meantime, I shall ask that the Senate adjourn until Friday, in order that Members may have 2 or 3 days in which to "festivicate" during the Christmas holidays.

As in legislative session, I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 23, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 22, 1941:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William A. Holzheimer, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, division No. 1, District of Alaska. Mr. Holzheimer is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 3, 1941.

Noel K. Wennblom, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, division No. 3, District of Alaska, vice Joseph W. Kehoe, resigned.

Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, division No. 4, District of Alaska. Mr. Rivers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 30, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 22, 1941:

TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

To be rear admiral

Capt. John F. Shafroth, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Jerome J. A. Borkovec, Berwyn.

MICHIGAN

Bessie Lois O'Brien, Manton.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1941

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, who makest us glad with the yearly remembrance of the birth of Thine only Son, Jesus Christ, at whose coming the angels sang of peace on earth to men of good will: Help us as again we draw near to His manger-cradle, to see in His infant face the light of Thine infinite love, and to find in Him the man that we may yet become. As we approach this holy season, we ask Thy mercy upon a world in which sinful men have denied to us the privilege of peace, yet whose violence cannot rob us of that peace above all earthly dignities, a still and quiet conscience.

Especially we pray Thy blessing upon all in authority over us and those with whom they take counsel, that, being inspired by Thy wisdom and led by Thy providence, under their aegis our Nation may be so patterned after Thine eternal kingdom that, even in rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, we may render unto Thee the things that are Thine.

We ask it in the name of the Babe of Bethlehem, for whom we long, and in that longing, are sure to find, even Thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 22, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on December 22, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 138. An act granting a pension to Mary Jane Blackman;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of James Roswell Smith;

S. 2077. An act amending the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, so as to provide for agricultural-conservation program payments to farmers whose crops have been acquired under the national-defense program; and

S. 1623. An act to suspend the export tax and the reduction of the quota prescribed by section 6 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), as amended, for a fixed period, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries;

S. 2082. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards; and

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii.

PROHIBITION OF POSSESSION OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS AND EXPLOSIVES ON CERTAIN VESSELS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2119) to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels, which was, on page 3, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, or repeal any provision of section 4472 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (54 Stat. 1023; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 170).

Mr. BURTON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

IMPROVEMENT OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE ANTHRACITE REGIONS: INVESTIGATIVE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the junior Sen-

ator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] as members on the part of the Senate of the Commission to Investigate Ways and Means for Improving Economic Conditions in the Anthracite Coal Producing Regions of the United States, created by Public Law No. 355, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 19, 1941.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Lyttleton B. P. Gould, of Noroton, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to require the registration of labor unions and the regulation of their accounts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Dan C. Eslinger, superintendent of schools for Logan County, of Napoleon, N. Dak., praying that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be not deprived of his seat in the Senate; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr WAGNER:

A resolution of the board of directors of the Broome County, N. Y., Farm and Home Bureau and 4-H Club Association, expressing assurance that the citizens of Broome County will exert every effort to increase production and assist in maintaining the principles of a free people during the existing emergency; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the board of directors of the Kiwanis Club of Westminster, Md., praying for the curtailment of nonessential nondefense expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RESOLUTION OF LINCOLN COUNTY, WIS., TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION—CURTAILMENT OF NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution adopted by the Lincoln County Taxpayers' Association at Merrill, Wis., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the expenditures of the Federal, State, and local governments totaled more than $18,000,000,000 annually prior to the beginning of the Federal defense program; and

Whereas authorizations of more than $50,000,000,000 for national defense have been made by the Federal Government alone; and

Whereas this Nation cannot meet the cost of the defense program and continue to spend for other governmental activities at the old rate; and

Whereas officials of State and local governments have been urged by Federal officials to delay all spending which is not absolutely vital in order to give priority of materials, men, and money for the national defense program; and

Whereas Federal spending for nondefense purposes has not been decreased: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lincoln County Taxpayers Association hereby calls upon the Members of Congress, especially Senators ROBERT LA FOLLETTE and ALEXANDER WILEY and Congressman BERNARD J. GEHRMANN to take immediate steps to reduce Federal nondefense spending so that the defense program will not be retarded and so that citizens will be better able to stand the great financial strain they are facing; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the herein-named honorable representatives.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION CONVENTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred the program adopted by the National Farmers' Union Convention held at Topeka, Kans., on November 19, 1941, in which that organization appeals to the Congress to enact certain legislation for the benefit of the farmers.

There being no objection, the program above mentioned was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATION

To achieve parity of income and opportunity to family-type farmers we demand that the Federal Government, through legislation and administration, adopt the following policies essential to that end:

I. PARITY INCOME

a. Enactment of the Farmers' Union Income Certificate Plan and continue commodity loans and parity payments until it is adopted.

b. Revise Agricultural Adjustment Administration acreage allotments (1) to protect small farmers, (2) to require farmers to shift from commercial production of surplus crops to deficit crops in areas where it is economically sound.

c. Provide increased soil conservation payments to family-type farm operators, and eliminate present unwarranted payments to large-scale operators.

d. Extend the Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs to additional commodities.

e. Continue and expand the Surplus Marketing Administration to meet the needs of farmers and under-fed people now and after the war.

f. Extend crop insurance to corn and other commodities, provide coverage on the top 75 percent of loss, with administrative expenses to be assumed as a Federal obligation for those special risks to which agriculture alone is subjected.

g. Place no ceiling on farm commodity prices, since farmers will produce abundance and thus assure reasonable prices, but who now require, instead of ceilings, floors under farm prices. If, despite this assurance of abundant supplies, which other industries are not able or willing to make, such ceilings are forced upon our record-breaking yields of food and fiber; then we insist that farm prices be set at levels yielding living incomes and capital return comparable to those returned from other products; and that all forms of income—whether dividends, interest, profits, salaries, rent, or wages—be accorded exactly the same treatment, so that no individual, no matter how highly placed, shall succeed in escaping sacrifices equal to that which farmers would then be making.

h. Replace the 1941 tax bill with its unfair levy on low-income groups, with (1) personal income taxes based on parity of living conditions, (2) elimination of hidden excise taxes upon necessities, (3) policy of taxing all excess profits out of existence, with no loopholes, (4) base any enforced defense savings program upon a parity of living standards rather than further bleeding people now living below a minimum for health and decency, (5) abolition of tax exemption on Government securities.

II. CREDIT

a. Continue and expand the work of Farm Security Administration.

b. Pass an adequate farm debt adjustment bill which will (1) retire and eliminate the present compulsory stock requirement or any compulsory membership fee; (2) furnish credit to farmers at the cost to the Government, plus only necessary administrative expenses; (3) place appraisals upon a farm's earning capacity, and guarantee the farmer the right to scale down his debts to the productive value of his farm.

c. Stop speculation in farm lands and refuse Government credit to absentee investors.

III. PROTECTION OF COOPERATIVES

a. That the Government shall refrain from invading, through Commodity Credit Corporation, the field of warehousing and marketing agricultural products.

b. Make available to cooperatives, lend-lease funds to add needed facilities for processing agricultural commodities to be shipped abroad, on the same terms as Government-financed private defense plants, and assure a fair share of additional facilities for cooperatives.

c. Give preferential, or at least equitable treatment in awarding priorities for needed farm supplies; particularly to immediately correct the refusal of former power trust officials now in O. P. M. to allot copper and other supplies to the Rural Electrification Administration on the same basis as to private utilities.

IV. FAMILY-TYPE FARM POLICY

We ask Congress to declare by firm, explicit directions, after necessary investigations, that the policy of this Government is to aid in maintaining and establishing the family-type farm in America; and that all Federal farm programs be coordinated to that end, with such additional aids as are necessary, so that human needs of America's farm families may replace the property values now given preference in many of our Federal programs.

V. POST-WAR ABUNDANCE

We insist that our Government begin now to plan a post-emergency America, in which not only agriculture, but also industry, business, finance, and labor will be required to produce abundance without selfish restraint or restriction. Only upon such a promise, the proof of which possibility, is now before us in the unexampled expansion of a sick economy for war purposes, will the citizens of this country who work in factory, field, and office know with certainty that they are now defending a democracy that will survive this emergency. We extend to all farm groups and to labor and to all other citizens our promise to cooperate in demanding such a national guaranty now before it is too late.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

1. We demand in the negotiations of reciprocal trade treaties that the farmers' products not be placed at a disparity in order to give advantages to American industry.

2. We wholeheartedly support the efforts of the Department of Justice to prosecute and curb monopolistic practices.

3. We continue to favor legislation providing for the Government-insured loan as the most practical method to make farm owners out of tenants.

4. We continue to support legislation and adequate appropriations for the extension of cooperative rural electrification, as far as the defense requirements warrant and permit.

5. We favor the extension of the Federal sugar program, with appropriate changes to give needed protection to family-type growers and field labor.

6. We support wholeheartedly the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a long-standing farmers' need, now urgently needed for national defense.

7. We urge a unified Federal forestry program, such as recommended by the President's joint committee on forestry, and we strongly favor continuing the shelter-belt program in the Great Plains area.

8. We favor increased marketing information services, continued research for new uses for farm products, continued efforts to remove interstate trade barriers, and the protection of our domestic market for American agriculture.

9. We reaffirm our position that the administrative personnel of Federal farm programs should be farmers democratically elected insofar as legally possible; all other administrative personnel should be persons who understand, participate in, and are sympathetic to farm organizations and the cooperative movement.

10. We favor old-age pensions paid from Federal funds on the basis of age and citizenship. We favor the improvement and extension to farm people of the social-security program.

11. We wholeheartedly support legislation to provide Federal aid for rural health service, urging especially that cooperative hospitals be approved agencies for securing financial aid. We are strongly in favor of the nutrition campaign being made a continuing rural program.

12. We shall continue to support legislation for adequate funds for aiding rural young people, both through Federal aid to education, and through such programs as the National Youth Administration.

13. We favor an appropriate program of low-cost rural housing to clear our rural slums, with credit at the cost to the Government, and subsidies where needed.

14. We strongly oppose requirements for the payment of poll taxes as a condition for voting, whether in local, State, or national elections, and urge prompt congressional action to outlaw poll taxes as a franchise requirement for voting in Federal elections.

15. The National Farmers' Union is vitally interested in State legislation affecting agriculture and will, to the extent possible, support our State unions in their State legislative programs when these are not in conflict with the national program. We recommend that a model constitutional amendment to allow the graduated land tax and homestead exemption be furnished each State union for submission to its legislature if it so desires.

COOPERATION WITH LABOR

16. We again reaffirm our resolution to cooperate with organized labor on legislation matters, express our appreciation for labor's support, without which we would have lost all of our appropriations, and offer our fullest support to organized labor in its fight for a parity relationship with other groups in our national economy.

17. We oppose abolition of the Work Projects Administration until all able-bodied workers are provided opportunity for gainful employment.

The Farmers' Union declares for a national economy of abundance to replace the scarcity economy under which industry has always operated. Industrial production is always adjusted to prospective demand at a predetermined price level; thus industrial prices are almost always rigid, frozen at a point of desired profit.

Except for artificial restrictions during recent years under Federal programs, agriculture has always produced on an abundance basis. It is now returning to abundant production under defense stimulus. Farmers believe in abundance. They do not believe in scarcity.

But if agriculture produces abundantly and industry on a scarcity basis, the postwar price disparity will be worse than we experienced during the recent long depression. Correction of disparity should not be by agricultural scarcity, but through industrial abundance—useful goods and services produced in abundance and exchanged freely and equitably. Such an economy is as essential in peace as in war. It is as readily attainable.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6163. A bill to prohibit parking of vehicles upon public or private property in the District of Columbia without the consent of the owner of such property; with amendments (Rept. No. 925).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4077. A bill to amend the District of Columbia License Act so as to permit sightseeing operations in the District of Columbia, without procurement of a license or payment of a tax, in the case of certain vehicles performing such operation in connection with transportation of persons to the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 926).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2112. A bill authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 927).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1891. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States by making certain gratuitous issues; with an amendment (Rept. No. 928).

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER FROM GUAYULE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably from that committee, without amendment, Senate bill 2152, to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses, and I submit a report—No. 924—thereon. Because of the imperative nature of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered and passed on this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2152) to provide for the planting of 45,000 acres of guayule in order to make available a domestic source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I probably have no objection; I am very much interested in the subject matter; but I should like to have the exceedingly able Senator from California discuss the possibilities of the culture and growth of this shrub and where and under what auspices.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the bill, as reported, was prepared by the Department of Agriculture. The committee presents with its report a letter from the Department of Agriculture giving its approval and all the details of the plan. The report itself is very brief.

Guayule rubber has been produced for many years on a small but very definite scale in the Salinas Valley in California. There is practically an unlimited acreage in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and perhaps in some other Southern States which is adapted to its culture.

For the first year or two the amount of money involved, which would be expended by the Department of Agriculture, would be very insignificant—perhaps a few million dollars. If, at the end of 1 or 2 years, it should appear that there are better methods of producing rubber or if the Japanese should no longer be in possession of Asiatic waters, then the Department of Agriculture could do what it desired with the plants that have been developed.

There was a full hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee on this question. Jesse Jones was present and expressed his approval of it. So far as I know, there is now no objection to this proposal. The Department of Agriculture was represented by witnesses at the hearings and was favorable to the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have had no opportunity to study this bill, but I have no objection to its present consideration, subject to a reservation.

Subsection 8, on page 3, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture—

to sell guayule or rubber processed from guayule and to use the funds so obtained in replanting and maintaining an area of 45,000 acres of guayule inside the United States.

My information is that that section does not have the approval of the Budget Bureau or of the President, because apparently it authorizes the Secretary to sell the rubber anywhere in the world. He is not limited to the United States.

In view of that information, I think it might be well to let the bill go over for today unless that provision can be eliminated. It may be that it ought not to be eliminated. My attention has just been called to the part of the bill stating the authority conferred upon the Secretary. It seems to create a revolving fund out of which he may use money without any restriction at all in selling the rubber product anywhere in the world. It seems that that provision is objected to on the part of the Budget Bureau, and, I am informed, on the part of the President.

Mr. DOWNEY. I had understood from representatives of the Department of Agriculture that the Budget Bureau had approved the bill in its present form. In view of the very vital need, we should act quickly in this matter. Therefore, since section 8 is not vital to the bill, and since it will be necessary to plant the seeds of this shrub soon after January 1, I will consent that the bill be amended by striking out section 8, if this action is within my prerogative as chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that it is very generous on his part to agree to do that. The bill is a Senate bill, and if it is necessary to confer this authority I am sure it can be done in the House or in conference. In view of the information I have just obtained, I think the bill should not be considered today with that provision in it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question or two?

Mr. DOWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator kindly tell us where this culture has been carried on in the United States in the past?

Mr. DOWNEY. The culture so far has been carried on in a major way in the Salinas Valley, California, which was selected after many years of observation and experimentation. There also is an experimental station in Arizona, and one in New Mexico; and it is very probable that large acreages in both Nevada and Arizona are adapted to the culture of the guayule.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to ask one or two more questions, if I may.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. I merely wish to obtain some information.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to know how much money has been expended from appropriations to the Agriculture Department up to date on the culture of guayule.

Mr. DOWNEY. The amount is nominal. They have done merely a few thousand dollars' worth of work, but the particular company referred to in the bill has been in the business for 30 years and has spent, I understand, between three to four million dollars.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it a private concern?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; the Intercontinental Rubber Co. The bill proposes that the Department of Agriculture shall take over their rights.

Mr. McCARRAN. What rights have they?

Mr. DOWNEY. They have a processing plant with patents upon the machinery. They own certain acreage that is now planted to this shrub, but I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that the most important thing they have is 23,000 pounds of seed, which will be sufficient to plant 50,000 acres. That seed has been developed over a period of about 30 years of experimentation, and I understand that the domesticated plant has from two to three times as much rubber content as the guayule shrub which is now being harvested in Mexico.

Mr. McCARRAN. What will the private concern receive for the seed?

Mr. DOWNEY. I was present at a conversation between their vice president and Paul Appleby, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in which it was decided that the company would ask only the return of their investment without any interest or profit.

Mr. McCARRAN. How much is that?

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand their investment is somewhere about $3,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Where has this investment been made in the past?

Mr. DOWNEY. The company has been in business for about 30 years, carrying on experiments and developing patented processes. They own patents upon machinery for the processing of this plant. I may say to the distinguished Senator, as the report of the committee states, I am not prepared to present to the Senate a financial statement. The Department of Agriculture is authorized by the bill to work out equitable terms between the Government and the company; and, judging from what I have seen of the negotiations, I have no doubt that the Government will be very well represented in the negotiations.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no doubt about that; but it appears to me now—perhaps I am not sufficiently advised, but it appears to me from the statement of the able Senator from California—that this is a plan whereby the Government is to buy some concern which has been engaging in this private venture in the past. Is there anything to prevent the Government from going forward on its own initiative, without buying this private concern?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; there is. This company has the only seeds of value and the only planted acreage of value in the entire world. As a matter of fact, I may say to the able Senator that I think those 23,000 pounds of seeds may become one of the most valuable assets we have, assuming that Japan will cut off our rubber commerce with Asia, which now looks pretty definite. Penang, one of the greatest rubber areas of the world, is already in possession of the Japanese. Singapore, which is the greatest rubber area in the world, is in peril.

There are, as the report states, several methods of securing rubber. The first is to reclaim rubber, which is now being done on a more efficient and wider basis than ever before. The second is the building of synthetic-rubber factories, whose results are not yet entirely sure, because of the nature of the product; and the process is very slow, and also conflicts with other priorities. The third is to import very limited amounts of wild rubber and guayule rubber from Mexico and Latin America. It is the belief of the committee that within 3 years a very substantial quantity of rubber can be produced from guayule to help our commerce and our defense, and that within 5 years we could, if we wanted to do so, produce from guayule all the rubber used in the United States; that is, from six to seven hundred thousand tons annually.

Mr. McCARRAN. Were hearings held at which both representatives of the Department of Agriculture and others gave testimony as to the efficiency of this process, and as to the other conditions that may prevail with reference to it?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Were the hearings printed.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know whether the hearings have been printed as yet. Mr. Jesse Jones, who is handling the rubber situation, was present, and after the conclusion of the hearings he stated to me that, in his opinion, every effort should be made immediately to proceed with the production of guayule.

The War Department has filed reports on the subject. The Commerce Department has done likewise. There are many reports by both private and governmental organizations on guayule. While our Government apparently has not realized it, except during the past 18 months or a year, guayule is a perfect substitute for the rubber that comes from Asia. It is only about 90 percent as effective, but the same machines can use it. It is practically the same substance and can provide a perfect substitute. The only reason why I am in this haste is that it is necessary to begin planting the seeds by March 1, and before that time the land has to be acquired, the deal has to be arranged with the company, and the nursery beds have to be gotten into shape. While the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, some of whom are very distinguished gentlemen, are optimistic that if they can obtain authority from Congress by January 5 they will be able to have the seeds planted, I, who have had a great deal of unhappy experience with weather conditions and farming conditions and the adversities of Nature, feel that we are operating on a very small margin of time, and if we do not get the seeds planted this spring we shall lose an entire year.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would there be any great harm from putting the bill over for a day or two, which would enable me to look over the report? I make this suggestion to the Senator because, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it has been brought to my attention that we are making appropriations to the Department of Agriculture all the time for this very culture in other places, and much Federal money has already been expended along this line. I take it the Senator knows his subject, and undoubtedly is giving us a statement of the facts as best he can in the short time he has, but I respectfully suggest that no great impairment can be brought about by a delay until the next meeting of the Senate, which I take it will be either the last of this week or the beginning of next. I should like to have until the early part of next week to look over the report.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, if it is the desire of the Senator from Nevada to have a delay until the time he suggests, I shall be very happy to acquiesce. However, further action by the Committee on Appropriations on a deficiency bill will be required before the plan may be actually carried into effect.

Mr. McCARRAN. I realize that.

Mr. DOWNEY. That was one reason why I felt free to ask the Senate to consider the bill today. I knew we could later present to the Committee on Appropriations a full financial statement, before the measure would become effective.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall make it my business to get a typewritten transcript of the hearings immediately and make a study of it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very deeply appreciative of the Senator's suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I enter an objection, in order that I may make further study of the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to suggest to the Senator from California that

in the meantime he consider a little further change in the bill, instead of striking out subsection 8, on page 3, as was suggested a few minutes ago, that in line 13, the name "United States" be changed to "Western Hemisphere." I make the suggestion for reasons which the Senator will appreciate. Practically all the countries of the Western Hemisphere are associated now in the enterprise of winning the war; they all need rubber, and there are probably some sections south of us where it might be more propitious to attempt at least a part of this program than in the United States. It is worth while making a survey in order to determine that question. Then, on page 2, line 14, where the Secretary is authorized to make a survey, I suggest that the same change be made, so that the Secretary may be permitted to make the survey not merely in the United States, but in the Western Hemisphere. I should like to have the Senator give consideration to those suggestions.

Mr. DOWNEY. I immediately accede to the wisdom of the suggestions. I think they are excellent.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I happen to have some personal knowledge of the production of rubber from the guayule plant. It was originally discovered that the wild guayule growing in northern Mexico had a substantial rubber content, and when the price of rubber was high, the wild plants were harvested and a process devised whereby rubber could be extracted, which, as the Senator from California has stated, for all practical purposes is a substitute for rubber which comes from the East Indies, and which originally came from rubber trees in Brazil.

Quite a quantity of guayule was grown south of Tucson, at a place called Continental—the Intercontinental Rubber Co., which has been referred to, named the place Continental—where the plant was grown under irrigation in the valley, and the seed selected. By selecting the seed the company has been able to produce a plant the rubber content of which is higher than the average content of the wild guayule. That has been going on for a good many years, and I have no doubt at all that the only reason why that experiment, as it might be called, failed was the low price of rubber. It costs more to grow the guayule plant and extract the rubber than it does to get rubber from the jungle trees with cheap tropical labor. But with the advance in the price of rubber, the picture has entirely changed. I think it is highly desirable that as soon as possible the better grade guayule, which has a high rubber content, be grown in the United States from selected seed. It has to be planted early in the spring, and if we are to do anything about it, the time to act is now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Is it not the purpose that the properties and facilities of the company referred to be acquired by the Federal Government?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no knowledge of the plan or of the text of the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. The bill has been worked out by the Department of Agriculture, and I understand with the consent and clearance of the Budget and the President.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am merely advising the Senate that this is a matter which has had long study as an agricultural problem, as a crop-improvement problem, as a selected-seed problem, and it is known that rubber can be produced from the plant. There is an established means of doing it, and, in view of the great need for rubber, we should give consideration to this method of obtaining it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Are we to understand from the Senator from Arizona that guayule is a plant which grows under certain climatic conditions such as those of northern Mexico, Texas, Arizona, and that section in general?

Mr. HAYDEN. It grows in the semiarid areas of northern Mexico as a wild plant, in Chihuahua, and to the south.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does it require irrigation?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not a crop which requires a large quantity of water, but undoubtedly it is possible to produce a better crop if the plants are irrigated. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, before we leave this subject, I should like to call attention to the fact that in Ohio much study has been devoted to the production of rubber from the guayule plant. Manufacturers in Ohio are proceeding with the experiment as rapidly as possible, and they think that there should be action like that proposed in the measure before the Senate as soon as possible, because the plants will have to be put in the ground at an early date.

I call the attention of Senators to a recent report by the United States Tariff Commission, which summarizes the whole subject in five or six pages. I think that report would be of value if it were presented to the Senate when the bill again comes before it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I take it the bill is meritorious, and it was not with a view of impeding its progress that I suggested a short delay but rather for the purpose of enabling me to familiarize myself with the subject, in view of the fact that we have been appropriating considerable sums of money in the past for studies in the culture of rubber in various places, and particularly in South America, to some extent.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to make plain to the Senator from Nevada that we are endeavoring to get a financial statement of the entire transaction ready to present to the Committee on Appropriations at as early a date as possible.

I understand, then, that the Senator from Nevada requests that the bill go over for the time being?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, until early next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar. Are there further reports of committees?

STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 184. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 184) submitted by Mr. MURRAY on October 28, 1941.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was, on page 1, line 5, to strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, is hereby increased by $10,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the absence of the minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate what amount was originally allowed for this investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. The original amount was passed on by the Senate before I became chairman of the committee, when my predecessor as chairman, the then Senator Byrnes, of South Carolina, presided over the committee. I think the original amount was $10,000. The pending resolution presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is chairman of the investigating committee, asked for an additional $25,000. After due consideration the committee thought $10,000 would be sufficient for the moment, at least, to carry forward the work. I am not completely familiar with all the work which has been done by the investigating committee, but the Senator from Montana is present and can inform the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Is the appropriation sought to complete the activities of the committee and the program they have in mind?

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that the amount requested is for a continuation of the investigation which has heretofore been made by the committee for the purpose of attempting to aid the small businessmen throughout the country.

Mr. McNARY. I am merely asking these questions for information, in the absence of the minority member of the committee. How long has the investigation been going forward?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to answer that question.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the committee has been carrying on investigations in the field of small business for about a year and has sent questionnaires throughout the country to small business

enterprises with a view of eliciting information from them regarding the problems they feel are interfering with their success in conducting their various enterprises. The committee, in addition, has been conducting a series of studies into these problems and has prepared and had printed a number of reports on the subject. During the past week the committee has been conducting hearings into the immediate problems affecting small business enterprises as a result of the national defense and war effort. It was investigating the manner in which small businesses are being deprived of materials necessary to the continuance of essential civilian production and other problems, such as subcontracting and conversion, which are incident to the national-defence effort.

Mr. McNARY. Has the committee held public hearings?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; public hearings were held all the past week. A number of small business men and representatives of small business organizations, and also representatives and officials of departments of the Government, appeared before the committee. Mr. Odlum, of the Division of Contract Distribution, was the last witness who appeared before the committee last Friday, giving a very exhaustive statement of the problems resulting from the war-production program as it relates to small business enterprises.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator stated the committee began its investigations about a year ago?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I am anxious and rather curious to know what the committee did. Did it send out questionnaires to small business enterprises?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; it sent out questionnaires to small business enterprises located throughout the country. These reports have been tabulated and analyzed and form the basis of studies now being pursued.

Mr. McNARY. The $10,000 which is asked for now is to conclude the work the committee is undertaking?

Mr. MURRAY. It would conclude the work immediately before the committee. If it is the intention of the Congress really to go into the problems of small business enterprises and undertake to work out legislation, if legislation is deemed advisable, for the purpose of protecting small business enterprises, it would be necessary, of course, to continue the work of the committee and necessary to have further exhaustive hearings and studies on the subject, requiring additional funds.

It is a well-known fact that small business enterprises are rapidly being driven out of existence and that, of course, is having a very bad effect on our American economy. If Congress desires really to protect small business enterprises, it would be necessary for Congress to make a considerable study of these problems, which seem to be increasing in severity.

Mr. McNARY. I think we are all sympathetic with the predicament in which the small business men find themselves. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] recently introduced a resolution covering the same subject matter, I believe. May I ask the Senator from Illinois if that is not true?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to that question I will say that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] did introduce a bill having for its purpose the aid of small business men, and the bill was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I am a member. The committee held hearings, as I recall, for 3 days, just previous to the time of the attack by the Japanese upon Pearl Harbor. In those hearings we reached practically unanimous agreement as to the type of legislation which should be presented to the Congress in aid of small business concerns throughout the country, but the shock of the war came to the country, and it also came to the committee, and since that time the matter has simply been lying dormant.

I will say to the Senator from Oregon, the distinguished minority leader, that, in my opinion, the proposed legislation which the Committee on Naval Affairs was considering, which is simply an amendment to the Priorities Act passed by the Congress sometime ago, would accomplish the purpose insofar as aiding small business is concerned.

When the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]—and I am speaking now not as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate but simply as a Senator—says that the hearings may continue for a long time, in order to determine what legislation should be enacted, I say to him in all candor and frankness that, from my study of the small business problem as it exists in the State of Illinois, from my correspondence and from my observation, and from my contact with men who have been there recently, as well as from my experience as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, having heard and considered the testimony which was adduced before the committee, I am persuaded that if we are to give small business the relief we think it entitled to, insofar as critical and strategic materials are concerned, we cannot delay for months action on legislation which may be proposed. I hope my statement answers the question of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was just about to pose that inquiry. I will say to the Senator from Montana I think we all understand the problem which his committee is studying. The committee is seeking a solution which we all seek, and the solution must be found at as early a date as possible. I have discussed questions along the same line with some of the distinguished members of the S. P. A. B. and the O. P. M., and I am simply curious to know from the Senator what is being done. What does the committee contemplate to do for the very early solution of the problem which is now submitted for the committee's attention?

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator from Oregon. The committee is now in process of preparing a report on the hearings which have just been had concerning the effect on small business of priorities and the protection of small business enterprises in the immediate situation. Mr. Odlum, who appeared before the committee, gave considerable testimony on that subject, and made a number of recommendations, and also is preparing other recommendations for us, which will be submitted later. My understanding is that the legislation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] contemplates the establishment of a board before which businessmen would be able to bring appeals from the Priorities Board, and which could hold hearings with a view of determining whether or not certain business enterprises are entitled to certain materials necessary to continue their various operations. Mr. Odlum discussed this proposed legislation and offered advice concerning it, which will be found in the record of our hearings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question with reference to this matter. Prior to the creation of the committee of which he is chairman the Senate created the so-called Truman committee, which has been investigating a very wide field of matters pertaining to contracts and piorities and things of that sort, and I have been advised that that committee is covering at least a part of the field which the Senator's committee may have covered. Also, the President has set up in the O. P. M. a small business man's division, the head of which is Mr. Odlum, who has already been referred to. That division is making an effort to bring about an immediate accommodation of businessmen who have been inconvenienced, and many of whom have been greatly damaged by their inability to obtain materials due to the fact that at the moment the defense program has priority over everything.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, went into the small business situation. The question is, To what extent do the investigations which the Senator's committee has heretofore conducted duplicate the work of the Truman committee, the work of the Odlum organization in the Office of Production Management, or the work already accomplished by the Senator from Wyoming and his committee?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not believe that the work of the Truman committee to which the Senator has referred, or any work being done by Mr. Odlum's department, is being duplicated. Let me say also my committee was created long prior to the Truman committee. As a result of the efforts of my committee a number of small enterprises have already been saved from extinction as a result of priority rulings. Among other things, I wish to call attention to the case of the National Electric Sign Association—I do

not now recall whether that is the correct name—which was about to be closed down as a result of failure to obtain materials for the industry. As a result of correspondence with this organization, the committee took the matter up with the priorities division of the Office of Production Management and failed to meet with any success. It finally went to the Department of Justice, and as a result of efforts which were brought to bear on the Office of Production Management through the Department of Justice, the concern was finally allowed the material which was necessary to continue it in operation. It employs about 60,000 men distributed among a number of small concerns. If it had failed in its efforts to secure the material it would have been completely shut down.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's frank answer. What is in my mind—and I am sure it is also in his—is the fear of duplication. I favor the resolution as reported by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Let me say to the Senator that we have concluded the hearings in which we have been engaged. We intend to make a report and to make some recommendation in reference to what might be done to assist small business enterprises in these immediate problems of priorities, subcontracting, and conversion. If the immediate problem is taken care of there will be no further action in that direction by the small business committee. The committee, of course, was designed to go into the subject of preserving small business enterprise generally and would necessarily be expected to continue studies in that direction. It will be understood that this committee was created long before the other committees mentioned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the immediate and acute problem which now affects small business is very largely due to the defense program, although the small business man constitutes a permanent problem for us in many respects.

What I had in mind in my inquiry was the desire to avoid not only duplication, but confusion in the mind of the small business man as to where he can finally go to obtain the remedy which he seeks and needs. We all appreciate the fact that if too many agencies, either of Congress or of the Executive, are covering the same field, confusion will be created in the minds of those whom we are trying to help. I wish to guard against that result.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure the Senator will believe me when I say that the committee intends to cooperate along those lines.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel sure of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. A very interesting question was presented to me, and I should like to ask the Senator from Montana if his investigations relate to a case such as I shall proceed to relate.

I had called to my attention the case of an expert machinist, who had been in business for a great many years. I think he would be classified as a small business man. He wished to bid on materials for several projects which the Government was inaugurating in the national defense program. He could not obtain contracts without having certain tools in addition to what he had in his business. When he tried to obtain the tools he could not acquire them without having a contract. What are we to do about a case of that kind? He cannot obtain the contract unless he has the tools, and he cannot obtain the tools unless he has the contract.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a question of priorities.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. Who has charge of the matter? Who could afford a remedy, if there is a remedy?

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly what the committee has been working on for the past week, for the purpose of developing some procedure whereby small business enterprises such as the one the Senator has mentioned may be provided with relief and enabled to obtain the materials which they need.

It was shown by Mr. Odlum, while he was on the stand the other day, that probably not more than 1 or 2 percent of the critical materials that are used in the country would be required for the purpose of maintaining the vast majority of small business enterprises. It would be absurd to deny them such an insignificant proportion of defense materials, because only a very small addition to the national defense production would be affected. To deny small enterprises such materials would drive them out of business and would create a very desperate situation in the country.

That is one of the things on which the committee has been working, and on which it intends to make a report in a few days, with recommendations regarding how the problem should be handled. Mr. Odlum and the O. P. M. are cooperating with us in that direction. I think we shall have something to recommend.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, because of the turn which the debate has taken, I wish to make one or two further comments concerning small business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been very much concerned about small business enterprises throughout the country. I doubt if any other Member of the Senate has made a closer study of the problem than he has. It is true, as the Senator from Montana says, that his bill sought to set up a special independent agency in Washington to hear the complaints of small business because of priorities or some other problem; but the Committee on Naval Affairs, including the distinguished Senator himself, concluded that it was not practical to go through with that kind of bill.

The Senator from Wyoming agreed to report the bill back to the committee at the earliest possible opportunity with an amendment or amendments which would make it mandatory upon certain agencies of the Government to grant priorities to small business throughout the country in connection with critical and strategic materials, such as copper, tin, steel, and other materials.

Before that committee was the testimony of Mr. Nelson's representatives and I think one of Mr. Odlum's representatives, in which they said that not less than 1 percent, nor more than 6 percent, of all the critical and strategic materials would be required by small business enterprises. With such a small proportion of the strategic and critical materials, the civilian economy of the country could be carried on without any serious impairment of the national-defense program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 184), as amended, was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2154. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2155. A bill for the relief of Berdella Smith Brown; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LIBERTY AND THE BIBLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Liberty and the Bible," delivered by Senator DAVIS on universal Bible Sunday, December 4 at Philadelphia, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE OF SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Christmas message delivered by him over the radio at Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ALFRED P. SLOAN, JR., ON INDUSTRY'S POST-WAR RESPONSIBILITIES

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Industry's Post-War Responsibilities," delivered by Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the General Motors Corporation, on December 4, 1941, before the Forty-sixth Annual Congress of American Industry, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING AND POST-WAR PLANNING—ADDRESS BY DR. LUTHER GULICK

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Housing and Post-War Planning in England and America," delivered by Dr. Luther Gulick to the Citizens' Housing Council of New York on November 10, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS AT CHARLESTON, S. C.

[Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. MAYBANK) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy and Ambassador to Mexico, upon the occasion of the launching of the destroyer *Tillman*, at Charleston, S. C., December 20, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTEMPORARY LETTER DESCRIBING BATTLE OF BUENA VISTA

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated February 26, 1847, describing the Battle of Buena Vista, Mexico, written by a participant therein, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENTRALIZED COORDINATION OF DEFENSE PURCHASING

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from What Is Happening in Taxation and Government Regulation of December 15, 1941, and an article from the Washington Post of December 23, 1941, on the subject of the need for centralized coordination of defense purchasing, which appear in the Appendix.]

ALASKAN TERRITORIAL GUARD

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5822, No. 957 on the calendar, to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

In this connection I wish to state that last Wednesday, December 17, the House passed the bill without a dissenting vote; and at that time the Delegate from Alaska [Mr DIMOND], who is now in the Chamber, and who is seated by me at this time, made the following statement:

We have a National Guard in Alaska, but it has already been brought into active Federal service and it is not available for local use and therefore we want this bill passed. The most important feature of the bill is to establish a Territorial guard, and while some units of such a guard have already been organized, at the present time they have not the protection of any such legislation. The immediate passage of this bill is of high importance to the safety and more adequate protection of the citizens of Alaska. The bill is more completely explained in the House report thereon which I ask to have here inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it appears that the bill has some defense attributes, but I do not know how pressing they are. The bill may propose desirable legislation, but is there need for its immediate passage? Would it be satisfactory to let the bill remain on the calendar until the Senate resumes more active sessions in January; or is it a bill upon which we should act at this particular time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the legislation is actually needed immediately, for the reason that as we all know, we have not, unfortunately, developed our military defenses and our civilian defenses in the vast frontier of Alaska as greatly as we should have done. However, we could not foresee the future; and, furthermore, we could not strengthen our fortifications in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, and refortify innumerable areas and points.

Unfortunately, today our only westward post in the vast Alaskan Territory is a naval base located at Unalaska, known as Dutch Harbor, which lies at the foot of the Bering Sea. We have not been able to give to Alaska the attention which should have been given to it, with the exception of developments at Kodiak and at Sitka.

Mr. McNARY. I am conscious of that fact. I wholly agree with the Senator. What would this particular bill do to supplement the efforts heretofore made, but which have not been carried forward as speedily as they should have been?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The bill provides the administration—that is to say, the Governor of Alaska—with authority to organize units in addition to the National Guard, which has already been called into service by the administrative authorities of Alaska. The bill authorizes the organization of Territorial guards, for which many persons have already volunteered, but they have not been officially inducted into the service of the Federal Government and the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5822) to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRICE CONTROL—OILS AND FATS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day which will be read.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 209, submitted by Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and 27 other Senators), on December 17, 1941, as follows:

Resolved, That the Price Control Administrator be, and he hereby is, requested to suspend the order issued by him on the 12th day of December 1941, fixing a ceiling on oils and fats, and take no further action in the matter of ceilings on oils and fats until final action has been taken on the pending price-control bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the matter is being worked out, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution go to the table calendar. It is not necessary to have it called every time the Senate meets.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The routine morning business is concluded.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to affix his signature to any bills or resolutions ready for his signature during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY AND AERIAL PROTECTION FOR PITTSBURGH AREA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, this year we had a glorious Thanksgiving. The mines, mills, farms, and factories all over the land were producing at top speed, and all the fruitage of the work was bringing increased enjoyment to our people. Newspapers carried word of the negotiations for peace in the Pacific. Members of the Japanese Government were here. We had settled down in the confident belief that through full production and peaceful negotiations, we could hold our place in the world without a shooting war.

Then, in the cold dawn of December 7, came the treacherous act of the enemy at a time when we were not alert to the encroachments of deceit and the cruel stealth of a military clique. Overnight our people were unified because of the just resentment which this treacherous act aroused amongst us. Differences amongst us have vanished, and we are determined to work and fight for the maintenance of our rights.

Now our steel furnaces are producing at a maximum. The day has almost been forgotten—only a few years ago—when the furnaces were cold, and there was no smoke in the sky. From a 20-percent productivity, in an incredibly short period of time we have risen to 100-percent production. Practically 92,000,000 tons of steel will be produced this year. Mr. Worker, from management down to the unskilled hand, is doing a marvelous job. The man who stands before the furnace, the worker operating the rolls, the man who operates the cranes, the man who stands before the open hearth—all these are the servants of the people, making munitions of war and materials for the ships that go down to sea.

Each man knows that he is responsible for the full performance of his duties. He knows that he must meet his responsibility for continuous work. He does not forget his rights in industry, and he is determined to conciliate, mediate, and arbitrate, and keep on working.

The miner is side by side with the steel worker in the job of defense production. If all our resources of manpower and technical improvement were at work, we could produce from seven hundred and fifty million to a billion tons of coal a year. The miner and the steel worker are our front line of defense at a time when battles are won through full production.

Pennsylvania is the center for the production not only of steel and coal but also of glass, which is a necessary part of defense production.

On May 23, 1940, I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the testimony of one of Pittsburgh's most eminent engineers, Mr. Samuel Diescher, now consultant for the National Inventors' Council. Although 18 months have passed, the military and aerial protection for which I asked are a long way from realization. It is, therefore, absolutely essential again to present this subject to the attention of the American public.

Mr. President, the killer stabs at the heart. Pittsburgh, with its environs, is the heart of industrial America. There is need for an airplane base for national-defense purposes at Pittsburgh to protect the steel industry and all other activities in the Shenango and Mahoning Valleys.

The Pittsburgh steel industry comprises many plants, each apparently nondependent on the others. The true situation is, however, that generally the plants

are interdependent. There is an integration among them which creates an interdependence to such extent that the destruction of even a part of one plant may cause the shut-down of other plants located miles away. Their relationship extends from the ore pile through many stages until there results finally the many highly finished products essential to winning a war. In many instances their integration might be likened to the links of a chain. A broken link may mean a totally useless chain.

The mills in the Pittsburgh district, because of their being so numerous, so highly productive, and so elaborately and extensively integrated, seem more vulnerable to bombing than can readily be described. Another weakness is the apparent improbability of camouflaging or hiding steel operations from the enemy. For instance, no Bessemer plant can operate without there arising from its converters flames of great volume and of intense luminosity which are visible many miles away.

Mr. President, the importance of an adequate supply of steel during war ought to be apparent to all, as ought also the importance of Pittsburgh as a steel center. The measure of Pittsburgh's predominance seems demonstrated by the recent action of the United States Steel Corporation centralizing in Pittsburgh the operating control of all its major branches, no matter where they may be located.

In this district almost all steel mills are located on lowlands along the rivers, as are also all the principal public-utility electric-power plants, upon which latter the entire public and many of the steel plants depend. No easier guide for enemy bombers can be imagined than these rivers.

During the spring of 1936 the rivers became flooded to such extent that great loss of money and a stoppage of steel, power, and other production resulted. Air defense cannot stop natural floods, but it seems reasonable to expect that, with the presence at the headwaters of both the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers of the recently constructed flood-retaining dams, and with the construction of the contemplated additional ones in both these drainage systems, the devastation of floods might be added to by bombing the dams. An attack timed with a heavy thaw and rain might prove very disastrous.

A site must be selected for an air base having sufficient area for virtually simultaneous take-off and ready landing of a large fleet of high-speed aircraft, not only for combat but likewise for bombing; also for housing the fleet in a manner to protect it from destruction by enemy bombing; for housing a large number of pilots, mechanics, and attendants under bombproof conditions; for housing spare parts, airplane engines, emergency power equipment, together with fire-fighting and also repair equipment, all under bombproof conditions; and for storage of gasoline, oil, and supply water, likewise under bombproof conditions.

The selection of the site should be by United States military men expert in aerial defense and attack and in the needs involved. There are not many areas from which the experts will be required to make a selection, for the terrain about Pittsburgh affords but very few suitable areas. Time seems of the essence in making the selection.

Mr. Diescher's idea of some features of this phase is that the field should have a circular area of not less than a mile in diameter; that all hangar facilities should be at a locality about a mile from the boundary of the field and in line with the least prevailing winds; that all hangar, shop, power, and other vital facilities should be housed in aisles separated by concrete walls sufficiently thick to bear above the roof plates a load of about 2 tons per square foot, and that the roof structure should be of steel girders, one next to the other, and amply strong to carry not less than 30 feet of earth covering on the structure, or perhaps less earth and high physical steel plate, as embodied in designs of the gate protection at the Panama Canal.

Any such structure must be supported by walls resting on bedrock, and underneath the hangar area no coal must ever have been mined. Wide ramps must be provided at both ends of the aisle systems to give access and egress to the aisle adits and exits. The ramps should be at field level and so should the aisle floors. A cross aisle should be provided giving access for shifting planes from aisle to aisle for repair and also for egress in case bomb effects should interfere with the use of any exit. Gasoline and oil should be stored away from the hangar area and should be underground sufficiently deep not to be affected by bombing, and so should also the piping for carrying such fluids to the hangar system and also to the field.

It seems that a construction of the very massive character described and of liberal ramp widths and field area would have to be attacked with hundreds of the very heaviest bombs to be made even partially ineffective. If such a field is built, the enemy will know of it and may therefore hesitate to plan an attack on Pittsburgh's industrial facilities. It seems also that such a field ought to be not much farther than 30 miles from the junctions of Pittsburgh's rivers.

Mr. President, the needs of Pittsburgh for defense are the needs of the Nation. If our steel production is wiped out, we stand to lose the war. We no longer can stand idly by and say there is no probability of invasion. Too many improbables are now written in the historic destruction of the enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia. The aerial and military protection I ask for Pittsburgh I ask in behalf of the Nation and for all of us. What we do must be done quickly.

PROPOSED LABOR LEGISLATION AND THE LABOR CONFERENCE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I read in the newspapers this morning a story with reference to the welders' strike. Our country is now at war; American boys are dying on the battlefields, on the sea, and in the air. The Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate recently, at the request of high Government officials, met in an executive session, which I attended, and at which were present the three members of the Labor Relations Board and also Mr. Hillman, Madam Perkins, Mr. Davis, of the Mediation Board, and another member of that Board. The committee was asked to defer any action so far as the Smith bill was concerned or any other proposed labor legislation, such as the bills introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], or the Senator from New Hampshire until the labor conference called by the President had an opportunity to act. Like all other members of the Committee on Education and Labor, I was glad to join in deferring action by the committee until the President had an opportunity to call the conference.

The conference was called. Representatives of labor and representatives of industry, employer, and employee groups have been meeting, and it is rather saddening to read that the conference is on the point of a break-down on the closed-shop issue. The closed-shop issue should not be brought up at this time. We should take action to "freeze" the open- or closed-shop status throughout all industry today. This crisis should not be used to force the closed-shop issue by the unions.

In my judgment, when American boys are dying and we need action all along the line in order to assure producton, it is disappointing, disheartening, and disillusioning to see a conference going on in this city which is unable to arrive at definite action quickly.

When I, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, agreed that action be deferred until the conference was held, I did not preclude the consideration of appropriate legislation to carry out the program of the conference. I think we had such an idea very definitely in mind.

The groups now meeting cannot agree. With a war on, with this country in danger and threatened on both sides, it is time that we in Congress "took the ball back" and took some action of a fair constructive nature that will stop strikes. We have certainly given the conference an opportunity. I do not like to see bickering over an issue such as the closed shop when the Nation is in danger.

I note by the morning papers the rejection of the Government's plan which was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who is acting as moderator, or one of the moderators, of this group. I was rather astonished at this, because I had very clearly understood—and my memory is pretty good—that the Government was not to offer a plan; that this was to be a conference between industry and labor, and they were jointly to work out a voluntary solution of the matter. I also understood that if they should fail to do so Congress would take some action, or, if legislation should be necessary in order to carry out their theory of action, Congress would pass such legislation.

I do not know for whom the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was acting, whether for himself or for the Committee on Education and Labor or for the President of the United States, or who

is meant when the newspaper articles say that "the Government program" offered by the Senator from Utah was rejected. It was not my understanding that the Government was to put forth a proposal. It was my understanding that this was to be a voluntary conference, that it would be a get-together of employers and employees to work out a program to stop strikes and lock-outs and jurisdictional disputes and everything else for the duration of the war.

We are in a war. We are in danger. We are threatened on both sides. American boys are dying, and it is time we got action; and, in the interest of this country, if the parties cannot agree or if the closed-shop issue is to be forced, then Congress had better step into the picture.

HENRY KOTILA—VETO (S. DOC. NO. 151)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, a bill (S. 201) to provide for the payment of the sum of $115.80 to Henry Kotila, of Negaunee, Mich., as compensation for property damage sustained by him as a result of a collision between an automobile which he was driving and a truck of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

It appears that on November 26, 1935, a truck of the Civilian Conservation Corps and an automobile owned and operated by the claimant, Henry Kotila, were proceeding in opposite directions on a highway near Camp Escanaba, Mich., and were approaching each other. The road was icy and slippery and apparently one or the other, or both, of the vehicles skidded and an impact between them resulted. On the one hand, it is asserted by the Government witnesses that the Government truck had come to rest on the side of the road when the claimant's automobile ran into it. On the other hand, it appears to be the claimant's contention that the Government truck skidded to the wrong side of the road and ran into his automobile.

It is not necessary to resolve this conflict in the testimony, since in neither event does it appear that there was any negligence on the part of the driver of the Government vehicle. Concededly, both vehicles were being driven cautiously and at a reasonable rate of speed in the light of existing conditions. Apparently the collision was the result of an inevitable accident for which neither driver was seemingly responsible.

It is contended by the claimant that the lieutenant in charge of Camp Escanaba instructed a near-by mechanic to repair the claimant's automobile and assumed responsibility for paying the cost of the repairs, which turned out to be $115.80. It is apparently thought that under the circumstances the Government should undertake the payment of the mechanic's charge. This contention is not, however, well founded, since the bill would provide for the payment of the amount, not to the mechanic, but to the owner of the car, who has apparently paid the account.

In the light of all the circumstances, there appears to be no moral obligation in this case on the part of the Government to compensate the owner of the automobile, and I am, therefore, constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 23, 1941.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

From the Committee on Appropriations:

Paul Edwards, of the District of Columbia, to be Work Projects Administrator for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, effective January 1, 1942.

From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Several postmasters.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

That concludes the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is no further business to be transacted, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourned until noon Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, December 26, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 23, 1941:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Paul C. Leahy, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware, vice Hon. John P. Nields, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Herbert W. Christenberry, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Rene A. Viosca, resigned.

Donald C. Miller, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, vice Hon. Emerich B. Freed, resigned.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant, with rank from date of appointment

Chaplain (First Lt.) Ralph Henry Pugh, Chaplains' Reserve.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. John Martin Cone, Field Artillery (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1940.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel, with rank from December 11, 1941

Lt. Col. John Putman Dinsmore, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 23, 1941:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Edward Postell King, Jr.
George Fleming Moore
George Marshall Parker, Jr.
Richard Kerens Sutherland

To be brigadier generals

Clifford Bluemel
James Roy Newman Weaver
William Edward Brougher
Albert Monmouth Jones
Joseph Peter Vachon
Bradford Grethen Chynoweth
William Fletcher Sharp
Allan Clay McBride
Clyde Andrew Selleck
Spencer Ball Akin
Charles Chisholm Drake
Richard Jaquelin Marshall

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Edward J. LeBlanc, Abbeville.
Emily D. Straughan, Colfax.

NORTH DAKOTA

Margaret F. Scouton, Inkster.
Ruth Cooper, Parshall.
Arlene D. Sand, San Haven.

OHIO

John H. Glick, Bascom.
Lillian M. Weber, Blue Ash.
Reuel H. Johns, Diamond.
Leon R. Noble, East Liberty.
Roy K. Myers, Greentown.
William H. Hesselbart, Lindsey.
James B. Hagerty, Mingo Junction.
Albert Daman, Napoleon.
Mabel F. Robinson, South Park.

TENNESSEE

Lizzie Norman, Adams.
Burrell G. White, Bell Buckle.
Thomas Henry Rutledge, Collierville.
William Walter Eledge, Sr., Englewood.
Bessie T. Queener, Jacksboro.
Martha S. Williams, Lucy.
Amy G. Sylar, Ooltewah.
William F. English, Pulaski.
Alexander J. Kennedy, Vonore.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer G. Rose, Caretta.
Nona G. Marcum, Ceredo.
Maymie C. Ballard, Danville.
Donald Crum, Delbarton.
Mary Kathalene McIntyre, Marmet.
Earl E. Bennett, New Cumberland.
Hattie L. Dillon, Smithers.
Oliver L. Green, Sophia.
Lamar L. Spangler, Union.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COLE of Maryland.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast measured the waters in the hollow of Thy hand and meted out heaven with a span and weighed the mountains in scales, Thou hast come, and the people who walk in darkness have seen a great light. We praise Thee that eternity has broken into time and the multitudes with the heavenly hosts are singing: "Peace on earth to men of good will." We rejoice to believe that His name shall be called "Wonderful" to the end of time, spreading light like the dawn, His eternal mission being to heal wounds, open prison doors, and give liberty to the captives.

Almighty God, while the lights of the world are going out, we rejoice that there is one light that can never be darkened. Allow not the shadows of war to dim the joys of the holy advent. Amid the clashing elements of the years, once again we hear the voice of Him whose patience and long suffering are to help man up to God. Blessed Lord, if our country's soul is to be made strong it must come through our Saviour unlocking the door of human life. O Star of Bethlehem, shine upon us that our mystery-laden life may be free from all bitterness and hate. May it take on the spirit of the manger with its sweet serenity and heavenly humility, seeking the friendless, the homeless, and the hunger-bitten ones who have wandered long for rest. In our Saviour's name, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 20, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2111. An act to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense; and

S. 2149. An act to amend the act approved April 22, 1941 (Public Law 39, 77th Cong.), so as to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6128) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 793) entitled "An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 15, 1941:

H. R. 2297. An act to prohibit the introduction of contraband into the District of Columbia penal institutions;

H. R. 3149. An act providing for the pay and allowances of retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on active duty; and

H. R. 5377. An act to amend section 111, title 18, of the Code of the District of Columbia, with respect to designation of deputy clerks by the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

On December 16, 1941:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to declare abandoned the title of the city of Marquette, Michigan, to certain land in the county of Marquette, and to vest control of such land in the Secretary of the Treasury for Coast Guard purposes;

H. R. 527. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code with respect to the trial of joint defendants, the removal of fugitives from justice, and the regulation of criminal procedure in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 529. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 2799. An act authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.;

H. R. 4495. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code;

H. R. 4871. An act to amend section 96, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5476. An act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5509. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase or accept as gifts motorboats, yachts, and similar vessels for Coast Guard use; and

H. R. 5694. An act to prevent the sale of unwholesome food in the District of Columbia.

On December 17, 1941:

H. R. 5074. An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio-communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5757. An act to define and punish vagrancy in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6159. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On December 18, 1941:

H. R. 6233. An act to expedite the prosecution of the war effort.

On December 19, 1941:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means for improving economic conditions in the anthracite-coal-producing regions of the United States;

H. R. 4854. An act to facilitate and simplify the administration of the Federal reclamation laws and the act of August 11, 1939, as amended;

H. R. 5305. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes;

H. R. 5749. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Embry-Riddle Co. the military reservations of Carlstrom and Dorr Fields, Fla.; and

H. R. 6009. An act to provide pensions at wartime rates for officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard disabled in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict, while engaged in war, and for the dependents of those who die from such cause, and for other purposes.

On December 20, 1941:

H. R. 1548. An act for the relief of Mrs. H. C. Bivins, Henrietta Bivins, and Irvin Tatum;

H. R. 4905. An act to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition;

H. R. 5800. An act authorizing advancements from the Federal Works Administrator for the provision of certain defense public works and equipment in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1926; and

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes.

On December 22, 1941:

H. R. 4853. An act to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on a parity with other war veterans;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Fred Pierce, Sr., and Mary Pierce;

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5007. An act to permit 15-round championship boxing bouts in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE of Maryland). The Chair requests the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to administer the oath of office.

Mr. COCHRAN administered the oath of office to Mr. COLE of Maryland as Speaker pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a Christmas message by Dr. George W. Truett, of Dallas, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHRISTMAS, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in all the nineteen centuries since the birth of Jesus Christ in Bethlehem, mankind has never experienced a Christmas so fraught with deep significance as this Christmas in the year A. D. 1941. Against a dark background of cataclysmic events, rays of infinite light are illuminating the finite minds of men with the divine revelations of Holy Writ.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the peoples and nations of the earth, including ourselves and our own beloved country, have disregarded and violated the basic laws of the universe, which are spiritual and moral. In his second inaugural address, one of the most sublime utterances of modern times, which we in this solemn hour would do wisely to read, Abraham Lincoln enunciated the eternal verity that nations as well as individuals are subject to the just judgments of Almighty God for their conduct and deeds.

This terrible war of Armageddon which engulfs the world has come upon the children of men as the inevitable effect and natural result of sin, selfishness, prejudice, greed, ignorance, idolatry, and the worship of mammon. Men collectively have failed to heed the rules of life and the laws of nations as revealed by God the Father in the Christian Bible.

Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been evident to thinking men and women that we were sowing the wind and would ultimately reap the whirlwind. Social injustice, industrial cruelty, racial prejudice, national selfishness, national arrogance, national pride have brought upon all mankind the punishment and penalty which must inevitably follow as the final effect of wrongdoing and unrighteousness. The governments of the earth have failed miserably to properly appraise and evaluate the dignity and worth of human personality and the human soul. No Nation, not even our own, has practiced the virtues of true democracy—Christian democracy.

Democracy is not merely a political system—not only majority rule by popular elections and governments by parliaments and congresses. Democracy is far more than that. Democracy is individual liberty—equality of opportunity and justice for the individual. The Christian Bible clearly reveals the certain method and perfect plan whereby such democracy—the Kingdom of God—shall be attained and become a reality upon earth for all mankind.

My colleagues, the nations and peoples of earth must go back to God the Father, no matter how hard, how long, or how bloody the road. The conflict in which we are now and will be engaged during the coming years shall determine the destiny and type of government for mankind for the next 1,000 years. By our courageous faith, by our patient sacrifice, and by our loyal obedience to God we shall build a permanent new world social order founded upon the enduring and eternal principles of Christian truth and justice. This will be the grand climax of mankind's age-long endeavor and imminent struggle to conquer the chaos of evil forces and achieve and establish the divine order of the ages—peace, plenty, and prosperity for all nations and all mankind. The prophecy of Isaiah will thus be fulfilled:

> The government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may have permission to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, while listening to Walter Winchell on the radio Sunday night, I noted he made the statement that a news item reported Harry Bridges had requested all C. I. O. members not to report any case of sabotage to the F. B. I. or any Government official, but to report it to him, Harry Bridges.

By this action, Harry Bridges is asking every one of these people to commit a felony, under section 251 (Criminal Code, sec. 146), misprision of felony, as shown on page 1553, title 18, Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure, United States Code, 1940 edition, which I quote:

> Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of the crime of murder or other felony cognizable by the courts of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as may be disclose and make known the same to some one of the judges or other persons in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. (Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, sec. 146, 35 Stat. 1114.)

How many felonies does Harry Bridges himself have to commit, and get others to commit for him, and how much damage along his line of arch saboteur does he have to do before this country will take him out of circulation and place him in custody? Does he have to come to Washington and blow up this Capitol itself before his powerful friends here will permit his being taken out of circulation?

I think it is high time that these powerful friends who protect him are exposed along with him. Do these powerful friends condone his commission of felonies in the signing of his affidavits pertaining to citizenship?

Do they condone his actions in asking others to commit felonies? Do they condone his actions in asking that information on sabotage be kept from civil and military authorities?

Do they condone the charge of conspiracy to murder as placed in this RECORD by the Honorable Arthur Anderson, former Congressman and former district attorney of St. Louis?

Do they condone the 2-minute plan, shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whereby crews on ships are to murder their officers?

Do they condone the companionship that Bridges has kept and his philosophy of the destruction of this Government?

Are they willing to forget the destructive record of this arch saboteur, Harry Bridges?

I am beginning to think that perhaps this Government is so overshot with this type of arch "fifth columnist" and arch saboteur that these same people who are protecting him are of the same type, and that they are "fifth columnists" and saboteurs promoting Bridges' work.

It is time we began to clean house, and the best place to start is the taking into custody of this Harry Bridges in order that he may not be able to bore in more closely.

I address these remarks, particularly, to the Attorney General and the Department of Immigration; also, to Madam Perkins, who has protected Bridges in the past, and am sending them copies, asking that they take appropriate action.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1941.

Madam FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: The enclosed is self-explanatory.

Is it proper that this man Bridges ask the C. I. O. group to do these things?

Do you condone them?

This is the man that you and your Department, under Labor, dillydallied with so long. What do you think of him now?

Will you give your cooperation to deport him?

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

(Enclosure.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1941.

The Honorable FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I am enclosing herewith a copy of speech made today on the floor of the House, with reference to Harry Bridges.

Why is this man allowed to continue at large? This Harry Bridges has committed

many felonies and certainly is a more undesirable alien than many of those you are now taking into custody.

What is the answer and what are you going to do?

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

(Enclosure.)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1941.

Maj. LEMUEL B. SCHOFIELD,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General,
In charge of Immigration and
Naturalization Service,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MAJOR SCHOFIELD: I am enclosing herewith a copy of speech made today on the floor of the House, with reference to Harry Bridges.

Why is this man allowed to continue at large? This Harry Bridges has committed many felonies and certainly is a more undesirable alien than many of those you are now taking into custody.

What is the answer and what are you going to do?

Very truly yours,

L. M. FORD.

(Enclosure.)

UNION CHURCH OF THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 528), to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, line 24, after "grant", insert "to such pastors and to the pastors of other churches serving American residents of the Canal Zone."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not recall under what law this incorporation took place.

Mr. BLAND. The bill specifically provides for the incorporation. The Union Church was started as an organization at the time of the construction work in the Canal Zone. Later there were considerable contributions raised for the permanent establishment of this interdenominational church.

The situation is that there is no law in the Canal Zone whereby there can be either incorporation of these churches or whereby trustees may be appointed to hold the property of the church. In some of the States laws permit corporations to be formed. In others the statutes permit the court to appoint trustees. I think that is true in Virginia. In these ways, to a certain extent, church ownership of property is regulated. But there was no such provision with respect to these properties in the Canal Zone. Considerable property has been accumulated by the organization. Accordingly, a bill was passed in the House last session unanimously but failed of passage in the Senate. A similar bill passed unanimously again this session. The bill provides for the incorporation of this organization. The bill is recommended by the Federation of Churches of Christ in America and by various organizations. No opposition has been made to it.

As to the Senate amendment, I have had the Governor of the Panama Canal interviewed, also the present head of the Union Church organization and the War Department. They all favor the bill and request that we concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I am entirely in sympathy with the purposes of the bill. What I was primarily interested in was the incorporation. A great many bills are introduced in each session of Congress asking for Federal incorporations or Federal charters. There are laws in every State of the Union and in the District of Columbia, so that any of those organizations may be incorporated.

Mr. BLAND. That is very true.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want this, which will be a Federal charter granted to a church in the Panama Canal, to be a precedent for other churches within the States to come to the Congress and ask for Federal charters.

I happen to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and every year that committee has referred to it a number of bills asking for Federal charters. At one time they ranged from one extreme to the other. We do not want to run into that.

Mr. BLAND. The committee entertained views similar to those of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. The committee went into the matter very carefully and found there was a necessity for this legislation in the Panama Canal. The bill relates only to one specific organization.

Mr. MICHENER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a release from the Bonneville Power Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered on the radio December 22 by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the President of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram addressed to me and also a release signed by certain farm organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today following the special order of the gentleman from Vermont.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE TO THE HEROIC DEFENDERS IN OUR INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Congress should send a Christmas message of congratulation and encouragement to General MacArthur and the brave men under him on the wonderful defense they are making in the Philippine Islands, and also to those brave Americans who are holding out at Wake, Midway, Guam, and every other place in the Pacific Ocean where our men are stationed. I think we should do this to encourage them and to let them know that the American people are behind them as they wage this fight against the most savage and inhuman bunch of brutes that ever infested the earth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk of the House be directed to send them the following message, not as a precedent but as a note of encouragement from the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Accept our heartiest congratulations on the magnificent fight you are making, and be assured that the Congress and the people of the entire Nation are wholeheartedly behind you. We are proud of the glorious struggle you are waging against the enemies, not only of our country but also the enemies of our Christian civilization. God give you victory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PRIME MINISTER WINSTON CHURCHILL AND THE BRITISH DELEGATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I know we were all elated when we heard last night that Prime Minister Winston Churchill, Lord Beaverbrook, other high officials, and technical experts from Great Britain had come to visit President Roosevelt.

This Congress to a man is determined to see the war carried through to victory,

and I think it is very splendid that we now have immediate indications that all of the forces united in fighting totalitarianism are to devise a general plan whereby the resources of all the free nations can be united to crush the Nazi and Japanese terror that has been sweeping the world like a plague. We all welcome the arrival of the great and beloved Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill.

The news now ringing around the world of the momentous meeting now taking place in Washington will stir the hearts of all people in sympathy with the cause to which the English-speaking democracies and their allies have devoted all their resources and manhood.

Hitler has boasted that democratic countries could not act in unison. I am sure that he received an unpleasant surprise in the news that Prime Minister Churchill and staff had arrived at the White House to discuss ways and means of defeating Hitler throughout the world. We all earnestly hope that all of the nations fighting Hitlerism may in a similar manner join together under a central command so that the resources of every nation can be most effectively used in pursuance of the common goal.

America welcomes the great leader of the British Empire, and America applauds the purpose for which he has come.

MUNICIPAL POWER COMPANIES

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I have before called the attention of the House to the little city of Canby, Oreg., whose population numbers 1,000. This city affords the most progressive example we have of the savings to be realized by municipally owned power plants and of the profit represented by the difference between the wholesale and retail electric rates.

About 20 years ago Canby had a quarrel with a private power company over street lighting. They decided to take charge of their own electric distributing system. They paid for it in 3 years, buying power from a private company. They never owned a generating plant, though they enjoyed a very cheap rate. When Bonneville power came along they took it and that Bonneville rate gave them the cheapest power in the United States for retail distribution. When they bought private power they applied their profits on city expenses and betterments. Under the Bonneville contract profits must be distributed to the rate payers.

The history of this city's experience is well set forth in an article that appears in the Capital Press, of Salem, Oreg., of December 12. I feel that it is worth wide and careful study. It reads as follows:

[From the Capital Press, Salem, Oreg., of December 12, 1941]

CANBY HAS TOO MUCH MONEY—PROFITS OF MUNICIPAL POWER PILE UP TO AN EMBARRASSING DEGREE

Now the aggressive little city of Canby is up against it. Too much money is accumulating in the municipal power and lighting fund and there are problems as to what to do with it.

For a good many years Canby has owned its own electric distribution system (it only took 3 years to pay for it) and as soon as it acquired it the city reduced electric rates 35 percent, buying the juice from the Pep Co. Then when Bonneville came along Canby made a contract to get that cheap power and right away found it necessary to reduce rates again—clear down to the bottom—and became famous as the town with the lowest rates in the Nation. But still the money accumulates. The last annual statement by John Eid, who has been the city treasurer in Canby for 20 years, gives the following figures for the electric project:

Gross revenue		$15,530.88
Operating costs	$5,813.36	
Taxes paid to city	903.72	
Interest on investment	1,636.78	
Depreciation	750.00	
		9,103.86
Net profit		6,427.02

Isn't that a deuce of a mess? And, of course, those items of interest on investment and depreciation are still in the treasury, being merely separated on the books, thus making the real net profit $8,813.80. And that item of taxes actually paid in cash to the city treasury is also interesting, because when Canby was served by the private company Canby received only $179 from it in taxes. Yet the private company continues to yawp about "tax free" and "tax subsidized" publicly owned plants

Before making the contract with Bonneville the Canby folks used the profits from the electric business for various public enterprises which the town needed. They bought and improved a cemetery, built a tennis court for the school, bought furniture and fixtures for city departments, bought new hose and pumper trucks for the fire department, etc, etc. But they can't do these things any more. Their contract with Bonneville sternly stipulates that all profits of the electric business in Canby shall be returned to the rate payers and not used for anything else. But there are only 411 meters in Canby, so that $6,427.02 divided among them would make an average of $15.60 each to be returned to them. This should give guileless people an inkling as to the real profit of the electrical business during past years, when the private company was charging about 4 times the present Canby rate.

The Capital Press finds it difficult to suggest a way out of the difficulty for Canby. However, Governor Sprague and Utilities Commissioner Bean solemnly declare that Oregon is busted and cannot finance the dinky amount necessary to hook up the State institutions with Bonneville. Perhaps Canby should contact the board of control and offer a loan to the State as an outlet for the money accumulating in the treasury of the Canby electric plant.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the newspaper article to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address for Christmas Day to be delivered over my own station, WNBF.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner entitled "Women Respond."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, my fellow citizens of San Francisco were the first on continental American soil to hear the roar of enemy planes. As would be the case in every community in the land, under similar circumstances, the finest traditions of the Republic are being maintained. Every person is cooperating. I have a telegram from the mayor asking Congress to expedite legislation providing for supplies for all target cities and areas in the United States.

Friday last, the other body passed Senate 1936 which provides the National Division of Civilian Defense with authority to purchase gas masks, fire apparatus, ambulances, medical supplies, and other vitally needed equipment. Nation-wide requests for gas masks alone total 50,000,000.

May we not pass the Senate bill at once so there may be no delay in this pressing problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in reference to the subject Economy in Nondefense Expenditures of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]?

There was no objection.

MADISON IKES HELP UNCLE SAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word from my home chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, chapter No. 16, located at Madison, S. Dak., saying that this chapter had purchased a $100 national-defense bond and suggesting to other Izaak Walton chapters throughout America and other organizations having money in their treasury that this is a splendid way in which they can serve their Government while at the same time preserving a little nest egg for themselves. The Madison, S. Dak., chapter is planning to purchase a series of these bonds, and their action is typical of the manner in which the patriotic Middle West is responding to the challenge of war.

Our Madison chapter has had as its motto, "Saving nature serves humanity."

It is apparent now that this motto is being expanded a little bit to include, "Serving the Nation saves humanity," because in buying defense bonds these Waltonians are serving America, thereby helping to save America.

The directors of this enterprising chapter of the league are as follows: The president is Ben Odland; Gardner H. Dibble is secretary, and the directors are K. V. Mitchell, Emil Kuchenbecker, E. M. Frederickson, vice president, L. M. Pease, John Headley, and C. F. Norton.

I am happy to call this to the attention of the Congress and the country with the hope that other chapters of the Izaak Walton League of America scattered throughout the 40 States of the Union in which the league is organized will follow this splendid patriotic example. It is also an example which I urge other organizations of every type to follow until we have brought this war to a victorious close.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address on the Bill of Rights by a 15-year-old youth of Lynwood, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Last week we discussed the age limits for selective-service-draft purposes. The boys speak for themselves. When America calls they answer. To their patriotism age fixes no limits. They see their duty and do it. Yesterday in one of the papers in my district I saw a striking illustration of the true spirit of the American people. Clyde Dunnagan, of Warwick County, Va., living near Denbigh, the county seat, a youth of 18 years of age, learned that his brother, J. W. Dunnagan, who had enlisted 2 years ago in the Navy, had been killed at Pearl Harbor on that fateful and never-to-be-forgotten first Sunday in December, when Japanese infamy reached its zenith. With the consent of his father and his mother, though only 18 years of age, he immediately enlisted in the Navy with the express wish that he might be sent to the Pacific Ocean to take up the work where his brother left off.

This Nation can never be conquered while the youth of America are impelled by such loyalty, love of country, and devotion to duty as are evidenced by this act. This is the spirit of 1776 still regnant in the hearts of men. This is the spirit that can never be conquered. While boys like these live liberty cannot die.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, little did the Axis Powers realize what the mind of a free people could be when they felt that their nation had been attacked. Today all over this land there is a buoyant resolution and confidence in the ultimate success of the American cause. I think it important that we in our position be sure that that confidence does not become assurance. It is important for us to be prepared and for our people to be prepared for the tomorrows that lie ahead.

There can be no doubt of the ultimate outcome. I am convinced that we shall win, and I believe it for a fundamentally religious reason. Because, in my opinion, there are laws in this universe that render it impossible for governments which are founded on the denial of freedom of the individual spirit and on oppression and unbridled use of force, to prevail, and because I believe there is a strength in the souls of a free people, once aroused, which is irresistible. No fearful military machine forged by the ruthlessness of dictatorship can match that strength.

But the thing we must be sure of is that we are prepared for the tomorrows that lie ahead of us. They may be many, and they will be long and hard, full of anxiety, of weariness, of loss, and of sorrow. We must be ready for such tomorrows. Our people must be ready, too.

The victory will not be won by hate or suspicion or persecution. The enemy within our gates must and will be found and put where he can do no harm. The F. B. I. and other of our enforcement agencies will see to that. But what America needs is the help of every man, woman, and child who is loyal—however he may differ from the majority in race, color, or political opinion.

The first job of Congress will be to provide necessary legislation for the carrying on of the war. This must and will be done. But its second job is much more difficult—to see that the burdens are distributed according to ability to bear them; that no man or group of men are enriched by the sacrifice of others; that every citizen, however humble, has the food and shelter that he really needs to enable him to carry on. And the third job is the most difficult of all and the one I am afraid may be neglected too long. It is the job of preparing for tomorrow—preparing fearlessly and fairly so that when the men come back out of this war, when it is over, they will come back, not to unemployment and confusion and fear but to a better world than they left.

For there will be men coming back, and they will be men who have known three main experiences in their lives:

First, the joy and freedom of American school days—one of the brightest experiences in all human history.

But, second, they have known long years when, though there was want in the land, there were jobs too few whereby they—the youth—might have relieved that want. It was hard for young people to understand.

And, third, they have known that when war was brought by enemy attack upon our country and America confronted the might of despotism around the world—they have known that when that hour came we called on them for sacrifice and asked them to be heroes; and be it said to their everlasting honor and to the dishonor of every person who has spoken ill of American youth in the past that they were ready and willing—almost glad to go.

Well, these young men are coming back some day, and they will be millions, and the kind of world they will have to live in is the one the Congress prepares for them.

May God grant that even as we win through to the military victory that must be ours we will not neglect this other duty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the day after tomorrow will be Christmas. I take this opportunity to extend to the Speaker, to the majority and minority leaders, to my colleagues here, and to those of our colleagues who are taking a much-needed holiday at home, and to all the employees of the House my very sincere good wishes for the happiest possible Christmas season. In the words of Tiny Tim, I say to you and each of you, "God bless you every one."

UNITY

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the most signal thing that lights our hearts today is the absolute unity that prevails in America. I see that the American Allies, the United States and Canada, are now abolishing all tariff walls between them.

There is no lack of patriotism in America. That is shown by the action of this House. Though the Members may have differed in their ideas on national policy, when it comes to the fundamentals of patriotism one is just as strong and hardy as another.

When we saw how a boy, a typical American boy, came hurtling out of the sky to end his life in a blaze of glory, sending an enemy ship to the bottom of the ocean, as others are doing today, why should we not buy all the bonds we can and do everything that can be done to make as quick as possible the absolute victory that is bound to be that of the United States of America and her Allies in this great struggle for freedom in the world? The Japanese struck us before breakfast, but breakfast is now over, the day's work is before us, and Japan and her allies are about to find what a day's work by Uncle Sam really means.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from Tennessee said about the gallant men we have on Wake and Midway Islands. We cannot let them down. We must be ever alert, especially at this holiday season when we are so apt to celebrate and not be so vigilant. Do not take anything for granted, our people must cooperate with our civilian-defense officers because our enemies are ever on the alert looking for opportunities to destroy us and our institutions. Keep in mind what the Axis Powers have done and the methods used to subdue kind, loving people. We must not forget December 7—and above all, Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was particularly impressed with the statement of the gentleman from Virginia concerning the young man from his State who enlisted at once to carry forward the work of his brother, who lost his life in Pearl Harbor. That is an admirable attitude, one that I am sure can be duplicated many, many times.

My own State, which is an interior State far from the seaboard, has had several casualties already in this war. I find the same sentiment prevailing among my people as the gentleman from Virginia has expressed. This is true not only of men but of ships. One of the severest losses at Pearl Harbor was the sinking of the battleship *Arizona*, a ship of which we in my State were unusually proud. My people want another battleship *Arizona* to carry on and uphold the finest traditions of the American Navy.

I have a communication from the Governor of Arizona urging that a new *Arizona* be commissioned to strike terror to the foe and collect on our claim against the naval forces of Japan until they are paid in full. Thus may Arizona help to carry on with a new ship, a ship stronger and better than the one that was sent to the bottom on that fateful Sunday. This is the marked attitude of my people.

I find that the inland State I represent is aroused. Out there we understand the Jap problem and the Jap menace. We have had to deal with it in certain phases for many, many years, and we are prepared now to deal with it as a part of our national program of defeating and crushing that menace which has in treachery disturbed the peace of the world.

I find that the citizens of Arizona, from the Governor to the lowliest citizen, are remembering Pearl Harbor just as they decades ago remembered the *Maine*. If you will examine the records of the past you will find that many of Teddy Roosevelt's Roughriders were enrolled at Prescott, Ariz. They were the cowboys of the West, who came from the mountains of Arizona, and they gave a good account of themselves at San Juan Hill and elsewhere. With somewhat the same spirit my people are pleading to do likewise in remembering Pearl Harbor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman last Sunday at the dedication of the Catholic Community House in New York City for service men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein articles appearing in the Washington Post this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS AND CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks briefly at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one day last week I called attention to the value of the Civilian Conservation Corps as a construction agency and proposed that it be assigned to the Corps of Engineers during the present war emergency. I am glad to say that steps are now being taken in that direction. They should be expedited. Some of the C. C. C. projects under way should be completed as a necessary job for the national defense. Some of them could be postponed and the boys and their equipment put on some of the airfields and other military or naval bases that are needed. A large number of camps are already at work on such projects and the value of what they are doing is unquestioned. The Corps has more than $40,000,000 worth of construction equipment that is needed on defense activities of various kinds. I have discussed this matter with officers in the Corps of Engineers and I have discussed it with officials of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Recommendations have been made, I believe. I am very much in hopes that action may follow soon. There is no question but that the President has authority to transfer the Civilian Conservation Corps to the Corps of Engineers under the authority granted in the first War Powers Act of 1941, approved last week. It should be done speedily.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE SPIRIT OF 1941

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker—

We light the Christmas candles, once again,
And watch them flicker softly on the snow,
The cedar fragrance permeates the air,
And Yuletide logs reflect a happy glow.

The bells chime out as merrily and gay
As they have chimed through centuries of yore,
But if they chimed in rhythm to the heart
They would not sound as merry as before.

For there is grief and sorrow through the land,
And peaceful souls are burdened with despair,
But through the din of battle there will rise
The constant plea for peace, in every prayer.

That little poem by Mabel G. Austin seems to me to embody the thoughts of all of us this Christmas season of 1941.

It goes without saying that this should be a time when the little children should be made to know and feel the joy and gladness that ordinarily attend the Christmastide. For adults, however, it should be a time when we should seriously consider the fact that unless we win this war we may never again observe the birth of Christ as a Christian holiday.

We should recognize the fact that a world conspiracy of all the basest, foulest, most wicked criminals in history, saturated with a crazy determination to crush our civilization, threatens to stop all human progress, to destroy the work of centuries, and to establish their new order over our dead bodies.

The complacency and the apathy of so many people is this very minute the source of our greatest peril. It is too bad, but life cannot go on as usual. This is not a war against Japan and Germany and Italy but against the greatest coalition of bestial, pagan, anti-Christian millions that has ever happened. It is a fight between two opposing concepts; a struggle to determine whether the barbaric, heathen philosophies shall or shall not prevail.

In all humility and thankfulness, we should count our blessings as we undertake to decide what price each and every one of us is willing to pay to see them continued, both for our own and for the sake of our children and our children's children.

There should be no hysteria, but we should realize and appreciate that the most serious and fateful hour that has ever confronted civilization has struck. Never was there such a war as this, with so great an issue at stake, on the outcome of which hangs the fate of humanity.

It is for us to undertake and assume such a burden as has never before been assumed or undertaken in the long history of the world. Read the records and be advised and astounded. Are you prepared?

Never before has the issue between Christianity and all it stands for and paganism been so clear-cut. This is a war to a finish. It is either we or they. Do you realize it?

To the end, therefore, that we may win, as we shall if we be so determined, we must be prepared to make all essential sacrifices, strip ourselves of all encumbering impediments, put on the full armor of our faith in our form of government, and go forward to fight, and to die, if

necessary, for the cause for which we stand.

The immediate years that wait may not be happy ones for us. Certainly, they will not be unless we make them so as victors for the faith that is in us.

I have deliberately struck this note at this time. There are too many who do not appreciate the seriousness of the situation or realize the desperateness thereof or how critical are the times.

Everyone is called upon to serve either as a civilian or in some military capacity. You can buy defense bonds or stamps to help your country. You can do it if you deprive yourselves of luxuries in order to contribute to the defense of yourselves and of your country. Under the circumstances, not to do it is not to do your part. Selfishness for a cause is not a sacrifice.

If incapacitated for military service, you may serve in the civilian defense units, therein supporting your Commander in Chief insofar as is possible for you so to do.

Serve your country, then, wherever and in whatever capacity you may or can. Save yourself and civilization. It is worth the price!

"Peace on earth to men of good will"—the sod
Shrieks crimson challenge to that minstrelsy;
Yet peace on earth to every soul that trod
With steadfast zeal its blood-soaked calvary,
For we whom Christ has called the sons of God,
Can never wear the chains of slavery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

JAPANESE ATTACK ON PORT ARTHUR IN 1904

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, in February 1904 the Russo-Japanese War began with a naval attack on Port Arthur.

Now that a commission has been established to inquire into the circumstances of the recent Japanese attacks in Hawaii and to ascertain whether officers in charge of the United States defenses were at fault, I suggest that exhibit I before the commission should be the paragraphs I am about to read, descriptive of the sudden surprise attacks by the Japanese in 1904 on Port Arthur.

These paragraphs should have been burned into the minds of United States naval and military officers during the critical days of Japanese negotiations before December 7 last. Obviously, this was not done, and why it was not done should be answered by the appropriate intelligence and educational divisions of the Army and Navy.

I read without further comment from the Official History of the Russo-Japanese War, prepared by the historical section of the Great Britain Committee of Imperial Defense, the following:

Although Japan did not sever diplomatic relations with Russia until the 6th of February 1904, it had been evident to her for some time that little prospect of a peaceful settlement remained. Long before the rupture her plan of action had been carefully thought out, and the wise division of her limited resources had brought both army and navy to such a footing that when the crisis came it lay within her power to strike on sea and land without delay.

The whole issue of the coming struggle, if the question of finance be excluded, evidently depended on naval supremacy.

At 1 a. m. on the 6th of February, the admirals and captains of the Japanese Fleets were assembled on board the *Mikasa* to discuss the war. Admiral Togo's plans contemplated a torpedo attack on the Russian Fleet which was believed still to be anchored in the roadstead outside Port Arthur. This attack was to be delivered by the whole of his destroyers on the night of October 8. At 9 a. m. on the 6th of October the five divisions of destroyers got under way and left Sasebo, Japan. Battle was joined on October 9.

Above the naval commander in chief of the Russian Fleet was the viceroy and commander in chief of all the land and sea forces in the Far East, the Viceroy Alexiev, an officer high in the favor of the Czar. This officer, to whom had been entrusted the carrying out of Russian policy in that part of the world, must in the main be held responsible for the condition of affairs at the outbreak of war, and, being himself a naval officer of long service, he should have been in a position to judge of the strategical needs of the moment.

Unfortunately for Russia, he seems utterly to have underestimated the power of Japan and her capacity to take the initiative, and to have so far blinded himself to the result of the policy he was pursuing that he did not consider war imminent even at the last moment.

There is no reason to doubt that the Russian authorities at Port Arthur were aware that the Japanese Minister at St. Petersburg had been recalled, although the significant wording of his note may mostly have been unknown to them. Yet no special precautions were taken, and only those general preparations which had been in progress for several days continued.

Vice Admiral Stark's (Russian admiral) request for permission to place his fleet in a state of preparedness for war was met with a reply from the viceroy, "This is premature." He had, however, for 2 or 3 nights previously made the signal to "Prepare to repel torpedo attacks," but this order seems to have been looked upon by his subordinates as a mere peace exercise. Those ships which made an attempt to carry out the order (and it is reported that at least one ship took no notice whatever) did not get their torpedo nets out, no heavy guns were loaded, and in some cases the crews slept in their hammocks instead of at the guns. Moreover, some of the Russian ships were employed in coaling; but a story, which at the time was generally accepted in Europe, that many of the officers were attending an evening party on shore was unjust and without foundation.

Such was the condition of affairs when the 10 boats, comprising the Japanese first, second, and third destroyer flotillas, left Round Island and steered for Port Arthur in single line.

The comparatively insignificant losses are, however, no real indication of the results which had been achieved since the Japanese destroyers had left Round Island. In the 19 hours which had passed, Japan had vindicated her claim to be considered a first-class naval power, and her success had done much toward securing that sea command upon which the result of the war was largely dependent. The strength of the Russian Fleet, from which so much had been expected, was broken, and henceforth it was compelled to act entirely upon the defensive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for 2 additional minutes, as I would like to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to state to the gentleman from Ohio that I noticed in the papers some days ago that he had suggested that there were many German nationals in this country who might not be eligible for service in the United States Army, but who had expressed a desire to see the creation of a free German unit to fight Hitler and the totalitarian powers, which called to my mind that I know in my own district there are several who would be interested in supporting or joining a movement of that kind. As I recall, the newspaper account said the gentleman was writing Colonel Donovan and submitting the suggestion to him. I just wondered if there were any plans or any information that the gentleman feels he can give us with propriety relative to this very good proposal.

Mr. THOM. I am sorry to say that at the present moment there is nothing to report. I have not had the time, on account of the holiday season, to contact the proper authorities.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do hope the gentleman will follow up the idea, because it struck me as being a very splendid one, indeed. Also I hope the War Department and the Military Affairs Committee of the House will give the suggestion serious consideration.

Mr. THOM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MERRITT. I recall in the last war we had the Fifty-first Infantry, I think it was, set up along such lines.

Mr. THOM. In the Civil War also we had regiments composed entirely of German-Americans who had arrived in the country at about that time following a revolution in Germany to establish a republican form of government, and they performed very heroically.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DINGELL, indefinitely, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Between adjournment of the House today and its reconvening on Friday we pass through another Christmas Day. The Chair hopes that each Member may have the most enjoyable Christmas ever.

May the Chair also say to our distinguished Speaker, speaking, I am sure, on behalf of the entire membership, that as he enjoys at home a much-deserved rest through the holiday season, may it be to him one of the most enjoyable he has ever experienced.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2111. An act to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries;

S. 2082. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of Selective Service and Members of alien-enemy hearing boards;

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Friday, December 26, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1187. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend section 44 of the act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1097), as amended, so as to provide for extending to the waters of the Philippine Islands the authority of the President to establish defensive sea areas, and for punishment of offenses committed therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1188. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1189. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts as awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1190. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report that it has no specific recommendations to make at this time for new legislation for the promotion of safety of life and property through the use of communications pursuant to the second proviso of section 4 (K) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 6217. A bill to amend section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4910) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Murray, Jr., a patent to certain land; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

A bill (H. R. 5318) for the relief of Bessie Walden; Committee on Indian Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. LEWIS introduced a bill (H. R. 6287) conferring a military status upon certain civilian employees of the Engineer Department, United States Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2212. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Auburn, Ind., C. F. Kinsey, secretary, urging the immediate consideration of House bill 1036, the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2213. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petion of Mr. and Mrs. T. T. Graffenreidt and 17 other citizens of Easterly, Tex., favoring House bills 3753 and 3754; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2214. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Regular Democratic Club of the first zone, first assembly district, Long Island City, N. Y., approving the action of our Congress and our President, and offering their services as citizens of this free land to our President and Nation in whatever position they deem necessary to the end that ultimate victory may come to our Nation and to those allied with us in order that our sacred liberty may be preserved; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2215. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

2216. Also, petition of the Oregon Machinists' Council, Portland, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 1852 and House bill 5583; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1941

The Very Reverend Z@Barney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Father of Lights, and source of every blessing, who makest us sometimes to be glad between our sighs and tears, wearing a face of joy because we have been glad of yore: Grant unto us in this Holy Season the merry heart that doeth good by spreading cheer, and, if that cannot be, give to us the heart of peace, whose peace breathed and nourished from above floweth like a river that goeth softly. Be with us now in the after-glow of Christmas, a sanctifying presence, inspiring us to some gentler thought, some tenderer feeling, moving us to deeper sympathy for those in sorrow and to greater charity for those in need.

Be with all those, for their secret comfort, who by reason of their sickness or affliction were unable yesterday to go with the multitude that kept Holy Day, and, if it may be, bless and heal them both in body and in soul.

Grant that now we may be alive to the new promises of God; may this be a day of alertness to receive and to minister; a day of light if not without the shadow of a cloud, yet with light breaking through the cloud; and do Thou make it for us a day of happy trust which looks unto Thee and says when darkness falls, Father we thank Thee for the knowledge that within all shadows dwellest Thou. In our Saviour's name and for His sake we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 23, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that, on December 23, 1941, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1055. An act for the relief of Julius Yuhasz and Arvid Olson; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 528) to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore of the House had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2119) to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRIBUTE TO RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, is to address the Senate, the Nation, and the world in a few minutes, and, because of the significance of this occasion, I deem it appropriate to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tribute to him by Walter Lippmann as published yesterday in syndicated columns throughout the country.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL

(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Churchill is with us in our hour of peril. He is able to be with us because the prophecy which he made after Dunkerque has come true, the pledge he gave then has been honored.

On June 4, 1940, France was lost. Russia stood aside. America stood aside. Britain

stood alone. By all the calculations of the unbelieving and the faint-hearted, the war was lost. It was then that Winston Churchill made the prophetic pledge which will remain forever glorious in the annals of mankind:

"We shall go on to the end; we shall fight in France; we shall fight on the seas and oceans; we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air; we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be; we shall fight on the beaches; we shall fight on the landing grounds; we shall fight in the fields and in the streets; we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender; and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British Fleet, would carry on the struggle until, in God's good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the Old."

But for that decision to go on, made by Churchill and supported by his people, Russia would last summer have stood alone against the total power of the Nazi assault from Scandinavia all the way around to Turkey and Persia, and America would today be standing alone against a simultaneous attack in both oceans

No words can begin to express the debt which we, and all the people of the earth, owe to Winston Churchill and the British people

As the Prime Minister and the President, together with the military commanders, confer and decide, it would be impudent for the rest of us to offer them advice. Our duty is to assure them that we shall do our full duty whatever they, the proven leaders of the English-speaking peoples, ask of us. In the great decisions which have to be taken, the rest of us, sitting in the back seats, can best take to heart the words of a Roman consul, Lucius Amilius Paulas by name, who in the year 168 B. C., having been selected to conduct the war with Macedonia, addressed the assembly of the people in these words:

"In every circle, and truly at every table, there are people who lead armies into Macedonia; who know where the camp ought to be placed; what posts ought to be occupied by the troops; when and through what pass Macedonia should be entered; where magazines should be formed; how provisions should be conveyed by land and sea; when it is proper to engage the enemy, when to be quiet. And they not only determine what is best to be done, but, if anything is done in any other manner than what they have pointed out they arraign the consul, as if he were on trial.

"These are great impediments to those who have the management of affairs * * * I am not of those who think that commanders ought never to receive advice; on the contrary, I should deem that man more proud than wise who did everything of his own single judgment. What then is my opinion? That commanders should be counseled, chiefly, by persons of known talent, by those especially who are skilled in the art of war and who have been taught by experience; and next by those who are present at the scene of the action, who see the enemy who see the advantages that occasions offer, and who, embarked, as it were, in the same ship, are sharers of the danger."

The rest of us will not be truly ready to do our full duty until we realize that never until this moment have Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt been wholly free to take the measures which they and their best advisers have deemed necessary. Both of these men foresaw long ago the peril which confronts us. Neither was able to persuade his people to act before the peril became desperate. Mr. Churchill was warning the British of the growing power of Nazi Germany from the very day that Hitler came to power—nearly 9 years ago. But Mr. Churchill did not become Prime Minister until after the disaster in Norway. Mr. Roosevelt began warning the American people more than 4 years ago; it was not until the disaster at Pearl Harbor that the country waked up and began to come fully to his support.

Thus Churchill and Roosevelt are leaders who must deal with the consequences of inaction which a misguided public opinion insisted upon. It is not for them to say, nor have they ever, cheaply said, "I told you so." But now that they must repair the mistakes which they were not allowed to avert, it is of great importance for the rest of us, all of the rest of us, not merely some of the rest of us to realize that they did tell us so. This is necessary, not in order to prove that they are infallible, but in order that we, by realizing our own mistakes, should not make them again.

The great mistake of our lives—from which flow all the awful consequences we now face—was that, having won the other war, together with the British, we dissolved the partnership, went our separate ways, and even became rivals. This is the mistake which Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt are now trying to repair.

For by the separation of Britain and America, which occurred at the close of the other war, we prepared the disaster of this war. The deadly nonsense about the war debts, the selfish folly of British and American commercial policy, the blindness with which we insisted upon disarming each other, the contradictions of the far eastern policy of both countries—all these suicidal errors had their origin in the great error of not maintaining the union, in peace as well as in war, of the English-speaking peoples.

Thus, we did not see, because we were willfully blind, that the Pacific Ocean could not be protected by America from Hawaii alone, or even from the Philippines; that a joint defense from Singapore and Hawaii, from Hong Kong and Manila, was indispensable.

Nor would we see that the joint defense of the Atlantic was as indispensable as the joint defense of the Pacific; that the security of the British Isles was a vital American interest; that the survival of France was a vital American interest. We could not see that the world is round and that we are in it between the east and the west. On the beaches of Luzon, in the jungles of Malaya, and on the coasts of Africa we are now paying the price for not seeing this.

We can never put the memories of these terrible errors aside, amiably preferring to forget them, until they are so thoroughly realized and then rooted out of us that they will never again arise to divide the English-speaking peoples. Until we have done this we shall not have the mind—nor the heart—for the effort we must make; nor shall we have the quality, which the coming months will require, to look upon danger with what Mr. Churchill once called "a searching, but at the same time, I hope, with a steady eye."

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PAUL C. LEAHY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], I give notice that on the 2d day of January, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., public hearings will be held in the committee room of the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of Paul C. Leahy, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the district of Delaware.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

Two letters from the Secretary of War reporting, pursuant to law, relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN—SUPPORT OF THE WAR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copy of a resolution passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John "To avow the loyal support of the people of the Virgin Islands to the United States of America in the war against the Imperial Government of Japan, or any other belligerent nation that should attack the United States of America," with an accompanying paper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 154)

A letter from the Secretary of War as president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

COMMUNICATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH SAFETY OF LIFE AND PROPERTY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Commission has no specific recommendations to make at this time for new legislation for the promotion of safety of life and property through the use of communications; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, submitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with notation of subsequent national defense and other important activities) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

CRUDE-OIL PRICES—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF KANSAS INDEPENDENT OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter, with an accompanying resolution, adopted by the executive committee of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association at a recent meeting in the city of Wichita, urging the importance of securing a better price for crude oil in order that the independent producers may remain in business. I am in full sympathy with the appeal made by the independent oil producers.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS INDEPENDENT OIL
AND GAS ASSOCIATION,
Wichita, Kans., December 9, 1941.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Enclosed herewith you will please find a copy of a resolution prepared by the resolutions committee and passed by the executive committee of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association. Copies of this resolution are being mailed to

the Representatives of our State in Washington, to Petroleum Coordinator Harold L. Ickes, and to Leon Henderson.

There has been prepared and is available, if you do not already have one, a report on crude-petroleum costs. This information was prepared by the Independent Petroleum Association of America, after long thought and study. By giving this thorough study you may well see why the enclosed resolution demands immediate and serious consideration, as we are in our State, depleting the reserves of our crude petroleum at a price far below the cost of operation. If the independent producer is to continue operating we must have an increase in the price of our product. We trust that you will use every effort possible in working with us to try to get the price of crude oil raised to a sufficient level to show a fair profit, thus enabling the independent producers, who are responsible for a large percent of the new reserves being found, to remain in business.

Yours very truly,

D. R. LAUCK, *President*.

Whereas the responsibility of continuing a proper supply of crude petroleum to meet the normal demands for domestic consumption is now increased by the additional demands incident to our rapidly accelerated defense activities as well as the demands made upon the petroleum supplies by those countries to which our country has become obligated;

Whereas the increased cost of finding and producing this oil has greatly added to the individual responsibility of the oil producers;

Whereas the integrated companies who purchase our oil are also our competitors in the production and sale of oil. They sell their production through their refined products at retail and through Government contracts. These outlets have offered increased prices for crude petroleum so sold;

Whereas there is no increase of the price the independent producer can obtain for his oil that is commensurate with the increased cost he must bear to enable him to continue to compete with the integrated companies. We cannot strike for higher prices as can labor for higher wages. We do not ask for subsidies to maintain our operations;

Whereas our prices are below those of recent years, while our costs have steadily increased. Wells in stripper areas which represent a large part of the total oil reserves of the Nation are operating at a loss. The necessity of abandoning hundreds of these wells brought about by the current price situation is creating a deplorable waste; and

Whereas the discovery of approximately 70 percent of all new oil pools and reserves have been made by independent oil producers, some relief must be provided for ourselves as well as those of like situation. That relief can be provided by the governmental agencies charged with this responsibility: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association here assembled in annual meeting of this 5th day of December 1941, That we call upon the Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense and the Office of Price Administration to give attention to this situation at the earliest possible date without delay and that the respective Members of Congress, both of the House and Senate, assist our members to the end that whatever they can do to accomplish the purpose will be done. That if the purchasers of our products refuse to take proper steps to insure an adequate price in order to stimulate and make possible the discovery and development of new reserves that the necessary action be taken to ascertain whether or not they are interfering with the national-defense program by refusing to pay a proper price for crude petroleum.

LETTER FROM PITTSBURGH CENTRAL LABOR UNION—SUPPORT OF THE WAR

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter from the secretary of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union, together with a resolution adopted by that union, pledging all-out help in order to win the war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and resolution will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 23, 1941.

Hon. JAMES DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: At a regular meeting convened Thursday, December 18, 1941, the membership of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union of the American Federation of Labor pledged themselves individually and unitedly to give all assistance within their ability to further national defense and promote the welfare of our Nation.

The attached resolution was unanimously adopted by our membership.

With kindest regards from our membership and best wishes for your health.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. STACKHOUSE,
Secretary, Pittsburgh Central Labor Union.

Whereas the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, on December 8, 1941, approved and signed the joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial Government of Japan and the Government and the people of the United States; and

Whereas the members of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union of the American Federation of Labor, in regular session December 18, 1941, pledged themselves individually and unitedly to give all assistance within their ability to further national defense and promote the welfare of our armed forces; and

Whereas the United States was attacked by Japan without cause. The United States was still pleading for peace, still offering Japan honorable friendship, when she struck without warning. Our Nation is not the aggressor but the defender. This gives our peace-loving democratic people something that the imperialistic madmen of Europe and Asia lack—the will to fight and the will to win—and we shall see this through; and

Whereas we will fight as never before to maintain our liberties which we have enjoyed. It now becomes the duty of every American citizen who has enjoyed the privileges and benefits of this great Nation to do everything within his power to maintain these privileges. In this crisis we must have unity of thought, unity of sentiment, unity of spirit, unity of purpose, unity of action. This is no time for arguments. There is no time now for differences: And therefore be it

Resolved, That we the members of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union do pledge to our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, our unswerving loyalty, our unbending effort, our unstinted energies, and our undying devotion in the titanic struggle for human liberty upon which we have embarked; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, United States Senators for Pennsylvania, and to the Congressmen of our district.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, TOGETHER WITH MINORITY VIEWS (S. DOC. NO. 152)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the preliminary report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, submitted pursuant to law, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has already been filed with the President of the Senate in accordance with law. I ask that it be printed as a Senate document and also printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed as a document, and printed in the RECORD.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I file minority views for printing and printing in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the views of the minority will be received and be printed in connection with the report filed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and also printed in the RECORD.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

DECEMBER 24, 1941.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE; THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, a preliminary report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

This committee was established pursuant to title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, approved September 20, 1941, which directed it to "make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations, at the earliest practicable date."

PROCEDURE

The committee has had the benefit of the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, a member of the committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, and various other officials of the Government regarding the possibility of specific savings in existing departments and agencies. It has had before it for study the report of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, also a member of the committee, submitted in response to the request of August 28, 1941, from the Senate Finance Committee, as well as other data submitted directly to this committee by the Budget Bureau. The committee has received, also, suggestions of economies from civic agencies, taxpayers' clubs, and private citizens. It has collected, in addition, evidence from its own sources and it has devoted considerable time to a survey of the problems. This report is made on the basis of all the information thus collected.

INITIAL REPORT

Directed to report to the President and to the Congress "at the earliest possible date," the committee considers it highly desirable to present now a preliminary report. The committee emphasizes that this report is only its first, and that other departments, agencies, funds, programs, and items will be examined by the committee and treated in subsequent reports.

This is only a partial report. While the committee has worked diligently since its organization, the magnitude of the labor involved as well as the vital legislative matters before Congress in recent weeks have prevented due consideration to further reductions and eliminations, which will be reported on later. Subjects considered in this report are limited largely to those established originally as depression measures.

The committee believes that in view of the improved economic situation and the vital new war conditions the agencies of Government and the Members of Congress should have at the earliest practicable time the benefit of conclusions thus far reached by the committee, and any possible economies which now can be effected should not be deferred.

Before the war economy in nonessential spending was important. Now it is vital. There is no room for nonessentials in a government stripped for action. Our united purpose is to produce sufficient armament and trained personnel to win this war. Nothing can be permitted to interfere with this objective. The American people are being asked to pay extremely burdensome taxes which will become greater; they are being asked to make great sacrifice and endure hardships. The Government should set the example.

The United States Treasury is facing the tremendous task of financing the war. We must decrease its difficulties, not increase them. All nonessential spending must yield to the needs of our defense program.

Strenuous efforts are being made to prevent serious price inflation. To continue consumer subsidies created during depression years without urgent necessity will pour fuel on a disastrous inflation fire.

The committee believes substantial reduction in nonessential spending would be of material aid in holding down inflationary price increases.

We shall have to draw on all our resources and accumulated wealth, as well as manpower, to fight a long war. In addition to equipping our own armed forces and establishing at home our own defenses, we have undertaken to furnish military supplies of every description to all nations fighting the forces of aggression. We must continue this without stint. But it is a colossal obligation.

FEDERAL DEBT

We started this war with a direct Federal indebtedness of about $55,000,000,000.

Today the ultimate cost of the war is unpredictable, but to date we have appropriated and authorized $75,000,000,000 for national defense. This is only the beginning. Every dollar now added to the public debt without imperative defense need makes it more difficult for America to meet post-war period problems in both domestic economy and foreign trade.

In this titanic world struggle with totalitarian forces democracies must not only conquer, they must preserve their democratic system. That means the preservation of solvent government. National solvency—difficult in this emergency and so essential to the preservation of the democratic system—is of no necessary concern to totalitarian governments.

Necessary expenditure of billions for national defense has changed abruptly the reasons and advisability for continuing certain agencies, services, and functions of government.

Amounts expended for defense soon will be so large as to obviate much of the necessity for spending in relief and other items for which the committee recommends elimination or reduction.

Judged by national income, estimated at $105,000,000,000, 1942 will be the most prosperous year in American history. This may be compared with the national income of approximately $82,000,000,000 in 1929. That is one reason to believe that much of the relief expenditure continued from the so-called depression years now can be eliminated. Continuation of public works and some other types of projects during the war emergency would require diversion of vital manpower and materials from defense to nondefense projects.

The Federal Government alone must pay the cost of national defense. For years the Federal Government has been carrying a heavy load of State and local responsibilities. The committee believes that during this emergency the States and localities should reassume, where necessary, responsibilities historically theirs.

THE FUTURE PROGRAM

In general, the committee will continue its investigation, as follows:

1. It will continue its examination of all Federal expenditures to determine where further curtailment or elimination of expenditures can be made, in the light of defense needs, increasing industrial production and employment, and other factors:

2. It will examine further and in detail the activities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to determine whether all functions performed by departments and agencies are essential under existing conditions, whether duplications and corresponding functions can be consolidated, and the extent to which contraction can be substituted for expansion.

3. It will scrutinize Government-owned corporations to determine whether present loan policies are advisable in view of changed conditions, whether loans are being made efficiently, with proper regard to security, repayment, and other terms, and whether salaries and expenses of such corporations are reasonable.

4. It will examine purchasing, classification, salaries, transportation, publicity, and other items of expense and practice to determine whether they are being administered in an economical manner.

5. It will review all permanent agencies in an effort to determine the necessity and the efficiency of their administration and the advisability of more effective controls.

6. It will review defense expenditures and make recommendations for the elimination of waste and inefficiency in administration.

The committee's views on these subjects and possibly others will be embodied in subsequent reports.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. New adventures

The committee recommends that no new adventures or commitments in public works or costly Government programs be undertaken during the period of the war emergency, except those imperatively necessary to national defense.

The committee cautions against the futility of retrenching in existing nonessential spending and subsequently appropriating for programs or projects that could be deferred until after the emergency.

2. Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, Office of Education, Work Projects Administration

The committee recommends that the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the national-defense training activities of the Office of Education be abolished, effective as soon as possible and not later than July 1, 1942, and that there be established in some suitable agency facilities for training persons for work in defense occupations; this activity to be limited strictly to national-defense work and confined to those fields and to numbers to be certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as necessary for that purpose; also that there be merged in this new program any necessary part of defense training now under the Work Projects Administration as shall be certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as necessary to national defense; and further that all portions of previously appropriated funds for these agencies now held in reserve by direction of the Bureau of the Budget (totaling $132,000,000) be covered into the Treasury.

3. Work Projects Administration

The committee recommends that there be appropriated to the Work Projects Administration the sum of not more than $50,000,000 per month for 3 months beginning July 1, 1942. Any work now being carried on by the Work Projects Administration for account of national defense after July 1, 1942, should be carried on under the direction of the War and Navy Departments and the amount here recommended for the Work Projects Administration reduced accordingly.

The committee believes that with defense expenditures constantly increasing, Work Projects Administration appropriations should be on a quarterly basis beginning July 1, 1942, and that as employment increases the quarterly appropriations should be reduced accordingly.

4. Civil departments

The committee recommends that every possible retrenchment be made in the administrative costs of the civil departments and agencies. There has not been sufficient time for the committee to investigate fully these administrative costs. This will be done as promptly as possible.

The Budget Bureau report before this committee estimates that under a plan to reduce Federal nondefense spending one and one-half billion dollars, the allotted reduction in regular appropriations to civil departments and agencies would be $100,000,000. This would reduce total appropriations from $830,000,000 for civil departments to $730,000,000.

The cost of publicity activities in the civil departments and agencies is estimated by the Bureau of the Budget to be at least $30,000,000, and should be carefully reviewed for reductions and eliminations.

5. Agriculture

The committee at this time considered in detail expenditures by the Department of Agriculture, among the regular departments, because of the large programs and far-reaching activities established within and transferred to that Department during the depression period. The committee based its study on material furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget and its agricultural examiners, and by department officials who work with the programs and activities. This study will be continued and as a partial report the committee now recommends:

(a) Elimination of all land purchases by the Department of Agriculture during the period of the emergency.

(b) Review of administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture and elimination of all unnecessary overhead, and especially the wages and overhead incident to the employment of nearly 100,000 Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen.

(c) Reduction of $100,000,000 in the appropriation for exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities program.

(d) That rates and premiums of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation be made actuarily sound in a manner to carry losses and that the Corporation be made self-supporting.

(e) Abolition of the farm-tenant program, with an annual administrative cost of $7,122,570 and authorization to borrow $50,000,000.

(f) Abolition of the Farm Security Administration, with $70,500,000 in direct appropriation and authority to borrow $120,000,000; its national-defense activities, to the extent that they are necessary, to be transferred to some more suitable agency.

(g) Deferment of rural-electrification expansion to the extent that it conflicts with national-defense priorities on materials.

6. Federal highway and public works

The committee recommends that during the emergency one-half of the Federal highway appropriations and authorizations be deferred, at a saving of $64,000,000.

The committee believes all appropriations and authorizations for all public works, including Federal dams, flood control, reclamation projects, and public buildings not directly essential to national defense, should be deferred until after the emergency.

Such appropriations and authorizations, including highway funds, total approximately $160,000,000. These items immediately should be reviewed carefully.

7 Reserves impounded

The committee recommends that all funds impounded by the Bureau of the Budget from previous appropriations and held in reserve now be covered back into the Treasury.

The committee recommends that legislation be enacted which would authorize the Director of the Budget to set up reserves out of any future appropriation, at such times and in such amounts as the Director may determine.

8. Government corporations

The Government, more and more, is relying upon the thirty-odd Federal corporations for financing both defense and nondefense operations. Most of the funds thus used, amounting to many billion dollars, are not subject now to the usual budgetary and audit control, nor does Congress have control over disbursement of funds through these corporations, except in blanket authorizations. Receipts derived from collections on loans made by these corporations return to their credit. They are subject only to control by the corporations themselves outside of any congressional jurisdiction.

These corporations already have authorization substantially to obligate the credit of the Government. These obligations constitute an indirect Federal debt to the extent that they are guaranteed by the Federal Government and that they are not met by the institutions themselves.

The committee recommends coordination of these corporate activities, legislation subjecting the corporations to budgetary and audit control, and that Congress assume tangible and direct control over their funds by means of its constitutional appropriating machinery.

The committee will deal with the disbursements of Government corporations and make more specific recommendations in subsequent reports.

TABULAR RECAPITULATION

If the specific recommendations by the committee are adopted, the appropriations for the next fiscal year will be less than in the current fiscal year by the following amounts:

	Savings
Civilian Conservation Corps (abolished)	$246,960,000
National Youth Administration (abolished) (nondefense)	91,767,000
Work Projects Administration (present appropriation $875,000,000 annually). Recommendation for quarterly appropriation, including defense activities for first 3 months of next fiscal year of $50,000,000 monthly and further reduction as employment improves due to defense expenditures should save at least for the year	$400,000,000
Agriculture:	
Deferment of land purchases	3,000,000
Savings in overhead expenses of Department as indicated	50,000,000
Reduction in appropriation for "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities"	100,000,000
Farm-tenant program (abolished) (cash)	7,122,000
Farm-tenant program (abolished) (loan authorization cancelation)	50,000,000
Farm Security Administration (abolished) (cash)	70,500,000
Farm Security Administration (abolished) (loan authorization cancelation)	120,000,000
Public works and Federal highway: One-third deferment in public roads	64,000,000
Other public works:	
Deferment of public buildings for nondefense	43,164,000
Deferment of Department of Interior items	26,727,000
Deferment of rivers and harbors and flood-control items	27,835,000
Cash savings	1,131,075,000
Cancelation of loan activities	170,000,000
Total	1,301,075,000

In addition, if funds impounded by the Director of the Budget were covered into the Treasury by legislative action, as this committee recommends, there would be immediate savings of $415,890,061.

These savings specifically recommended are partial in scope and leave a field of economies in which further substantial reductions will be recommended.

In the field for future investigation by this committee, where no recommendations are as yet made, are reductions in administrative costs of civil departments as referred to above and noted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his report to the Senate Finance Committee. The committee has lacked time for investigation into many other expenditures which are and will be under study.

The committee is deeply grateful, especially for the cooperation of Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the Secretary of the Treasury, and Hon. Harold D. Smith, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, as members of the committee, and for the expert information which they have made available to the committee. The committee is grateful also for the cooperation of the heads and officials of the various departments in the committee's deliberations.

This preliminary report is based upon the great amount of factual information, testimony, and other documentary evidence which will be incorporated from time to time, in additional forthcoming reports.

Harry F. Byrd, chairman, member, Senate Finance Committee; Robert L. Doughton, vice chairman, chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, subject to qualifications as stated in his letter, which is attached; Carter Glass, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Walter F. George, chairman, Senate Committee on Finance, see attached comment; Kenneth McKellar, Democratic ranking member, Senate Appropriations Committee; Clifton A. Woodrum, Democratic ranking member, House Appropriations Committee; Thomas H. Cullen, Democratic ranking member, House Ways and Means Committee; Allen H. Treadway, Republican ranking member, House Ways and Means Committee; John H. Taber, Republican ranking member, House Committee on Appropriations; Gerald P. Nye, ranking Republican member, Senate Committee on Appropriations. (Approves recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8, but makes exception to recommendation 5. See attached comment.)

Senator GEORGE's comment:

"In my opinion the defense activities of the National Youth Administration and educational activities relating strictly to defense activities in the Bureau of Education should be continued in the agencies respectively unless a substantial saving could be made by combining the two."

Senator NYE's exception:

"I take exception respecting recommendation No. 5, relating to reductions in the Department of Agriculture.

"While I am confident that large savings can be accomplished in that Department, I am not ready to recommend just where and in what amount the savings shall be undertaken, without chance for searching study of the subject of effect in each recommended reduction.

"We must keep agriculture strong and ready for the adjustment that must follow the war. When we let agriculture down during and after the last war, we contributed largely to the economic break-down which finally encompassed the whole country. We must not repeat that experience."

Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, participated actively in the preparation of the report, and was unexpectedly called home. The opportunity was not available to present the report to him for signature.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 22, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am willing to sign that report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, subject, however, to my disagreement with the recommendations under "Agriculture." I disagree with the recommendations with respect to "Agriculture," and in lieu of the recommendations contained in the committee's report I desire to suggest the following:

"When I appeared before the committee on November 14, I stated that expenditures included in the Budget under the farm program which was initiated in 1933, after the catastrophic fall in prices in 1932, were designed mainly to meet conditions involving low prices for farm products, surplus production, and loss of export markets. Present conditions are radically different from those which the farm program was designed to meet. It is estimated that in 1941 the farmer's share of the national income will be 20

percent greater than in 1932, notwithstanding a reduction of almost 10 percent in the proportion of the farm population to the total population of the country. Although governmental aid was necessary in order to bring the farmer's net income from three and one-quarter billion dollars in 1932 up to eight and one-half billion dollars or more in 1941, certainly, after having reached this goal, there does not appear to be any reason to continue spending at the same rate. The farmer is getting his share of the total expenditures made by the Government, as the increase in his net income indicates. In addition, there are substantial benefits that will accrue to the farmer from the lend-lease program.

"In view of all these circumstances, I feel at this time that we should make drastic cuts in our agricultural expenditures, and I would recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture be required to operate the agricultural program included in the Budget with an annual appropriation of $500,000,000 less than authorized for the current fiscal year.

"With respect to that part of the agricultural program carried on with funds borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, I would want the committee to make a more thorough investigation of these activities before I make any definite recommendation for reductions in the amounts available for this purpose.

"I also raise a question about the recommendation (par. 1 of item No. 7, 'Reserves impounded') to cover into the Treasury all reserves set up by the Bureau of the Budget. Reserves are set up primarily to meet unforeseen contingencies and to avoid deficiencies. Many times these reserves result in large savings. It seems to me that if a general recommendation of this kind is adopted, it would defeat the very purpose for which reserves are created."

Sincerely yours,

HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
Secretary of the Treasury.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1941.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: While I have cooperated with the committee by making available the facilities of the Bureau of the Budget, in view of my position as head of the Bureau and my official participation in the preparation of the President's forthcoming 1943 Budget to be submitted January 3, I obviously cannot join in a report which may contain recommendations at variance therewith.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. LA FOLLETTE

(Pursuant to sec 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941)

The sweeping recommendations of the majority of the committee are hasty and unwarranted. Although in presenting this dissenting report it is my purpose to deal only with some of the major items covered in the majority report, the brief hearings and scattering testimony, taken largely from secondary sources and carefully removed from public scrutiny by executive sessions and confidential hearings, do not justify, in my opinion, the conclusions reached by the committee.

Congressional approval of the recommendations would knock some of the major props of Federal support out from under our social structure in the lower income levels at a time when national unity and national strength require that high morale and potential abilities be maintained and strengthened among the unfortunate one-third of our population, which has just cause for dissatisfaction with an economic and social system that has treated them shabbily. The various recommendations make a "whipping boy" of minor abuses and deficiencies in established Federal social programs which have proved their worth and need, while absolving or overlooking the major abuses and costly maladministration and much larger sums involved in the defense and war expenditures.

WAR EXPENDITURES NO ANSWER

War expenditures are no answer to the problems of public assistance. The direct and indirect benefits of this flow of Government money are meager and remote to many classes of people in many areas of the country. No matter how great, war expenditures can in nowise substitute for or alleviate the need of the bulk of present public assistance. To assume otherwise, as does the majority of the committee, is simply to deprive needy, worthy citizens of aid and to depreciate our present inadequate standards of public assistance.

Why war expenditures are no effective relief can easily be seen. In the first place, defense contracts have been awarded in a very distorted pattern in comparison with normal industrial activity. It is estimated that 12 States hold 71 percent of the value of all contracts; that 20 industrial areas have 59 percent. A few months ago it was shown that 56 corporations had 74 percent of the total value. In the second place, certain groups simply cannot share in defense employment for obvious reasons of unemployability, lack of requisite training, social or economic ties which prevent migration to job openings, or, even physical incapability or poor health which might very well be the result of present inadequate public assistance.

It is inconceivable that a government which is sorely pressed now for capable men and women in military and civilian capacities should exercise such short-sighted judgment as to eliminate or drastically cut those very activities which are rehabilitating and augmenting our potential manpower, by various means of public assistance.

INADEQUATE EVIDENCE

The recommendations for drastic curtailment of the social programs now administered by the National Youth Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, and Work Projects Administration were made on the basis of about 10 hours of hearings, less than 50,000 words of testimony on this complex problem of public policy. More than 14 times as much testimony was taken by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees in making their recommendations for the current fiscal year. Similarly, the proposed changes in the agricultural program are based on less than 25,000 words of hearings. In complete contrast, the House Appropriations Committee alone took about 1,200,000 words of testimony on the 1942 agricultural appropriation bill.

The proposed reductions are wholly disproportionate to the respective values of the various Government services. It appears that they are based more on considerations of what can be most easily curtailed or eliminated rather than considerations of relative value of the services or simple fairness to all parts of the population. The underprivileged youth, the faltering or incapacitated or inefficient worker, the farmer, and others who have never had a chance to get started on the right road to help themselves because of lack of initial capital or initial training—all these, who have been receiving some, though meager, aid from the Federal Government would be deprived of their chance to help make this country strong. It is sheer folly to build up the military defenses and at the same time neglect the problems of hunger and privation of millions of our Nation.

FUTURE NEEDS

Equally important to remember is the fact that post-war needs will require, more than ever before, well-perfected machinery to cope with post-war social and economic problems. To wreck the machinery now only to have to rebuild it from the ground up later may in the end be more costly than any immediate saving.

The Budget Bureau's initial report to the committee (which was prefaced with the warning "it is apparent that many of the indicated downward revisions would seriously impair the defense effort and other vital governmental activities" and with the explanation "it must be emphasized that the reductions discussed are in no sense a product of the normal budgetary process of request, review, and recommendation") suggested various allocations for hypothetical savings of $1,000,000,000, one and one-half billion, and two billion. It is significant to note that even under the most severe curtailment program to which consideration was given by the Bureau, the Bureau did not recommend curtailments as severe as those now proposed by the committee for certain items.

For example, if the Budget Bureau were forced to achieve a billion-dollar reduction under the 1942 Budget (which apparently would be inadvisable in its own opinion), it would reduce the National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps by $185,000,000. Yet this committee proposes to make a slash of almost double that amount and wipe out the whole so-called nondefense program. Under the same conditions, the Bureau of the Budget would cut the farm-security program by $33,000,000. This committee recommends $77,000,000—an unreasonable elimination of rural rehabilitation functions which have consistently met with the approval of Congress.

The greatest foe of democracy, the greatest threat to our domestic strength—a vital and necessary second line to military defense—is poverty and underprivilege. The Farm Security Administration, the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the Work Projects Administration—each in its respective fields has waged war with some success against these antidemocratic forces. This is no time to discontinue a job that is so essential to the preservation of the Nation's human resources. We must not, in our sincere efforts to economize on nonessentials, blind ourselves to the dangers of losing what we cannot afford to lose.

RURAL POVERTY AND DISTRESS

Look at the facts, first, as to rural poverty and distress: It is estimated that in 1940—only last year—about one-fourth of all farm families, or 1,500,000 of them, made $400 or less from their farms, including the value of farm-produced products for home consumption. This is $2 or less per person per week. Another 1,000,000 farm families made less than $750 a year, a weekly income of $3 or less per person.

Naturally, improved farm prices have helped many of them increase their incomes. But a vast proportion of the Nation's low-income farm families actually produce a very small portion of the Nation's commercial farm output. They do not have the resources. They are out of the running.

Even in 1929 the lower half of American farmers produced for only 10 percent of the market for all commercially traded farm products; the other 90 percent of the market was supplied by the upper half of the farmers. In 1935 about a majority of our farms included less than one-sixth of the Nation's farm land. These small farmers do not profit

much from better farm prices. They are chronically disadvantaged.

About one-third of the Nation's farm families do not have access to a land resource (either directly as operators or individually as laborers) sufficient to support a decent living. Moreover, the trend toward diminishing resources for these people has been unmistakable.

These are indisputable facts. Their meaning to this Nation in time of all-out war is obvious. We cannot afford to abandon our efforts to try to cope with rural poverty.

One of the most serious results of poverty is poor health. Thousands of our farm families need better food, but they cannot get it without help. Thousands need medical care, but they cannot afford it.

Poor health on the farm means loss of the Nation's manpower. Most people know that about one-third of all Army volunteers are rejected for physical disability. It is also important to remember that a larger proportion of enlistments have come from rural areas. These areas have contributed more than their share to the Nation's ill health.

Americans must not overlook, either, that it is in the rural areas that the Nation's highest birth rates exist. A greater and greater portion of this democracy's future population is coming from the farm. And it is an established fact that the highest birth rates are in the poorest rural areas—the areas whose problems are being tackled by the Farm Security Administration today. This attack cannot be relaxed if we are to guarantee a strong democracy tomorrow.

It is true, of course, that there is some movement out of these areas. The tragedy of this migration, however, is twofold. In the first place, the people who move out carry with them the effects of their years of poverty and privation in disease, low morale, and backwardness. They become a net liability to the Nation even after they move. In the second place, the out-migration is not fast enough. The areas of the most acute farm problems are areas in which the population continues to grow, even in face of accelerated economic activity in towns and cities. There is no full employment in submarginal rural America.

In addition to the chronic forces, there have been adversities of a catastrophic nature that would have wrecked thousands of farmers if it had not been for assistance by the Federal Government through the Farm Security Administration. Droughts, floods, and similar disasters have hit great numbers of farmers within the past decade. In each instance they have been able to turn to the Government for aid through a machinery that exists in the Farm Security Administration.

WHAT THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION HAS DONE

No other agency in our Government has a more impressive record of helpful service to the people of this Nation than the Farm Security Administration. This agency has tackled the problems of rural poverty at the roots, where the strength of democracy lies.

In the past 6 years the Farm Security Administration has made rehabilitation loans to more than 900,000 low-income farm families to enable them to buy necessary operating goods, better use their resources, and add to their productive capital. It has taught them how to produce their own food in sufficient quantities for good health. It has shown them how to farm so as to save the land and increase their production. It has taught them skills and new methods of farm and home management.

As a result of these rehabilitation loans, which are but one of the phases of the Farm Security Administration program, these low-income families have increased their annual net incomes by a total of more than $75,000,000, or 35 percent, over the year before coming on the program. In addition, they have increased their net worth—the total value of their belongings and productive equipment, over and above all debts, including their loans from the Government—by nearly $80,000,000, or 21 percent.

At the heart of this great record has been the families' own efforts to produce their own food and feed. These families, in 1940, increased the value of the goods produced for farm and home use by more than 60 percent over the year before coming on the program. In their stock pile of healthful food during 1940 was an average of 391 gallons of milk per family, 266 quarts of fruits and vegetables canned, and 391 pounds of meat preserved.

Moreover, these families increased the land resources at their disposal and added to their stock of tools and equipment and livestock with which permanent rehabilitation is made possible.

The Farm Security Administration has also helped more than 22,000 tenant-farm families to become owners as a result of the tenant purchase program. The tenant purchase program has brought the American dream of farm and home ownership to families that otherwise would not have been able to achieve it.

With tenant purchase loans these families have bought family type farms capable of providing them with a decent living. Costs are spread over a 40-year period. A recent report shows that this Government activity has the remarkable record of repayments of 96.5 percent of principal and interest due as of June 30, 1941.

One of the truly remarkable features of the Farm Security Administration program is the smallness of its cost. It has been estimated that the cost of rehabilitating a disadvantaged farm family on the Farm Security Administration program is less than $75 a year. This figure includes the expenses of teaching the families new and better farming methods, helping them get better leases, losses on all loans advanced to them for livestock and equipment, grants made for direct subsistence purposes, and total administrative expenses.

This figure is all the more remarkable when compared with the expense of maintaining a farm family on work relief. This would amount to at least $800 a year, and the family would be little better off after the year's end. Rehabilitation provides for long-run security.

In this connection, an appraisal of Secretary Morgenthau is appropriate. In a statement to the committee under date of November 14, 1941, he said:

"I should like it understood that in making the suggestion that this class of farm expenditures should be reexamined I do not refer to the bulk of activities undertaken by the Farm Security Administration, inasmuch as the need for much of their expenditures is, in my opinion, still urgent.

"Just as I suggested earlier that there should be no reduction of expenditures for the help of the undernourished, so I believe that there should be no reduction in our help of the sharecroppers and farm tenants who are in urgent and continuing need of economic rehabilitation."

PAST CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDE

The action of this committee in recommending the elimination of the activities of the Farm Security Administration stands in direct contradiction to the consistent and steadfast policy of the Senate and the Congress in extending aid to low-income farmers.

As early as June 24, 1935, the Senate passed S. 2367, which had for its purposes the promotion of more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, the correction of the economic instability resulting from some forms of farm tenancy, and the establishment of a rural rehabilitation program. In the following year the work of the Resettlement Administration, which had been set up by Executive order, was recognized in the Bankhead-Black Act of June 29, 1936.

On July 22, 1937, the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 552) was enacted to encourage and promote the ownership of farm homes, and authorized the making of rehabilitation loans to farm owners, farm tenants, farm laborers, and sharecroppers. This act created the Farm Security Administration, which took over the work of the old Resettlement Administration.

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was based largely on the recommendations of the President's Committee on Farm Tenancy which had made an exhaustive report on the problems of underprivileged farmers, with recommendations to Congress, in 1937. This committee was made up of a representative group of American leaders from all walks of life who were cognizant of and interested in the problems of rural people. The committee's report, recommended the need for a continuing Federal organization to aid in alleviating these problems.

Since the establishment of the Farm Security Administration, the Senate has passed legislation aimed at greatly expanding the activities of the Farm Security Administration in the promotion of farm ownership. On June 28, 1939, the so-called Austin amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was passed by the Senate providing that loans be made not only to enable small tenant farmers to acquire farms and make necessary repairs and improvements, but also to enable them to refinance existing mortgages on farms.

On July 6, 1939, the Senate passed S. 1836, the so-called Lee bill, providing for Government-insured loans to farmers, the encouragement of sale of farms held by absentee owners to farm tenants, and the making of long-term, low-interest-rate loans on farms.

On July 10 of the same year Senator BARKLEY introduced S. 2758, providing for the construction and financing of self-liquidating Government projects, including a total of $500,000,000 for loans to enable farm tenants to become owners.

Throughout the years the Senate and the Congress have given interest and support to the program. The committee's present recommendation is an about-face.

FEDERAL AID TO YOUTH

Another major category of Federal assistance to the underprivileged is the aid for needy youth, administered by the National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps. The majority of the committee has seen fit to recommend that the aids be discontinued and the programs and organizations be abolished except so-called defense activities that are to be continued under the supervision of "some suitable agency."

The recommendation is based on a dangerously false conception of defense activities and upon a mistaken belief that the war situation permits the Federal Government to shirk obligations which it could not afford to neglect in peacetime. If it is necessary to preserve the morale of youth when the Nation is not in danger, it is doubly important when the national security is at stake. What is more, these agencies can and have prepared the youth of the Nation to fill more capably their places in the civilian and military establishments of the country.

The elimination of those activities which are not included in the narrow definition of defense training would have a serious effect upon the morale of thousands of young people and their families.

For example, school-lunch projects operated by such agencies as the Work Projects Administration and National Youth Administration are helping over 3,000,000 children in poor

families with highly beneficial results in health and morale. Many other National Youth Administration activities, such as public health and hospital work, assistance in nursery schools for children whose mothers must work, and similar activities, are positive contributions—much more than is generally realized—to the morale and well-being of the people who must produce the munitions and materials of war. To eliminate these functions would be a step in the wrong direction.

The Nation's hospitals and public-health services, overburdened in peacetime, are now of unique importance to keep workers on the production line. Twelve thousand young people are receiving experience and training in hospital and health work through the National Youth Administration program, and many thousands more are needed to meet the increasing need for health and hospital services, as well as to replace the people in these occupations who are going to the military services and overseas.

With more married women working, and the consequent problems that are arising in the communities of war industries, the need for adequate care of children of working mothers is increasing rather than decreasing. The States and cities have never undertaken to provide in any adequate way for the day care of preschool children, and the facilities of private agencies are already overburdened. If we are to take advantage in our war industries of the skills of mothers, we must provide at least minimum facilities to care for their small children while they are at work.

Both the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, by giving inexperienced youth the opportunity for work experience and preemployment training, are providing our war industries with a supply of qualified workers that would not otherwise be made available. During the 11-month period January through November 1941, nearly 400,000 youth were enabled to leave National Youth Administration projects to take private employment. The Civilian Conservation Corps, similarly, is at present supplying private industry with 8,000 to 10,000 young men monthly—young men who have learned the rudiments of work training and experience and whom employers praise highly. Those who have or will become a part of our armed or naval forces are better material because of their training in the National Youth Administration or Civilian Conservation Corps. General Marshall is authority for the interesting statement that one-fourth of all the cooks in the Army are former Civilian Conservation Corps cooks, where a large share of them received their initial training. This record is concrete evidence that industry and government want and need workers with National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps work experience.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION STUDENT-WORK PROGRAMS

The recommendations made by the majority of this committee include elimination of the National Youth Administration student-work program. This is a recommendation for the scrapping of a program that has helped over a million low-income families and that is now affecting nearly 400,000 such families. Through this program, education has been made more effectively free to families that cannot afford to maintain their children in school. Needy students, selected by local school officials, are now given part-time work so they can earn sufficient wages to remain in school and continue their education. Payments average about $4.50 a month in high schools and $12.50 in colleges. The average annual income of the families of these students, in the academic year 1939–40, was less than $650, with 20.9 percent earning less than $300 and 67.4 percent having annual incomes of less than $900.

The Federal Government has not developed a single program that reaches and assists so many families and individuals at so low a cost per person benefited. The $23,100,000 that was originally appropriated for this program during the current fiscal year would have reached over 500,000 low-income families through the students that would be employed. Over 90 percent of the schools in the country, 1,600 colleges and 27,000 high schools, are participating in the program. Each one of these schools and colleges will be vitally affected by any decision to eliminate the National Youth Administration student-work program, and the effect on the morale and physical well-being of the students and their families will be anything but favorable.

DEFENSE TRAINING

Placing these defense-training activities under some different agency (as the majority of the committee recommends) would not increase the training facilities of the country. Nor would it eliminate any so-called duplication between the training programs of the several agencies engaged in training. The fact is that the National Youth Administration training program and the training programs operated under the Office of Education supplement and strengthen each other, rather than overlap. The National Youth Administration program reaches youth who have left school and are between the ages of 17 and 24. The training they are given on National Youth Administration projects is of a preemployment production type that gives them actual experience in the use of tools and machinery, and builds the skills basic to good workmanship. The vocational schools are concentrating their efforts upon upgrading and refresher training, to enable persons with previous work experience to acquire additional and to polish up rusty skills. Schools are also providing classroom instruction of a preemployment character to supplement the work experience the youth obtains on the National Youth Administration project. Thus, the youth on the projects learn by doing a job and by receiving related training in the schools. He has the benefit of both practical work experience and classroom instruction. This combination represents the flexible and practical type of training that industry needs. The function of each type of training, on-the-job training, and classroom instruction, is clearly defined and there is no duplication of effort.

If the National Youth Administration training activities are placed under some other agency, the same type of activities would have to be carried out or the whole training program would suffer. The schools, however, which are already overburdened by their present load, would have to assume the additional administrative and supervisory functions involved in the National Youth Administration program, additional functions that they are not able to undertake. It would be detrimental to the best interests of the school system to saddle them with this additional burden.

The present geographical distribution of the vocational-school facilities of the country also furnishes reasons for rejecting the recommendations of the majority of this committee. Vocational schools are expensive to establish and maintain, and in spite of Federal aid in the past, vocational-school facilities tend to be located in the urban and wealthier sections of the country. Ten States have over 70 percent of the full-time vocational-school facilities in this country. There exist large sections of the country, particularly in the South and the Midwest, where vocational-school facilities are relatively scarce, and, what is equally important, where there are large numbers of youth who cannot afford to attend the schools that are available. It is in these sections, where few contracts for war material have been let, that the need for a program that provides the training and wages available on National Youth Administration projects is as vital now as it ever was.

The National Youth Administration has established a highly developed training mechanism that reaches into all sections of the country, rural as well as urban. Before its recent drastic reduction, National Youth Administration projects were operating in all but 250 of the counties of the United States. Together with the school facilities, the National Youth Administration provides a training system that taps the pools of unused labor supply and makes them available for work in war industries. By giving these youth a chance to acquire preemployment training, and then guiding them, through the State employment offices, to areas where their services are needed by war industries, disorganized mass migrations of workers are reduced, thus helping eliminate the chaotic problems of bad housing and overcrowded conditions that already characterize too many defense areas.

OTHER BENEFITS OF THE YOUTH PROGRAMS

The benefits of the various Government youth programs can be measured, not only in benefits accruing to the youth but also in tangible physical accomplishments of benefit to the Nation as a whole. The Civilian Conservation Corps, for example, has planted two and one-half billion trees that will be worth $260,000,000 in commercial timber 25 years from now if we maintain fire protection. Soil-erosion control has been effected for 25,000,000 acres of land, with more than 5,000,000 dams to check the rush of water and mud. The value of National, State, and local parks and forests has been immeasurably enhanced. Lodges, bridges, cabins, and dams involving sturdy difficult construction work have become notable additions to public vacation lands, and have provided first-class experience in the basic elements of carpentry, stone masonry, concrete work, and many other occupations so essential now to national defense.

WORK-RELIEF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The committee recommends a substantial reduction in general public assistance in the form of work relief. Unfortunately, the present high levels of employment and production have given the erroneous impression that Federal work relief is now unnecessary. The complete facts tell an entirely different story. According to best available estimates, unemployment in October approximated 4,000,000 persons. Only 1 out of 4 was on the Work Projects Administration program, and at least twice as many were eligible on the basis of present standards.

Because of technological advance and a steady growth of the labor market, the number of unemployed now is vastly in excess of that in comparable periods of high production. Although depending upon which of several widely different estimates are used, it appears likely that the present level of unemployment is at least three or four times as great as 1929.

An ominous factor in the present situation is the portending priorities unemployment arising out of raw-material shortages. Various careful studies have indicated from one and one-half to three million workers will be displaced during the transition from civilian to defense production. Now that more recent events have indicated an accelerated diversion of raw materials from civilian industries, it appears these former estimates are understatements.

Except for unemployment compensation, which will cushion only a part of the impact, because many workers are eligible for little or no compensation, there is no Federal program which can take care of these people until and if they receive defense employment, other than Work Projects Administration.

As for the outlook for defense employment, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the awarding of defense contracts has been very spotty in geographic distribution. As stated previously, 12 States hold about 71 percent of all the defense contracts; 20 industrial areas with only 26 percent of total Work Projects Administration employment hold 59 percent of the defense contracts. The present indications are that of job openings in the next year 93 percent will be concentrated in 21 States; 50 percent will be in 6 States.

The relative unemployability of many persons is another factor. Advancing age, particularly, may be a severe handicap in reorientation and learning a new job. It is highly significant that the average age of those persons working for the Work Projects Administration is now about 43, as compared with an average age of 37 a few years ago.

That the States and localities are unable to carry this load is best attested by the data on general relief which show that recipients are receiving niggardly payments. Furthermore, local public-welfare resources are being seriously affected in some areas by Federal purchases of large tracts of land or the building of Federal production plants that are not taxable by State and local governments, although greatly increased local costs are incurred by the influx of defense workers. In short, the national emergency has aggravated a situation that was already serious.

Still another factor bearing on the situation is the increased cost of living. Whereas other groups in the population can tighten their belts a notch when confronted with rising prices, increased taxes, and the like, those living on Work Projects Administration wages cannot reduce their standard of living without impairing health and physical well-being. Hence it is only proper that Work Projects Administration wages must in some degree follow increases in cost of living (such adjustments have already been made) but with each increase of that nature, the aggregate fund must be increased to take care of any given number of recipients.

Finally, it must not be overlooked that Work Projects Administration activities to a large extent are directly tied in with national defense. More than one-third of the total number on the rolls, about 350,000 persons, are engaged in various defense projects: In connection with military posts; airports; sewer and water systems for military cantonments; construction of strategic roads, sidewalks, and communication lines; and even reclaiming of land for military uses. Were it not for the extensive airport and airway work of the Work Projects Administration in past years, aviation in the United States would not have progressed as it has.

SURPLUS MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

The majority of the committee has recommended a cut of $100,000,000 in the funds for the various programs of the Surplus Marketing Administration—or a reduction of almost 45 percent in the total funds available this year from customs receipts and direct appropriations ($98,000,000 and $125,000,000, respectively), for the food-stamp plan, cotton-stamp plan, school-lunch program, and direct distribution of surplus commodities to needy people. The recommendation is made on the theory that Government food purchases under the lend-lease program obviate the need for continuation of the domestic programs at present levels.

It is true that lend-lease buying has bolstered prices of certain farm products (it can even be said that some prices and some production have been raised and distorted too much for the ultimate good of the producer) but this in itself is no justification for scuttling the domestic program.

The Surplus Marketing Administration program is predicated on two basic considerations: (1) To provide stable and adequate markets for farm produce, and (2) to supply nutritive, health-giving foods, and cotton clothing, to millions of undernourished and underclothed fellow citizens. Lend-lease buying helps to accomplish the former, but it does nothing to help our own urban populations suffering from lack of food or clothing. Nor is lend-lease buying based on the principle of taking surpluses off the market; it is based primarily on foreign needs and only secondarily to the disposal of surpluses.

In this respect, lend-lease buying actually intensifies the need for greater assistance in the procurement of an adequate diet for our low-income groups, because purchases which are not surplus purchases have the effect of increasing prices beyond the range of low-income groups.

In effect, therefore, lend-lease buying has not solved the market problems which equivalent dollars of regular Surplus Marketing Administration funds would do. Numerous commodities are still in need of market support. On the other hand, new public dietary problems have arisen as a direct consequence of lend-lease buying.

Malnutrition in America: The malnutrition prevalent in America is a shocking and inexcusable situation. Studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and of the Public Health Service show that alarming dietary deficiencies exist among a large proportion of relief clients and low-income families. The Surplus Marketing Administration program, with its food-consumption subsidies, has made a notable advance toward better national nutrition and better national health. It is incongruous that a program which admittedly has such an intimate relationship with the health and production efficiency of the individual worker should be curtailed at a time when maximum production and efficiency is essential to the war effort.

In factual terms, this is the excellent record of the Surplus Marketing Administration insofar as national nutrition is concerned.

Stamp plan: The food-stamp program now reaches about 4,000,000 persons of nearly 11,000,000 persons receiving public assistance. It is now operating in 395 areas, which cover approximately 1,200 counties. The program now covers nearly 60 percent of the population, but in terms of the physical area of the United States about 45 percent. Of the 1,800 counties not now under the program, requests have been received from approximately 1,000 counties. Expenditures are now made at the rate of about $9,500,000 per month for blue stamps—the stamps which are given free at the rate of one to two to certified public assistance persons buying orange stamps.

If placed on a national basis, it is estimated that the food-stamp program would now cost about $220,000,000 a year. The most optimistic estimates of the reduction of the number of public assistance people in case of full employment are that we would still have about seven or eight million persons receiving public assistance, including the blind, the crippled, the aged, orphans, and other groups.

School lunches and direct purchase: Financed also out of present funds is the school-lunch program. Approximately 4,500,000 school lunches are now being served daily, relying largely upon food purchases made by the Surplus Marketing Administration. The total number of school children in the country is 27,000,000 plus. More than 9,000,000 are estimated to have unmet nutritional needs, many of them of a very serious type. This program is now on the increase with the goal for this winter set at 6,500,000 children. It represents an expenditure of about $25,000,000.

Purchase for the direct distribution of surplus foods for the last fiscal year totaled about $67,000,000. The rate of purchase this year is lower. But demand is increasing, particularly in (1) flood-stricken farm areas of east Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas; (2) areas where the defense program has produced little employment; (3) areas where the defense program is already resulting, and is likely to result further, in substantial disemployment, due to the nature of local industry, priorities, strategic material shortages, etc.

It is important to maintain the framework of this type of machinery because direct distribution is one of the simplest ways to supply foodstuffs for the destitute, to quickly eliminate market gluts, and to meet serious post-war situations arising out of reduced national income, increased unemployment and lower farm prices.

Relief-milk distribution: Still another activity is relief-milk distribution. Reduced-milk-price programs now are carried on at an expenditure rate of about $12,000,000 a year. This framework, both on surplus disposal and nutritional grounds, needs to be expanded. It is needed to carry off excess milk which may result from the production-goal program and this outlet is needed in connection with price support assurances given in connection with cheese, evaporated milk, and dry skim milk. On nutritional grounds Federal policy probably should be geared to some assured minimum milk allowance in this country for every growing child, nursing or pregnant mother, etc.

The Surplus Marketing Administration and the farmer: The other coordinate activity of the Surplus Marketing Administration relates to the farmer and agricultural marketing. As previously mentioned, some of the pressure of the problem of surplus commodities has been relieved by lend-lease purchases. Yet, the problem is not squarely met because lend-lease needs do not necessarily coincide with our surpluses nor are they timed nor flexible enough to meet sudden shifts in market supply.

These new factors are injected into the picture: The Government has made commitments to the farmers to obtain certain production increases. Necessarily, this involves great risks to the farmer because increasing or decreasing farm production is not an exact, but a hazardous process. It is not unlikely that production goals will be overshot for individual commodities in individual areas at certain times. There are many commodities where production in quantitative terms cannot be forecast because of the weather and other factors. For instance, it is possible to increase many vegetable crops by as much as 30 or 40 percent. Also, it is desirable to meet unusual market situations such as are constantly arising.

The Government has a moral commitment to support prices of the commodities which it has encouraged farmers to produce in greater quantity. The program of the Surplus Marketing Administration is a flexible framework for support in any contingency. Having machinery and funds available which can promptly move price depressing surpluses is of extreme importance because of the large number and variety of products produced on American farms. The impact of demand and price is not equal for all.

CONCLUSION

To me, the conclusion is inescapable that almost the full impact of the recommendations of the majority of the committee would, if enacted, fall almost entirely on the very lowest income groups among our population. This action would be unwise in time of peace; confronted with total war which may be of long duration, I regard it as a grave error in policy.

High morale—in fact, the very essence of dynamic democracy—is dependent upon a whole nation enjoying at least a minimum of the necessaries and comforts of life. All the social legislation of the past decades, all of the

trends toward greater public assistance for the underprivileged have had the wholesome effect of tending to make democracy a reality in America. To the extent that the programs have been successful they have given hope to millions that some day equality of opportunity may be achieved.

To cripple or destroy the efforts which have thus far been made in this direction will have an adverse effect upon morale at the very time when we should be redoubling our efforts to build it up. To accept the report of the majority of the committee will shake the confidence of millions of people that the sacrifices of war are to be equitably apportioned among all sections of the population .

The recommendations to economize at the expense of low-income families and the unemployed are in the face of widespread continuing need in large sections of our Nation. It is a well recognized fact that war-industry orders have for the most part been concentrated in a few areas. Nor do higher farm prices answer the problems of many of many of the people in these States. The fact is that in many States, especially the States of the South, many farmers' crops have been so meager that they are in a more desperate situation than has been true for the past several years.

Curtailment of nonessential industries has had the effect of putting many of our people out of work. The war boom has created a sort of prosperity in some sections of the Nation, but it has caused serious and ruinous dislocations in others. In towns and cities where there have been no war-industry controls, skilled workers have picked up their belongings and moved to centers having war contracts. As a result, new ghost towns are appearing overnight all over America.

In effect, the committee is recommending to take from the many who have not benefited from the war-industry effort the small aids which up to now have been provided. This will pile injury on top of injury. First we locate war contracts in a few States to the exclusion of the thousands of small firms and small communities. This drains off the key workers of the excluded areas and leaves them in weakened condition. We are asked to take from them such Government aids that remain. If they had need of Government aids before these new dislocations occurred, they have greater need of them now.

No one can disagree with the general objective of reducing waste and all nonessential expenditures of government. The crux of the matter is, "What is nonessential?" and "Where is the waste?" My own view is that the various social programs which the majority of the committee would eliminate are vital to the successful conduct of total war. The entire civil arm of the Government will spend in this fiscal year $6,600,000,000. Defense and war will cost at least $21,000,000,000. It is my contention that the majority report attempts to save at the spigot by drastic curtailment of essential aid to the underprivileged while the waste occurs at the bunghole of war and defense.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1994. An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries;

S. 2082. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards; and

S. 2086. An act to authorize the employment of nationals of the United States on any public work of the United States in the Territory of Hawaii.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced a bill (S. 2156) to assist in the control of inflation and to promote the national defense through the sale of defense stamps, saving certificates and bonds, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMERICA AT WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. THOMAS of Idaho asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The United States of America at War," delivered today by Senator TAFT before the Executives Club of Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to consider the calendar of executive nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, as in executive session, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul Edwards, of the District of Columbia, to be administrator for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

PROGRAM OF TODAY'S SESSION AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a few moments the Members of the House will come to the Senate Chamber in a body and other distinguished guests will be here to listen to the address to be delivered by the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain. After the House assembles in the Chamber, I shall suggest that the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives appoint a committee of three to escort our distinguished guest into the Chamber.

After that shall be accomplished I shall ask that the Senate stand in recess during the proceedings which are to follow, and that, at the conclusion of Mr. Churchill's address the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PRINTING PROCEEDINGS (S. DOC. NO. 153)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now ask, in advance, that the proceedings during the recess of the Senate and during the informal joint session, including the address of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, be published in the RECORD as a part of the Senate proceedings, and be made a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The order as agreed to was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the address of the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, delivered before the Senate of the United States on December 26, 1941, together with the proceedings incident thereto, be printed as a Senate document.

ADDRESS BY RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL, PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate being in recess,

The House of Representatives, preceded by the Clerk, South Trimble, and the Sergeant at Arms, Kenneth Romney, and headed by the Speaker pro tempore, Hon. WILLIAM P. COLE, Jr., of Maryland, entered the Chamber.

The Speaker pro tempore was escorted to the chair to the right of the Vice President, and the Members of the House of Representatives were escorted to the seats assigned to them.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Chamber and were escorted to the seats assigned to them.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, headed by the Marshal, Thomas E. Waggaman, and the Clerk, Charles E. Cropley, entered the Chamber, and were escorted to the seats assigned to them.

Chiefs of the diplomatic missions in Washington entered the Chamber, and were escorted to the seats assigned to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that on the part of the Senate the Vice President appoint a committee of three, and that the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives appoint a similar committee, to escort our distinguished guest into the Senate Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair

appoints on the part of the Senate, as the committee to escort the Prime Minister of Great Britain into the Chamber, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the Prime Minister into the Chamber, Mr. BOEHNE, of Indiana; Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas; and Mr. MICHENER, of Michigan.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes, p. m., Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, escorted by the committees of the two Houses, and accompanied by his personal assistant, Commander C. R. Thompson, R. N.; J. M. Martin, Esq., private secretary; Sir Charles Wilson, president of the Royal College of Physicians of London, England; and Capt. F. D. W. Brown, private secretary, entered the Chamber, and was escorted to a seat on the rostrum in front of the Vice President and the Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate and guests of the Senate, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. CHURCHILL. Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, I feel greatly honored that you should have invited me to enter the United States Senate Chamber and address the representatives of both branches of Congress.

The fact that my American forebears have for so many generations played their part in the life of the United States, and that here I am, an Englishman, welcomed in your midst, makes this experience one of the most moving and thrilling in my life, which is already long and has not been entirely uneventful. [Laughter.]

I wish indeed that my mother, whose memory I cherish across the vale of years, could have been here to see. By the way, I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been American and my mother British, instead of the other way round, I might have got here on my own. [Laughter and applause.] In that case, this would not have been the first time you would have heard my voice. In that case, I should not have needed any invitation; but, if I had, it is hardly likely that it would have been unanimous. [Laughter.] So perhaps things are better as they are.

I may confess, however, that I do not feel quite like a fish out of water in a legislative assembly where English is spoken. I am a child of the House of Commons. I was brought up in my father's house to believe in democracy. "Trust the people"—that was his message. I used to see him cheered at meetings and in the streets by crowds of workingmen away back in those aristocratic Victorian days when, as Disraeli said, the world was for the few, and for the very few. Therefore I have been in full harmony all my life with the tides which have flowed on both sides of the Atlantic against privilege and monopoly and have steered confidently toward the Gettysburg ideal of "government of the people, by the people, for the people." [Applause.]

I owe my advancement entirely to the House of Commons, whose servant I am. In my country, as in yours, public men are proud to be the servants of the state, and would be ashamed to be its masters. On any day, if they thought the people wanted it, the House of Commons could by a simple vote remove me from my office. But I am not worrying about it at all. [Laughter.] As a matter of fact, I am sure they will approve very highly of my journey here—for which I obtained the King's permission—in order to meet the President of the United States [applause] and to arrange with him for all that mapping out of our military plans, and for all those intimate meetings of the high officers of the armed services of both countries which are indispensable to the successful prosecution of the war.

I should like to say, first of all, how much I have been impressed and encouraged by the breadth of view and sense of proportion which I have found in all quarters over here to which I have had access. Anyone who did not understand the size and solidarity of the foundations of the United States might easily have expected to find an excited, disturbed, self-centered atmosphere, with all minds fixed upon the novel, startling, and painful episodes of sudden war as they hit America. After all, the United States has been attacked and set upon by three most powerfully armed dictator states, the greatest military power in Europe, and the greatest military power in Asia. Japan, Germany, and Italy have all declared and are making war upon you, and a quarrel is opened which can only end in their overthrow or yours. But here in Washington, in these memorable days, I have found an Olympian fortitude which, far from being based upon complacency, is only the mask of an inflexible purpose and the proof of a sure and well-grounded confidence in the final outcome. [Applause.] We in Britain had the same feeling in our darkest days. We, too, were sure that in the end all would be well.

You do not, I am certain, underrate the severity of the ordeal to which you and we have still to be subjected. The forces ranged against us are enormous; they are bitter; they are ruthless. The wicked men and their factions who have launched their peoples on the path of war and conquest know that they will be called to terrible account if they can not beat down by force of arms the peoples they have assailed. They will stop at nothing. They have a vast accumulation of war weapons of all kinds; they have highly-trained and disciplined armies, navies, and air services; they have plans and designs which have long been contrived and matured; they will stop at nothing that violence or treachery can suggest.

It is quite true that on our side our resources in manpower and in materials are far greater than theirs; but only a portion of your resources are as yet mobilized and developed, and we have both of us much to learn in the cruel art of war. We have, therefore, without doubt, a time of tribulation before us. In this time some ground will be lost which it will be hard and costly to regain. Many disappointments and unpleasant surprises await us. Many of them will afflict us before the full marshalling of our latent and total power can be accomplished.

For the best part of 20 years the youth of Britain and America have been taught that war was evil, which is true, and that it would never come again, which has been proved false.

For the best part of 20 years the youth of Germany, Japan, and Italy have been taught that aggressive war is the noblest duty of the citizen, and that it should be begun as soon as the necessary weapons and organization have been made. We have performed the duties and tasks of peace. They have plotted and planned for war. This naturally has placed us in Britain, and now places you in the United States, at a disadvantage which only time, courage, and straining, untiring exertions can correct.

We have, indeed, to be thankful that so much time has been granted to us. If Germany had tried to invade the British Isles after the French collapse in June 1940, and if Japan had declared war on the British Empire and the United States at about the same date, no one can say what disasters and agonies might not have been our lot. But now, at the end of December 1941, our transformation from easygoing peace to total-war efficiency has made very great progress. The broad flow of munitions in Great Britain has already begun. Immense strides have been made in the conversion of American industry to military purposes, and now that the United States is at war, it is possible for orders to be given every day which a year or 18 months hence will produce results in war power beyond anything which has yet been seen or foreseen in the dictator states. Provided that every effort is made, that nothing is kept back, that the whole manpower, brainpower, virility, valour, and civic virtue of the English-speaking world, with all its galaxy of loyal, friendly, or associated communities and states, are bent unremittingly to the simple but supreme task, I think it would be reasonable to hope that the end of 1942 will see us quite definitely in a better position than we are now [applause], and that the year 1943 will enable us to assume the initiative upon an ample scale. [Applause.]

Some people may be startled or momentarily depressed when, like your President, I speak of a long and a hard war. Our peoples would rather know the truth, sombre though it be; and, after all, when we are doing the noblest work in the world, not only defending our hearths and homes but the cause of freedom in every land, the question of whether deliverance comes in 1942, or 1943, or 1944, falls into its proper place in the grand proportions of human history. [Applause.] Sure I am that this day, now, we are the masters of our fate; that the task which has been set for us is not above our strength, and that its pangs and toils are not beyond our endurance. As long

as we have faith in our cause and unconquerable will power, salvation will not be denied us. In the words of the Psalmist:

He shall not be afraid of evil tidings: his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord.

Not all the tidings will be evil. On the contrary, mighty strokes of war have already been dealt against the enemy. The glorious defense of their native soil by the Russian Armies and people have inflicted wounds upon the Nazi tyranny and system which have bitten deep, and will fester and inflame not only in the Nazi body but in the Nazi mind. [Applause.]

The boastful Mussolini [laughter] has crumpled already. He is now but a lackey and serf, the merest utensil of his master's will. [Laughter and applause.] He has inflicted great suffering and wrong upon his own industrious people. He has been stripped of all his African empire. Abyssinia has been liberated. Our armies of the east, which were so weak and ill equipped at the moment of French desertion, now control all the regions from Teheran to Benghazi, and from Aleppo to Cyprus and the sources of the Nile. [Applause.]

For many months we devoted ourselves to preparing to take the offensive in Libya. The very considerable battle which has been proceeding for the last 6 weeks in the desert has been most fiercely fought on both sides. Owing to the difficulties of supply on the desert flank we were never able to bring numerically equal forces to bear upon the enemy. Therefore we had to rely upon a superiority in the numbers and quality of tanks and aircraft, British and American. Aided by these, for the first time we have fought the enemy with equal weapons. For the first time we have made the Hun feel the sharp edge of those tools with which he has enslaved Europe. The armed force of the enemy in Cyrenaica amounted to 150,000 men, of whom about a third were Germans. General Auchinleck set out to destroy totally that armed force; and I have every reason to believe that his aim will be fully accomplished. [Applause.]

I am so glad to be able to place before you, Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, at this moment when you are entering the war, proof that, with proper weapons and proper organization, we are able to beat the life out of the savage Nazi. [Applause.] What Hitler is suffering in Libya is only a sample and a foretaste of what we must give him and his accomplices wherever this war shall lead us, in every quarter of the globe.

There are good tidings also from blue water. The life line of supplies which joins our two nations across the ocean, without which all might fail, is flowing steadily and freely, in spite of all the enemy can do. It is a fact that the British Empire, which many thought 18 months ago was broken and ruined, is now incomparably stronger and is growing stronger with every month. [Applause.]

Lastly, if you will forgive me for saying it, to me the best tiding of all, the United States—united as never before—has drawn the sword for Freedom, and cast away the scabbard. [Applause.]

All these tremendous facts have led the subjugated peoples of Europe to lift up their heads again in hope. They have put aside forever the shameful temptation of resigning themselves to the conqueror's will. Hope has returned to the hearts of scores of millions of men and women, and with that hope there burns the flame of anger against the brutal, corrupt invader, and still more fiercely burn the fires of hatred and contempt for the filthy Quislings whom he has suborned. In a dozen famous ancient states, now prostrate under the Nazi yoke, the masses of the people, all classes and creeds, await the hour of liberation, when they, too, will be able once again to play their part and strike their blows like men. That hour will strike, and its solemn peal will proclaim that the night is passed and that the dawn has come.

The onslaught upon us, so long and so secretly planned by Japan, has presented both our countries with grevious problems for which we could not be fully prepared. If people ask me, as they have a right to ask me in England, "Why is it that you have not got ample equipment of modern aircraft and army weapons of all kinds in Malaya and in the East Indies" I can only point to the victories General Auchinleck has gained in the Libyan campaign. Had we diverted and dispersed our gradually growing resources between Libya and Malaya, we should have been found wanting in both theatres. If the United States has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that it is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles and for the Libyan campaign, and, above all, because of your help in the battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends, and which has in consequence been successfully and prosperously maintained.

Of course, it would have been much better, I freely admit, if we had had enough resources of all kinds to be at full strength at all threatened points; but, considering how slowly and reluctantly we brought ourselves to large-scale preparations, and how long such preparations take, we had no right to expect to be in such a fortunate position. The choice of how to dispose of our hitherto limited resources had to be made by Britain in time of war, and by the United States in time of peace; and I believe that history will pronounce that upon the whole—and it is upon the whole that these matters must be judged—the choice made was right.

Now that we are together, now that we are linked in a righteous comradeship of arms, now that our two considerable nations, each in perfect unity, have joined all their life energies in a common resolve, a new scene opens upon which a steady light will glow and brighten.

Many people have been astonished that Japan should, in a single day, have plunged into war against the United States and the British Empire. We all wonder why, if this dark design, with all its labourious and intricate preparations, had been so long filling their secret minds, they did not choose our moment of weakness 18 months ago. Viewed quite dispassionately, in spite of the losses we have suffered and the further punishment we shall have to take, it certainly appears to be an irrational act. It is, of course, only prudent to assume that they have made very careful calculation and think they see their way through. Nevertheless, there may be another explanation.

We know that for many years past the policy of Japan has been dominated by secret societies of subaltern and junior officers of the Army and Navy who have enforced their will upon successive Japanese cabinets and parliaments by the assassination of any Japanese statesman who opposed or who did not sufficiently further their aggressive policy. It may be that these societies, dazzled and dizzy with their own schemes of aggression and the prospect of early victories, have forced their country, against its better judgment, into war. They have certainly embarked upon a very considerable undertaking [laughter]; for, after the outrages they have committed upon us at Pearl Harbor, in the Pacific islands, in the Philippines, in Malaya, and the Dutch East Indies, they must now know that the stakes for which they have decided to play are mortal. When we consider the resources of the United States and the British Empire, compared to those of Japan, when we remember those of China, which has so long and valiantly withstood invasion [great applause], and when also we observe the Russian menace which hangs over Japan, it becomes still more difficult to reconcile Japanese action with prudence, or even with sanity. What kind of people do they think we are? Is it possible they do not realize that we shall never cease to persevere against them until they have been taught a lesson which they and the world will never forget? [Prolonged applause.]

Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, I turn for one moment more from the turmoil and convulsions of the present to the broader spaces of the future.

Here we are together, facing a group of mighty foes who seek our ruin. Here we are together, defending all that to freemen is dear. Twice in a single generation the catastrophe of world war has fallen upon us; twice in our lifetimes has the long arm of Fate reached out across the oceans to bring the United States into the forefront of the battle. If we had kept together after the last war; if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us. [Applause.] Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind, to make sure that these catastrophes do not engulf us for the third time?

It has been proved that pestilences may break out in the Old World which carry their destructive ravages into the New World, from which, once they are afoot, the New World cannot by any means escape. Duty and prudence alike command, first, that the germ centres of hatred and revenge should be constantly and vigilantly surveyed and treated in good time; and, secondly, that an adequate organization should be set up to make sure that the pestilence can be

controlled at its earliest beginnings before it spreads and rages throughout the entire earth. [Applause.]

Five or six years ago it would have been easy, without shedding a drop of blood, for the United States and Great Britain to have insisted on fulfillment of the disarmament clauses of the treaties which Germany signed after the Great War. That also would have been the opportunity for assuring to Germans those raw materials which we declared in the Atlantic Charter should not be denied to any nation, victor or vanquished.

Prodigious hammer strokes have been needed to bring us together today; or, if you will allow me to use other language, I will say that he must, indeed, have a blind soul who cannot see that some great purpose and design is being worked out here below, of which we have the honcur to be the faithful servants.

It is not given to us to peer into the mysteries of the future; still I avow my hope and faith, sure and inviolate, that in days to come the British and American peoples will for their own safety and for the good of all, walk together side by side in majesty, in justice, and in peace.

[Prolonged applause, the Members of the Senate and their guests rising.]

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

At the conclusion of Mr. Churchill's address, the distinguished guests having retired from the Chamber, the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, stood in adjournment until Tuesday, December 30, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 26, 1941:

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

David J. Winton, of Minnesota, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named ensigns (temporary) to be lieutenants (junior grade) (temporary) in the United States Coast Guard to rank from date of oath:

John R. Shuman
Robert E Reed-Hill
Norman L. Oleson
Preston L. Taulbee

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be brigadier general

Col. Henry L. Larsen to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 22d day of December 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 26, 1941:

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Paul Edwards, to be Work Projects administrator for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, effective January 1, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Anna R. Ellis, Norwood.
Elizabeth B. Phinney, Pocasset.

NEW JERSEY

Ethel Light, South Vineland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore Mr. COLE of Maryland.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the folowing prayer:

Almighty God, under the canopy of Thy greatness and goodness, we gather in faith and humility to compose and gird ourselves for the duties and responsibilities of this day. Above us and around us there are dangers, but Thou art nearer than all dangers, and in the assurance of Thy presence we are unafraid.

We pray that Thou wilt give Thy protecting care to all the homes of our beloved country. May Thy sustaining power be with the brave men who are defending us so valiantly on land and sea and in the air. Preserve them even in the midst of danger and save them in every time of trial and temptation.

Grant that these may be days of unclouded vision for our President, for our Speaker, and the Congress as they courageously consecrate themselves in Christlike service for all who are in need. Fill our souls with a passionate longing for that glorious day when this and all wars shall end and men and nations shall give their allegiance to the Prince of Peace, who rules not with the rod of iron but with the scepter of justice, righteousness, and love.

In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 23, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2119. An act to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. DAVIS and Mr. GUFFEY of Pennsylvania as members on the part of the Senate of the Commission to Investigate the Ways and Means for Improving Economic Conditions in the Anthracite Coal Producing Regions of the United States, pursuant to Public Law No. 355, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 19, 1941.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it stand adjourned until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time today the Chair may declare the House to be in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement. On Wednesday last the majority leader of the Senate informed the Chair that he had, in the name of the Senate, extended an invitation to the Right Honorable Mr. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, to attend the session of the Senate today at 12:30 o'clock p. m. and address them. Senator BARKLEY, on behalf of the Senate, asked me to extend to the Members of the House an invitation to be present in the Senate Chamber today at that time to hear the Prime Minister. Owing to the shortness of the time, it was found impossible to make any formal arrangements. The Chair has informally accepted for the House the invitation of Senator BARKLEY, and those Members of the House who wish to hear the Prime Minister will form in line in the middle aisle, after the present occupant of the chair and the majority and minority leaders, and proceed to the Senate Chamber. The Chair also announces that, due to the smallness of the Senate Chamber and lack of facilities, only present Members of the House will be permitted to enter the Senate Chamber. Therefore the Chair requests Members of the House to refrain from taking children or any other persons with them.

The Chair now declares the House to be in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House reconvened at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m., pursuant to the recess.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REMAIN IN WASHINGTON

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we friends of the Rural Electrification Administration are very much disturbed over the order to move its headquarters out of Washington. We hope that order will be rescinded, and that the R. E. A. will be kept here where it is needed and where it belongs.

There are many other bureaus that could be moved if necessary, but the Rural Electrification Administration which has done so much for the farmers of the Nation, and with which almost every Member of the House and the Senate has to make contact practically every day, should be kept within reach of this Capital. If it were removed to some far-distant section of the country, the expense of the telephone communications

alone would be enormous. That alone would greatly handicap the service, to say the least, of it.

In addition, it is well established in a building well suited for it. As I said, if we are going to move any of the bureaus of the Government away from Washington, we should move some that are not so vitally important to the everyday life of all those millions of American farmers we represent, and who are depending upon the Rural Electrification Administration for this service for their homes and their communities.

If we are going to move anything out of Washington, let it be some of those private establishments that are now crowding the District. Remember this District was created for the Government and its agencies, and not for selfish, private interests.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Is it not true that various Representatives have farming communities in which we are endeavoring to have the rural electrification extended, which makes it necessary to personally consult with the heads of that bureau, in order that the problems may be solved speedily and rapidly?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Absolutely! We have more than 6,000,000 farms in America. We have been struggling for the last 8 years to electrify those farms. We have reached only one-third of them. This rural electrification program which is self-sustaining and self-liquidating, is moving as rapidly as possible and doing the work for which the American farmers have been praying for a quarter of a century.

I hope every Member of the House and Senate will join me in the request that the Rural Electrification Administration be left in Washington where it belongs and where it will be convenient to the Members of both Houses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and such other unanimous-consent requests as may be submitted, I be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—PATENT OFFICE TRANSFER

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] upon his very able presentation of this problem which confronts us, if it is necessary for Government agencies to be moved out of Washington. What have we got a capital for, if essential Government departments are not to be located there? For instance, let us take the Patent Office. No one has asked me to say anything about it, but, speaking as a lawyer and in the interests of attorneys and inventors all over this country, I want to say that it would be a tragedy if the United States Patent Office were to be moved away from Washington, where tradition has kept it, where it has been built up, and where the patent attorneys are located.

I sincerely hope that whoever is advising the administrative heads of this Government as to moving bureaus, will give more thought to it, and not commit errors that already have been committed, and I trust that the order will be rescinded.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, following the thoughts expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], I feel I should report to the Members who are present this afternoon that the District Committees of the House and Senate have attempted to gather testimony, listen to counsel, and seek advice on the subject of the shifting of governmental agencies and bureaus which are now in Washington to other parts of the country.

You will remember that the Presidential order, through the Budget Bureau, fell quickly, and there had been no discussion, as far as I know, by Government officials with the members of the respective Committees on the District of Columbia in the Congress of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If you remove the Rural Electrification Administration or the Veterans' Administration or the Patent Office to some other place, the telephone expenses will be enormous, to say nothing of the delays and inconveniences.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That was brought out during the hearings which we conducted on Monday for 3 or 4 hours. The chairmen of the respective District Committees have requested an audience with the President on the subject of removal of agencies from Washington to other parts of the country. We have voluminous material to present. I believe it is a subject which deserves the very closest attention of the Members of Congress because this is the seat of government. I trust we will make no mistake in shifting from the District of Columbia those permanent agencies which have been fabricated into our National Capital over a long period of time. The Patent Office appears to be one of these. There are perhaps others involved.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address I made at the dedication of one of the Army chapels at Indiantown Gap, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend at this point in the RECORD some observations I personally made on my recent visit to war-torn England.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WORK WINS WARS—EVERYBODY WORKS IN ENGLAND

Mr. SNYDER. On November 14, 1941, I left LaGuardia Field, New York, by clipper for England. I was accompanied by Col. Arthur Wilson from the Chief of Staff's office, who is always a hard-working, close-observing fact finder for our armed forces.

The trip from New York to Lisbon, Portugal, by Pan American clipper was routine except the stop made in Bermuda, where the United States now has the largest air base in any of our possessions. This base is vital on the Atlantic as is Hawaii on the Pacific.

Lisbon is a beautiful city of 1,000,000 people. In reality, the Germans control all of Portugal now. We think Hitler can take it over by telephone when he chooses. Lisbon is the hub of the European world, filled with spies, who knew my every move while there.

From Portugal we flew to England, some 1,400 miles, out over the ocean, in an old Douglas landplane. We were met at the airdrome by our United States Ambassador, John Winant, and Lord Beaverbrook.

The pilot of this plane said that on Saturday evening, May 9, 1940, he was downtown in Rotterdam, Holland, a city of over one-half million. He said the conversation on every corner was, "What will Hitler do next? Czechoslovakia and Poland were crushed." Nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand Hollanders agreed that Hitler would not disturb them, as the Holland people had always been peace-loving and never had put anything in Hitler's way.

This pilot and another was at the Rotterdam Airport before the break of day the next morning, Sunday, May 10, to do some test flying. Their engines were warmed up. It was now daybreak. They heard the hum of motors. They looked to the east. Here was coming wave after wave of German bombers. In a minute they were low over the airfield. In another minute all the airfield was in ruins or on fire, except one corner where a few planes were standing. This pilot took off in one of them and landed in England, only to learn that his parents, his wife and children, and tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children of Rotterdam were killed and wounded that morning in less than 3 hours and the city ruined and plundered.

Yes, my friends, the German bombs and the "fifth-column" traitors of Rot-

terdam had in a few hours not only killed and wounded these thousands and thousands of peace-loving God-fearing people, but the iron heel of Hitler has kept the rest of the Holland people in slavery ever since that May day in 1940.

Yes, our Negro slavery was heaven compared to the slavery that Hitler puts on the people of the nations he has conquered. These people are saying in their hearts—"remember Rotterdam."

On my second day, I was accompanied by Ambassador Winant to the chambers of Mr. Morrison—English Secretary of War—where we had a 2-hour conversation. That afternoon they showed me some 20 of the bombed sections of London, such as: Trafalgar Square, Parliament Center, Piccadilly Circle, Buckingham Palace, and the like. The destruction was much worse than I thought it could be. Thousands of homes, stores, churches, and buildings of all kinds are literally leveled to the ground by bombs and fires.

I then visited for the next few days, within a radius of 150 miles of London, airplane factories, tank factories, machine-tool factories, and factories of all kinds. The factories run shifts working 24 hours a day. Hundreds of thousands of women are in the factories doing their bit and on many occasions doing it better than the men.

In England you see the real black-out at nights. No lights except a little blue-amber light on the bottom of your fender or a similar hand flashlight for your personal movements.

The courage, the working spirit of these people, is most unbelievable. The factories are distributed all over England in small units and they make their way to these factories in a change of shifts in the dark. For instance, at 3 in the morning, one shift makes their way to these factories in that dark, foggy, gloomy environment and the retiring shift trudges home—5, 10, 20, 30 miles—but never a whimper about it.

Yes, I went to Dover. As a boy and school principal and teacher, I read and heard much about the chalk cliffs of Dover. They are now a British catacomb of defense. The city of Dover has been blasted to shambles. It is just 22 miles across to France and Dunkerque. The Germans frequently try out their big guns across the channel to Dover. A bright spot, however, is that the British have put big, powerful guns on the chalk cliffs and if the Germans try to invade, another story will be written about English bravery and the slaughter of the blood-thirsty Nazis.

I talked with Admiral Ramsey, the man who directed the evacuation of Dunkerque—the man who directed the boats and ships that brought back alive from Dunkerque across the 20- or 25-mile English Channel, some 325,000 brave soldiers. But some 125,000 of their buddies died on the shores of Dunkerque holding back the Germans so that these 325,000 might escape back to Dover.

Sherman's definition of war—"war is hell"—was too mild for the German slaughter at Dunkerque, when you heard Admiral Ramsey tell the story.

I attended Parliament which is much like our own United States Congress. I spent an hour or more in conversation with the Chief of Staff, General Dills—corresponding with our own Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall—a high-powered gentleman who knows his job.

I visited Coventry, a city of some 200,000 population, about 80 miles from London, on Sunday morning. Coventry, as you know, was leveled to the ground by German bombers at daybreak on a beautiful October Sunday morning in 1940. More than 20,000 buildings were damaged and more than 5,000 were totally destroyed.

I was escorted to the Lord Mayor's chambers—in America we call it the city hall—there I was received by them raising the American flag. It was inspiring but not as inspiring as when the Lord Mayor took me about two squares from his chambers to what was left of St. Michael's Cathedral. This large cathedral was built in the twelfth century. It covered what we would call a square. German bombs had crushed the church walls to the ground, but the Supreme Commander of all the armies of the world directed the bombs away from the tall 308-foot tower, something like the Washington Monument. There that church tower stands today, pointing to the heavens in defiance of Hitler's way of life.

I talked to the workers in all walks of life—mills, factories, stores, mines—everywhere they worked and toiled, old and young, rich and poor.

Yes, the rich and well-to-do are giving their all. So is labor. The Honorable Clement Attlee, member of Parliament and spokesman for labor, went in the same plane with me from Bermuda to England and labor knows that if Hitler wins, there will be no labor unions, no collective bargaining, no wage-and-hour scale. It will be slave wages as in Poland.

Before leaving, Prime Minister Churchill invited me to conversation for 20 minutes to get my impressions of England's all-out war efforts and ask about our own progress in national-defense efforts.

The national feeling which is embedded in the very hearts and souls of the people of the British Empire is reflected in Mr. Churchill's every word and act. He literally breathes the will of the people, as does President Roosevelt in our all-out war effort in our United States.

He took me by the arm and we stepped outside under that famous street number—No. 10 Downing Street, London. He asked that a picture be taken, then wished me Godspeed home to the United States with the message that with God's help the democracies of the world will survive. I arrived home 2 days before "Pearl Harbor." Yes, we will all remember Pearl Harbor.

REAR ADMIRAL SAMUEL M. ROBINSON

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great Texan, Rear Admiral Samuel M. Robinson, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Navy Department.

The entire shipbuilding program of the Navy is in his capable hands. During this emergency, to date, over $15,000,000,000 have been placed at his disposal in cash and contract authorization to build ships and ships' ordnance. That sum is far in excess of any amount entrusted to any other man in Government service, excepting the President.

Admiral Robinson is wisely and judiciously spending this huge sum. But, of greater importance, he is producing ships. In addition to our huge fleet now afloat, he will set afloat before the end of 1943 a complete battle fleet composed of 6 battleships, 5 aircraft carriers, 20 cruisers, 100 destroyers, and 50 submarines. Each of these vessels is being completed from 3 to 6 months ahead of schedule. For this outstanding work, which requires the greatest of engineering skill, long hours of planning, months and years of tedious construction work, and eagle-eye supervision all through the process, Texans join with all other Americans in paying tribute to Admiral Robinson. History will record that he is one of America's greatest defenders.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LOCATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in considering the problem of moving these agencies from Washington I trust the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and others who are working on it will study the bill I have introduced to create a Capital Clearance Commission instructed to report to the Congress on the better use of land acreage within the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say that at the hearing to which I referred earlier it was brought out that there were some 5,000 acres within the District of Columbia that could be readily used for the construction of buildings.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and I believe the gentleman will find that most of that acreage is cited in this bill.

The bill would set up a committee composed of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, and the Chairman of the National Capital Parks and Planning Commission.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from South Dakota that that is what the District of Colum-

bia was created for—so that the Government and Government agencies, especially those agencies with which it is necessary for Members of the Senate and House to get into contact every day, should be located here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert three brief articles. One is an article on the Philippines and the war by Maj. O. W. Coursey, of Mitchell, S. Dak., who served in the Philippines during the Spanish-American War; another is a suggestion regarding tax levies in the next revenue measure; and the third is a brief article on a very remarkable Sioux Indian woman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial from Mr. Walter Lippmann relating to the visit to this country of the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution by the Illinois State Senate relating to racial discrimination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE RIGHT HONORABLE WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this body has just joined with the Senate in the Senate Chamber to listen to the excellent and constructive address of the Prime Minister of England. An expression of the feeling of this body regarding the address ought to be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Since we have come back and reassembled together on the House side, we may deliberate on the strength of his address, the power of his message, the plausibility of the things he had to say, and the attention and certainly the cooperative spirit with which the House and the Senate entered into the speech of the Prime Minister of England.

It bodes well for the peoples of the world, and when he spoke of the people arrayed against the totalitarian powers, the dictator powers, it seemed an unconscious reference to fellowship that naturally obtains at this time among democratic peoples that must be felt, and unquestionably is felt between the defenders of democracy all over the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] about the Rural Electrification Administration, because I am one of those who are sympathetic with that development. We have in my State at the present time a number of partially developed R. E. A. projects, some with electric-light posts but no wires, some with partially erected wires, and so forth. I take this time simply to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who has done such a grand work in leading our fight in this connection, whether he can advise us as to the present status of priorities so far as completion of these projects is concerned.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I say to the gentleman that at no time have we requested materials that are necessary for national defense, but on copper that is not necessary for national defense we feel the Rural Electrification Administration should have first priority. Recently an order has been issued to permit us to have 1,500 tons a month, which is not all we need, but with increased production that will come about through stimulation of production, we feel sure that we will soon have enough copper to supply all the demand. Enough additional copper can be produced in a half-dozen Western States to make up the amount the Rural Electrification Administration might need by probably 20 times. This movement is increasing the demand for copper and is stimulating the producers of copper to such an extent that we hope this shortage will soon disappear and that we will have all the copper we need for rural electrification.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and agree with him wholeheartedly when he says we do not want to rob national-defense projects of whatever they may need, but certainly we should try to supply these R. E. A. projects and complete the development of those now under construction as rapidly as possible.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That is what we hope to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a news editorial; and, second, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 7 minutes.

THE UNNECESSARY COSTS OF WAR

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 6 or 7 years ago, the public generally, as well as Members of Congress, believed the Federal Government was stepping into high gear in spending the taxpayers' money. As the national-defense program gets under way, it is becoming clear that back in those other days we "had not seen anything yet."

Hardly a week now goes by that the program of defense spending pace is not revised upward. Our national-defense program is only 1½ years old. Already we have appropriated or given contractural authority for sums approaching $70,000,000,000, and we are warned that additional billions will be asked for this purpose within a few weeks.

It is high time that the American people realized just what all this spending means in the way of increased taxes. It is well for all of us to remember that the only source of revenue the Government has, the only source from which it can get money, is the American people themselves. Every dollar the Government appropriates for any purpose whatsoever, be it for the normal expenses of government, emergency expenses entailed in properly arming our own forces, or for the purpose of arming the forces of Great Britain, China, Russia, or such other nations as we have already helped or that we will help under the provisions of the Lease-Lend Act, must eventually come out of the pockets of the people themselves.

Most of the money now being spent is borrowed. The Government has pledged the credit of our people in order to secure this money. Interest must be paid for its use. That interest must be paid each year until the debt itself has been discharged. These debts, until they have been paid in full, constitute a mortgage upon the holdings as well as the earning power of every person living in this country. This means that the already high taxes must necessarily be increased again and again, until the burden of tax in this country will become much greater than any of us have ever before dreamed was possible.

A national debt of $200,000,000,000 or more is now mentioned as a possible limit. As a matter of fact, it now appears the grand total of expenditures will go far beyond any possible estimate which could be made at this time. Anyone who mentions the fact that pay day must come is termed "defeatist," "unpatriotic," and, by some, "fifth columnist."

The tragic fact is that too many of the poor folks, the wage earners and the farmers, believe they are going to escape most of the taxes which will be necessary to meet these obligations. I again call attention to the hidden taxes, taxes included in the price of everything we buy, the concealed taxes, which are already taking a toll of 27 cents out of every dollar we spend. As additional taxes are placed upon our people, we may expect that this 27 cents may well grow until more than 50 cents, and per-

haps even 60 cents, of every dollar will go to pay these concealed taxes. Let us not forget that a dollar spent for taxes cannot be used for food, clothing, and so forth.

We are at war. It will be a long, bloody, bitterly fought, and highly expensive war. Because of our failure to provide the equipment and supplies for a large American Army and Navy, because we failed to pile up stocks of strategic materials with which to meet a greatly expanded program of national defense, we now find ourselves in a position where tens of thousands of heretofore prosperous small manufacturing plants are denied the materials which will permit them to continue to employ several million of our people. These must either find work in other channels or they must go on relief and thereby add to the necessary spending of the public funds. The manufacturers, when their plants close and their incomes cease, are completely removed from the tax-paying class, which automatically throws a greater burden of taxation upon all others.

History repeats itself. Already we find evidence of highly exorbitant profits in the national-defense industries. Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan, has disclosed the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in the cost of constructing cantonments alone. In our haste to spend money for the things we so desperately need, we are giving altogether too little thought as to how this money is being spent. It is high time that the Congress and the administration realized that a country is only as strong in war as is its ability to finance a war. It may easily occur that the money we now so carelessly and uselessly spend may prove to be the determining factor as to the outcome of the war itself in which we are engaged. Always the public moneys should be most carefully disbursed. This is highly important in peacetime. It is vital, if we are to win the war in which we are now engaged.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2119. An act to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did, on Saturday, December 20, 1941, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5558. An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951;

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6215. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability for military service and for the registration of the manpower of the Nation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6251. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of insulin, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday;

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; and

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 30, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1191. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1192. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 27, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a reexamination of Cape Fear River above Wilmington, N. C., with a view to ascertaining what damages have been caused to drainage districts bordering the said river, and whether any remedial works are advisable, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 8, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1193. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting preliminary report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States, pursuant to section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941, together with minority views; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6288. A bill providing that personal correspondence of members of the armed forces of the United States on active duty be transmitted in the mails free of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 6289. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey for flood control, run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on the Bayamón and Hondo Rivers in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Flood Control.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Resolution No. 8, dated December 23, 1941, relative to legislation for the purpose of furthering national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PAGÁN introduced a bill (H. R. 6290) for the relief of Pedro Sagazeta, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2217. Mr. ROLPH presented a resolution of the executive committees of the Peace Officers' Association of the State of California, the District Attorneys' Association of California, and the Sheriffs' Association of California, for Congress to adopt House bill 5727 or Senate bill 1936, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1941

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of Hosts, who of Thy divine providence hast made and preserved us a Nation: Vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to continue Thy almighty and gracious guidance and protection of our Country in the fiery trial of war. Endue with the spirit of wisdom and courage those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government. Strengthen and protect our defenders by land, by sea, and by air, and suffer no dishonor to stain our arms, that, with clean hands and pure hearts, we may go forward in Thy might.

Bless those who labor in field and factory, in office and home, for our Country's welfare. Unify us with a quickened sense of responsibility to our Nation and a deepened loyalty to Thee. And let Thy tender mercy, O Lord, be upon all who suffer violence at the hand of man; succor the wounded, receive the dying, and comfort the bereaved.

We ask not that Thou wilt keep us safe, but that Thou wilt keep us loyal. And grant us grace always to live in such a state that we may never be afraid to die; so that, living and dying, we may be Thine, through the merits and satisfaction of Thy Son, Christ Jesus, in whose name we offer these our imperfect prayers. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1941.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President Pro Tempore.

Thereupon Mr. GEORGE took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 26, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 26, 1941:

S. 1544. An act to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway;

S. 2096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 588. An act to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and for other purposes;

S. 2082. An act extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, to State directors of selective service and members of alien enemy hearing boards; and

S. 2087. An act to extend the time for examination of monthly accounts covering expenditures by disbursing officers of the United States Marine Corps.

On December 29, 1941:

S. 793. An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT—PEANUTS (H. DOC. NO. 470)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

In view of the urgency of the need for extending the period for Federal administration of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the desirability of giving assurances at this time to producers of basic agricultural commodities regarding continuation of the 85-percent-of-parity loans, I have approved S. 588. I believe, however, that in connection with the incorporation, while the bill was in conference, of the provision making 85-percent-of-parity loans applicable to peanuts, appropriate consideration was not given to the comparability of the parity price of peanuts with the parity prices of other commodities. I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that since the 1909–14 period, which, according to existing legislation, must be used as the base period in computing parity prices for peanuts, there have been substantial changes in the production and consumption of peanuts. The result is that the parity price for peanuts, computed in accordance with existing legislation, is not comparable with the parity prices for other commodities, and this bill makes mandatory loan rates on peanuts which are excessive in relation to the loan rates on other commodities.

I recommend that this problem receive appropriate consideration by the Congress prior to the effective date of the loan on the 1942 crop of peanuts and that existing legislation be modified so as to permit the determination of parity prices for peanuts which are comparable with parity prices for other commodities.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 29, 1941.*

AWARDS OF ARMY CONTRACTS—EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Mrs. Dorothy Miller, of Cape Girardeau, Mo., praying for unity and cooperation in the Nation for the successful prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions and letters in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of the State of North Dakota, praying that the contest or proceeding involving the right of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. LANGER) to a seat in the Senate be dismissed; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of Alice Lightner, of New York City, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require the registration of members of the Communist Party of America as agents of a foreign power; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the City Council of Baltimore, Md., pledging support and loyalty to the Government in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND PREVENTION OF VICE IN THE VICINITY OF MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS FROM VERMONT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I present for the RECORD and appropriate disposition several petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Vermont in support of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments.

The petitions come principally from Newfane, Townshend, Chester, and Randolph, all in the State of Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions presented by the Senator from Vermont will be received and lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATED PENNSYLVANIA CONSTRUCTORS—SUPPORT OF THE WAR

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, one of the most active organizations of which I know is Associated Pennsylvania Constructors. Under the leadership of such organizations as this, Pennsylvania produced its great turnpike from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh, the model of modern road building. These forward-looking men are the brain and brawn and heart of an alert citizenship, representing the strength and enduring power of our Commonwealth. They have dedicated themselves to the cause of national defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from Mr. A. E. O'Brien, executive secretary, Associated Pennsylvania Constructors, together with a resolution adopted at their annual convention December 10, 1941.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution presented by Mr. DAVIS were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATED PENNSYLVANIA CONSTRUCTORS,
Harrisburg, Pa., December 22, 1941.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the direction of the board of directors of the Associated Pennsylvania Constructors I am forwarding you a copy of a resolution passed at our recent convention in Harrisburg.

Respectfully yours,
ASSOCIATED PENNSYLVANIA CONSTRUCTORS,
A. E. O'BRIEN, *Executive Secretary.*

Whereas the territory of the United States has been treacherously attacked by the Imperial Japanese Government; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has decreed that a state of war exists between this Nation and that of Japan; and

Whereas the Associated Pennsylvania Constructors are today assembled in annual convention in the city of Harrisburg: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association pledge its united support and that of each of its members to aid the Government of the United States and the government of this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by giving complete assistance in every manner possible to the duly constituted authorities of the said governments to the end that the light of liberty and freedom will continue to burn in those lands in which it has been threatened by the armed aggression of unscrupulous force and regimentation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the end that they may be appraised of the loyalty of each member of this association to our flag and our Nation, and that they may call upon us, collectively or individually, to perform any tasks for which they deem us peculiarly fitted.

Passed this 10th day of December A. D. 1941.

RESOLUTIONS AND TELEGRAM FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present two resolutions and a telegram in the nature of petitions to Congress, and ask that they be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions

and telegram will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

MONROE, WIS., *December 22, 1941.*

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member of Congress, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of this association held December 9, 1941, the membership voted unanimously to adopt the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That we endorse the program of the United Dairy Committee and urge Congress to pass legislation which prohibits the interstate shipment and sale of oleomargarine, which contains any dairy product, which is yellow in color, taste, and appearance; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge the strengthening of the statutory authority of the Federal Trade Commission to proceed against the manufacturers of oleomargarine or their representatives in respect to unfair and deceptive statements or pictures in their advertising of these products, with particular emphasis on the use of yellow color in advertisements and use of descriptive dairy terms;

"Resolved, That this association insists that no price ceilings be placed on agricultural products unless comparable ceilings be placed on the prices of materials and the wages of labor involved in the production of equipment used by farmers;

"Resolved, That the association make every effort possible to get Swiss, limburger, and brick cheese included in the diet of American soldiers."

We sincerely hope that these resolutions will have your undivided support in measures which come before Congress.

With kindest regards and the season's greetings, we are

Yours very truly,

WISCONSIN SWISS AND LIMBURGER CHEESE PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
CHAS. E. STONE.

To the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas the jobs, working conditions, and wages of thousands of working men and women in the communications industry have been placed in jeopardy by the schemes of the owners of the industry for the creation of monopolies through mergers of the major wire, radio, and cable telegraph companies; and

Whereas these monopoly-merger plans are being engineered with complete disregard for the interests of the public, labor, and national defense; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission and other Government agencies have given sanction to these monopoly plans without having established that such plans would not be inimical to the interests of the public, labor, and national defense; and

Whereas the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, in a report issued on October 28, joined with the Federal Communications Commission and the companies by making recommendations which would open the door to mass lay-offs; and

Whereas there is grave danger that an attempt will be made to push permissive merger legislation through Congress without benefit of public hearings; and

Whereas the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in convention assembled, fully supported the fight of the American Communications Association for absolute protection of all present employees of the communications companies in any legislation which would permit mergers in the industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eau Claire Industrial Union Council, 2801 S. Slope Terrace, Eau Claire, Wis., join with the American Communications Association in demanding that the appropriate congressional committees afford labor an opportunity to present its viewpoint on any legislation which may be introduced affecting communications workers by calling public hearings on such proposed legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Wisconsin Congressmen and Senators, the Federal Communications Commission at Washington, D. C., and the American Communications Association, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

RACINE, WIS., *December 27, 1941.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Congress of the United States has appropriated $73,000,000,000 to be used for the purpose of properly arming our country. Allocation of these contracts has been left to the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. To date only approximately $13,000,000,000 of the sum appropriated has been allocated and of this 54 companies out of 138,000 eligible for defense work have received contracts amounting to 75 percent of this sum. The same conditions are reported to exist in expanding production of copper and aluminum and in other phases of the defense program. The defense committee of the District Council No. 8, U. A. W., C. I. O., embracing 16 affiliates with 12,000 members realizes that such inefficiency means loss of work and delay in arming our country. At a city-wide meeting of all officials, delegates, and defense-committee members it was unanimously voted to protest against such action and to urge that contracts be distributed among all possible companies so that all-out production may be obtained in places of defense unemployment.

HAROLD J. THOMPSON,
U. A. W., C. I. O., District Council No. 8.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REGULATION OF OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1945) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, operate, and regulate public off-street parking facilities, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 929) thereon.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—PREVENTION OF PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in the enforced absence of the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], I am asked by him to submit in his behalf the report of that committee on a Senate bill.

From the Committee on Privileges and Elections I report back, without amendment, the bill (S. 1968) to amend section 13 (c) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, so as to permit the sale of certain publications not published or sold for profit, and I submit a report (No. 930) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 26, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2119) to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2157. A bill for the relief of Henry Angeli; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 2158 (by request). A bill to issue and sell special postage stamps, the proceeds to be used for the building and construction of additional defense units for the United States Navy; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2159. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit the vestry of Rock Creek Parish to utilize for burial sites certain land within its present holdings in Rock Creek Cemetery; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2160. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of March 19, 1918, entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States" (40 Stat. 450); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

FREE MAILING OF CERTAIN MATTER BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for free transmission in the mails of certain mail matter sent by members of the military and naval forces of the United States, and ask for its appropriate reference. I also ask to have the bill printed in the RECORD, together with an Associated Press article setting forth statements supposed to have been made by Postmaster General Walker with respect to this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2161) to provide for free transmission in the mails of certain mail matter sent by members of the military and naval forces of the United States was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any mail matter admissible to the mails as ordinary mail matter which is sent by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States (including the United States Coast Guard), while on active duty or in the active military or naval service of the United States, to any person in the United States, including the territories and possessions thereof, shall be transmitted in the mails free of postage, subject to such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe.

The article referred to is as follows:

WALKER URGES FREE POSTAGE FOR UNITED STATES FORCES ON OUTPOST DUTY

WASHINGTON, December 25.—If Postmaster General Frank C. Walker has his way, members of the armed forces on duty outside of the continental United States will be able to mail letters free of postage.

He recommended Wednesday that Congress place such soldier letters on the free list. At the same time he announced that the Post Office Department would place in effect immediately reduced rates on air mail and parcel post to and from service men in United States outposts.

The domestic rate of 6 cents a half ounce for air mail will apply to matter carried to and from members of the armed forces outside the continental United States, and for fourth-class postal and parcel-post matter sent by air the post office will charge the do-

mestic fourth-class rates between the post office of mailing and the office where airplanes unload the mail.

DATES OF MEETING OF SECOND SESSION OF SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS AND FIRST SESSION OF SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 5, 1942, and the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 4, 1943.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the reason for the joint resolution is that under the amendment to the Constitution the second session of the present Congress would have to begin on Saturday, which will be the 3d of January. There is no point in Congress meeting on Saturday. Therefore I am asking that the joint resolution be passed fixing the beginning of the next session as of Monday; and, inasmuch as the following year the 3d of January falls on Sunday, the joint resolution seeks to take care of that situation also by providing that Congress shall meet on the Monday following.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the action on the joint resolution just passed, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the 2d day of January 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the present session would expire automatically at noon on Saturday. Neither House will be in session on that day, and therefore it is desirable that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday they adjourn sine die.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on July 3 I introduced a bill (S. 1712) to assure conservation of, and to permit the fullest utilization of, the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes, and had it referred to the Committee on Commerce. Subsequently a resolution was passed reviving the activities of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources. In my judgment, that committee has more intimate knowledge and can make a more perfect study of the subject than can the Committee on Commerce. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made.

CONGRESS IN WARTIME—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, our people are united as never before in the all-out effort to establish fundamental principles of fair play and economic stability throughout the world. We are taking our responsibilities seriously and gathering strength for the greatest military effort our Nation has ever been called upon to make. Nothing should unnecessarily be laid in restraint upon this tremendous move to win the war.

Congress has a larger measure of responsibility for its own activities now that the present emergency is upon us. We are determined not to be overcome by a sense of futility or to give way in the task which is always before us in keeping alive the effective representation of the people. Our Government continues to draw its strength from the rank and file of the 130,000,000 citizens of this great Republic. Without public support we cannot win this war. Congress has the task of building up public confidence in the united programs of Government necessary to victory. I am confident that Congress can and will do much in this way to win the war through constructive criticism and friendly suggestions. If sacrifices of personal nature are required of any of us, I am confident that we stand ready to lead the people in the spirit of sacrifice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Times, December 28, 1941, entitled "Congress in Wartime."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 28, 1941]

CONGRESS IN WARTIME

In time of war the ordinary relationship between the President and Congress is bound to undergo a profound change. Almost inevitably more power must go to the Executive, with correspondingly less power for the legislative branch. Decisions must be taken immediately; they cannot be subject to protracted discussion and debate. But while it is the duty of Congress to collaborate with the President to the utmost possible extent, it is certainly not desirable that it should abdicate. Few can doubt that the House of Commons has played an important part in making Britain's effort as effective and inspiring as it has become.

It must be admitted in all frankness, however, that if Congress continues to try to operate in its customary manner it is likely to lose both prestige and power to a much greater extent during the war period than otherwise. To the extent that Congress shows itself to be inefficient or irresponsible, the public will lose patience with its efforts to influence the course of events. And that is why, more seriously than ever before, Congress must consider the necessity for reforming itself—for reforming, above all, its internal organization.

The House today has 47 standing committees and the Senate 33. These "little legislatures," as President Wilson once called them, compete against each other for jurisdiction and power. The heads of these committees get their posts by seniority in congressional service and not by ability or because they represent the views of Congress as a whole on any subject. On the contrary, to take a single recent example, the Labor Committee of the House does not represent the views of the House on labor problems; the amendments to the Wagner Act passed by the last House and the Smith bill recently passed by the present House came from the Judiciary Committee.

A "disintegrate" body (to use President Wilson's phrase) of 531 members is obviously not fitted to cooperate effectively with the President in wartime. It cannot keep military secrets; it cannot frame a coherent set of policies or put them promptly into effect. But a small body consisting, say, of 5 or 6 men from each House, and selected by the membership as a whole to represent their views, could exercise in wartime at least a few of the functions that Congress as a whole exercises in peacetime and that a British Cabinet normally exercises. Such a body could be taken into the President's confidence. It could be a constant consultative body, far better equipped either to effectuate executive policies or to offer constructive criticism of them. It would necessarily have to be granted some of the powers today exercised by the fourscore "little legislatures" within Congress, while it need not assume any of the powers that Congress as a full body exercises today. Congress as a full body would still, as now, retain ultimate power to accept or reject whatever legislative measures were proposed by its centralizing committee.

If Congress is to maintain both prestige and consultative effectiveness in the present total war, it must impose upon itself some such internal reform.

A UNITED NATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "A United Nation," delivered by him in the Washington Evening Star Forum on December 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOODROW WILSON'S VISION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Woodrow Wilson's Vision," delivered by Senator GUFFEY on December 28, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENTRALIZATION OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram addressed by the President of the United States

to the Governors of the respective States on December 19, 1941, relative to the centralization of employment services, and also a statement by Herschel C. Atkinson, administrator of Ohio bureau of unemployment compensation, which appear in the Appendix.]

DIRECTOR OF SUPPLY—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wanted: A Director of Supply—Buying Agent Needed To Get Arms Production Now," written by Alfred Friendly, and published in the Washington Post of December 26, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DAY OF WRATH—ADDRESS BY HENRY R. LUCE

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from Life for December 22, 1941, entitled "The Day of Wrath," by Henry R. Luce, editor of Life and Time, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AND RECEIVING MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Presiding Officer may be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate may be authorized to receive any messages from the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF NOMINATIONS UNACTED UPON AT END OF SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, which I ask to have read and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

As in executive session,

Ordered, That paragraph 6 of rule 38 of the standing rules of the Senate, relating to proceedings on nominations, be, and it is hereby, suspended with respect to nominations unacted upon during the present session, and their status quo shall not be affected by the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the reason for the order is that there are pending before committees a few nominations upon which action cannot be taken between now and Friday. It is desired that these nominations shall remain in status quo, so that they may be taken up at the next session without the necessity of having them resubmitted to the Senate. Two of them are judiciary nominations, pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, and there are one or two others.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the order apply to all nominations?

Mr. BARKLEY. All nominations.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very glad of that, because before the Committee on the District of Columbia there is one important nomination which we should like to look into.

Mr. BARKLEY. The order takes care of all nominations not acted upon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

ALLOWANCE FOR PURCHASE OF UNIFORMS

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1891, Calendar No. 963, a bill prepared by the Committee on Military Affairs and approved by the War Department, which provides for furnishing $150 each to officers' training-school graduates.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1891) to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States by making certain gratuitous issues.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming ask for the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Yes, Mr. President. It is my judgment that not much time will be required for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. The bill would have to abound with emergency qualities before I should consent to its consideration today. I shall be glad to have the Senator make a statement of the purposes of the bill.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I should like to make such a statement, if I may.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I shall be glad to listen to it.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Under the present law, a total of $150 is allowed for the purchase of uniforms for Reserve officers under Public, No. 511, Seventy-sixth Congress, which is the act of May 14, 1940, and is paid in installments of $50 each upon completion of three different periods of service in 3 consecutive years. Under the act of June 3, 1941, aviation cadets receive an allowance of $150 for uniforms when commissioned in the Air Corps Reserve. That is Public, 97, Seventy-seventh Congress. The Committee on Military Affairs and the War Department were of opinion that a like allowance of $150 should be given to graduates of Army officers training schools and the graduates of the R. O. T. C. So far, about 8,000 of them have been examined and finally graduated, and are now second lieutenants. In some of these cases the young men have been simply unable to buy uniforms, and in several cases they have served as second lieutenants for several months in their privates' uniforms.

That is the main purpose of the bill. Practically all that it does is to provide that the graduates from the Army training schools and the graduates from the R. O. T. C., when they are given commissions as second lieutenants, shall be allowed the $150 that all other Army officers, except graduates from West Point, now receive for the purpose of buying the necessary uniforms.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, bills on the calendar do not expire at the end of the session, as do nominations on the Executive Calendar. I am curious to know what is the urgency of this bill today, when we can well take it up on the first call of the calendar next week.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I was not advised that the calendar is to be called next week.

Mr. McNARY. I am not the leader, as the Senator from Wyoming well knows; but I assume that the very able and accommodating leader of the Senate will have the calendar called early in the next session, probably some time next week. The point is, what is there that differentiates the status of this bill from that of any other bill on the calendar, and what is the necessity of having it considered today? Can it not ride over until the next session, next week or the week following, without injuring the boys whom the Senator desires to favor?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Of course, it depends on what we consider to be an emergency and what we do not consider to be an emergency.

Mr. McNARY. It was understood, when the semivacation was arranged, that no proposed legislation would be taken up unless it were of a very emergent nature. A great many Senators are absent. I wish to ask, as I have repeatedly, what is the emergency pressing upon us today that this measure should be taken up before any other bill on the calendar? If the Senator will make that clear to me, I shall not object; otherwise, I shall.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. It is a matter of individual judgment as to what constitutes an emergency. This is a bill prepared by the Committee on Military Affairs at the suggestion of the War Department, and it is intended to enable the young men who have graduated from the training schools, and who are now commissioned as second lieutenants, to get uniforms. Quite a number of them never earned a dollar in their lives, and many of them are drawing from $31 to $41 a month. By reason of their study, they have now been graduated as second lieutenants. A great many of them are young men who entered college and went through the R. O. T. C., with the assistance of the N. Y. A. They have demonstrated their ability, and now hold commissions, and they are performing their duties, though some of them are still in private's uniform. We allow other officers $150, and aviation cadets $150.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator advise the Senate how many of these graduates have been commissioned and are not now able to obtain uniforms?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I have not that information. I know that about 8,000 of these young men have been commissioned, but how many of them are unable to obtain uniforms I do not know. I understand some were able to borrow money and purchase uniforms, and some of them have not been able to do so. As to the immediate emergency, I suppose this is a matter which can wait, if it is considered to be too controversial.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have the bill considered now. It seems to be a bill recommended by the War Department, to which there will be no serious

opposition, probably. I am not urging it, but if it does go over, I will cooperate with the Senator to have it taken up next week at as early a date as possible.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. I observe this is a Senate bill. I do not know of any reason why the bill should be taken up at this time. The Senator from Wyoming has not specified why it should be taken up ahead of any other bill. A number of Senators have asked me about bills on the calendar, and I have repeatedly stated that, conformably with the agreement we had a week ago, we would not take up measures on the calendar unless they were pressing in their nature.

The Senator tells us these young men are waiting for their uniforms; that they will be disappointed if they have to wait a few more weeks. The fact that the War Department has recommended the bill does not make it emergent, in my estimation. I appeal to the good judgment and fairness of the Senator. I have held up other bills on the calendar because so many Senators are absent. Each Senator should have an opportunity to examine and to have explained every bill on the calendar. There is only a handful of the membership present today, and unless the Senator can do better than he has so far—and I am sure he has gone as far as he could—I shall have to object. I shall cooperate next week, if there shall be a call of the calendar, in having the bill considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard to the present consideration of the bill.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session the committees may be authorized to submit to the Senate reports on bills, resolutions, and nominations. I have particularly in mind the fact that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has before it a number of nominations, and I should like to have this authority granted so that that committee or any other committee may make reports.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE LATE BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, December 29, was the anniversary of Billy Mitchell's birth. It was the birthday of a great American.

I do not rise at this time to attempt a vindication of this great American. The recent years, the recent events have vindicated him.

I do not rise to criticize those who lacked the vision of Billy Mitchell. I have done plenty of that heretofore.

They who failed him failed their country. They have their reward. The country forgets and forgives, but it cannot forget or afford to forgive the men who in the present crisis lack vision, who are not on their toes fronting the future.

I am hoping that the spirit of Billy Mitchell will enter our great military, naval, and air establishments. I pray God that his spirit is there to enliven, to give vision to the men who hold in their palms the safety of our America. I am hoping also that as a result of his life and his sacrifice the subordinates in the ranks, the men of ideas, will be given an opportunity to express them, to sell them, if you please, so they may be put into operation. I am hoping also that the establishments of the Army and the air and the Navy will not be so hide-bound that they will fail to reach out for ideas that will help this country, no matter whence the ideas come.

Mr. President, we must not have antiquated minds looking after the defense of America. We must not have outmoded minds looking after our defense. If we do, we shall not have any America.

We are in one of the stupendous periods of history, comparable with the period of the industrial revolution, the Renaissance, and the Reformation; and anyone who is "sitting by the side of the road" and does not appreciate that the world is turning over is simply not awake. Consequently, it is up to us to realize that we cannot follow our outmoded methods of yesterday, whether in warfare or in thinking.

Yes; the past is dead, except as we can learn from it and get rid of some of the antiquated tactics, red tape, and minds that are in a rut. The present is pregnant with plenty to do.

The domination of the air we must have and retain, and we must put a premium on the men of foresight and invention—men who are big enough to get out of the rut today, to cut out red tape, and put efficiency into the picture.

Mr. President, some time ago, in April 1940, as I recall, I introduced a joint resolution in relation to reinstating Billy Mitchell's rank. The joint resolution went into "cold storage" in committee. But on May 20, 1941, I introduced Senate bill 1543, which I read:

> That the President is authorized to issue posthumously to the late William Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, a commission as a brigadier general, United States Army, with the date and rank as of the date of his death in 1936.
>
> SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to amend the records of the War Department so as to show that the said William Mitchell was a brigadier general, United States Army, at the time of his death.

In October, last, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 109, of the same tenor as the bill. The joint resolution is pending before the Military Affairs Committee.

As I have said, Billy Mitchell does not need any vindication, but the committee has not reported the joint resolution, and my purpose in rising today is to ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution in order that today—today, Mr. President—the Senate of the United States may have the opportunity and the privilege and the honor of passing it.

There came to my attention yesterday a belated letter, dated November 13, 1941, signed by Mr. Stimson, in which he raises no objection to this act of justice, this act of honoring America by honoring a great spirit who has passed into the beyond. Yet the committee has not favorably reported the joint resolution. It appears that for some 2 years, and previously, efforts have been made to do honor to this man who, when red tape and closed minds were controlling the very destiny of the Nation, had the fortitude and the courage to speak. Now, Mr. President, the Secretary of War at long last raises no objection; but still the joint resolution is not on the calendar. So I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 109, and that it be placed on the calendar, or that today, in 1941, we pass it, and thus show that the Senate of the United States is no longer dominated by a department of government, especially in matters which do not affect the war policy of the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution referred to by him?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the same reason that applied a moment ago when the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] objected to consideration of a bill on the calendar would apply to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin. I have no prejudice one way or the other about the joint resolution which the Senator introduced, but with the small attendance present today, it seems to me we ought not to discharge a committee simply because it has not reported a measure.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. There may be good reasons for the action of the committee, or the failure of the committee to act, and I do not think we ought to establish the precedent of discharging a committee by unanimous consent, which is rather unusual. Without any prejudice at all to the Senator's joint resolution, I should be compelled not to agree that the committee be discharged and that the measure be placed on the calendar. The measure will not die with the expiration of the present session; it will continue on into the next session, and the committee will have an opportunity to act then. Of course, as the Senator knows, the Committee on Military Affairs has been very busy in the last 3 or 4 weeks, and I do not think the procedure suggested should be encouraged in the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the letter of the Secretary of War be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. If the Senator from Wisconsin

will permit me, I may add that the measure is in the hands of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, all the members of which are away during the holidays. It seems to me that under the circumstances it would be unfair to take such action as is now proposed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ascertained yesterday when I obtained the letter written by the Secretary of War that the members of the subcommittee were now favorably inclined to recommend that the measure be favorably reported, by reason of the fact that the Secretary of War had written the letter. It is that practice, of course, that I cannot wholly condone. I think a committee or a subcommittee of this great body, if it is to fulfill its historic destiny, should decide for itself, and not let some department decide for it. But as I have said, apparently the War Department has already come around to favoring the joint resolution, which simply provides for reinstating the late Billy Mitchell's rank of brigadier general so that on the records of the War Department the rank of brigadier general shall appear after the name of Billy Mitchell.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Wisconsin is not now asking that the joint resolution be taken up, or is he asking that that be done?

Mr. WILEY. No; my request was that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution and that it be placed on the calendar, if agreement cannot be obtained to take it up for consideration today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall have to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Exhibit A

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 13, 1941.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: Further reference is made to your letter of October 14, 1941, requesting the views of the War Department concerning Senate Joint Resolution 109, to restore the rank of brigadier general to the late William L. Mitchell.

The proposed legislation would authorize and direct the Secretary of War to make the records of the War Department indicate that the late William L. Mitchell's rank of brigadier general has been restored as of the effective date of his resignation from the Army and would authorize the President to issue the necessary commissions or documents incident to the restoration of such rank.

The records show that Gen. William Mitchell entered Federal service during the Spanish-American War as a private on May 14, 1898, and later served as signal officer, United States Volunteers, in the grades of second lieutenant and first lieutenant from June 8, 1898, to April 26, 1901. He served in Cuba from December 1898 to August 1899, and subsequently in the Philippine Islands at the time of the insurrection. On April 26, 1901, he entered the Regular Army as a first lieutenant, Signal Corps; was promoted to captain March 2, 1903; major July 1, 1916, and lieutenant colonel May 15, 1917. He held emergency commissions as colonel in the Signal Corps from October 10, 1917, to October 14, 1918, and as brigadier general, Air Service, from the latter date to June 30, 1920.

On July 1, 1920, he was promoted to the permanent grade of colonel, and was assistant chief of the Air Service with the rank of brigadier general from July 16, 1920, to March 4, 1921—when recess appointment expired—and again held that office from April 27, 1921, to April 26, 1925, when he reverted to his permanent grade of colonel. He resigned as a colonel, Air Service, effective February 1, 1926.

General Mitchell was on the initial General Staff Corps eligible list, was a distinguished graduate of the Army School of the Line in 1908, a graduate of the Army Staff College in 1909, and was detailed in the General Staff Corps from February 14, 1913, to June 7, 1916. He served overseas from the spring of 1917 to February 1919, and participated in seven major operations. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for repeated acts of extraordinary heroism in action and for displaying bravery far beyond that required by his position as Chief of the Air Service, First Army, American Expeditionary Forces. He was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services as Air Service commander, first of the zone of advance and later of the First Corps and First and Second Armies. Other decorations conferred upon him include the British Order of St. Michael and St. George, the French Croix de Guerre with Palm, the Legion of Honor, and the Italian Order of Sts. Maurice and Lazarus.

As a result of his trial and conviction for violation of the ninety-sixth article of war, by a general court martial which convened at Washington, D. C., October 28, 1925, General Mitchell was sentenced "to be suspended from rank, command, and duty, with forfeiture of all pay and allowances for 5 years." The sentence was approved, except that so much thereof as adjudged forfeiture of all of the allowances and one-half of the monthly pay of the accused, a total of $397.67 monthly, was, during the pleasure of the President, suspended. The sentence was promulgated in General Court Martial Orders No. 3, War Department, dated January 26, 1926. On the same date a copy thereof was delivered to the then Colonel Mitchell. His resignation as an officer in the Army, dated January 26, 1926, was received in the War Department the following day and accepted by the President to become effective as of February 1, 1926. Information contained in the files is to the effect that General Mitchell died February 19, 1936.

Inasmuch as General Mitchell rendered service during the World War as a brigadier general he was entitled to bear that official title after his resignation, in accordance with the provisions of section 2, act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793).

The present measure contains a proviso that no pay, allowances, or other financial benefits shall be held to have accrued or to accrue by reason of the enactment of this joint resolution, and if it is the desire of Congress to honor the memory of the late General Mitchell in the manner proposed, the War Department offers no objection to the passage of this joint resolution other than to state that the late General Mitchell's name is borne upon the records as William Mitchell.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That completes the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4932) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the 2d day of January 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 528. An act to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska; and

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 30, 1941:

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Hon. Edward C. Eicher, of Iowa, to be chief justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Alfred A. Wheat, retired.

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Charles T. Fisher, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1940, vice Carroll B. Merriam, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Alexander H. Bell, of Norfolk, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va., to fill an existing vacancy.

MEMBER OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

L. Welch Pogue, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Department of Commerce for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1947, vice C. Grant Mason, Jr.

APPOINTMENT TO TEMPORARY RANK IN THE AIR CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant colonel

Capt. James Gordon Pratt, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps; temporary major, Army of the United States).

(NOTE.—The date of rank is omitted as the death or other unforeseen change in status of a senior officer might require a change in the date of rank and necessitate the renomination of this officer.)

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be chief of chaplains

Chaplain (Colonel) William Richard Arnold, United States Army, to be Chief of Chaplains for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, with rank from December 23, 1941, with the temporary rank of brigadier general, Regular Army, under the provisions of Public Law 314, Seventy-seventh Congress.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

First Lt. William Egbert Ragsdale, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps, with rank from date of appointment

First Lt. Russell Henry Augsburger, Dental Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Robert Sylvester Nourse, infantry (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from June 12, 1936.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. (temporary) Charles D. Barrett to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of December 1941.

Lt. Col. James F. Moriarty to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of December 1941.

Maj. George W. McHenry to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of December 1941.

Capt. John S. Letcher to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of December 1941.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940:

John A. Anderson
Jack Tabor

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of March 1941:

Ferdinand Bishop
Cliff Atkinson, Jr.
John F. Schoettel

First Lt. Marlowe C. Williams to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of October 1941.

First Lt. Maynard C. Schultz to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of December 1941.

Joel B. Laseter, a citizen of Georgia, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of May 1941.

Marine Gunner Stephen J. Zsiga to be a chief marine gunner in the Marine Corps to rank with but after second lieutenant from the 26th day of November 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 30, 1941:

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Ralph R. Rea, Harrison.

FLORIDA

Luther L. Callaway, Chiefland.
Bessie E. Guthrie, Cortez.
Minnie Blanch Payne, Longwood.

MARYLAND

Guy M. Coale, Upper Marlboro.

MONTANA

Herman J. Webster, Custer.
Oscar C. Clute, Dixon.
Goldie G. Dobravec, Noxon.

NEW YORK

Ethel M. Cross, Burlington Flats.
Edward E. J. Kent, Cambridge.
Jay W. Metcalf, Deansboro.
Roxa A. Youker, Dolgeville.
David J. McHenry, Granville.
Walter B. Jaynes, Greene.
Marion L. Jenkins, Rensselaer Falls.

NORTH CAROLINA

Charles R. McNair, Rockingham.
Ola A. Sutton, Windsor.

VIRGINIA

Betty L. Morrissette, Midlothian.
Peter D. Holland, Moneta.
Robert L. McConnell, Nickelville.
James R. Parker, Jr., Providence Forge.
Nannie Lee Stickley, Rose Hill.
Edgar L. Boone, Troutville.
Mary R. White, Vinton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COLE of Maryland.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the afterglow of this holy season, we would be still and know that Thou art God. A brooding tenderness and a Father's love hath visited us. In the silence of sacrificial faith, in obedience to inner human power, and in allegiance to all loyalty, we would wait at the altar of consecration, praying Thee to empty us of all envy, guile, and selfish ambitions; do Thou fill our lives with the glory and majesty of the open heavens, that we may hear the higher voices. Thou who fashioneth the hearts of all, who observeth all their works, exalted by Thee, teach us to reveal that which conscience dictates, clearing the path along which our fellow countrymen are to travel.

Heavenly Father, Thou dost speak to us in the dictates of our higher selfhood and in the blessedness of Thy holy word; forgive us, blessed Lord, when we are unmindful of their necessity; Oh, may Thy light be our light, Thy service our joy, and Thy teaching command every power of our being. Out of Zion hath come Thy truth; we pray that it may live and burn in the very soul of America: "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves and pray and seek my face and transform their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and forgive their sins and heal their land." For the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of the House of Friday, December 26, 1941, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House, by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 23, 1941:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to authorize the commission appointed by the President to conduct an investigation in connection with the attack on Hawaii, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents;

H. R. 6223. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations incident to the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On December 26, 1941:

H. R. 1047. An act to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928;

H. R. 3019. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 385);

H. R. 4692. An act relating to the disposition of personal property of certain deceased patients or members of United States Veterans' Administration facilities;

H. R. 5726. An act to amend Public Law No. 74, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, relating to wheat-marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 5925. An act to amend the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936;

H. R. 6208. An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution making the fourth Thursday in November a legal holiday;

H. R. 5558. An act increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1951; and

H. R. 5988. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

On December 27, 1941:

H. R. 547. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to execute easement deeds to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for the use and occupation of lands and water areas in connection with the Sepulveda Dam and Reservoir project and the Hansen Dam and Reservoir project on the Los Angeles River.

On December 29, 1941:

H. R. 5785. An act to fix the responsibilities of disbursing and certifying officers, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make two separate extensions of my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following letter of resignation:

DECEMBER 26, 1941.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Twelfth District of Pennsylvania, effective January 3, 1942.

Sincerely,

J. HAROLD FLANNERY.

The resignation was accepted.

THE LATE RICHARD S. ALDRICH

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the membership of the House the sudden death on Christmas Day of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Richard S. Aldrich, who represented the Second District of Rhode Island from 1923 to 1933.

Many Members of this House who served with him remember Dick Aldrich as an affable gentleman, the type we all like to call our friend. He was a hard worker, always efficient and thorough in any task he undertook to perform.

He was born here in the city of Washington, on February 29, 1884, while his father, the late Nelson W. Aldrich, was serving in the United States Senate as a Senator from Rhode Island.

Educated in the public schools of Providence, R. I., Mr. Aldrich then attended Yale, where he received his A. B. degree in 1906. He then studied at Harvard School of Law, and in 1909 received his LL. B. degree.

After practicing law in New York until 1913, he returned to Providence, and in 1914 entered the field of politics, winning a seat in the Rhode Island House of Representatives. Two years later he was elected to the State senate.

Then came World War No. 1. Dick Aldrich interrupted his political career and went to France as the Red Cross' field representative with the Second Division of the United States Army. He was at St. Mihiel and in Champagne with the Fourth Army and at the Argonne with the Triage sorting hospital.

After the war, he returned home, reentered the political arena, and in 1922 was elected to Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island. During his first term in this body he was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and following his reelection he was given membership on the Ways and Means Committee.

Word of the death of Dick Aldrich, only in his fifty-eighth year, came as a great shock to me, Mr. Speaker, and, I am sure, to many of his former colleagues who are still in Congress. To his widow and the other members of his family, I am sure I bespeak the sentiments of his many friends here when I say we have lost a friend, his State has lost a fine citizen, and the Nation has lost a valuable statesman. To those who survive him, we extend our deepest sympathy.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT (H. DOC. NO. 470)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

In view of the urgency of the need for extending the period for Federal administration of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the desirability of giving assurances at this time to producers of basic agricultural commodities regarding continuation of the 85-percent-of-parity loans, I have approved S. 588. I believe, however, that in connection with the incorporation, while the bill was in conference, of the provision making 85-percent-of-parity loans applicable to peanuts, appropriate consideration was not given to the comparability of the parity price of peanuts with the parity prices of other commodities. I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that since the 1909–14 period which, according to existing legislation, must be used as the base period in computing parity prices for peanuts, there have been substantial changes in the production and consumption of peanuts. The result is that the parity price for peanuts computed in accordance with existing legislation is not comparable with the parity prices for other commodities, and this bill makes mandatory loan rates on peanuts which are excessive in relation to the loan rates on other commodities.

I recommend that this problem receive appropriate consideration by the Congress prior to the effective date of the loan on the 1942 crop of peanuts, and that existing legislation be modified so as to permit the determination of parity prices for peanuts which are comparable with parity prices for other commodities.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 29, 1941.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldridge, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution fixing the days of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing for the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123), which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 5, 1942, and the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress shall begin at noon, Monday, January 4, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 22, which is on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, the 2d day of January 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and following any previous requests, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DECENTRALIZATION OF DEPARTMENTS

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that there has been considerable discussion of the decentralization of Government agencies in the last few days. I take the floor at this time to advise the House that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I am chairman, has been holding hearings on the matter of decentralization for the past 10 weeks. We have been holding four hearings a week. We are nearing the end of the hearings. We have not made recom-

mendations in respect to the decentralization and we are willing to hear any Member of the House who may desire to appear before that subcommittee before we make our final report to the House.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNS. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman and his committee, as well as the other subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman BOYKIN, of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, have been doing a splendid job. We see that the Patent Office, which originally was to be sent to New York, has been shifted to Richmond, proving conclusively that hasty and ill-advised action was taken in the matter. I trust we can proceed very carefully in the decentralization of governmental agencies.

Mr. DOWNS. That fact and a vast amount of data secured by our committee, I believe, should be taken into consideration before any of the agencies are decentralized. I feel that this subcommittee has gathered more information on decentralization than any other unit studying the matter in Washington. I am passing this information along to the President today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE WORK OF THE PRESENT CONGRESS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress draws to a close with the year 1941, we must pause in retrospect and look back over the tremendous amount of work which has been accomplished by this House and by the Congress in general. When in the beginning of the year we were called upon to answer the demand for immense amounts of money for appropriations and authorizations for national defense this House responded to a man. Later, when we were called upon, after the fixed policy of lease-lend was adopted, to appropriate vast sums for the various democracies resisting aggression the House once more responded. At the end of this session it is only natural to look forward to the year 1942, and to examine the statement which Mr. Winston Churchill made in his recent speech before Congress, when he said that in 1942 the democracies of Great Britain and the United States will complete their armament program and will prepare for victory in 1943. I can only supplement that statement by saying that I hope the victory which Mr. Churchill prognosticates in 1943 will come in 1942.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY OF SPEAKER TO SIGN SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution of the Senate, Senate 123.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business today I be permitted to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLAUCHÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by the mother of one of the American boys who was killed when the *Reuben James* was attacked by a submarine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE TOWN OF KEMMERER, WYO.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4932) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo., with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike out "such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe" and insert "the applicable mineral land laws."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to have the gentleman from Utah, for the sake of the record, explain to us the Senate amendment. I know this is an important bill and should be passed at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The Senate amendment just does one thing. It changes the words from "discretion of the Secretary of the Interior" to make it applicable to the general mineral land laws, which I think is a very good amendment. I can see no objection to it.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief Christmas message from a gentleman from Oregon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the business today and any other special orders I may be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include therein an article by W. E. Priestly, of Seattle, Wash., our authority in the Northwest on Japan and China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on another topic, and that I may include therein a letter from the county assessor of my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on another topic, and include a letter from a labor union in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Pacific Rural Press entitled "Livestock's Greatest Worry."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all the other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

on two subjects and include certain excerpts in each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PLUMLEY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Argonaut of June 20 and June 27 of this year, by Prof. Joseph Walter Bingham, of Stanford University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EX-PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday last was the anniversary of the birthday of a great American. To the best of my knowledge, it passed unnoticed. Sunday would have been the eighty-fifth birthday of President Woodrow Wilson had he been living. President Wilson made his last address to the Nation on Armistice Day 1923. In that farewell address he paid tribute to the gallant soldiers who had won the war and he decried the policy of isolation through which the peace had been lost. I think it behooves all of us now to take to heart the words of that great First World War President along with the words of the great British Prime Minister who, when he addressed the Congress on Friday last, asked that it not happen a third time in our lifetimes. President Wilson blazed the trail to world peace a generation ago. Time and time again he told us that we must accept our responsibility as a world power. Let us hope that when the present deadly struggle has ended that we will at long last accept that responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to extend my remarks at this point and include therein a newspaper article relative to President Woodrow Wilson, appearing in the Evening Star, written by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

CHURCHILL'S TALK CALLED WILSON ECHO—PRESIDENT'S FATEFUL WARNING IN 1923 IS RECALLED

(By David Lawrence)

If only the Navy had had a half hour's warning at Pearl Harbor is the cry of Secretary Knox.

If only Britain and America as late as 5 years ago had begun to work together to enforce peace—that's the comment of Prime Minister Churchill.

But there's one man who on Armistice Day, November 11, 1923, in his farewell speech to the American people issued a warning, which if heeded might have prevented the second World War. The birthday anniversary of that man—the wartime President of the United States—was yesterday. No official observance of the day was noted and though a Democratic administration is in power and though it has become the custom to honor nationally the memory of great Presidents, no such homage has been paid Woodrow Wilson. Is he being forgotten so soon by the American people?

The man may be forgotten, but from the pages of history will never be erased the indelible words which he uttered in what proved to be his final speech. It came over the radio from his home and lasted but a few minutes. In it he was evidently referring to the action of the isolationists in the United States Senate who had forced the defeat of American participation in the League of Nations, and at one time he used the word "cowardly," which did not appear in the printed copies of his speech the next day.

But in the books that subsequently appeared the full text was presented, and it is worth reproducing now, because it predicts the reason for the second World War in phrases that his countrymen chose to ignore.

WILSON IS QUOTED

He said:

"The anniversary of Armistice Day should stir us to great exaltation of spirit because of the proud recollection that it was our day, a day above those early days of that never-to-be-forgotten November which lifted the world to the high levels of vision and achievement upon which the Great War for democracy and right was fought and won, although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered, chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of peace, or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

"This must always be a source of deep mortification to us, and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligation of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect, and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

"That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

"And now, as if to furnish a sort of sinister climax, France and Italy between them have made waste paper of the Treaty of Versailles and the whole field of international relationship is in perilous confusion. The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail."

ECHO FROM CHURCHILL

But there was a fateful echo of that speech last week. Prime Minister Churchill was saying to an applauding Congress:

"If we had stuck together after the last war, if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us. Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind, to make sure that these catastrophies do not engulf us for the third time? * * * Five or six years ago, it would have been easy, without shedding a drop of blood, for the United States and Great Britain to have insisted on the fulfillment of the disarmament clauses of the treaties which Germany signed after the Great War * * *. The chance has departed; it is gone. Prodigious hammer strokes have been needed to bring us together today."

Who was to blame? The same forces of isolation which fought Woodrow Wilson and rendered null and void the plan of world organization which he and others hoped to see established with American might behind it as a means of keeping peace.

These same influences for 20 years have kept America from being prepared and that's the true meaning of the plight of American troops in the Philippines and the fact that we do not have an adequate-sized Navy or air force today.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time unwarranted attacks are leveled at the Federal Bureau of Investigation and at its able Director, J. Edgar Hoover. The latest of these occurred in connection with the disaster at Pearl Harbor, and it has been intimated indirectly, if not directly, that this organization is responsible for what happened before that surprise fighting from the standpoint of sabotage and spy activity there.

We recall it was only 2 or 3 years ago that the F. B. I. was assailed when it was declared that so-called civil liberties were denied because indexes were kept of undesirable aliens who resided in this country. The Federal Bureau of Investigation will survive this latest unwarranted charge upon it. The Members of Congress, I feel sure, have full confidence in the personnel and actions of Mr. Hoover's hard-hitting and effective G-men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] is recognized for 7 minutes.

A UNIFIED AIR FORCE

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, public opinion has run far in advance of legislative action in the demand for a separate air force. Recent tragic events have shown us that a nation without adequate air defense cannot survive. Proper air defenses cannot be developed in the

traditional schools of land and sea operations. The job must be entrusted to specialists with the experience and foresight to promote every ounce of potentiality of the new weapon. The United States can be attacked only by air. This makes it vitally important for us to devise proper air strategy and prosecute all-out aerial warfare now.

We paid the price of unpreparedness of our air forces in the first World War, but there is no excuse whatsoever for making that mistake twice. Our air forces are equally, if not more, important than our land and sea forces. This has been unhappily proven in the Hawaii attack and in the battles raging now in the Philippines.

I have long advocated a separate air force, and there are many who agree that an independent air arm is necessary. But we have been reluctant to move toward such reorganization because we were threatened with an emergency.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, let me say, first of all, that I did not know the gentleman from New York was going to talk on this subject today, but I want him to know that I appreciate the work that he and others who agree with him have done in behalf of an independent or a unified air force. I believe the RECORD will show that not only the gentleman from New York but other Members of this House have, over a long period of time, attempted to have hearings on this subject. However, we have been unable to receive any consideration.

Mr. BEITER. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his contribution.

Now the emergency is upon us and we have additional and more urgent need for the most efficient air system possible. Civilian air experts, such as Maj. Alexander Seversky, Col. Roscoe Turner, Al Williams, and numerous others, have for years tried to make us see the light. But our military leadership has been busy with land and sea preparations, with which they are quite naturally most concerned, and we find ourselves today without an adequate aerial striking force. In the new order of warfare yesterday's traditions must be set aside, just as we discard old weapons for new. We know that wars today are won or lost in the air.

Great Britain has an Air Ministry Department because the English people demanded air power. They learned that air power is the capacity to control and dominate the air and that the air force should be considered and treated as a fighting force separate from the Army and the Navy. Small as the R. A. F. is, it cannot be denied that it has been the main defense of the British Isles. Winston Churchill said of the achievements of the Royal Air Force in staving off the attempted invasion of the British Isles by the Germans that "never in all recorded history have so many owed so much to so few." Maj. Alexander Seversky, the world-famous authority on aeronautics, brought out that the job was done "single-handedly by Britain's air force, while its magnificent Navy and the land forces deployed on the imperiled islands looked on in helpless awe."

In Hawaii and in the Philippines the ability of air power to strike at long range has been successfully demonstrated. We have acquired outlying air bases because we have been shortsighted in our long-range airplane development. Because we do not have the range to fight from the air over the Philippines the Japanese have been able to bomb Manila and invade a part, if not all, of those Pacific islands. Had the money poured into the outlying air bases been spent on development of long-range fighting planes, we would not now be worrying about our national defense; we would be in a position to carry the offensive to the enemy and retaliate in kind for its treachery.

I urge the immediate establishment of a United States air force.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In building up that air force would the gentleman go so far as to adopt a policy so that any man could work on it without joining a union? Would the gentleman go that far?

Mr. BEITER. I am for a strong——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman support the open shop?

Mr. BEITER. I think the gentleman's remarks are irrelevant.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman let anybody who had not joined John Lewis' union build them? Would he?

Mr. BEITER. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought the gentleman would not.

Mr. BEITER. I urge the immediate establishment of a United States air force. Let us get together the best possible air force and call on the best possible minds to manage it. I urge that we have true air power, equipped and trained to assume mastery of our skies, and thereby assure our safety in this time of peril. What we need is not just a 2-ocean Navy, but a 2-ocean air force as well. The air power of our enemies is ready to strike not only at our industrial centers but at our open cities and coast lines. We need long-range bombers, expert airmen, and we need them now. I believe the people of the United States would rather have 1,000 bombers than 1 battleship which must have planes to protect it from the enemy's air power. Let us give them what they want. And pick the right men for the job. Our military power can be the most forceful and the most efficient in the world, but only if we attain complete superiority in the air.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. We are in full accord on the desire for this country to have the greatest air force in the world, but I believe it is going a little bit too far, especially right now, when we are engaged in this war, to be telling the military and naval authorities of this country what is best for our national defense. If the gentleman from New York will read some of the records of the R. A. F., he will find not only that they did make a wonderful record, as the gentleman said, in defending the British Isles, but go further and read what happened at Crete, in Greece, at Alexandria; read what happened at Dunkerque; read what the R. A. F. planes did to their own ships, including the battleship *King George V*, when they were engaged in sinking the *Bismarck;* he will have a different opinion of a unified air force. I believe the gentleman is on the wrong track. I believe he should study the question before voicing his sentiments on the floor of the House, more so at this time than ever before.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman from Missouri has asked me to refer to some of the incidents of the past. Let me refer the gentleman from Missouri to a statement made by Major Seversky early in October, when he predicted just what would happen at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not talking about what happened in Pearl Harbor. I am talking about the R. A. F. and the united air force of Great Britain.

Mr. BEITER. But I am talking about what happened in Pearl Harbor. That is of more importance to us than what happened over in the Mediterranean.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, who has been a strong advocate of an independent air force.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for constructive criticism of this type. It does not hurt our defense or our offense efforts.

This Congress for years has been attempting to secure a hearing on the subject, but we have been denied by the standing committees of this body. Certainly we should pursue with every rightful course the desire to bring this matter into the open. We had 2 years ago less than 30,000 men in our Air Corps. Today we have only 300,000, whereas we have got to have 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 ultimately to win this victory.

Mr. BEITER. We should at least have the opportunity to benefit by the experience of experts and thus strengthen our air defenses.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have asked repeatedly for the opportunity to bring before congressional committees to be heard, leading experts, trained airmen who fought in the last World War, but they have not been given the opportunity of coming to the Capitol.

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. LEAVY rose.

Mr. BEITER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman from New York disclose to the House the attitude of such men as Maj. Alexander D. Seversky, the foremost aviation expert in America, and of men who have demonstrated their ability? What is their attitude on a unified air force?

Mr. BEITER. They are unanimously for a separate air force; and, as I pointed

out, in October Major Seversky, who is known the world over as a foremost air expert, stressed the need for a separate air force. Long before we entered the war he predicted that future battles would be won or lost by air and that our air defenses were inadequate. Others gave us similar warnings.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Where was the separate air force of Great Britain when the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* were sunk?

Mr. BEITER. There were no planes in the Pacific; the British were not warned in advance of the Japanese treachery any more than we were.

Mr. BOGGS. If the British commander at Singapore had had an air force under his command, that would not have happened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 3 minutes in order to pay a tribute. At this very moment some young men of the United States are actually giving their lives in the defense of this Nation, and there are millions of others who for many months have been in training in anticipation of the time when they would be called upon to actually hold the front-line defenses of this country and democracy. All this they have done with a spirit worthy of everything that is best in American tradition.

There are two reasons for people loving their country: One is because of what the country has done for them, and the other is because of what they can do for the Nation that they love. Of these two motives the second is obviously much the higher. All of us know these things.

But there is one thing I want to draw to the attention of the Members of the House because perhaps we may forget it. This same generation of young men upon whom the very defense of the basic ideals of this democracy must depend are the same young men who in their time of youth faced a nation when it was most discouraging, when their opportunities were the least, when the whole situation was more confused than it has perhaps ever been for any other generation of American young men. Their service today is not because this Nation held out to them the opportunity to get rich quick or even, in many cases, to find a job at all. Their service to the Nation today is because they understand perhaps better than some older people what America really means, not because they experienced an easy economic system that worked for them. They are serving America because they love her soil, because they love her people, but most of all because she gives a chance to people like themselves to build better things and a better world than they have ever known before.

I hope as time goes on and as we hear again and again the tributes to the devotion of these young men we will remember these things and will give them credit not only for heroism but also for a heroism grown out of no easy outlook and no great opportunity for enrichment for themselves, but out of a fundamental understanding of what America and the basic principles of their Nation mean. These are things to which all of us can give thought. And having given thought we can act to guarantee that the America to which these young men come back after their service will have a place for them—a constructive challenging place—and that never again will joblessness haunt them or rob them of hope or happiness. They will do their part and more. Let it not be said that this body or any other responsible group or agency of our Nation failed to do its part for their future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes at the conclusion of previous special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, headlines in today's Washington Times-Herald scream, "Morgenthau warns of drastic taxes," and in this same newspaper news items set forth that yesterday 90 Japs from the Jap Embassy were transported from the Embassy to the Homestead at Hot Springs, Va. Saburo Kurusu, who was offering the hand of friendship and peace in Washington at the time Jap planes were spreading desolation and death in their cowardly attack on Pearl Harbor, is among those who, at great expense to American taxpayers, will be favored with American hospitality at one of the finest resort hotels in this land. Reference is made in another part of the paper that 200 Nazi officials, including members of the diplomatic staff and their families, headed by Hans Thomsen, German Minister to the United States, are guests of our State Department at the expense of American taxpayers at the Greenbrier Hotel, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. I protest against this, and denounce the striped-pants State Department boys in spats, with sweet-smelling flowers in their buttonholes, who arranged this fine gentlemanly hospitality. It is time for Americans to get tough. The Greenbrier, at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., and the Homestead, at Hot Springs, Va., are two of the most luxurious resort hotels in the Western Hemisphere. Recently my wife and I, driving to Washington, stopped at White Sulphur Springs. We felt we could not afford to stay at the Greenbrier, so stayed at a cottage nearby. The fact that we are meeting in the House of Representatives today, instead of enjoying the holidays home among our constituents, is due to Jap aggression leaping at us across the broad Pacific. Surely our officials should not cater to double-dealing Japs and to the Nazi officials by lodging them as guests in the most luxurious and fashionable resort hotels on this continent. A little common sense instead of this Emily Post sort of business would be more in line. We will give the Jap and German diplomatic staffs and their families and associates safe conduct and treat them properly, the same as international law calls upon their Governments to treat American officials and newspapermen in those enemy countries, pending the time they can be returned to this country, and we in turn can ship these people to their unhappy lands. You may say that the Japanese Empire and not American taxpayers will in the end have to pay for the luxuries of Hot Springs. When we get through with Japan, I do not want enough left of the Japanese Empire to pay for a cot in a flophouse.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would like to make the observation that White Sulphur Springs is not far from my home town. It is a lovely section of the country and one of the outstanding all-year-around resorts. It is in a mountainous section. Of course, the hotel itself is located in a valley, but really, and this is not an unfounded fear, I anticipate reading in the newspapers at any time that some tall, patriotic mountaineer with a rifle has taken a pot-shot at some of the gentlemen of the German and the Hungarian Embassies who are playing golf as Hitler wages war against mankind.

Mr. YOUNG. I trust the gentleman from West Virginia will not be too hard upon any constituent who should try that, because the gentleman from West Virginia and I agree that the Greenbrier is one of the most beautiful and one of the most luxurious hotels in the entire country.

It is high time for Americans to get hard, and in this connection I contend our high Army and Navy officers deserve no praise for distributing pictures in this country of a company of American soldiers standing at attention during the burial of a Jap lieutenant of aviation who was shot down in the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. That was a sneaking, vicious, cowardly assault on the armed forces of a peace-loving people, and for Americans to stand at attention and pay the respects deserved by a gentleman who has been a valiant foe in fair combat is revolting, and should not have been permitted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized.

POWER AND METAL SHORTAGES

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, Pearl Harbor has brought to all our people a realization of the fallacy of a program of scarcity in defense matters. Before that eventful date, in spite of frequent and steady warnings, O. P. M. was piloted on such a course. This now is water over

the dam, however the costly lesson emphasizes the urgency of our constant demands that any further tendency to formulate or tolerate a program of scarcity be checked. It is to this phase of the war effort that I am addressing a few constructive remarks.

This Nation is currently spending on war effort at the annual rate of $16,000,000,000. This represents about one-fifth of our possible total as measured by our resources and about one-third of the equivalent rate Germany is putting into war effort. It is therefore apparent that we must immediately triple the rate of our defense production. It has been estimated that this rate will have to be expanded in excess of $50,000,000,000 in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943. The sooner we get into such action the sooner the war will be terminated, and the less the loss in blood and treasure.

The deficiencies in aluminum, zinc, rubber, copper, steel, chrome, magnesium, tin, high-octane gas, and other materials are upon us, and civilian consumption must be cut. The civilian production which will be reduced because of materials is largely of the low-power, high-labor-cost type, whereas the replacing metal and machine production requires longer and larger quantities of electric power. Electric energy is the very foundation of our war effort. It is obvious that the critical metal situation now upon us is going to be repeated in 1942 and 1943 in the field of electric power.

In certain sections of the country a power shortage has been encountered, whereas in other sections available power is not being used. This shows lopsided planning. Available power from federally owned and other plants will be wasted in 1942 unless policies are altered. This is a situation which must be immediately corrected.

Before we plan new power projects, taking 3 or 4 years to construct, necessity demands that we immediately use all available power from plants already built or under way. Our metal and shop availability is not such that we can carry on many new projects and at the same time provide our Army and Navy needs.

For some time I have called to the attention of O. P. M. the true power and metal situation, but with little success. It is evident that Congress will shortly have to take a hand in correcting the shortcomings of the power situation. It is evident that our war needs and the the aim of Congress are being subordinated to certain private interests. In this connection it may be pertinent, though somewhat frivolous, to remind my colleagues that one of the definitions of O. P. M. is "Office of Private Monopolies." To continue the record, I am inserting further correspondence with Mr. W. L. Batt, Director of Metals, of O. P. M., supplementing material in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 5522. This record will, in my opinion, serve a useful purpose. The first letter is Mr. Batt's very inappropriate and inadequate reply to my letter of November 24, printed in full in the RECORD cited. His mistakes are pointed out in my reply.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1941.

The Honorable WALTER M. PIERCE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PIERCE: With reference to your letter of November 24, the fact is that we have been counting on Douglas Dam to provide power for aluminum production which is definitely scheduled for the Southeast.

Far from discriminating against the Pacific Northwest, the war program will require every kilowatt-hour which your great projects in that section can produce, and as quickly as they can be made ready. For a long time I have taken the position in the field of electric power, as well as in other fields, that the thing we needed to worry about were the shortages that were bound to develop. In the case of electric power, we are now confronted with serious threats of shortage during the next couple of years.

As to the Northwest, it is our conclusion that all of the power facilities that can possibly be installed between now and the end of 1943 are needed to meet the presently projected loads in that area. Our conclusion with respect to the situation in the Northwest is confirmed by our conversations with representatives of the Bonneville administration and the Department of the Interior. I am enclosing a copy of a letter of December 9, 1941, from the Secretary of the Interior which shows how tight the power situation is in the Northwest, and which will be of interest to you because of the views expressed on the power situation throughout the country.

We are doing everything within our power to expedite the delivery of electric generating facilities for the public projects in the Northwest, but even with the best schedule there will be no power surplus in that area.

We appreciate very much your interest in these problems of defense power supply.

Very truly yours,

W. L. BATT.

DECEMBER 27, 1941.

Mr. W. L. BATT,
Director of Materials, Office of Production Management, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BATT: I am glad to have your letter of December 12, 1941, which still leaves open the points I covered, but nevertheless gives me an opportunity to offer some constructive suggestions which, in my opinion, are badly needed in these critical times.

Your conclusions on the Northwest available power supply are not in accord with the record and cannot be allowed to remain unchallenged. If your power staff were familiar with the record made in Congress during the past 5 years on the power and metal situation, they would not have fallen into the error of reaching conclusions from generalized statements.

The record on the availability of Columbia River power can be found tabulated on pages 298 and 299 of the recent House hearings on the third supplemental deficiency bill. This information in turn can be checked from the earlier hearings, capacity authorizations, and press releases.

This record shows that around 200,000 kilowatts of available capacity will be wasted, as far as defense effort is concerned, for about 6 months in 1942. This rounded figure will then taper down to an amount slightly less than 100,000 kilowatts in the latter part of 1942, and thus continue until the spring of 1943, when Bonneville units Nos. 7 and 8 and the fourth Coulee unit (totaling 216,000 kilowatts) are brought into service. For the remainder of 1943 about 150,000 additional kilowatts will be available above stated commitments.

In 1944 machines already authorized by Congress, under proper priorities, will add nearly 500,000 kilowatts additional.

The "tightness" of around 100,000 kilowatts during the winter of 1942 and 1943 can be augmented by operating so that short hour peaks will be eliminated, and by storage. Seasonal load swings and reserves from the interconnections already authorized and constructed can be used. Such type of operating for a relatively short period will make a larger block of Columbia River power immediately available for defense.

I have written in terms of kilowatts in order to state the case briefly, but far more important still is the use of kilowatt-hours. Pounds of metal depend entirely on kilowatt-hours. The defense program should use every possible kilowatt-hour for the next 2 years even if it is necessary to balance load within hours of use. With power deficiency apparent on a national scale, no kilowatt-hour which can be turned into defense work should be wasted. Your letter evidences the fact that much needed kilowatt-hours will be wasted.

The use of Secretary Ickes' letter to sustain an erroneous conclusion comes with little grace, as evidently the letter you enclosed was not written for the purpose you intended in sending me a copy. It is apparent that the Secretary's letter was written to aid Office of Production Management in the Douglas Dam matter. If the fourth paragraph of this letter is read closely, it will be evident that he is calling attention to the available difference between the installed capacity and commitments.

With limited supplies of strategic metals, it is far better to construct and to utilize authorized machines that can turn out a continuous kilowatt with one kilowatt installed, instead of projects that require 1.6 kilowatts installed per continuous kilowatt, as is shown on pages 22 and 54 of the hearings on the second deficiency bill of 1941. The Coulee machines are all 100-percent prime-power producers. In making this comment I do not wish to be understood as saying that power that can be brought in during 1942 and 1943 should not be used. On the contrary, all power available during these years should be used. In view of the cited record, Mr. Krug's statement as given on page 74 of these hearings should, in fairness to defense, be corrected. His answer was in response to a query from Congressman WIGGLESWORTH.

What is happening to the Pacific Northwest bears out what I have been indicating on the record for the past few years. This situation requires that all kilowatt-hours available be put to work on metals for our air, Navy, and ordnance needs in 1942 and 1943. These 2 years will be the critical ones in our war effort.

Any new industrial authorization to use available kilowatt-hours should, in the interest of metal conservation, be placed as near to the powerhouses as is possible.

These suggestions are offered to enable you to see the picture as it appears to men with long experience in northwestern matters. The critical situation demands that every contribution any section can make be quickly used. The strategic outposts lie nearest to these large power sources. What I have suggested for the past few years, if followed out, would have used every kilowatt-hour and would have placed the consuming industries beyond the protecting high mountains of the Cascade Range. May I ask that you review this power utilization situation so that every resource we have will be put to work? Public safety and interest demand such attention.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER M. PIERCE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter I have received from Mr. Batt, under date of December 12, and also my reply to that letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the last several sessions, Congress has appropriated various sums for the construction of California's great Central Valley project.

Eight years ago this month, or, to be exact, on December 19, 1933, the voters of my State marched to the polls and placed the stamp of approval on this outstanding public improvement. Jim Rolph, of San Francisco, was Governor at the time, and it was largely through his efforts, in personally campaigning from one end of the State to the other, that the measure was carried.

When completed, Central Valley may very likely prove to be the best insurance policy to which Uncle Sam ever subscribed. So you may know how valuable that insurance is, I submit certain figures which recently came to my desk.

The Bureau of the Census shows for 1940 California first among all 48 States in total value of agricultural products. Breaking the figures down, the Golden State registered 29 firsts, 10 seconds, and 8 thirds in diversified farm products, embracing field crops, fruits, and vegetables.

In several important items of fruit production, California furnished more than 90 percent of the national supply.

The Central Valley project will conserve those waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, which in the flood seasons of late winter and early spring overflow, causing far-reaching damage and finally going to waste in the wide Pacific. By making possible the holding back of these precious waters for irrigation purposes during the dry summer and fall seasons, you are assuring our country, through the years ahead, increased production of the wide variety of crops as shown on the attached table.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the figures at this point. Same are found on Bureau of the Census Print 3–30191.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

California scores many firsts in agriculture in 1940 census

Item	California's rank in United States	California's number or quantity	United States number or quantity	California's percent of United States
Alfalfa hay, tons	1	3,612,318	25,653,221	11.7
Hives of bees, number	1	217,306	2,277,077	9.5
Honey produced, pounds	1	6,518,856	66,902,136	9.7
Asparagus, acres	1	64,905	116,751	55.6
Cantaloups, muskmelons etc., do	1	28,953	141,521	20.5
Carrots, do	1	16,017	54,987	29.1
Cauliflower, do	1	11,736	28,679	40.9
Celery, do	1	10,682	36,486	27.6
Lettuce, do	1	79,673	121,104	65.8
Tomatoes, do	1	59,774	517,453	11.6
Sugar beets, do	1	151,713	867,424	17.5
Do, tons	1	2,394,140	10,299,939	23.2
Peaches, bushels	1	20,129,958	56,576,746	35.6
Pears, bearing trees, number	1	4,203,134	12,414,162	33.9
Pears, bushels	1	8,556,720	24,980,749	34.3
Grapes, bearing vines, number	1	206,196,986	273,327,014	75.4
Grapes, pounds	1	4,195,680,000	4,589,413,142	91.4
Plums and prunes, bearing trees, number	1	12,915,324	21,663,269	59.6
Plums and prunes, bushels	1	18,832,536	25,646,331	73.4
Oranges, bearing trees, number	1	17,125,400	32,611,432	52.5
Oranges, tons	1	1,547,710	2,872,674	53.9
Almonds, bearing trees, number	1	4,361,218	4,366,245	99.9
Almonds, pounds	1	47,876,000	47,910,710	99.9
English walnuts, bearing trees, number	1	2,352,129	2,868,946	82.0
English walnuts, pounds	1	118,344,000	128,453,713	92.1
Flower and vegetable seeds, acres	1	11,038	68,807	16.0
Flower and vegetable seeds—sales, dollars	1	$3,930,245	$19,662,245	20.0
Cash wages paid by farms, do	1	$114,123,135	$781,791,558	14.6
Motortrucks on farms, number	1	58,015	1,047,084	5.5
Barley threshed, bushels	2	32,549,532	260,980,878	12.5
Peas (green), acres	2	34,897	296,299	11.8
Spinach, do	2	6,684	69,255	9.7
Hops, do	2	6,354	29,949	21.2
Do, pounds	2	8,767,816	32,485,614	27.0
Peaches, bearing trees, number	2	6,645,718	47,147,060	14.1
Cherries, pounds	2	53,554,000	310,397,048	17.3
Turkeys raised, number	2	2,593,406	27,933,756	9.3
Field and seed beans—dry, acres	2	286,612	1,591,211	18.0
Dry field and seed beans, bushels	2	5,691,465	23,606,104	24.0
Eggs produced, dozens	3	129,686,042	2,391,691,510	5.4
Farms with hard-surfaced roads adjacent, number	3	80,199	1,146,936	7.0
Dwellings lighted by electricity, do	3	110,014	2,032,316	5.4
Rice, bushels	3	7,929,991	43,807,455	18.1
Flax, do	3	1,481,077	18,829,453	7.9
Cherries, bearing trees, number	3	954,677	9,564,695	10.0
Grapefruit, bearing trees, do	3	1,028,072	10,107,441	10.2
Grapefruit, tons	3	81,899	1,236,673	6.6

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, we of California are grateful for your confidence and your help. We will show our appreciation by maintaining and increasing production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

THE LABOR SITUATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who is always sincere and always earnest, in his opening sentence today said that men are dying for this country of ours. He made the statement that men are dying in far-off lands in order that we may be safe here. Everyone knows that those men should have had adequate means of defense, that all our forces should be fully equipped, that they should have everything needed before they go into battle, yet it is evident to all of us, in view of what has happened, that neither our Army nor our Navy were properly equipped when the assault was made on the 7th of December.

There is not very much use in arguing about—there is not very much to be gained by discussing the reasons which impelled us to send so much of our material to other lands and to other nations while neglecting our own possessions—our own fighting men.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] spoke about the necessity of having a separate air force. I do not care to enter into that discussion because I do not know anything about it, but you will recall that when he was speaking I asked him a question about whether or not he is willing to go far enough to advocate legislation which will permit all patriotic Americans who desire to do so to work furnishing the equipment which an air force must have, and he declined to answer.

The majority party has an overwhelming and a workable majority in this House. The leadership of that party knows that neither our Army nor our Navy have the things they should have. The leadership of this House knows that only by calling into action every productive force can we be fully prepared, yet it yields to a few selfish labor politicians. Just a few days ago the President called a conference here in Washington to determine upon a labor policy. Until this time we have not had a labor policy, except the policy dictated and carried out by John L. Lewis.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The conference has just been completed between labor and management and the public. I was disappointed, however, this morning, as I am certain other Members of this House were, to read that Senator THOMAS, who was cochairman of that meeting, had said that we could expect in the future continued strikes in defense industries in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that; not only are strikes to continue, but the same gentleman is coauthor of a bill which passed in the Senate last year, was referred over to the House, and is now pending before the Labor Committee of the House, in which it was made a criminal offense for any employee in any defense industry—although defense industries were not named—to report to

the management that subversive activities were being carried on in such factories.

I repeat, the majority party has a working majority, and the responsibility rests upon it to get production. I ask you, when are you going to amend the Wagner Act so that patriotic Americans, those who stay here at home, those who have sons, and those who have brothers in these far-off possessions of ours, where they are giving their lives, as the gentleman from California has said, I ask you when you will make it possible for those boys here at home to work in our factories and furnish the food, the clothing, the implements of war, the bombers, and the pursuit planes, and the tanks, I ask you when will you make it possible for those boys to work here at home without buying a license from John L. Lewis' organization? When are you going to back your President sufficiently and actively enough so that you will free him from the domination of John L. Lewis?

The President told us in no uncertain terms that this Government of ours would never force a man to join a union, and then he appointed an Arbitration Board, with Steelman at the head of it, and it came down with an order that men had to join. So that you do not have a President controlling things as far as the labor situation is concerned.

The man who dictates the policy of this country on labor, who has a monopoly over labor, is John L. Lewis, and you know it. No American can work when John says he cannot work until that man comes across and lays on the table the initiation fee, until he pays the dues, until he gets that little slip of paper acknowledging allegiance to John.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is the gentleman not conversant with the fact that the House has discharged the major portion of its obligation to the Nation by sending a bill over to the other side of the Capitol, and they have put it in their hip pocket and are sitting on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We did that last year and we did it again this year, and they have it over there. The leadership of this House, the majority party, the administration, lacks the nerve, the courage, to say to the other body that we want action on the bills we send over there. It is true we have no right to tell them what to do. No one intimates that we have that right. But we certainly have the right to insist that they get out of their sit-down strike over there and show courage, if they have any, and vote on the propositions that we sent over.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 528. An act to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone; and

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore also announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.), pursuant to its order previously entered, the House adjourned until Friday, January 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1194. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of Joint Army and Navy Board on a bridge from Hunter Point and Bay Farm Island across San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1195. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1941 of the National Park Trust Fund Board; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1196. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to create the limited-service Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1197. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1198. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1199. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers, No. D42-200, recommended to him for disposition by the Panama Canal; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6291. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the coordination of the forwarding of waterborne exports from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6292. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of service to applicants for engine-room ratings on vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6293. A bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 260. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to acquire certain lands in Nassau County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res 261. Joint resolution granting certain priority rights in the rationing of automotive fuel and equipment to taxicab operators in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. Res. 397. Resolution creating a committee to devise and distribute identification devices to Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PADDOCK introduced a bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of Leon F. Harris, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2218. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Congregation Shearith Israel in the city of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2219. Also, petition of the Municipal Assembly of Ponce, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2220. Also, petition of the Butchers' Union of Greater New York and Vicinity, Local No. 174, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2221. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Chief Austin Black Crow, of Norris, S. Dak., with reference to conditions on the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

2222. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Resolution No. 15 of the State of California, as per pages 54-55 of the California Legislature, Senate Daily Journal, asking for an immediate study of the San Francisco Bay project, or the Reber plan; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 2, 1942

The Very Reverend Zebarney T. Phillips, D. D., Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, by whose gracious tenderness we are brought to the beginning of this New Year: Make us ever mindful of Thy goodness toward us, and grant that each day, as it dawns, may find us diligent in the discharge of such duties as may be allotted by Thy Providence.

Grant to us now, and especially in the days that lie ahead, Thine own gift of loyalty. For our homes, increase in us the spirit of tenderness and devotion to our loved ones; for our Country, may we count no sacrifice too great for the maintenance of national ideals and sacred honour; for our Church and the religious affiliation of each citizen, grant us the spirit of reverence and fealty to each sacred obligation, and, above all, grant to us, a united people, the ever forward look of Hope, even though at present

there may be something of a shadow in her gaze.

We ask it in the name of Thy Blessed Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, before whom all shadows flee away. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 30, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On December 31, 1941:

S. 2119. An act to prohibit the possession of dangerous weapons and explosives on board certain vessels.

On January 2, 1942:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4932) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo., and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AWARDS OF CONTRACTS FOR THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting pursuant to law, relative to division of awards of certain quantity contracts for aircraft, aircraft parts, and accessories therefor entered into with more than one bidder under authority of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Chairman and directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, submitting, pursuant to law, the eighth annual report of the Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Panama Canal, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with an accompanying paper); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions and letters in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of the State of North Dakota, praying that the proceeding involving the right of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to a seat in the Senate be dismissed; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by members of George W. Hood Unit, No. 91, American Legion Auxiliary, of Washington, Kans., praying for the enactment of House bill 4, to liberalize pensions for the widows and dependents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Finance.

WHEAT-ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Governor Ratner, of Kansas, copy of a letter which he addressed Secretary Wickard asking that the wheat-allotment program be amended in such a way as will permit farmers to harvest volunteer wheat without their being ruled out of compliance with the A. A. A. regulations. I think the suggestion should have serious consideration. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Through a rare combination of favorable weather conditions, Kansas this year has volunteer wheat estimated at as much as 2,000,000 acres, which, unless action is taken by the proper authorities, will be destroyed in compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration crop regulation program. A similar situation exists in a number of other wheat-producing States.

Kansas volunteer wheat could and should be harvested in 1942 in order to help contribute precious food toward our vital task of winning the war. Yet, unless the proper steps are taken, it will be destroyed.

I am well aware of the theory behind the present regulations on wheat production. But yesterday's theories may prove dangerous and impracticable in the grim war days ahead. Conditions are changing rapidly. Abundance today may be followed by critical shortages tomorrow. We cannot assume that our present abundance will continue during the years to come. We dare not gamble with fate when our freedom is at stake.

Natural causes, such as insects, plant diseases, hail, drought, and other adverse weather conditions, might result in deficient crops for several seasons in Kansas and other States.

The world is so deeply involved in war that the agricultural output of many countries is greatly decreased or virtually wiped out. It must also be realized that the United States, and other countries, will lose food as ships sink on the high seas. There is also the ever-present danger of wheat being destroyed through sabotage, both in its growing state and in concentration points. More wheat must therefore be made available to compensate for such war losses.

Our farmers are also faced with a steadily dwindling labor supply, due to the increased need for men in our armed forces and in the field of industrial defense. Farm machinery will be harder to obtain in the seasons ahead, and even speedy farm machinery repairs can no longer be assured. In other words, our ability to seed, harvest, store, and process wheat may not be as great a year or two from today as it is now.

With the world's supply of food steadily diminishing under war conditions, I cannot conceive of any reason why growing wheat, or any other potential food, should be destroyed.

As a modification to the present Agricultural Adjustment Administration regulations, on the basis of information given me by a number of experienced Kansas wheat growers, I am therefore suggesting consideration of a program of this general nature:

Permit our farmers to harvest from volunteer wheat acreage in excess of their allotments, and if necessary require them to hold off the 1942 market all wheat thus harvested, provided war conditions justify such action at that time. This wheat could be held without storage charge in each farmer's granary, or stored in Government granaries under regulations established by the proper officials. It is clear that the storage of wheat in thousands of granaries throughout the Wheat Belt would be much safer than concentration in a few warehouses, because of the factor of military security.

It may be that it would prove desirable to permit farmers to use, without deductions from their 1942 fall planting a part of this volunteer wheat for pasture of livestock for as long a time as the producer needs, provided conditions do not justify harvesting the grain for human consumption. This would aid in the present effort to produce more meat and dairy products.

These and other details would, of course, be worked out by national, State, and local officials now in charge of the program, after sanction for these modifications is obtained.

Our chief concern is to protect this great supply of potential food for ourselves and for our Allies throughout the world. I am informed that it might cost our country about 1,000 loaves of bread for every acre of volunteer wheat destroyed — 2,000,000,000 loaves in Kansas alone. When these figures are applied to the estimated 2,000,000 acres of volunteer wheat growing in Kansas, and the result is added to the amounts in other States where similar conditions exist, it is apparent that the destruction of volunteer wheat would be a severe blow against the war effort of the United States. In our present "all out" effort there should be maximum production of all foods.

In time of war the destruction of any weapon which can help defeat the enemy, or any resource which will aid us, borders on treason. We are told that "food will win the war, and write the peace," and I believe it will.

As an act of patriotism, and in the interest of all Americans and all humanity, I hope that you will do your utmost to see to it that this great supply of potential food is preserved for possible future use, and that none of our "food for freedom" is destroyed at this time of vital need.

Sincerely,

PAYNE RATNER.

RESOLUTION OF SCHUYLKILL COUNTY (PA.) LAW ASSOCIATION—AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. DAVIS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution I have received from the Schuylkill County Law Association of the city of Pottsville, Pa., relating to an amendment of the Bankruptcy Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 4847, now pending in Congress, to amend section 75 (a) of the Bankruptcy Act, which bill, as now drafted, would permit the appointment as conciliation commissioners of persons who are not lawyers, should be redrafted so as to

include, instead of exclude, a requirement that a conciliation commissioner be a member of the bar of the appointing court, because in order to render service of high character a conciliation commissioner as well as a referee in bankruptcy, should have knowledge of the law and of the administration of justice and should be experienced as a counselor in the light of the rights and duties of persons under the law; and

Resolved further, That the chancellor and the secretary of this association be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the committee on Federal law of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, to both of the United States Senators from Pennsylvania, and to our Representative in Congress, Hon. IVOR D. FENTON, and such other Senators and Representatives as they may determine.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present several resolutions from Wisconsin, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Appropriations:

Whereas during the depression period many emergency relief programs were instituted by the Federal Government in order to relieve the financial needs of groups of citizens; and

Whereas today with industrial employment at a high level and farm help a scarcity due to both production of defense goods and the enrollment of men in the armed forces; and

Whereas citizens are being called upon to make personal sacrifices in order to finance the defense program, and are as willing to pay these bills as they were to pay the cost of emergency relief in all its phases when there was a real need for those Federal activities; and

Whereas, despite the great demand for manpower and money in the national-defense program and despite the fact that citizens must sacrifice in order to pay these costs, Federal spending for nondefense activities has been increased this year rather than decreased; and

Whereas many public officials, including the Secretary of the Treasury have stressed the need of a reduction in the Federal nondefense spending and Congress has recognized this need by calling upon the Director of the Budget to submit estimates for economies up to $2,000,000,000 in the current budget, and has also appointed a joint committee with Senator BYRD as chairman for the purpose of determining what economies may be made: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Waupaca County Taxpayers Association urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the nondefense Federal spending; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators ROBERT LA FOLLETTE and ALEXANDER WILEY, and Congressman REID F. MURRAY, our Wisconsin representatives in Congress, urging them to support the movement to reduce nondefense spending.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
RALPH PERRY POST, NO. 3392,
Algoma, Wis., December 27, 1941.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It gives me great pleasure to present the following resolution, which was passed at a recent meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Kewaunee County, Wis.:

"*Resolved*, That in view of the crisis existing in our country, which is facing one of the darkest hours in our history, wherein our freedom and right to live is threatened, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Ralph Perry Post of Kewaunee County cast a unanimous vote of confidence in the steps taken by President Roosevelt and Congress to protect our rights and liberties which our forefathers brought here and for which they fought and died."

Respectfully yours,
LESTER C. HEIDMANN,
Commander.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Realizing in recent times more than ever before that dairy products are the Nation's first line of health defense and that increasing the per capita consumption of cheese, butter, milk, and all dairy products is of prize economic importance to the welfare of the dairymen, this organization, the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association, was created.

Whereas nearly 100,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers over a period of years have contributed much, both in money and effort to the accomplishment of this worthy objective, we resent the pronouncement of the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, urging a decreased consumption of cheese as being detrimental to a national program of health and as contrary to the welfare of American dairymen.

RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas the recently adopted standards of oleomargarine constitute the legalizing of fraud and deception upon American consumers, and inasmuch as these standards are designed to assist the sale of an imitation product to the detriment of butter and at the expense of the health of our people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Security Agency be requested to change these standards so as to require oleomargarine to stand on its own feet and sell on its own merits, preventing the use of butter or other dairy products in the manufacture of oleomargarine and requiring the use of some color and flavor not in the imitation of butter; and be it further

Resolved, That oleomargarine labels be required to specify the various fat sources and the exact percentages of these various fats used.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

Be it resolved, That the bylaws of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association be amended as follows:

A. That in place of the Wisconsin Cooperative Milk Pool, a group be represented on the board of directors to be known as other cooperative cheese factories, and the independent cheese factories be a definite group with representation on the board of directors.

B. That under the heading of organizations entitled to an associate director, the name of the Wisconsin Agricultural Authority be omitted.

C. That in article VI under title of "Quorum" there be added the following: "If less than two-thirds majority are present, then unanimous vote shall be required."

RESOLUTION NO. 4

Inasmuch as the demonstrational type of promotion appears also to be very effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we suggest to the board of directors of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association that consideration be given to a dairy demonstration type of program within the State by employing, at least part time and possibly in conjunction with sound and reputable organizations, a person or persons to conduct dairy-product cooking schools.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

We recommend to the board of directors of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association the desirability of building interest in and support for the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association by encouraging greater attendance at the annual meeting. We suggest this to be done, first, by encouraging the attendance of farm women; second, by providing a luncheon for dairymen and their wives attending the annual meeting, and also by supplying entertainment and demonstrations. We believe it is basic to the endurance of this organization that greater interest be instilled and a much larger attendance at annual meetings be guaranteed. To the accomplishment of this valuable objective we submit that the spending of an amount up to $600 would be a sound investment for the future of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas maintaining the health of American soldiers and sailors is as essential now as always and inasmuch as other spreads in place of butter will not provide as adequate nutrition: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association, assembled in annual meeting at Marshfield, Wis., October 20, 1841, That bill S. 1959, legalizing the use of oleomargarine in feeding the armed forces of the United States be strenuously opposed.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas information furnished this association from reliable sources indicating ever-increasing activities of price control of agricultural products, especially dairy products, and realizing the responsibility the dairy industry has in the present emergency for national defense when the Government requests greater quantities of dairy products to be produced for export; and

Whereas it is the purpose and function of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association to assist and promote in every way possible this national movement of greater production of dairy products, it is of great concern to the entire dairy industry to have movements promoted for the regulation of prices on dairy products and other agriculture products, all of which at present are 21 percent below the 1929 level;

Whereas labor costs are 5 percent over the 1929 level, creating a disparity and placing the dairy industry in a position where national request for additional production cannot be met: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association, in convention assembled at Marshfield this 20th day of October 1941, That the true condition of our industry be brought to the attention of our Representatives in the United States Senate and Congress, in order that immediate steps be taken to prevent any further movements by Government agencies or others to infringe on the rights of the farmer, and particularly the dairyman, of receiving a fair price for his products, by Government regulations, creating inequality between types of dairy products, promotion of substitutes, and importation of dairy products at a price when the dairyman is starting to receive somewhat near cost of production.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas the inconsistent prices on dairy products, especially butter, as compared with other dairy products, are seriously damaging the industry and interfering with Government requests for lend-lease help from the dairy industry. Continuation of apparently contradictory policies will result in very serious repercussions in the entire dairy industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association, assembled in convention

this 20th day of October 1941, request the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and all Representatives and Senators of Wisconsin, to help prevent such repercussions in the dairy industry; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of Wisconsin and Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture.

RESOLUTION NO. 9

Be it resolved, That copies of the foregoing resolutions pertaining to the pronouncements of Secretary Wickard, and those relating to oleomargarine standards and the use of oleomargarine in feeding the armed forces of the United States, be sent to Wisconsin Congressmen, United States Senators from Wisconsin, to Secretary Wickard, to Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNutt, and to any others in Federal service to whom such resolutions might be of concern.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

A. J. Brovold was one of the incorporators and a director of the Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association when he was taken from our midst. Mr. Brovold had at heart the welfare of the dairy industry. He spent much of his time and effort in behalf of dairymen, and his counsel and advice were much appreciated. It is with deep regret that we record the passing of A. J. Brovold. We extend our sincere sympathy to the family of the deceased.

RESOLUTION NO. 11

Because of the hospitality enjoyed by all attending this the third Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association annnual meting, we thank the Marshfield Commercial Club, the Eagles Club of Marshfield, and all others locally who contributed to the success of our 1941 meeting. Particularly we are grateful to Mr. Huffman, of Wisconsin Rapids, manager and director of the Wisconsin radio network, and to the several broadcasting stations that have cooperated in publicizing this convention and who have so generously worked together in carrying our program to the dairymen of Wisconsin. We also thank the personnel of station WLBL for their assistance and cooperation.

We are appreciative for the contributions made by our State department of agriculture, Wisconsin College of Agriculture, the daily, weekly, and farm press, and radio stations, which has meant much to the success of our Wisconsin Dairy Industries Association.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 30, 1941, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) fixing the dates of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

NOMINATION OF COL. HENRY L. LARSEN, MARINE CORPS

Mr. GILLETTE. By request, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, as in executive session, I report favorably a nomination in the Marine Corps, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Col. Henry L. Larsen to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 22d day of December 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nomination as in executive session?

Mr. McNARY. At this time, yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it will have to go to the calendar, if there is objection, and, under the rule, could not be taken up today.

Mr. McNARY. I understand the rule; I am not objecting to the presentation of the report; but, at the present time, its consideration would interfere with the orderly proceedings of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2162. A bill for the relief of Luther Edwin West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

S. 2163. A bill to amend section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the pooling and division of certain revenues of carriers subject to such act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

COMPENSATION TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR TIME ON MILITARY DUTY

Mr. DAVIS. I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It relates to the payment of compensation of officers and employees of the United States Government for time spent on duty as members of the military forces—other than the National Guard—of a State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the committee a letter I have received from Robert G. Woodside, colonel, commanding the Third Infantry at Pittsburgh, Pa., and also a letter from the First Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2164) relating to the payment of compensation of officers and employees of the United States Government for time spent on duty as members of the military forces (other than the National Guard) of a State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The letters presented by Mr. DAVIS to accompany the bill, S. 2164, were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, THIRD REGIMENT,
PENNSYLVANIA RESERVE DEFENSE CORPS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 24, 1941.

Subject: Federal Government employees on duty with Pennsylvania Reserve Defense Corps.

To: Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS, United State Senate, Washington, D. C.

For your information, I am enclosing herewith copy of letter received from the First Assistant Postmaster General by the commander of our Company B at New Castle.

We have been endeavoring to have employers cooperate with us in the operation of our force by taking care of the difference in pay received by these men in their regular employment and what they receive from the State while on this service. Most of our men are men of family and for this reason are serving with us instead of the other armed forces. As you are probably aware, the Pennsylvania Reserve Defense Corps are mobilized on order of the War Department, and it puts us in an awkward position if the Government facilities refuse to do what we are asking private employers to do. I might say that Governor James is taking care of the matter satisfactorily for all the employees of the State under his control.

I would appreciate it very much if you would have this important matter given immediate attention.

ROBERT G. WOODSIDE,
Colonel, Commanding Third Infantry.

N. B.—The only way this can be rectified is by act of Congress.

DECEMBER 17, 1941.

Captain MCCLELLAND,
Commanding Officer, Company B, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Defense Corps, New Castle, Pa.

MY DEAR CAPTAIN MCCLELLAND: Reference is made to your telegram of December 15, 1941, to the Postmaster General regarding the payment of salary to post-office employees while in the military service, with particular reference to Clifford B. Gill, a city carrier in the Sharpsville, Pa., post office, who is a member of Company B, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Defense Corps, which is on duty.

Based on the present information of the Department, a post-office employee, during the time he is called out for duty as a member of a State defense organization, would not be entitled to any compensation under the Post Office Department. However, should he have vacation leave to his credit, he could be granted such vacation to the extent accrued and, of course, be paid as usual under this Department. Otherwise he would be granted leave without pay by his postmaster.

Very truly yours,
AMBROSE O'CONNELL,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING BILLS AND RECEIVING MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I present an order and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered and entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress today, authority be given to the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the House of Representatives and to the Vice President to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the order is entered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT OF PRICE CONTROL BILL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I wish to state that the

Banking and Currency Committee is called to meet at 2 o'clock to receive the report of the Subcommittee on Price Control Legislation, and expects to order its report this afternoon. It is not contemplated, I will say to the Senate, that the bill be taken up before next Tuesday, but the sooner the report is filed the more time all Senators wil have to read it and study it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized, during the adjournment of the Senate, to make its report upon that proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I am glad to note the committee is ready to make a report. As long ago as August last, I discussed the matter with the able Democratic leader, and suggested that the lateness in getting the bill before Congress and the delay in the other House were causing a dislocation of business. This is the first of the year. I am not ascribing any delay to the committee or to the able leader on the Democratic side. However, I want a little time to study the measure before it is brought to the floor for action. Monday, I understand, will be given over to a message from the President, and probably a Budget message. I do not know whether we want to plunge into the discussion of this measure on Tuesday, with so little time being given to study the hearings and the report and the bill, which has not been filed, but which, I think, is an improvement over the House bill. So we should have some opportunity for consideration and reflection.

The point I am making is that there was an emergency for this measure long ago, but the call was not heeded, and I am not now in a disposition and mood to rush into it without opportunity given for thorough study of the measure. If the report could be printed by Monday, or earlier, and we could go along until Wednesday, it would suit me better than to take up the bill Tuesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I agree with his preliminary statement. The Senator from Oregon has been interested in and he and I discussed price-control legislation frequently, and, indeed, as early as last August. The delay has not been due to any fault of this body or of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The hearings and proceedings of the committee were greatly shortened, compared with the hearings held in the House of Representatives. We have had nonpartisan cooperation among the members of the committee in an attempt to get the proposed legislation reported.

I am not particular about the bill being brought up Tuesday, as compared with Wednesday, but if we cannot get the consent which I have asked, the committee could not report until Monday, the report would not be available until Tuesday, and to that extent there would be a denial of opportunity to Members of the Senate to study the legislative proposal and the hearings.

The hearings have been in print for a week or two. If we can get the report filed, it will be printed and will be available Monday or Tuesday; and I am satisfied the Senator from Oregon and I can agree on a time when consideration of the bill may begin, without doing injustice to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. I exculpated the Senate committee in my preliminary statement. I am sure I shall have no difficulty in coming to an agreement with the able Democratic leader. If we can have the report printed soon, and then approach the subject gradually, and discuss it Tuesday, and then, if some Senators may not be able to speak on it that day, we could take an early adjournment to Wednesday, that would be very satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection. I am sure we will have an understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky is granted, and the report will be received and printed.

FALL OF MANILA—AMERICA HAS JUST BEGUN TO FIGHT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, Senators no doubt are advised that the War Department has just announced that Manila has been captured by the Japanese. I feel that under ordinary circumstances this information would be somewhat disquieting to our people, and I think someone should sound a note to the effect that there is no cause for depression by reason of the fall of Manila.

Military and naval experts for years have regarded the Philippines as a military liability, and not an asset. Because of the distance from this country to the Philippines and without bases nearer than the United States, it is very difficult, of course, even in normal times, to reinforce them and properly supply them.

Everyone knows that Japan has been meditating and preparing for an attack on the United States, and whether she intended to attack the United States or not, she has been prepared from a military and naval standpoint and has been engaged in war for 4 years. No doubt she could put a million men in the Philippines, if it were necessary, before we could even get one transport to that neighborhood. So I trust that the people of the United States will not be disheartened and will not regard the capture of Manila as a tragic incident.

When we get ready with our Army and Navy forces—and I hope it will be soon—of course, we shall recapture the Philippines, and we shall take the necessary measures to see that appropriate punishment is meted out for the treacherous attack made on our Navy and Army at Hawaii.

Mr. President, I wanted to sound this note on my own responsibility alone—I speak for no one except myself—in order that the people may be somewhat reassured that we are not going to lose this war.

We are a peaceful people. We were not expecting a war; we were not prepared for war. An attack was made on us at a time when Japan was supposedly negotiating for an amicable adjustment of our differences, an attack conceived in treachery and executed in the most villainous and dastardly fashion known to modern times. As soon as we hit our stride, as soon as our Navy and Army are ready, as soon as we marshal our manpower and marshal our factories—which means that we will have to marshal them so that there will be no strikes in them—we will bring the war to a triumphant conclusion.

THE END OF THE SESSION—AMERICA'S TASK FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, today the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress comes to an end. The legislative history of this session and the contemporary events of this period will take a prominent place in the life story of the Nation.

As the gavel falls upon our labors, bringing about sine die adjournment of the session, it finds Congress and all the people of the United States united in a single purpose—to preserve our representative institutions of government, and to uphold the cause of justice in behalf of liberty in every part of the world.

As one who represents in part the industrial and agricultural bounties of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I speak for our communities the common desire to cooperate in every possible way for the security and safety of the Nation in this hour of peril.

The relation between the States and the Federal Government becomes increasingly important in times of national emergency. Work of war production is accomplished in the great centers of population. This war will be won through agricultural and industrial production. The first responsibility of government now becomes the encouragement and guidance of such production, and the servants of the people in the Government most closely identified with this task are the leaders of victory. While we vote appropriations in Washington, the real job of winning the war is being carried on in mine, field, mill, and factory throughout the Nation. This is true, and will be increasingly true, in the Keystone State of Pennsylvania. Through the channel of our full production will roll out the machines, the equipment, the food, the clothing, the manpower, which are absolutely essential to victory.

Mr. President, our national needs now and in the future require the preservation of our two-party system of government. That effective instrument of democracy should not be impaired. This can well be accomplished by affording help to the unified objective of winning the war and securing the peace. Unquestionably the end of the war will leave us heavier responsibilities in international duties than we have ever before been called upon to assume. We can better bear the burdens of the weak by increasing our own strength. Our effective instruments of production and distribution for future needs must have increased efficiency. The free enterprise for which we fight this war and with which we fight

it must have its full reward in opportunity for service in the post-war world.

To all Members of the Senate, including its faithful staff, I wish health and strength to carry on in the new year as they have so well done in the session now coming to an end.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating sundry officers for promotion in the Navy for temporary service, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF COL. HENRY L. LARSEN, MARINE CORPS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I now renew my request for the consideration of the nomination of Col. Henry L. Larsen to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, which I reported earlier from the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Is the nomination on the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination was reported a few minutes ago by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McNARY. Was the report made by the committee today?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I have just returned to the city, and when I entered the Senate Chamber today I was handed a telegram from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] asking me to present the report on the nomination, and to have it called up today and confirmed if possible.

Mr. McNARY. Has the committee acted on the nomination?

Mr. GILLETTE. The committee has acted.

Mr. McNARY. It acted today?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not today; no.

Mr. McNARY. When did the committee act on the nomination? The Senator has not made an explanation about it.

Mr. GILLETTE. I can only repeat my statement that I have just returned to the city, and when I entered the Chamber today the clerk of the Committee on Naval Affairs handed me the report on this nomination, with the following message from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]:

Suggest Senator GILLETTE or some other member of committee request confirmation of Larsen as brigadier general.

I have merely acted on that message, and have presented the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it true that the Committee on Naval Affairs ordered this nomination to be favorably reported?

Mr. GILLETTE. I assume it did. As I have said, I just returned to the city last night, and I assumed the committee had acted.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think we had better have something stronger than an assumption. I am sure the Senator can ascertain from the secretary of the committee what the situation is. I do not want to permit a nomination to be presented here unless it has back of it a committee report.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I can readily understand that, Mr. President. I am simply acting at the request of the chairman of the committee. If the Senator from Oregon desires, I will go to the telephone and ascertain the fact.

Mr. McNARY. That would be a very commendable action on the part of the able Senator from Iowa. I think he had better ascertain what the fact is.

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just conferred with the secretary of the Naval Affairs Committee, who informs me that under the standing rules of the committee, if a nomination stands for 3 days without objection, the chairman of the committee is authorized to report it favorably, without action on the part of the committee or without calling the committee together, and that the chairman has acted under the committee rule in requesting that the nomination be reported at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Then it amounts to an action on the part of the committee?

Mr. GILLETTE. It amounts to that under the standing rule of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. Under those circumstances, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report favorably a number of nominations of postmasters and ask for their immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters just reported be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. McKELLAR. While I am on my feet I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Mr. BARKLEY. From the Committee on Finance I report favorably a nomination, which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alexander H. Bell, of Norfolk, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va., to fill an existing vacancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is no further business to be transacted as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, the Senate adjourned sine die.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 2, 1942:

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be rear admirals

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John R. Beardall, November 3, 1941.
Willis A. Lee, Jr., November 4, 1941.
William R. Purnell, November 5, 1941.
Theodore S. Wilkinson, November 18, 1941.
William W. Smith, November 19, 1941.
Olaf M. Hustvedt, November 20, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 2, 1942:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Alexander H. Bell to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be brigadier general

Henry L. Larsen to be brigadier general for temporary service from December 22, 1941.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Lewis A. McLean, Livingston.
Evie L. Griffin, Moundville.
Henry Leland Cummins, Opp.

CONNECTICUT

Bruce B. Randall, Bridgewater.
Leola W. Beck, Columbia.

GEORGIA

Arthur C. Turner, Statesboro.

ILLINOIS

Louis J. Bianchetta, Coal City.
Gladys V. Rosson, Makanda.
Delmar D. Debault, Mason.
Minnie D. Davis, Mooseheart.
Charles E. Myers, Pontiac.

INDIANA

Mary C. Shaffer, Arcadia.
Louise M. Patton, Hardinsburg.
Alva R. Staggs, Monticello.

KENTUCKY

J. Roy Cox, Livermore.
Imogene Baumeister, Pewee Valley.
Sally H. Ratcliff, Praise.

LOUISIANA

George E. Johnson, Boyce.
Stephen R. Jackson, Cheneyville.
Robert H. Nelson, Shreveport.

MAINE

Everett F. Larrabee, Bridgton.
Merle R. Pitman, Lovell.
Lester E. Goud, Topsham.
Howard F. Wright, Wilton.

MINNESOTA

Charles R. Whitcomb, Morgan.

MISSISSIPPI

William C. Bourland, Fulton.
William J. Pettyjohn, Marks.

NEBRASKA

Blanche E. Kammerer, Ashland.
Edith F. Francis, Belden.
Glenn D. Young, Firth.
A. Otto Erdman, Venango.
Mary May Holley, Waverly.
Edith C. Hackl, Wynot.

NEVADA

Florence Sears Jackson, Imlay.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Theodore W. Drew, Intervale.

OHIO

John Roth, Excello.
Josephine M. Furey, Hanoverton.
Virginia Lange, Kelleys Island.
Bertha R. Murphey, Lakemore.
Theodore C. Gilroy, Waynesfield.

OKLAHOMA

Logan E. Lentz, Ames.
Benjamine F. Cooksey, Fairland.
George W. Blair, Yale.

OREGON

Cdden L. Dickens, John Day.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Dexter E. Ellerbe, Florence.
Bertie Lee B. Williams, Neeses.

UTAH

Lyman Baker, Eureka.

VERMONT

James Emil Petersen, Salisbury.

VIRGINIA

Bessie J. Deane New Canton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Peter J. Groseclose, Hemphill.

WYOMING

Ella M. Sullivan, Evansville.
Robert W. Macy, Moorcroft.
Alfred J. Johnson, Ranchester.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 2, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COLE of Maryland.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations, and no storms are able to destroy the serenity of a soul that rests under the shadow of the Good Shepherd; there Thy rod and staff will comfort and lead us through the shadow-hung valley of the new year. We praise Thee that Thou hast prepared a table in the presence of all enemies; surely our cup runneth over and Thou hast blessed us with love's inexhaustible fullness. Dear Lord, while we do not disdain Thy material blessings, though we thank Thee for home, for social relations, and for all worldly mercies which have attended us, yet we would discern the home of the soul where broken men are brothers all.

Oh, soul of our country, seek Thy aid from the heights. With heaven as Thy shield and buckler, welcome be Thy message, O Lord, "Come unto Me." Oh, set us free from all bitterness, all hateful resentment; breasting the gloom of the future, may we find the rarer lusters when the flames have died out. Bless all churches with their appointed servants as they make known to men Thy word: "I am the strength of thy life; I will hew great windows, wonderful, measureless windows, for thy soul." We offer and ask all in the spirit of our Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 30, 1941, was read and approved.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses, which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of all business on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to precede the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has a special order for today?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and he has consented that I may precede him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a group of patriotic citizens of Marion, Ind., to the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in one of them an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article in Common Sense by Richard L. Neuberger, entitled "What God Hath Wrought."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a prominent citizen on the Pacific coast on the war and the method of financing it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, today we close the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which has been more lavish in expenditures of Government funds than any Congress that has ever been held in this Nation. We have spent much money very foolishly and much money has not been spent wisely or judiciously. We are now in war, and it is up to every American citizen to do everything he can to see that the war is prosecuted following the very best methods that can be used. If we are going to do this, as we open a new session next Monday, we must cut out all unnecessary departmental expenses of Government. We must cut the necessary expenses of Government to the bone. It is going to be your duty and it is going to be my duty to see that this happens, and when we receive the President's Budget message next Monday it will be his duty and the duty of everyone to see that all functions of Government that are not absolutely necessary are eliminated. This is going to be essential, and if we do this we can save one and a half or two billion dollars, cutting out useless or unnecessary functions of Government that have been set up in the last 10 years. I sincerely hope that we do this. If we do not, we are going to bankrupt this Gov-

ernment of ours, and then how will we be able to prosecute the war? Where will you get the money? I say in all seriousness that we must do everything we can to cut down or eliminate or consolidate various activities of the Government, at the same time getting rid of all functions of Government now carried on that have become obsolete or unnecessary. You have appropriated and allocated during the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress over fifty-eight billions of dollars, some eight billions for the departments and over $50,000,000,000 for national defense, as was so many times said, for national defense to keep us out of war. You can see now that it did not keep us out of war. Our national defense was not so strong, for today we are fighting a losing battle in the Philippines. Unless we make our financial structure strong we will lose all battles in the end. Make every dollar we spend count for the prosecution of the war; yes, make every penny count for national defense now. It is not how much we spend, but how wisely we spend. It is not how much we spend, but make every dollar we spend count in winning the war we are now engaged in. We need wise, prudent, discreet men at the head of the Government. Mr. President, get rid of the incompetent, the unwise, and the hangers-on politically. The best that is in the President, the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the Marine Corps, and all Government workers, and the American people, will be none too good. Keep in mind that we must make every penny count. If you do, a happy New Year to all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a Hutchinson, Kans., newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE DEFENSE OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the brilliant leadership of Gen. Douglas MacArthur the defense of the Philippines has been magnificent. So was the defense put up by the military and civilian Americans on the islands of Guam, Midway, and Wake. History of the future will be illumined by the heroism which was the rule rather than the exception in these actions. But all the heroism, all the magnificent courage of those Americans, officers and men alike, who so bravely fought does not stamp out one iota of the stigma of unpreparedness, of laxity, of indifference to repeated warnings, of the naval and military high command in those areas.

It would be bad enough if we simply had not been able to pay for or to manufacture the implements of defense which were so sorely needed when the unexpected and surprising assaults were made by the Japs. But it will be recorded in history as a blacker fact that high-command officers of the Army and Navy did not discharge their duty of seeing that their troops were on the alert, that the various devices already furnished for the detection of hostile airplanes and submarines, provided such devices had been furnished them, were not manned and on the alert.

It will forever be a black page in the proud annals of the Navy that Japanese submarines actually entered the narrow channel into Pearl Harbor, cruised under the ships at anchor there, and supposedly did their deadly work before anyone even knew of their presence. It will be an equally black page in the proud annals of both the military and naval intelligence services that the Japanese had a complete and most effective "fifth column" service organized in Hawaii, apparently without the knowledge or suspicion of the authorities whose great and constant responsibility it was and is to ferret out and uncover these dangerous—vitally dangerous—"fifth columnists."

Indeed, as the ghastly story unfolds page by page, it now appears that these Japanese military spies were in the very households of high-command naval and military officers. They served the supplies to the ships. They knew even as well as our own officers the disposition of every bit of naval and military equipment. Somebody deserves court martial and disgrace for that awful failure.

We have heretofore considered it incredible that with all the billions we have spent and all the work that has been done in the United States, we would have been so blind and foolish as to practically give it all away, to other nations, keeping not even sufficient equipment and supplies for our own adequate defense. Yet that is what now proves to have been the case. We had to learn those facts from the frank lips of the British Premier, Winston Churchill, in his talk before the joint session of the Congress. We did not learn these facts from any military or naval or administration officials of our own. We had to wait until the blunt, candid Premier of another nation came to our Congress and publicly told us the facts when he said:

> If the United has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that it is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles and for the Libyan campaign, and, above all, because of your help in the battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends, and which has in consequence been successfully and prosperously maintained.

We have heretofore considered it incredible that our East and West coasts might not be adequately protected. We have believed it inconceivable that with reiterated warnings of impending danger, and with the expenditure of the unlimited billions we have poured into what we were told was the national defense, that at least enough machines, munitions, and supplies would be retained to protect our own coasts. It begins to look as though we may have been mistaken.

Had there been anything like adequate foresight on the part of those charged with the responsibility for looking ahead both in the Atlantic and the Pacific areas, the Philippines, Guam, Midway, and Wake would have had help from our airplanes. The Japs would not have had it all their own way. New York, Baltimore, Washington, San Francisco, Seattle, and other great coastal cities would not be shaken by fears of bombings. We have been told no enemy could get within 200 miles of our coasts or borders. We were told that repeatedly. Congress was assured and reassured on that point by responsible naval, military, and administration officials. The country was assured and reassured on that point time and again. But it all seems to have been empty—or nearly empty—promises.

Regardless of where the blame falls, the incompetents in the administration and in the Army and the Navy must be ferreted out and thrown out. This is no time for face saving. It is time to save America. Instead of further concealing these weaknesses and permitting them to continue, we must eliminate them and plug up the dangerous open holes in our defense.

It is worse than silly to talk about hushing up all criticism for fear the enemy may find it out. The enemy has already demonstrated that he knows more about our weaknesses than our own Army and Navy officials did. There must be an end to that situation. This is life-and-death business now. America must be protected. Incompetence must be ended. Incompetents must go. Bureaucrats and self-seeking politicians must give way to earnest, patriotic, capable men and women who can and will do the necessary job of making certain our defense is adequate and our preparedness great enough to do whatever must be done to preserve the America we know and love.

LET US FACE THE FACT

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], who just preceded me, have given me inspiration for this 1-minute talk. We all remember how we used to comfort ourselves with the thought that we were a race of supermen. We always boasted about our ability and decried our potential enemies. We all remember the Japanese tinderbox theory, a nation of fragile homes that we could blow out of the sea in no time, and of how their airplanes were run by squint-eyed Japanese, who could not see straight or shoot straight, how their battleships were third rate, and that all but a few were top-heavy. We were sadly awakened. The fact is that the Japanese gathered more striking force at the point where they needed it than we had. Their attack was a skillful attack, and we were caught unprepared. I think it is about time for us to stop talking. It is about time for us to buckle down to work and to face the fact. The American Nation can face it, and I am sure that Congress can face it, and I think that it has

become the duty of all of us here in Congress to rekindle the fires of patriotism in our people, and to accept the inevitable sacrifices and face the fact bravely, doing whatever work there is to be done.

BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4365) to give additional powers to the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, strike out the words "of Congress."

Page 4, line 5, strike out the words "of Congress."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The amendments do not change the bill in any respect?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No. The actual language of the bill in respect to its provisions is changed in no way. These are two technical changes of language.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were concurred in was laid on the table.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE LABOR CROSS MEDALS FOR EXCELLENCE IN WAR WORK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include as a part of my remarks the excellent address delivered by Mr. Fulton Lewis over the radio last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, those who heard Fulton Lewis last night know the answer to his excellent address. In effect it would provide that Congress authorize a Distinguished Service Labor Cross—a medal to be given to individual workers or to a group of workers for excellent performance in national-defense work. Every one of us knows that the war cannot be won with men alone, no matter how brave and gallant they are. We know that it must be won with materials of war. We know, Mr. Speaker, that there is no drama—there is often agony of spirit and of mind during the sweat of production. Much of the production is extremely difficult, and is performed under very trying conditions. I shall introduce a bill which will provide that a Distinguished Service Labor Cross be given to individuals or groups who perform exceptionally fine work. I believe other similar bills may be introduced, and I earnestly hope that one of them may pass, and that we may during this great emergency thus express our deep appreciation to those who make possible the materials of war.

Following is a part of Mr. Fulton Lewis' radio talk:

Four thousand workers at the Fairchild airplane factory at Hagerstown, Md.—where primary training planes are made for the Army—today voluntarily informed the company that they will work full time, on Sunday, free of charge, to give to the Army Air Corps two additional training planes, as a demonstration of the fact that they are remembering Pearl Harbor. The company will pay them their usual wages for the day, but those wages will be used to pay for the materials that go into those two training ships, so the men actually will be contributing two complete Army planes.

And that brings up a special item.

You may recall that several weeks ago I mentioned a similar gesture, by the C. I. O. union workers at the North American Aircraft plant, near Los Angeles, Calif.

It's no mere figure of speech, that this war is going to be fought on the benches and machines and production lines, and in the mills and factories of the Nation, as much as on the actual fighting front. We have immense programs under way, for enlarging the defense factories already in operation, and building new ones for the future, to expand production. But the real expansion of production—and this is an expansion that can take place immediately, and is taking place in a great many places—lies in the workers themselves, in their patriotic desire to help, by driving four rivets in the time it normally takes to drive three. There actually are plants in the United States in which production per man has increased 70 percent since Japan attacked the United States on December 7, solely on account of the individual enthusiasm of the workers.

We are giving, in this war, various decorations and honors and military awards, to the men on the fighting front, who perform outstanding service, and exceptional valor. That is just as it should be. But I suggested, in that previous broadcast, that perhaps there should be some equal recognition for outstanding service, and valor of another kind, in the workshops of the Nation, and the factories and the mines.

Since that time, I've gone into the matter rather carefully, and I've discussed it with numerous figures in Congress, and in the administration, and tonight, on this first day of what we hope will be the victory year of 1942, I have a suggestion to make—to Congress, and to the Army and Navy, and to you, ladies and gentlemen.

That suggestion is that a special act of Congress be passed, establishing a Distinguished Service Labor Cross—to have equal rank and dignity and distinction, with the Distinguished Service Crosses of the Army and Navy—this one to be awarded for outstanding meritorious service, on the fighting front at home.

There has been talk in Congress, in fact there's a bill pending now, to permit the Army and Navy to recognize unusual performance, on war production, celluloid buttons for workers in a plant to wear in their buttonholes, with some sort of an emblem on them, that misses the point completely. The mere commonness of those buttons makes them valueless.

This ought to be an award of real distinction. It could go to a union, or to an individual, perhaps to some worker who develops a method of improved production, or better design, an award that would carry real honor, to be awarded on the basis of real military or naval service to the Nation, and to be awarded by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy.

If you have any comments or suggestions, I'd be delighted to have them. I can't promise to answer all of them, but in the meantime, we'll see whether Congress will at least give this Distinguished Service Labor Cross some consideration.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are advised that the program for defense provides and that it is resolved to increase the production rate of airplanes beyond 50,000 a year, to produce 25,000 tanks, launch 150 more fighting ships, and add 600 vessels to its merchant fleet;

To increase our Army to more than two and a half million men, to train more than 70,000 warplane pilots, to enroll more than a million civilian volunteers, and increase arms factory workers by millions;

To more than double output of machine tools, to produce arms five times faster than last year, to mobilize 80,000 industrial plants for war purposes, and to supply food and increased aid to all enemies of the Axis.

It is the business of Congress to compel the carrying out of this program. If that is done we will have a happy but busy new year in 1943. It is in the last analysis the responsibility of the representatives of the people to see to it that the program for victory, for liberty, and freedom is not permitted to be deviated from one jot or tittle, and that we go forward unified, united, to be victorious. We will win this war, we shall make the peace.

WE ARE IN IT

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we are in it—in a world revolution being fought to determine whether the moral foundations of our form of government are to be left standing. Long before we came in, those whom we are beginning to fight declared that democracy was marked for the kill. I could not understand how the isolationists, even then, expected to see our way around it. But I realize that the mere isolationist is as honest and patriotic as I. Our civilization is no product of a sporadic jaunt of human conception. It has come out of many wars, and down from many governments, and is the product of many, many minds. Its backwaters are Greek and Roman culture, and it stem tides from the Christian and Jewish religions. It has ripened into what we frequently call a way of life. There are a few clearly drawn characteristics that identify this way of life.

First. It stands for essential justice toward all men.

Second. The supremacy of the law of all over the will of the few.

Third. The dignity of the individual—the human person.

Fourth. The recognition of the rights of all persons.

Fifth. The proposition that one man can be as good as another to the exclusion of the idea of a superior group.

This is the major point in argument—the one great thing back of this terrible war. The Nazi contention is simply that there exists a superior race, one mighty set of men, whose duty it has become to manage the affairs and determine the doctrines of all people on earth. Of course, this powerful, energetic, and virtuous race is the superior German, with secondary powers of rulership vested in the Italian in the west and the Japanese in the east.

Ours is the principle out of which came the Government of the United States of America, the theme of its Constitution, its Bill of Rights, and most of its laws. We are committed to the belief that the humblest human being has rights, certain natural and inalienable rights, which rights are inviolate. We are opposed to the idea of a master race. The Nazi theory of government clashes with ours, with our culture, and with our way of life in every vital particular. We recognize no master race among the children of men.

This is a struggle of two worlds, and it is a fight to the death. Both cannot exist. There is not room on this one physical earth for two opposing worlds of human behavior. Either the commerce, exchange, and association among the nations will follow the Nazi course or the course defended by the Allies. Let me repeat here what I have fallen into the habit of saying, "This Axis bid for power is a bid for each effective world power as will enable the Axis group to lay hold of the wealth of other nations. It is a plain scheme of robbers, robbers among nations, to secure such a grip on the affairs of the world that it becomes necessary to first subdue the spirit of their people and to subjugate them to the will of the aggressors."

Notwithstanding all their deceit and wicked practices of duplicity, the exponents of the new world order have been frank and free to truthfully accept this fact; indeed, no other way was open to them. It was one category in which they could not attempt to deceive without defeating their own purpose.

In no world conflict revealed by the pages of past history have the issues been more clear or the lines more sharply and definitely drawn. This is a staggering bid for unbridled power with the world as its scope.

We know our cause and we know the enemy. Surely we know our duty. We have in our great and beloved country vast resources, with courageous and God-fearing people. At last we are in thorough accord and unity. Our great-great-grandchildren must be proud of the account we render.

I thank you.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DIRECTOR OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks I may quote briefly from an editorial in the New York World-Telegram dated December 30, and from the Washington Merry-Go-Round dated January 2, and from a part of an address delivered at city hall yesterday by Mayor LaGuardia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I addressed the House and I appealed to the President of the United States to replace Fiorella LaGuardia as Director of Civilian Defense. As you know, Mr. LaGuardia occupies at least four different offices. As mayor of New York City he has a man-sized task; as National Director of Civil Defense he has another full-time post, requiring a director of ability, patience, and imagination. The other posts are equally important and deserve the attention of a trained diplomat and statesman. Mindful of the manifold duties attached to these places, it is unreasonable to expect from an average man such qualities of leadership and administrative genius.

Because of the extraordinary demands on the Director of Civilian Defense, to faithfully and competently discharge the obligations of office, I now plead with the President to release Mr. LaGuardia so that at least New York City will have a full-time mayor and the people of the United States will have their interests tended by a full-time Director of Civilian Defense. At the time of my previous denunciation on the floor of the House we were going through a campaign in our city, and most of the newspapers decried the request on the ground of politics. Since that time, however, the newspapers are unanimous in their denunciation of Mr. LaGuardia, his manners, his conduct of the office, and his neglect not only of the mayoralty of the city of New York but of the office of Director of Civilian Defense. Today, in the name of seven and one-half million people of my city, I plead with the President to replace Mr. LaGuardia in the office of Director of Civilian Defense.

During the last campaign the press were most considerate of Candidate LaGuardia, but today they realize their blunder. He was recommended as the superman capable of doing anything and everything, including insulting editorial writers who had the termerity to question his conduct. The Washington Merry-Go-Round has the following to say this morning:

WASHINGTON.—Fiorello LaGuardia is a good mayor of New York. He is still remembered in the House for far-sightedness, peppery statesmanship. But as Administrator of Civilian Defense the Little Flower has been a flop.

This didn't matter much while the country was still at peace. But now, with blackouts, first-aid training, bomb protection, very real civilian defense becomes vital.

Fiorello continues to want to boss the whole show, still cannot delegate authority, still has vigorous differences with Mrs. Roosevelt, even to the point of reaching into her division and firing two of her aides. This caused sparks to fly. The irate First Lady rehired her assistants.

Differences between the mayor and Mrs. R. illustrate some of the things which may be wrong with civilian defense.

BANDMASTER

Fiorello, in the first place, can't get out of the habit of thinking in terms of the bandmaster or theatrical producer. (His father was an Army bandmaster.) He sees uniforms, fire hats, sensational rescues.

Mrs. Roosevelt believes civilian defense must be built from the ground, from the poor people, who haven't the price of uniforms, of people who have been the backbone of civilian defense in England. She sees the picture in terms of morale building and long-range work, even in communities where bombs may never fall.

This difference came out sharply when LaGuardia announced that civilian defenders would have smart, costly uniforms designed by Hattie Carnegie. Mrs. Roosevelt's friends say he wanted the defenders to be slim, slender, stylish, parading down Fifth Avenue, saluting him in the reviewing stand.

But Mrs. Roosevelt wanted simple folk who would join for real service, in a costume costing not more than $3.

LaGuardia necessarily has had to spend much of his time in New York, but insists on passing on minute details. His office once had to fly an assistant to New England to catch the mayor and get his initials on some page proofs for a bulletin.

To ease LaGuardia to the sidelines, Roosevelt first offered the job to Wendell Willkie, has since been considering appointment of a chief executive who would really do the job. More recently, Roosevelt's friends have urged a housecleaning, holding he must profit by the lessons of the Churchill cabinet, that the time has come when personal friendships cannot supersede wartime efficiency.

The New York-World Telegram, on December 30, 1941, published this editorial:

NOT "COMMEDIA" NOR "FINITA"

The public cannot pass over lightly the resignation of a highly efficient municipal department head like Markets Commissioner William Fellowes Morgan, Jr.

Nor can the public accept Mayor LaGuardia's shrugging attempt to dismiss the incident with the Pagliacci line—"the comedy is finished."

It was not comedy. Furthermore, the implications and conclusions involved are by no means finished.

Under stress of too much work on too many jobs, the mayor's natural irascibility and impatience have increased to a point where he cannot treat even one of the most trusted of his administrative aids and supporters with due official consideration.

The dubious LaGuardia habit of dictating departmental appointments is now made worse by pressure and lack of time, which prevent the mayor from even discussing such appointments with protesting department heads. The latter can either submit or resign.

This is not comedy in the eyes of those who hoped for continued sound municipal administration.

Nor does it make any difference, we think, that one of the appointments in the Morgan case seems to have involved feminine rivalries between the Office of Civilian Defense and the American Women's Volunteer Services.

A mayor too overworked or overwrought to handle such a situation without losing one of the city's most valuable commissioners is, likewise, too overworked or overwrought to direct, at the same time, national civilian defense.

President Roosevelt should realize this, if the mayor doesn't.

Unless a new civilian defense head is appointed and Mayor LaGuardia restored to his sole and full-time mayoralty job in New York, other situations may arise which will be anything but "comedy" for city or nation.

It's the futile LaGuardia two-job struggle and straddle that should be finished.

These excerpts are from the New York Times as of January 2, entitled "Mayor's Address Defending City and Defense Records."

The bill for equipment I told you about has passed the Senate and is now in the House. Oh, I suppose I could stop there, but there is something else to think about. We get no original ideas just now from certain sources which might have helped.

* * * * *

I don't believe there is a person who has written on civilian defense that understands it or that knows what has been accomplished. I make that charge without reservation. There is a great deal of misapprehension about it. I have been asked by some of the very men who have written these articles.

* * * * *

DEPLORES EQUIPMENT LACK

Some have complained that we have no equipment, and the very people that criticized are those who criticized 5 months ago when I asked Congress for this very equipment. You can't blame that on ignorance. There must be another reason.

* * * * *

Let me give you some simple illustration. Criticism was made about the instructions for the protection of school children, and they are using this word "confusion" regarding those sent out from Washington and those issued here in New York. That statement is not true; that is deliberately false, but you can appreciate the terror, the lack of confidence that it puts into the hearts of the mothers of these children. What an unmanly thing to do. My friends, I did not write those instructions. Those rules and regulations were written in the Office of Civilian Defense by a board of the best educators in the entire country.

Only recently we had a test of a so-called air raid. Millions of children scampered around the streets, knowing not where to go. One order from the Department of Education was, "Send them home." Another from the police and fire departments was, "Keep them in." I am sorry to confess that in some cases the principals of the schools were the first ones out. Of course, perhaps they do not know the law of the sea that the captain goes down with his ship. However, our mayor was nowhere to be found. He was thousands of miles away. Today he is assailing the newspapers as two-by-four editors because in their honesty they are printing the story of what actually exists in our city.

The campaign is over. Mr. LaGuardia has been elected. He is going to be mayor for 4 years, regardless of anything that I may say. But I have a solemn duty to my people, and I propose, as often as it is necessary, to stand on this floor and urge the President to correct the situation. We must organize our city. I hope to God nothing ever happens until it is organized under proper auspices, with the proper officials. No man has the human energy to properly fill these two offices. Recently in our city the commissioner of one of our city departments could not see the mayor for days and had to resign because of a tempest in the teapot among the social butterflies now running things for defense.

Our women's organizations are headed by very lovely ladies. They are leaders of society. So a fight was stirred up because a lady was selected from one group rather than another, and the mayor, in his typical way, directed the commissioner to get rid of his "lady friend." Now, that is a gross insult. We know that it infers something wrong. Here is a fine outstanding woman who finds herself catalogued by the mayor of the city in that fashion because of petticoat politics.

That is what we are putting up with in New York City, and I hope it will not be for long.

Mrs. Roosevelt is doing an excellent job, but she has many other tasks to perform. Mrs. Morgenthau is also down there. We have many other very fine and lovely people volunteering their services in our city. But it is impossible to get a decision. The police say, "Don't blow your horns on New Year's Eve." The mayor says, "Blow your horns if you want to." Now, this is not a joke. It is a serious matter. The people of my city are worried. They are concerned. Daily the press is pleading with him and begging with him, and his only answer to all of those things is his typical bragging insult that goes with all of those things. Today I appeal to the President again, in face of the existing conditions not only in my city, but in every other city. I understand the mayor has set up 48 divisions, one for each State, plus an extra one for New York City. But New York City is extra-territorial. Our Governor has nothing to say about our city, as far as the mayor is concerned. The mayor must push that button in the city hall. No one else can push it. What a ridiculous set of circumstances.

This Congress has refused certain funds for the mayor, very properly; and I presume they will do so in the future, but I want the RECORD to show, I want the President to know, if he does not read the newspapers, that we in New York City are bound hand and foot. There is nothing we can do. We plead and beg, but we cannot see the mayor. Yesterday we had the sorry spectacle of a $2,400 stenographer being sworn in as commissioner of markets. She was a very fine lady, to be sure. Fifteen minutes later her resignation was accepted by the mayor. This was merely a mechanism of his own devising to put certain people in office. I have no complaint about that, for that is his responsibility. But here is a man who represents the United States Government, here is a man who speaks for the President, here is a man who acts for the Congress of the United States, and this is the conduct, this is the example he is setting. I was never more serious about anything than I am about this.

Our police department is demoralized, because they do not know where they stand. Our fire department gets new orders every day. We have a young man as acting mayor—a delightful, charming young fellow, but after all not elected by the people.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Yes; I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. After listening carefully to the gentleman's remarks we can conclude only that they have a miniature New Deal up in New York City.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I do not subscribe to that. Mr. LaGuardia is an American Labor Communist. That is not a New Deal, it is a deal of his own.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the general understanding.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Before it is too late, I hope and pray that the President will take such steps as he deems wise to solve the problem of a full-time official in the office of Civilian Defense Chairman, which is now being served by bungling, tumbling, and alibiing Fiorella LaGuardia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LAST YEAR AND NEXT YEAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, are there any more special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last several days I have written letters of sympathy to the humble families of humble boys who died at Hawaii or in the Philippines. Coming as it does at about the time that marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of my enlistment in the United States Army on January 4, 1917, I could not be other than in a devotional state of mind as we ring down the curtain on the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It is rather opportune that the year end and the Congress end should be almost coterminous. It has been a significant Congress. Time and history will appraise it and inscribe on the record its significance and the epic events that happened in the life of this body.

It was rather inspiring to me that the first day of the year should have been designated by our President as a day of prayer. As we measure the magnitude of the task that is before us, I think it was a splendid way to begin the year 1942. I like to go back at the moment and think of this month of January in which we stand today. Its name was derived from the ancient mythological god Janus who had two faces, one in front and one behind—one with which to watch the departing year and find a note of inspiration, the other to look into the future in the hope that it might present something more fruitful and something better for the world and mankind. As I think of the beginning of 1942 as a day of prayer, I wonder if it would not be appropriate to suggest that we have not one day of prayer in 1942 but that every day be a day of prayer? That great mystic crusader, the Apostle Paul, who did so much for the establishment of the teachings of the Man of Galilee, once wrote a letter to the Thessalonians in which he said, "Pray without ceasing." And it has some practical import for us, because, after all, our

prayers are not just cloistered supplications, they represent desire; and in proportion as they represent desire so they build up the effort, the ability, and the power to carry on to achievement the inevitable victory which the President described to us from the rostrum so recently.

I was thinking of Susan B. Anthony on yesterday, because a long time ago when she was carrying on a determined agitation for votes for women a woman in the Midwest said to her:

Oh, Miss Anthony, I am going to pray for you.

Miss Anthony's reply was:

Well, pray for me with your hands and feet. I like prayers that take the form of work.

It will be a timely message in 1942. We must also pray with our hands and feet and heads as we stimulate production and move onward to victory.

There is one thing the Congress can do in 1942, and that is to make emphatic and impressive to the people of the country the magnitude of the task which is before us. You will remember that back in 1917 when Theodore Roosevelt was undertaking to recruit a division to be known as Roosevelt's Own for service in France he made his representations to Newton D. Baker and to President Wilson. At long last President Wilson finally disapproved the idea with a short message, in which he said:

The business in hand is undramatic.

That is one of the great things on the pages of history from the first World War days—"the business in hand is undramatic." The business in hand today is undramatic. We must remember that as we undertake to marshal all of the resources of the country. So the Congress can do a real service in making emphatic to the country the task which is before us so that it might be speedily and undramatically pushed to triumph.

It is a rather amazing thing that the war should come in the Christmas season. I remember that on December 7, in the afternoon, I left the hotel with the first brief radio message ringing in my ears. I ventured forth on the street, where one could hear the cry of the newsboys, who were shouting "Extra; war extra!" As I walked along and looked in the windows I saw the tinsel, I saw the miniature Santa Clauses, I saw the Christmas trees and the evidences of the Christmas spirit. I heard a radio through an open doorway from which came that music of the Little Town of Bethlehem. The spirit of peace on earth was everywhere manifest. The sharp contrast of a serene and peaceful Sunday in the Christmas season with the grim news of an unprovoked and deadly attack must have struck anxiety and turbulence into the minds and hearts of many devout people in the country, whose spiritual resources we must marshal in the present struggle. I recall what Richard the Lion Hearted said in Richard the Third: "My soul's in arms and eager for the fray." I believe that is the sentiment which must be awakened in our country at the present time.

How shall it be done? How shall we cast aside that turbulence and that anxiety from the minds and hearts of a great many people so that unity will be not merely a lack of opposition to conflict but a crystal-clear and militant unity that will provide the sacrifices which are necessary to carry through to victory?

It appears to me that after all there is one issue that will somehow marshal into a great swelling crescendo that requisite unity in the hearts and minds of America. It is the moral issue. Let us reexamine our own cause. What do we want out of this conflict? Nothing, and we shall get nothing. We wanted nothing in the World War and we got nothing. We ask not for territory, we asked for no imperial aggrandizement; today we ask for nothing except a world in which human personality is exalted and that all mankind shall have the opportunity to work out in the great spaces of freedom, their own destiny. That is all we ask for the world. We seek only a guarantee of those ideals which will enoble mankind and the individual and which constitute the last best hope for human progress.

It is not too much to invoke the aid of Providence on our side as we reexamine our cause and examine the cause of our adversaries. I am familiar with the cleavage; I am familiar with the division of spirit which once prevailed and which so speedily melted under the impact of attack and the necessity for complete unity in a crucial hour. All of us on this last day of the session are fully familiar with those things that are a part of the history of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Today as we stand in the very shadow of adjournment of this session, let us put aside for a moment every argument with which we have become familiar and seek common and fundamental ground upon which to stand. Surely, in this crucial hour, there is a cause and a spirit which can and will fire the zeal and eagerness of our people and serve to give direction to their efforts as we prosecute the present conflict.

We need but think back a brief week to the natal day of that Great Teacher whose thundering influence has grown through more than 19 centuries of history. Not only did He bequeath to the world a sustaining hope but a moral code as well which is the very foundation of modern society. Our laws, our customs, our usages are, after all, predicated upon the firm foundation of justice and truth and constitute our concept of what is right and what is wrong.

It is the moral law. It is so easy of application. It admits of no hairsplitting and no fine distinctions. In the conduct and behavior of individuals and nations alike, actions must be measured by the yardstick of right and wrong. And today, as we apply that stern yardstick to the conduct of nations who are our adversaries, our cause stands crystal clear.

It was wrong for Japan to move into China more than 10 years ago, and begin its spoliation of that huge and humble land. It was wrong for the bombers and the troops of Mussolini to hurl destruction upon the peaceful people of Ethiopia. It was wrong for Japan to undertake her open and undeclared war upon China in 1935. Measured by the moral code, it was wrong, and today we find our adversaries pursuing a course which in the judgment of men and history is wrong.

It was wrong for Hitler to dismember the peaceful country of Czechoslovakia; it was wrong for the panzer legions to strike the ancient home of the Poles; it was wrong for the Hitler forces to ravage the quiet countrysides of Belgium and brutally assault the land of the Marsellaise; it was wrong to despoil the quiet villages of the diligent Dutch; it was wrong to bring force to the green countrysides of the Danes; and it was wrong to invade the fjords of Norway and subdue a peaceful people who have contributed so much to the culture and happiness of mankind. All this was wrong. Argue as one will, the moral code rises up to place its stigma upon this conduct of powerful nations, and therein the people of our own country, unselfishly pursuing those ideals of freedom and exalted personality will find a zeal for sacrifice as we wage this war to a complete triumph. And thus, as the curtain rings down upon the labors of this session, we are united in a militant unity to command every resource of the land—material, moral, and spiritual—that the ideal of human freedom may be preserved and that mankind shall go forward to the fulfillment of its exalted destiny.

Victory is but the shadow of complete cooperation. We cannot all go into the lines in uniform any more than that millions could not go into uniform in the first world conflict. But there are other tasks which we can do in the common cause. In our humble way we can touch the zeal and the spirit of our people at home that all of the 132,000,000 people of our land may become happy warriors for freedom.

And, finally, let me reecho what has been said so often in recent days. The times cry for patience and for hope. Patience we shall require to meet bad news and hope we shall command until our task is done. What better note could one strike as we venture into the pages of 1942 than to say with that poet who wrote so gloriously of the west wind:

O wind, if winter comes, can spring be far behind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, conceding the truth of what the gentleman from

Illinois has said, that it was a great moral wrong for the Japs and the Germans and for Hitler and the rest of them to do the things they did, there is something else that is wrong, and it is right here at home.

A week ago Wednesday, in the little town of Hamilton, in my home county, a young man whose brother was lost in the Philippines came up to me and, in substance, said, "How come that my brother had to die without the things that were necessary to make a fight?"

You can talk all you want to about the wrongs that other rulers or other nations have committed—and I agree with you on that—but how about this wrong, this criminal act of sending our men to die without means of defense? That is a wrong—a crime for which we are to blame—a situation which never again must occur. That boy said to me, in substance, how come that the fighting planes and the bombers and the ships were not provided to aid my brother in making his fight for his country? How come they were over in the other, the Eastern Hemisphere? And did I have an answer? No. There was no answer. Except the one that we had sent the fighting planes, the bombers, the destroyers to aid Britain.

In the days to come, when all those who have so much to say about the necessity and the advisability of fighting right away, of sending an A. E. F. at once, learn that they are not going to get tubes and tires and automobiles, you listen to the squawking, and the loudest squawk will come from those who advocated immediate war, and that without thought of preparation. How is it that today the newspapers, the editorial writers, and the columnists want us to go here and there and all over, when they know we have nothing to go with? Look back over their files and their records, and you will find that those are the newspapers that have opposed every bit, every piece of pension legislation. They opposed vigorously the payment of the soldiers' bonus. They gave us hell for giving the veterans a bonus. They are willing to make veterans, but they are loath to provide for them or their dependents.

I hope this Government of ours cracks down to the bitter end in its drive for victory. I hope we take away the tires and the tubes and the automobiles and the chewing gum and the cigarettes and the beer and the whisky and a thousand other things we do not need and use the savings for guns and ammunition and all the things the soldiers need.

A VOICE FROM THE FLOOR. Not the whisky.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; the whisky. Why let some drink themselves drunk while others die? Take away the luxuries, too. People count them necessities, but we do not need them. Take them away until this war is brought home to every mother's son of us, until every last one of us begins to pay.

Dig up that old bill I offered long ago to tax the salary of a Congressman 35 percent, and see what you have to say about it. I know it is not popular and I know it will not get me any votes next November, either, but long, long ago I advocated giving a piece of this war to everyone. And if that pie is made of sawdust, instead of some juicy fruit, let us all have a piece—and be made to eat it. This is our war. I hope the first to lose their tubes, their tires, their automobiles, their cocktails, and their dinners down at the swank hotels will be the Senators and the Congressmen. I should like to see them go back and eat a little cornmeal mush and a baked potato without butter or even milk gravy. I should like to see, and it is going to be my purpose as far as I can to try to see that every red cent which we appropriate goes for the boys who are doing the fighting, and to see that we who stay here at home do not squawk too much over something that does not hurt us.

Let us go back to that man who, when someone complained about his shoe pinching, said, "Well, brother, that is all right, I feel sorry for you, but you notice I do not have any legs."

That is the kind of spirit we should have, coupled with a willingness to sacrifice willingly and gladly that the boys who die fighting for you and for me may have every single thing they need. That all those who are not hurt, who only think they are, quit their squawking and think of and act for the men who are doing the fighting. To support the fighting men wherever they may be is the cause to which I propose to dedicate my services.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we are about to conclude a record-breaking session of Congress. This session of 365 days, one of the longest in the history of the National Legislature, made some of the most epochal decisions in 150 years. Appropriations and contract authorizations approved in the present session total $61,773,000,000, as compared with appropriations and contract authorizations aggregating $36,000,000,000 during the 1917–18 World War Congress, which met for 354 days.

When this session convened in January 1941, we were a nation at peace; as we conclude, we are a nation at war. When we convened, the people of this Nation were confused in their thinking and leading citizens were at odds. As we conclude, national unity is the order of the day. America is aroused and bending every effort and enlisting every resource to achieve final and complete victory.

It is only meet and fitting, then, that we reflect upon some of the high lights of this momentous session.

At this session of Congress we declared war upon Japan, Germany, and Italy; enacted the lend-lease bill and two resultant appropriation bills to implement the measure; revised the neutrality law to permit arming of our ships and their dispatch into any and all waters and ports; amended the draft bill removing all limitations on the service of the selectees.

Congress can justly be proud when the roll of its accomplishments is called.

For my part, I am proud that I have been privileged to serve my constituency in this session and to know that I voted consistently for all these necessary defense measures.

While we are justified in taking inventory of our achievements, yet we must at the same time, without pause or respite, plunge into the grave work that lies ahead.

At this time I beg leave to read an editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun of January 1, 1942:

A WAR SESSION OF CONGRESS CLOSES

During the year-long session which formally closes tomorrow Congress has had to deal with a multitude of momentous questions, including the choice between war and peace. Members of both Houses have struggled with the complexities of finance and production, with doubts and hesitations, and with their own consciences as legislators have not had to do since 1918. They may not have taken the right turning in every instance, but in general their reactions were such as to generate fresh confidence in the processes of legislation by representative assemblies in a free country.

The climax of the session came with the successive declarations of war on the Axis Powers. But long before events made those declarations inevitable Congress had been wrestling with fundamental issues of the national security. Enactment of the lend-lease bill and of the two consequential appropriation bills to implement that measure; the amendment of the neutrality law to permit the arming of our ships and their dispatch into whatever waters circumstances might require; the amendment of the draft law removing all limitations on the service of the selectees—these and many other matters brought Congress face to face with issues comparable in seriousness to those finally provoked by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

On each and every one of these matters Congress gave a good account of itself. Further achievements of scarcely less importance are to be found in the appropriation bills lifting national commitments under the defense program to seventy billions; in the new revenue bill designed to add $3,500,000,000 to Federal tax yields; in the study of nondefense economies through the Byrd committee; and in the investigations conducted by groups in both the Senate and House into the progress of the defense program and the operations of so-called defense contract brokers.

On these matters the session now concluding has felt a record of real achievement. On the other hand, the record shows a conspicuous blindness and a great deal of shilly-shallying on other issues equally as important. The long record of temporization with the price-control bill in the House forms the worst feature of the session. This bill, which was asked by the administration as long ago as last August, did not get through the House until the end of November. The Senate Banking Committee has so far handled the measure with dispatch, and if present indications are followed, the bill is due to come up on the floor of the Senate early in the new session. The utmost vigor and decision will be needed in this connection to redeem the unfortunate situation which delays in the House created.

Another bad blot on the congressional record is to be found in the subservient way in which the demands of the agrarian pressure groups for larger appropriations and more liberal loans were accepted. This subservience

was particularly marked in the Senate, which time after time voted for farm handouts far in excess of those given in any previous year.

This prodigality with public moneys for a favored group would have been objectionable in any circumstances. It was almost shameful in an emergency period in which natural forces were pushing farm prices up and in which the farmers were also benefiting from heavy expenditures for food for Britain under the lend-lease program. The Byrd committee's proposals for retrenchment in the farm program will afford the new session one opportunity to erase the bad record of 1941, and there will doubtless be other opportunities of similar nature as the session progresses.

These are only two of the tasks bequeathed to the session of 1942 by the session of 1941. There will be many others. After price control the most important subject before the new session will be that of taxation. Nondefense economy in general along the lines suggested by Secretary Morgenthau and charted by the Byrd committee will come next. Labor legislation will also require attention, and there will be many other matters arising from the conduct of the war which will call for prompt and prudent action by Congress. Let us hope that the response will be such as to heighten our faith in the adaptability of democratic institutions to the urgencies of a world-wide crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this apt and timely editorial presents in a clear and constructive fashion a fair appraisal of the achievements of this session but at the same time concludes with a penetrating analysis of some of the weighty problems that await attention and require our prompt action in the session which lies ahead.

In view of the privilege that has fallen to my lot of making the concluding address to this session of Congress, I cannot refrain from suggesting that we all do here resolve to approach the session which lies before us with courage, industry, and humility so that by our cooperation and every act our armed forces may the sooner achieve complete victory over the forces of aggression.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following agency, The Panama Canal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TABER, for 2 weeks, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore:

H. R. 4932. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Friday, January 2, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 528. An act to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone; and

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, the Chair declares the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on January 3, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4932. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo.

APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS

A message from the President informed the House that he had, on the following dates, approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

December 31, 1941:

H. R. 528. An act to incorporate the Union Church of the Canal Zone.

H. R. 5822. An act to establish a military code for the Territory of Alaska.

January 5, 1942:

H. R. 4932. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Kemmerer, Wyo.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization on Wednesday, January 7, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 6250.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1200. A letter from the Director of Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a detailed statement of the expenditure of the appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1201. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1202. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1203. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1204. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1205. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of contracts awarded under the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1206. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make available for the purposes of civilian defense, such arms, munitions, supplies, and equipment for instructional and demonstrational purposes only as can be spared by the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1207. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a recommendation for changes in the recommendation made on November 13, 1941, by the Attorney General with regard to section 5 of the act of June 25, 1929 (46 Stat. 41); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1208. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the reports of inspections, 1,058 in number, of the records and accounts of disbursing officers of the Army, made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, by officers of the Inspector General's Department or others detailed for that purpose; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. SCRUGHAM introduced a bill (H. R. 6295) to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 4, relative to refraining from action calculated to exempt from State and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, for contractors in the performance of certain contracts with the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 6296. A bill for the relief of Anne Berbig and Alfred E Berbig, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 6297. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the

District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2223. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Petition of the Emergency Peace Committee of Tacoma, Attorney Rex S. Roudebush, chairman, in the form of a telegram to Congressman JOHN M. COFFEE, of Tacoma, Wash., pointing out that Lt. Gen. Henry Arnold has declared that the Lindbergh application for return to duty in the air force indicates a definite change from the isolationist standpoint; asserting that such allegation by General Arnold is wholly erroneous and is made without any foundation whatsoever; urging that General Arnold forthwith be retired as having thereby demonstrated his ineptness and prejudices, and contending that he wishes to contribute to disunity and dissension within our country; averring that Arnold has placed himself beside Admiral Kimmel; insisting that such officials be eliminated before thousands more young lives are sacrificed; asseverating that Arnold's opposition to long-range pursuit planes reveals his incompetence; and therefore urging that the United States Government forthwith displace General Arnold; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2224. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the Peace Officers' Association of Oakland, Calif., to immediately adopt House bill 5727 (or some measure of like purpose), which would provide protection of persons and property from the ravages of fire in bombing attacks or sabotage in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and which would authorize the procurement of materials and supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2225. By Miss RANKIN of Montana: Resolution of the Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council, Missoula, Mont., stating that the President of the United States and the Congress have declared that a state of war exists between the United States of America and the Axis Powers, namely, Japan, Germany, and Italy; and that we pledge our wholehearted support to the President and the Congress in the defense of the Nation and to the Governor in defense of the State of Montana, and to the mayor in defense of the city of Missoula; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2226. By Mr. ROLPH: Joint resolution of the State of California, Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, relative to flood control on the Sacramento River, Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2227. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2228. Also, petition of the Willamette Democratic Society of Oregon, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2229. Also, petition of the Bill of Rights Association of Noroton, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2230. Also, petition of the Japanese-American Citizens League National Headquarters, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign affairs and the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2231. Also, petition of the General Reidge Club of Woburn, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2232. Also, petition of Edmond C. Fletcher, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to praying the impeachment of Francis M. Shea, an assistant attorney general of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.